



WHOSE BODY IS IT ANYWAY?

A Corpus Study of Transgender Representation in Children's Fiction

The portrayal of gender in children's fiction is highly influential in children's constructions of values and ideologies. A wealth of analysis points to findings of highly stereotypical depictions; females are passive, domestic and nurturing while males are active, aggressive and outdoors-orientated. However, the dichotomous concept of male-female no longer represents contemporary society, with modern understanding of gender identity existing upon a scale. The presentation of non cisgender identities in children's fiction is as yet relatively unstudied and this dissertation takes the first steps into considering transgender portrayals. Using a triangulation of Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Analysis, the use of body-parts within four award-winning transgender novels was considered. The study of keyness (unexpectedly high frequency of a lexeme) and concordance lines (keywords in context) produced both quantitative and qualitative results, which were then discussed as a whole. Findings showed that cis-male characters were portrayed stereotypically, as aggressive and dominant. Cis-females demonstrated both masculine and feminine behaviours, but were primarily nurturing towards transgender characters. Trans-females were highly passive and feminine, while trans-males were underrepresented and lacked agency. The impact of non-heterosexual relationships and the narrative style of books featuring trans-male protagonists were identified as avenues for future consideration.



ELOISA MAE LILLYWHITE

Supervisor: David Hornsby

11 May 2018

Word Count:10,904

1. Introduction	2
2. Cisgender Representation in Fiction	3
3. Approaches to Discourse Analysis	8
4. Methodology	
4.1 Research Questions	11
4.2 The Corpus	11
4.3. Focusing Analysis	12
4.4 Keyness	13
4.5 Concordance Lines	13
5. Results	
5.1 Keyness	15
5.2 Concordance Lines: Head	17
5.3 Concordance Lines: Arms	20
5.4 Concordance Lines: Legs	23
6. Discussion	
6.1 Keyness Discussion	25
6.2 Concordance Line Discussion	26
6.3 Knees, Shoulders, Hands and Face	31
7. Final Discussion	32
8. Conclusion	35
9. References	36
10. Appendix	39

1. Introduction

If one wants to consider ideologies presented through children's fiction, there is a wealth of analysis available. As an all-pervasive construct in life, gender identity is always apparent in literature and therefore highly conducive to analysis, providing a plethora of data on the portrayal of cisgender characters. The importance of considering gender representation in literature has long been established. Literary works are not written in a sociological vacuum but created under the influence of normative rules and stereotypes. Fiction in particular has been shown to not only reflect, but also perpetuate, societal values and ideals (Eggings and Ledema, 1997). It is surprising then, that the comprehensive analysis of gender portrayal has not yet expanded to consider transgenderism, a key concern of contemporary society. It is paramount to encompass concepts of gender fluidity into linguistic analysis in order to contemporise outdated frameworks and enrich future research.

Transgenderism is the phenomena of one's sense of gender identity being incongruent to natal sex. The number of adolescents seeking medical intervention for gender dysphoria (the experience of distress caused by such an incompatibility) has increased more than 14-fold since 2009 (The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, 2018). The passing of England's Gender Recognition Act of 2004 gave people the right to apply to change their gender on legal documents, and in 2013, diagnostic manuals declassified gender non-conformity as a psychiatric disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Despite these, and many other, progresses in the spheres of law and medicine, linguistic study of transgender representation in literature is concerningly underdeveloped. As this is a relatively new area of research, it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to offer an exhaustive account of all transgender representation in literature. It is, however, hoped that results found here highlight trends that may be expanded upon with future research.

2. Cisgender Representation in Fiction

Fiction written for young readers is particularly influential in the emphasis of ideologies as it is often children's primary representation of societal values (Gooden and Gooden, 2001). Message influence correlates with a reader's immersion level; children display high immersion in fiction and are therefore highly susceptible to the ideologies presented there (Dickman and Murnen, 2004). Many studies have looked at Caldecott Medal books, an award given annually to the most distinguished American picture books for children up to fourteen years old (American Library Association, 1999). Due to the prestigiousness of the award, Caldecott Medal winners are easily attainable in schools and libraries, and usually form part of a child's core reading scheme. Their prevalence, and therefore their wide reach, makes them a key candidate for analysis.

In one of the first comprehensive studies of gender representation in children's picture books, Weitzman et al (1972) conducted a statistical analysis of 18 Caldecott winners. They discovered that female characters were underrepresented in all aspects of the books; titles, illustrations, narratives and central roles. When female characters were present, they were mostly featured in insignificant, backgrounded roles, limited to watching or helping. Girls were passive, remained indoors and were restricted by their clothing while boys were engaged in energetic activity and displayed self-confidence and independence. To test the representativeness of their results, Weitzman et al repeated their analysis on different groups of books; Newberry Award winners, Little Golden Books and those described as 'etiquette books' (1972: p.1127). The Newberry Award is given to denote the best books for school age readers and are often found in libraries and schools alongside Caldecott winners. Little Golden Books was a highly popular series, easily accessible to the general populace, and the titles chosen for analysis each sold over three million copies. Etiquette books were those explicitly focused on prescribing 'proper' behaviour for boys and girls, and providing advice on 'appropriate' future aspirations. All groups mimicked the findings of Caldecott books, primarily that

female characters were passive, subservient or inconspicuous, while male characters were active, agentic and independent.

Many studies since then have arrived at similar conclusions. In an updated analysis, Williams et al (1987) followed Weitzman's procedure to study the subsequent 53 Caldecott winner and runner-up books. They discovered a significant trend towards egalitarian representation, in terms of character count. The number of female characters rose in narratives, titles and illustrations. Despite this, girls were still more likely to be depicted in domestic roles, indoors and immobile. They demonstrated nurturing behaviour and acted at the behest of other characters, but did not share any defining features besides. Male characters were likely to be outdoors, engaged in active pursuits, or involved in something tantamount to the narrative's progression. Female career aspirations were non-existent, and males were restricted from emotional displays.

Later content analysis of children's books complemented this discovery of a shift towards equal quantification, while characters maintained stereotypical roles. Female characters were often shown interacting with household items but male characters were rarely displayed in domestic pursuits (Crabb and Bielawski, 1994). Boys were achievement orientated, while girls shared traits of being clumsy, unintelligent and incompetent (Tsao, 2008). In terms of emotion, male characters were heavily restricted in their demonstrations and the majority of emotional displays were due to anger or pride. Females, on the hand, were emotional to the point of overreaction and demonstrated a large range including fear, happiness, guilt, and sadness (Plant et al, 2000). Even feminist tales, consciously written to depict highly agentic female protagonists, displayed similar stereotypical patterns. Female power was only acceptable when used for the good of others, and heroines were often tasked with mitigating male physical dominance or emotional cruelty with tenderness and gentleness (Jackson, 2001).

Studies conducted at the turn of the century described a significant improvement in the representation of female characters. The number of females and males as main characters reached

almost equality through a conscious effort to publish more examples of books depicting female characters in non-traditional roles. The occurrence of traits and behaviours deemed masculine or feminine were catalogued in a range of children's fiction books, and analysis often came to the conclusion that females were more likely to display masculine traits than previously. For instance, females could demonstrate assertiveness, confidence or self-reliance without being negatively portrayed (Evans and Davies, 2000). However, the categorisation of traits as either masculine or feminine was often based upon guidelines offered in previous studies, such as those defined by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Created in 1974, the BSRI measures people's psychological view of themselves, in regards to their gender identity. It achieves this through the scoring of traits predetermined to be masculine or feminine, decided by questionnaires about socially desirable qualities. As such, female traits include warmth, gentleness and gullibility, while independence, ambitiousness and assertiveness are deemed masculine (Bem, 1983). At the time of creation, scores on the BSRI reflected society well; gender roles were highly differentiated and restrictive in the western world (Donnelly et al, 2015). There have, however, been no updates to these criteria since their first conception. Demonstrated well by Donnelly and Twenge evaluating contemporary American college students on the BSRI, the scale does not accurately represent current perceptions of gender. Traits that were once defined as masculine, such as narcissism, are no longer considered restricted by group and certain characteristics are considered compatible where once they were mutually exclusive, such as being ambitious but also gentle (2017). As the BSRI does not reflect societal perceptions of gender as it used to, studies that use it as a basis for determining gendered qualities in fictional characters may suffer from misdirection. It is possible that an improved representation of female characters is due only to the measures being used to quantify them rather than an improvement in itself.

Indeed, a deconstruction of discourse often contradicts the trend towards equality claimed by a surface analysis. One such study, conducted by Wharton (2005) used a Critical Discourse Analysis approach to consider the text of books in an official school reading scheme, the Oxford Reading Tree.

At a clause-level consideration, Wharton employed Halliday's transitivity system, which equates grammatical verbs to *processes* and grammatical nouns to *participants* (Halliday, 2014). Processes are subdivided into material (e.g. run), verbal (e.g. tell), mental (e.g. hear) and relational-attributive (e.g. be). Female and male characters had an almost equal representation in material processes, but males were much more frequent in others, i.e. females and males *did* the same amount, but males *said*, *sensed* and generally *were* more. This was attributed to the conscious effort of authors to bolster female representation as active participants. Books that did not achieve this were often labelled sexist and unlikely to be distributed. However, Wharton's perhaps most interesting discovery was that of the 'male buffoon' (2005: p246). Male characters were inclined to commit errors in which they behaved inappropriately, causing a minor accident. Incompetency was always displayed in domestic tasks, rather than a sphere more often attributed to male dominance, such as paid employment, and most importantly was mitigated with humour. Other characters laughed, the culprit laughed, and readers were encouraged to laugh along with humorous captions. Ineptitude was not considered a socially desirable masculine trait on the BSRI, yet male characters in this role were being presented positively. Wharton's study demonstrated an inequality of gender representation, resistant to overt attempts of correction by educational authorities. However, a key point is that it also demonstrated the ineffectiveness of the BSRI in capturing current society's conceptions of socially desired behaviour in males and females.

It is not just children's fiction that demonstrates gendered narratives. All discourse is implicit in the presentation of ideologies and stereotypical presentation of males and females has been found in numerous forms of media. Steyer (2014) found television and video games presented females as passive, needing male assistance and placed in domestic, nurturing roles. Adult 'chick-lit' is a genre centered around powerful women and yet females were naïve, easily tricked, and surprised by events. The characters were often reinvented as innocent and helpless during the meeting with their 'ideal' man, who was usually more powerful than them physically and socially (Gill and Herdieckerhoff, 2006). The concept of benevolent sexism, where females are idealised or romanticised, touted as fragile and

needing a man's assistance, has been shown to be prevalent in many forms of discourse (Glick and Fiske, 2001). A reoccurring trend in literature is the use of the body to enforce stereotypical idealisations of gender. In children's primers, female characters were prone to demonstrating softness and communal spirit by holding objects close to their body, in what Jackson and Gee (2005) termed the 'cuddle factor' (2005:p120). Mothers adopted modest, submissive positions by bending at the waist rather than kneeling down like the fathers, and minimising their physical presence by sitting, tucking themselves up or crossing their legs. In studies of body-part representation in magazines, Motschenbacher (2009) found a divide between the outside view, or *Körper*, and inside view, or *Leib*; males were more frequently described with reference to body parts that were inside the skin, such as muscles, that had a practical value, while females were described by attributes outside the body, such as hair, that had an aesthetic value. The constant reiteration of this alternating focus has been argued to influence readers' perceptions of gender conformity (e.g. Jeffries, 2007).

There is a wealth of data to demonstrate that gender ideologies presented in fiction directly impact a reader's perceptions of themselves, and of others. Children that consistently read stories deemed non-sexist display a reduced tendency to stereotype sex-roles (Barclay, 1974). In narratives where gender discrimination is defeated, readers show less stereotyped attitudes towards jobs and 'permissible' activities (Campbell and Wirtenberg, 1980). Preschool children who are presented with non-traditional reading material show a marked increase in their consideration of future occupations suitable for both males and females (Trepanier-Street and Romatowski, 1999).

The portrayal of cisgender characters has been remarkably consistent since early analysis. The question now would appear to be how new concepts of gender alter the status quo. Perhaps transgender characters are enveloped into a dichotomous representation, with trans-males being presented in the same ways as cis-males, and trans-females as cis-females. They may be linguistically represented as four distinct groups, or analysis may find that the introduction of gender fluidity has interrupted concepts to such an extent that there are no longer distinguishable classes of gender at

all. In short, if transgender identities contravene heteronormative concepts of gender, how are they represented in relation to gendered stereotypes in fiction, and in relation to their cisgender counterparts?

3. Approaches to Discourse Analysis.

There are numerous approaches open to researchers looking to identify character portrayal in text. Some previous studies have been conducted within a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach, seeking to identify and explain covert messages within discourses. Texts exist within a complex intertextual and socio-political context and the interaction of a discourse, and its readers, with these influences is a key premise of the CDA framework. However, just as readers interpret a text differently, with regards to their own principles and beliefs, it has been argued that researchers do the same (e.g. Stokoe and Smithson, 2001). As Goatly (2004) described, there are three different methods to analysis; to approach a discourse with preconceptions of ideologies and look for evidence within a text, to identify consistently reoccurring ideologies apparent within the text itself and afford them a detailed look, or to analyse everything without expectations and let the discourse pronounce hidden trends. By definition of its premise, approaching a discourse from a CDA framework limits researchers to the first approach. While this has many uses, it is not impartial and approaching a text with preconceptions may influence a researcher's interpretations (see Weatherall, 2000 for this argument).

Working under the premise that linguistic investigation is better informed by authentic communication, Corpus Analysis (CA) utilises statistical analysis to identify reoccurring patterns in natural language and seeks to explain how these features interact with interlocutors' ecological context. A corpus program, a digital application that collates and organises files in a corpus, is used to facilitate analysis. The program used in this dissertation is AntConc 3.4.4 (Anthony, 2014a). For a full discussion of its capabilities and programming features, see Anthony 2014b. Corpus linguists often take a 'bottom-up' tactic, in that they approach a corpus with a set of hypotheses then are directed in

their analysis by the data. All linguistic patterns identified as statistically salient must then be explained. As corpora are usually very large and are analysed electronically, a CA approach reduces the possibility of researchers selecting (whether deliberately, or subconsciously) data that actively confirms or denies their hypotheses. Mackiewicz and Thompson (2016) provides a comprehensive breakdown of the methodological principles and aims of CA that have not been discussed in depth here.

Each approach, and indeed many others available, has strengths and weaknesses. In a study looking at whether these different methods contrast or complement each other, Baker and Levon (2015) adopted a triangulated approach. A corpus of newspapers was analysed by both methods, under the pretence of considering the portrayal of masculinity in the British press. These two methods were conducted independently then results were compared. Although both CA and CDA discovered findings that the other method did not, the sets of results were not contradictory. The researchers proposed a triangulation method for future research, i.e. different methods could be employed independently as long as results were eventually collated and discussed as a whole. This method updated Baker et al's 2008 proposal that CA and CDA must be amalgamated into simultaneous analysis to produce comprehensive findings. It is the updated method that this dissertation follows.

To that end, this study partially emulates an approach taken by Hunt (2015). Looking at the representation of cisgender characters in J.K.Rowling's Harry Potter books, Hunt used corpus program AntConc 3.2.1W (Anthony, 2007) to analyse keywords in a three step process. First, their keyness was considered. Keyness is the actual frequency of a lexeme, or word cluster, in a corpus, compared to its expected frequency, predicted by usage in a reference corpus. A high keyness level, and thus a statistically significantly higher frequency of a keyword, has been argued to indicate a preoccupation with that aspect of reality within the corpus (Fairclough, 2015). However, keyness only indicates salient concepts, which must then be analysed. To this effect, Hunt considered the most frequent collocates of each keyword. A collocation can be defined as the co-occurrence of two words, or word

clusters, within a predetermined span, usually 5 words (Sinclair, 1991). Collocations create connotations which can be strongly evaluative; a consistent use of collocates from a particular semantic field contributes to the very denotation of a word, in what Sinclair terms semantic prosody (1991). These implicit meanings represent and construct the values and dispositions of the author and the societal group they represent (Mautner, 2009). To complement the quantitative findings, Hunt conducted a qualitative analysis of the discourse by considering concordance lines (or Keywords in Context/KWIC). As the name suggests, KWIC lines are the lines of text that the keyword appears in. It is not only within close word spans that connotations can be constructed, but across larger sections of text, termed discourse prosody (Baker, 2006). As the sense of a word can often be more important than its frequency (see Baker, 2004 for example), considering concordance lines allows keywords to be grouped according to sense or structure to identify their influence.

Hunt found that the use of the body was heavily gendered and there was a disparity in agency; male characters were agentic, females were passive. Males were physically active and interacted with important plot items, while females were incapacitated by emotion, requested permission, and needed male assistance in physical tasks (2015). Due to the novels' preoccupation with intolerance towards discrimination, it is probable that the triangulated approach described by Baker and Levon (2015), coupled with the consideration of body part usage, rather than a more overt aspect of the narrative, allowed Hunt's findings to come to light. At the very least, it demonstrated an impartial and comprehensive methodological approach which seems a good way to open considerations of a new avenue: the representation of transgender characters in children's fiction.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Questions

The breadth of study that could be conducted on the relatively unknown area of transgender portrayal in fiction was far beyond the capabilities of one dissertation. Research here focused on one aspect: the use of body parts of transgender and cisgender characters in fiction written for a young adult audience. The questions to be addressed were as follows:

- In terms of agency, how are transgender characters represented in comparison to cisgender characters?
- Are cis and trans characters presented as four separate groups, with distinct behaviours, or if not, how are they categorised?

4.2 The Corpus

The corpus contained four young adult novels, each with a transgender protagonist. As a prestigious award presented to distinguished books revolving around an LGBT theme, the Lambda Literary Award is a high level of literary endorsement and was taken to indicate widespread popularity of award winners as they are easily accessible at libraries, schools, and bookshops. Once a comprehensive list of winners and finalists in the transgender category was compiled, a random number generator was used to select two books centered around a trans-male character, and two around trans-females. This was to facilitate comparison as books often involved only one transgender character and where more than one was featured, they were usually of the same identification, i.e. books revolving around a trans-female rarely featured trans-male characters, and vice versa. To ensure widespread availability of the novels, three bookshops in different counties were checked for stock; all four books were found to be available at all locations. This was felt to be important as an easily accessible book has the potential to influence a higher number of readers.

The resulting corpus was comprised of *Luna* (Peters, 2004), *I am J* (Beam, 2011), *Beautiful Music for Ugly Children* (Cronn-Mills, 2012), and *If I Was Your Girl* (Russo, 2016). When necessary to be divided into sub-corpora for the purpose of analysis or comparison, *Luna* and *If I Was Your Girl* comprised the henceforth MtF corpus, centered around a transgender female, while *I am J* and *Beautiful Music for Ugly Children* featured trans-male protagonists, forming the FtM corpus. Henceforth, these novels shall be referred to as (L), (IJ), (BM) and (YG).

To ensure only the immediate story was analysed, each novel was converted to text file and had its title pages, forewords, and other sections not constituting part of the narrative, removed to produce the *cleaned* data. Instances of body parts were manually identified and *tagged* to identify the owner; [F] denotes a cis-female, [TF] denotes trans-female, [M] is cis-male and [TM] is trans-male. Both the cleaned and tagged texts were used for analysis purposes, depending on the requirements of the corpus program at each stage.

4.3 Focusing Analysis

Using the cleaned data, an independent wordlist was created for each sub-corpora, to show the frequency of every lexeme used. Lists were created separately to avoid potential influence from unidentified disproportionate focus in any one text. For example, if it was found FtM texts heavily focused on *ankles* while MtF had a high frequency of *eyebrows*, this would have skewed the wordlists and insinuated that transgender fiction as whole shared these focuses. As it turned out, both wordlists were remarkably similar, so this was an unwarranted concern.

The first twenty body parts on each wordlist were identified and any that did not appear on both lists were disqualified for analysis. The full lists can be viewed in the appendix. Of the seventeen co-occurring keywords, *chest* was discounted due to time restraints: the homophones would have had to have been separated by meaning and, as *I am J* revolves quite heavily around a storage chest, it is probable that it would not have featured in the top 20 following the additional coding.

Keywords were further restricted on the consideration of their ability to demonstrate characters' agency. This resulted in the selection of seven lexemes: *arm, hand, head, face, knee, leg* and *shoulder*.

4.4 Keyness

The Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen (LOB) corpus, compiled of a million word collection of British English texts, was used as a reference corpus- in particular, subsection K, which is built of general fiction (Leech et al (1981-1986). The cleaned corpus was used to compute keyness statistics (the measure of actual frequency of a lexeme within a text relative to the expected frequency) for each body part keyword. It is worth noting that AntConc does not collate lemmas during keyness computation. As such, singular and plural forms produced individual measures. *Heads* and *faces* were removed from later consideration as they denoted more than one character at a time. As discussed previously, a high keyness level demonstrates a preoccupation within a text. For instance, a keyness of 7 for *toes* and 2 for *fingers* would indicate that *toes* were much more salient in the text, and an explanation for this would need to be considered.

4.5. Concordance Lines

For qualitative analysis, each instance of a tagged keyword (e.g. *shoulders*[TF]) was identified within its line of narrative context. AntConc pre-sets the parameters for KWIC lines to whole words up to 50 characters either side of the keyword. This was accepted as standard measure, although was increased whenever necessary.

Each concordance line was manually coded as to whose body part it was, who or what it was acting upon, and what the primary reason for such action was. This analysis was not approached with a pre-existing framework, i.e. finding examples of predetermined motives such as 'site of aggression'. Instead, every concordance line was interpreted freehand and emerging patterns later identified, in an effort to adopt an impartial, data-driven approach.

To determine reliability of qualitative analysis, a second coder, naïve to the purpose of this study, was given a sample of concordance lines that included all examples considered ambiguous, as well as randomly selected instances across all body parts. To minimise possible influence of preceding KWIC lines on interpretation, each instance was presented independently, over a period of three weeks. The two analyses initially correlated 98.3%: in the instance that coders disagreed, a discussion was held to determine the reason for difference in interpretation, and a consensus was reached.

Once each concordance line had been analysed, over 300 different categories were identified, each involving different motives or participants. Due to time restraints, it was not possible to analyse every result to the depth it deserved and as such, focus was given to reoccurring themes.

5. Results

5.1 Keyness

A keyness result of 3.84 is considered significant at the level of $p < 0.05$ and a result of 6.63 significant at $p < 0.01$. This means that a keyword with a keyness measure under 3.84 is not significantly more frequent than expected, i.e. it does not appear more often in the corpus than would be expected based upon its frequency within the reference corpus. A keyness measure between 3.84 and 6.63 is significantly more frequent in the corpus than expected, with a 95% certainty of not being a chance result. Finally, a keyness level above 6.63 is significantly more frequent, with a certainty of 99%.

Frequency	Keyness	Keyword
19	0.08	legs
17	0.47	knee
13	1.55	knees
17	3.18	shoulders
21	4.76	foot
34	6.37	arm
42	8.56	feet
15	11.06	leg
34	21.23	shoulder
36	23.34	arms
90	33.38	hands
132	35.96	hand
149	58.83	face
173	73.25	head

5.1a FtM Keyness

Frequency	Keyness	Keyword
6	-1.53	knee
24	1.10	legs
20	4.12	foot
27	8.59	knees
17	13.33	leg
46	29.00	shoulders
75	34.87	feet
109	49.98	hands
63	54.05	arms
80	74.61	shoulder
112	79.59	arm
190	83.31	hand
201	106.66	face
249	146.04	head

5.1b MtF Keyness

One keyword, *legs*, demonstrated an insignificant keyness in both the MtF and FtM corpus (1.10 and 0.08) meaning it did not appear more frequently than would be expected. *Knee* was also insignificant in the FtM corpus (0.47) but gave a negative keyness of -1.53 in the MtF, meaning it was unusually infrequent (although not significantly so). The plural lemma *knees* displayed a similar insignificance in the FtM corpus (1.55) but was significant at $p < 0.01$ in the MtF, with a keyness of 8.59. This means that

while it was not found in FtM texts more often than expected, there was a 99% certainty that *knees* was used in MtF texts significantly more than would be predicted. *Shoulders* was also significant at $p < 0.01$ in MtF (29.00) but was insignificant in FtM (3.18). One further keyword, *arm* was significant at $p < 0.05$ in FtM (6.37). All further keywords, in both corpora, demonstrated a keyness score significant to the higher level of $p < 0.01$. While both are acceptable for determining significance, looking at the difference between the keywords that fall in each category identified which aspects the corpora were most centered around.

All MtF significant keywords (at $p < 0.01$) had a strength measure approximately twice as strong as their FtM counterpart, ranked in order of keyness. For example, MtF *arms* had a keyness of 54.05 which was 2.55 times as strong as FtM *shoulder*, with a keyness of 21.23. These keywords appear at the same point in an ascending ranking of keyness. Temporarily discounting keywords significant at only the lower level, MtF had a mean keyness measure 1.93 times that of the FtM ranked counterpart. Even *face* and *head*, the two strongest rated keywords in both corpora, were 1.81 and 1.99 times higher in the MtF corpus.

Legs, while statistically insignificant compared to the reference corpus, displayed a marked tendency to appear in the MtF data compared to FtM. While both values fell below the 3.84 needed to demonstrate a preoccupation in the corpus, the keyword had a keyness strength rating of 13.75 times higher in MtF text. Two other keywords were similarly marked; *arm* and *shoulders*; 12.49 and 9.12 times more present in MtF, respectively.

5.2 Concordance Lines: Head

The use of a character's head distinguished four main classifications; being cocked or shaken (5.2a), site of physical injury (5.2b), site of psychological mechanisms (5.2c), and physically affected by others (5.2d). All instances of these four events are recorded below.

Quantitative analysis reveals that M heads were shaken 15 times, and cocked 5 times in a display of 10 different emotions or actions. As the most frequent, F heads were shaken 27 times and cocked 8, for 16 different reasons, including four demonstrated solely by them, such as 'cocked to laugh':

'Melissa was laughing with her head [F] tilted back- a fake laugh...' (JJ)

Note that as the corpus consisted of continuous text files, rather than hard copies of the books, examples from the text are given in the format of concordance lines, as identified by the software.

TF characters shook their heads 23 times and cocked them 9, for 13 different reasons. Three of these were demonstrated only by TF characters; shaking in anger, cocked to soften reproach, and cocked in surprise. One example of the latter was from (YG):

““Oh,” I said, cocking my head [TF], surprised. “Thank you.””

Finally, TM characters demonstrated the least movement by shaking their heads only 13 times in 4 distinct codes. There were two actions that were demonstrated by only cisgender characters (shaken in dismissal of a person, and cocked in encouragement), while shaken in confusion was only demonstrated by transgender characters.

The full results are displayed in table 5.2a and their importance will be discussed in 6.2.

5.2a SHAKE/COCK HEAD	TM	M	TF	F
Shake in disagreement		4	7	3
Shake in refusal	2	2	5	4
Shake in dismay		4	4	6
Shake in amazement		1	1	1
Shake in anger			1	
Shake to clear thoughts	3	1		1
Shake in dismissal of person		1		3
Shake in dismissal of other				4
Shake in warning		1	1	1
Shake in confusion	1		2	
Shake to say no (amicable)	6	1	2	1
Shake to stop someone talking				1
Shake as refusal to answer				2
Cocked in expectation of another's response			4	2
Cocked in surprise			2	
Cocked to listen		3	1	2
Cocked in rest			1	1
Cocked to soften reproach			1	
Cocked to laugh (deliberate action)				1
Cocked in encouragement		2		2

Characters can be rated in a hierarchy of the number of injuries received (TM:9, TF:6, F:4, M:3). Of the 13 injuries caused by others, M characters were the perpetrators of the majority: 8 in reality and 1 imagined scenario:-

“If she has an older brother, he [M] could bash my head [TM] in...” (IJ)

F characters caused 2 injuries in reality and 1 in a dream. A TM was the perpetrator of one injury to M head, while TF did not cause any.

TM	M	TF	F
Drunk	M Baseball bat	M car	M car
M hit	M threat	Imaginary fall	M car dash
Hungover	TM CD	Dehydration	Imaginary hammer
Imaginary M hit		Coughing (drugs)	Imaginary high heel
M hit		F pull (non violent)	
Hungover		Tree trunk	
Wall (M)			
F handbag			
F dream book			

5.2b INJURIES TO HEAD

Injuries not attributable to another character were categorised as self-inflicted or a result of extraneous forces. Of the former, only transgender characters suffered: TF hit themselves against a tree trunk, and fall in an imagined scenario, while TM suffer the effects of alcohol thrice. Dehydration is an ambiguous concept as it could be attributed to an outside factor (heat) or assigned as self-inflicted due to the character’s lack of self-care. For the purpose of these results, it was erred on assuming character agency. This did not appear to have any major impact as it didn’t alter the final hierarchy of character injury. However, in future studies, this is something to be cautious of; one result does not hold much sway, but a slew of ambiguous readings in a larger study likely would do. As with shaking and cocking the head, the quantitative results offer interesting insight but must not be considered without qualitative analysis, both of which will be discussed in chapter 6.

5.2c PSYCHOLOGICAL	TM	M	TF	F
Replay event			1	
Rehearse		1	1	1
Neg voice	3		3	1
Overwhelmed	4		2	3
Pos sensation			1	1
Work something out	3		1	3
Escape into	4	1	1	
Neg feeling	3			
Judge others	2			
Problem in the head	6			1
Muscle spasm				1
Scream in head	1			
Alarm				2
Disruptive memory				1

The use of *head* was coded as psychological when its primary function occurred internally. For example; ‘...he’d been in the world of his head [TM]’ (II) was coded as ‘escape into’. As with injury, TM characters were most impacted by psychological mechanisms, with 26 instances of 8 different types- 3 of these being the sole domain of the TM. F

characters demonstrated 14 counts of 9 different internal employments of their head, with alarm, disruptive memory and ‘muscle spasm’ (L) not being demonstrated by any other characters. There is a slight decrease of 10 instances of 7 types for TF characters, and only one of these (replay event) is

solely their domain. There is a significant drop in psychological displays for M characters, with only one instance each of 2 employments, both of which are also demonstrated by other characters.

Finally, the head was acted upon by other characters 21 times in total. 9 of these space invasions were performed against F characters while 6 were against TF, 5 against TM and only 1 against M characters. All actions involving restraining were committed by M protagonists,

5.2d TOUCH	TM	M	TF	F
Restrained by M	3		1	2(jokes)
Turned by F		1		
Looked over by X			F	M/TF/F
Touched by F	2		2	1
Touched by TF				3
Touched by M			2	
Touched by TM				

while F characters were most inclined to touch another's head: 6 out of 11 touches were instigated by a F character. TF only touched F heads, while TM did not act upon anyone else's head.

5.3 Concordance Lines: Arm(s)

An initial look at the use of arms brought to attention the wide variety of uses they are put to; the most insightful are recorded here. Instances of contact were coded with regard to who was touched, who instigated the touch, and the primary purpose. For example:

'He catches my arm [F] as I'm whirling to flee. "Don't tell Mom..."' (L)

was coded as TF grab F to stop F. This is marked on table 5.3a under 'grabbed and stopped by'.

F characters were touched on the arm by others most (17), with 47% of touches being instigated by a M character. 35% of F touches were from a TF, while TM only touched F twice and F instigated touch only once. Other than the one F-F touch, cis-female characters only ever grabbed and led TF characters: the one attempt at another action (grabbing TF for TF aid) was rejected. The only other characters to act upon a TF arm were male (to stop TF and to transfer a warning). M characters also acted upon TM arm 4 times; indeed, they were the only character to do so. TM characters were limited in their actions, only acting upon F arms twice (only 7% off all touches by others). Finally, TF characters

touched both M and F, although the latter most. TF touches on M arms were recorded thrice; however, once was while seeking protection, and one on a M in a vulnerable position while drunk. The only accepted contact for a characters own aid were conducted by M on F.

5.3a TOUCHED ON ARM	TM	M	TF	F
Grabbed for own aid by X		TF(DRUNK)	F(FAILED)	M/M/M/M/M
Grabbed and led by X	M		F/F/F/F	M/M
Grabbed and forcibly moved by X	M/M			
Grabbed and stopped by X			M	TF/F/TM
Grabbed by x for emphasis		TF		TM/TF/TF
Grabbed by x for x aid				TF/M
Grabbed by x for x comfort				2TF
Grabbed by x in fear		TF		
Touched for own aid by X	M			
Touched in warning by X			M	

Arms were also retracted to demonstrate emotion. F characters pulled away 4 times, M twice, TM once and one failed attempt, and TF only once. Interestingly, the only characters to retract arms in overt rejection of a situation were TM and M; F arms were retracted in a display of emotion, while the only time TF dropped their arm was in realisation.

Pull away (annoyance)				TM
Pull away (avoid talking)				F
Pull away from assault	M(FAIL)			
Pull away from concern	F	F		
Drop arm (shock)				TF
Drop arm (realisation)			1	
Drop arm (apology)				TF
Drop arm (sad)		1		

Arms were often deliberately crossed. F arms were crossed 3 times and uncrossed once, with the implication that they were crossed beforehand, totalling 4 times in a display of 4 different emotions. M arms were crossed 3 times while uncomfortable or angry, and TF arms were crossed twice, both whilst uncomfortable. TM arms were also crossed twice, but to display distress and expectation. Being emotionally uncomfortable was a significant reason for crossing arms, totalling 45% of the actions.

Cross arms (annoyance)				1
Cross arms (to consider)				1
Cross arms (uncomfortable)		2	2	1
Cross arms (angry)		1		
Cross arms (distress)	1			
Cross arms (expectation)	1			
Uncross (acquiescence)				1

Characters sometimes used their arms to hug themselves. With a significant majority, TF characters hugged themselves 7 times, while TM and F only once and M not at all. Distress was the primary reason behind the action, explaining 78% of these movements. One such instance was:

‘ “...I couldn’t be the son you wanted. I’m sorry.” Wrapping her arms [TF] protectively around herself...’ (L)

Hug self (distress)	1		5	1
Hug self (worry)			1	
Hug self (laughing)			1	

Finally, arms were used by characters to offer comfort, romance and intimacy to others. Due to space limitations, these tables can be found in the appendix (tables 5.3b, 5.3c and 5.3d), but key points will be detailed here. In the interest of clarity, an example of each is given.

TM offer comfort to F:

‘ I go to her and put my arms [TM] around her. “It isn’t anybody’s fault.”’ (BM)

F offer intimacy to F:

‘ “This is my cousin Riley,” Layla said, smiling, an arm [F] around the girl’s shoulder [F].”’ (YG)

M offer romance to F:

‘...he was really sliding his arms [M] around my shoulders [F] and moving in closer.’ (L)

Comfort was given mostly by F (4 out of 7), equally to TM and TF, neither of whom received comfort from anyone else, and only offered comfort to F in return (once each). Male characters were slightly more flexible in offering intimacy, twice to another male (one being a child relative) and once to a female. F characters also received intimacy once from TF and twice from another F. While this was the only instance of TF arms conveying intimacy, F arms acted upon M once, TF once and F twice. Romance, however, shows an inverse trend. The majority of arms being used to convey a romantic touch were cis-male (6 out of 10). These touches were enacted upon TF twice and F four times. TF returned romantic touch to M thrice, while one cis-female character enacted a romantic touch upon TF, once.

5.4 Concordance Lines: Leg(s)

Legs occurred less frequently than arms and were rarely used to interact with another; only 4 instances out of 31 involve more than one character. TF characters used their legs least (6) while TM used theirs 9, and M and F displayed 8 instances each. Trans-female legs acted upon a male character once but were the object of M action in response; lying across M lap, and being moved by M. A female character acted upon trans-male legs once and mutually interacted with male legs once, as

in the following instance, *wrestle*:

‘Which initiated a leg [M/F] wrestling match.’ (L)

Trans-male legs did not act upon any other character, and were only interacted with once. The most interesting results come from a qualitative perspective, which will be

5.4a USE LEGS	TM	M	TF	F
Tuck underneath self				2
Cross legged			3	4
Stretched out				1
Swinging				1
Dangle off ledge	2			
Dangle off bed	1			
Over stool		2		
Over rail	3	2		
Spread wide		1		
Across x lap			M	
Moved by x			M	
Knees to chest			1	
X tap (attention)	F			
Life of their own	2			
Uncross (non-threaten)		1		
Wrestling		with F		
Kicking (temper)		1		

discussed in 6.2 along with the importance of these quantitative findings.

The second prevalent theme is legs as a site of physical violation. In this aspect, TM characters outpaced any others with 4 coded injuries. It is worth noting that, due to limited data, the criteria for ‘injury’ accepted any form of physical violation, whether violent or not, and whether self or other inflicted. M legs were not injured at all, while both TF and F suffered twice each. Of TF injuries, one was self inflicted and one was caused by another character, M. F violations, however, were slightly ambiguous:

‘ “It was a few weeks after my mom broke her leg [F].” (YG)

‘...but all I see is the blood running down her leg [F].’ (L)

In the first, the cause of the injury is not specified, although is implied to be accidental self-injury. The second is not an injury per se, but the F leg is covered in the blood of a TF child.

Three of the four TM cases were self inflicted, although not violent. The fourth was caused by another character (F) but was, again, not violent. Due to the limited number of examples, a quantitative analysis is not particularly informative here, but a later qualitative approach is to be considered.

TM	M	TF	F
‘Pissed guest spot’		Kicked by M	Broken
Pee		Cut self	TF child blood
Pee			
Hormone injection			

5.4b LEG INJURY

6. Discussion

6.1 Keynes Discussion

The majority of keywords demonstrated a significant keyness, meaning that they were evidenced in the corpus more often than would have been expected, based upon their frequency in the 58,000 word reference corpus. Their high usage suggests a preoccupation with the body in both transgender sub-corpora. With an average keyness twice as high, MtF texts display a much stronger concentration on body parts than texts with a trans-male protagonist, cultivating a perception of female (both cisgender and transgender) characters as objects of aesthetic contemplation.

A highly significant keyness (at $p < 0.01$) in both corpora of *leg*, *face*, *head*, *shoulder*, *arms*, *hand* and *hands* showed a fixation on these body parts above and beyond their use in general fiction, and a heavier focus than of *shoulders*, *legs*, and *arm*. The difference between singular *arm* and plural *arms* is possibly due to their usage; a single arm is often a vehicle of interaction with the world, such as by touching or carrying something, whereas plural *arms* suggests an enveloping movement, such as hugging. It is not surprising that the singular form does not display a high keyness: it is likely to feature quite heavily in both this and the reference corpus. The keyness of the plural form, however, suggests a preoccupation with embracing (other characters, themselves or objects) that is not found in general fiction. *Shoulders* are not often used independently of each other (consider shrugging one's shoulders, carrying something over one's shoulders, etc). It is again unsurprising that *shoulders* demonstrates a low keyness; the plural usage is likely to be frequent in both general and transgender fiction. A similar explanation can be applied to *legs*. As a site of movement, they are usually described as a whole unit (consider getting to one's legs, or swinging legs etc) so could be expected to be found frequently in all corpora. It is worth remembering that a low keyness level does not equate to a low frequency. Both *shoulders* and *legs* could have occurred more times than even *head*, but crucially, they did not occur disproportionately and therefore do not demonstrate an unexpected preoccupation within the texts.

Legs were much more frequent in MtF than FtM corpus, despite being insignificant in comparison to the reference corpus. This means that, even though they did not occur more often than would be expected, transfemale centered texts were more concerned than the transmale-centric corpus with describing a character's *legs*. *Arm* and *shoulders* were similarly skewed. As mentioned above, the plural use of these body parts is relatively common in general fiction, mimicking their general use as a whole unit. A possible explanation is that FtM books were not concerned with accounting for typical movement and only focused on body parts (and their uses) that would distinguish them from other characters.

The majority of the above keywords are body-parts primarily concerned with interaction, both with others and with the world. In short, they are body-parts most associated with agency. Their high keyness scores, and thus their disproportionate frequency, would suggest that the corpus demonstrates a preoccupation with exploring character agency. *Head* and *face* are most often associated with emotional or psychological functions. With the highest keyness scores of all the keywords, it could be proposed that trans-fiction's main concern is with portraying emotional depth to characters, even beyond their physical agency. Taken together, these two preoccupations create an impression of narratives concerned with understanding lead characters' physical interactions with, and reactions to, the world. As a key aspect of the lead protagonist's identity is their transgender identity, these keyness trends complement the assumption that transgender fiction is preoccupied with exploring transgender characters' place in society.

6.2 Concordance Lines Discussion

One key theme consistently demonstrated through the use of *leg(s)*, *arm(s)* and *head*, is the appearance of 'touch hierarchy', i.e. which characters are shown to touch others. TMs are limited, both as agent and recipient of touch. They do not instigate any touches to characters' legs, only touch a head once and touch an arm once. Cis-male characters touch others more often, but still

infrequently, and their touches are often associated with aggression. They restrain TM heads thrice, TF heads once and F heads twice, although the latter is in jest. The majority of contact with arms involving force (such as forcibly leading someone) is instigated by M characters. The second use of M touch is to instigate sexual contact. They surpass F partners in romantic touch, although interaction is more equal between M-TF partners. Cisgender females touch all characters' head but their contact with arms is restricted to three domains; giving comfort to transgender characters, instigating intimacy with M, F and TFs, and forcibly leading TF characters. Trans-females occasionally touch Fs in return, although never with force. They touch F heads three times and arms twice, all in companionship and intimacy.

Trans-male characters, along with limited initiation of touch, are not often recipients. When they are touched, they either receive concern and comfort from F or are subject to M force. Cisgender males are touched even less: most frequently on their arms by TF characters pursuing sexual interaction. Cisgender females on the other hand, are the recipients of most touch. Their heads are jokingly restrained by M and touched in companionship by F and TF. They are subject to attention from all characters, for numerous reasons; they're stopped, aided and both forcibly and amicably led, for example. Trans-female characters are most often touched by M during romantic encounters, and led by Fs.

As for rejection of touch, Ms are never rebuffed. Aid given by a M is the only overt assistance that is accepted without mitigation- TF aids M once, but he is drunk and therefore in a vulnerable position, and TF aiding F is refused. F concern is rejected by both TM and M, with the dual implications that Fs show concern, and both TM and M are demonstrably undesiring of it. F characters sever physical connections by pulling their arm away and dropping their arm. The former could be described as countermanding another character's agency, while the latter is them exercising their own agency. This is an important distinction as TF characters only demonstrate the latter movement; they explicitly use their arms for their own purpose, but not to subvert another's control. TM characters do neither,

although this may be directly related to the small number of times they are touched to begin with. In one instance, however, a TM attempts to pull away from M assault and fails.

This complex touch hierarchy creates an impression of cis-males as resistant to other's touch and the instigator of dominant or aggressive contact. Transgender males are avoidant of touching others but subject to M aggression or F nurturing. Cisgender females are free with their touches but often restricted to offering comfort and intimacy. They are also freely touched, although subject mainly to M force and TF intimacy. Finally, transgender females mainly offer intimacy to F and are led in turn, and engage in both giving and receiving of sexual touch with M partners.

A second interesting discovery is the difference in use of legs. Ms have a propensity for placing their legs over things, while TM legs dangle:

'Chris was just looping a leg [M] over his stool...' (L)

'...on my back with my legs [TM] dangling off the bed...' (BM)

Both TF and F legs are most often crossed, or otherwise folded:

'She smoothed her skirt over her bent legs [TF]' (L)

'...plopping into a chair and tucking her legs [F] beneath her.' (IJ)

While cis-males assume an encompassing, dominating posture, trans-male legs hang passively, and both trans- and cis- females minimise their physical presence. Instances where F legs deviated from this were mitigated; in one such example, F legs are stretched out but the character slides down to sit on the floor. Solidifying the distinct characterisations is the intimation of TM legs having a life of their own (e.g. i), while M legs initiate the only examples of aggressive, although not violent, motion (i and iii).

(ii) '...and yet his legs [TM], ever devoted, pulled away...' (IJ)

(ii) '...complete with kicking his legs [M] and screaming...' (BM)

(iii) 'Which initiated a leg [M/F] wrestling match.' (L)

While F characters may minimise their physical presence, they demonstrate strong agency within the communicative realm. Their arms are most often withdrawn or crossed to demonstrate a disapproval with an interlocuter. The shaking of F heads is employed to disrupt conversation, either by stopping an interlocuter taking their turn, or by refusing to speak themselves. Fs also actively participate in facilitating conversation, such as by cocking heads in expectation of another's response, which suggests a voluntary yielding of the conversational floor. M heads also shake in demonstration of a negative response (such as disagreement), but only cock to listen: a passive response, not active facilitation of cooperative interaction. TFs shake and cock their heads, although without disruptive intent. Both M and F characters shake their heads in overt dismissal, although F more so. Trans-male characters, on the other hand, rarely use their head to interact in conversation. The majority of TM head movements are to answer 'no' to a question, such as in (v). They do this much more than any other character, although this could be due to lack of other interactions TM partake in. Other characters shake or cock their head to demonstrate a range of answers and emotions, while TM only shake their head to answer, coded as 'shake to say no (amicable)' in 5.2a

(v) "“Does she know you're trans?” J shook his head [TM].’ (11)

Third, injuries to head and legs demonstrate one key consistency: M characters are the instigator of the vast majority of injuries, both accidental and deliberate. In juxtaposition, an interesting contrast can be seen. All TM self-inflicted injuries to their head result from a deliberate action; excess alcohol consumption. However, self-inflicted injuries to TM legs are all caused by a lack of control over their body. TF injuries are most often an unintentional consequence of an action, such as dehydration from walking in the sun too long. Cis-females do not cause themselves injury, accidental or otherwise, and are also not subject to deliberate other-caused injury. Cis-males injuries are mainly caused by others in highly-aggressive manners, e.g. hit with a baseball bat.

Finally, the psychological mechanisms of the head demonstrate some interesting patterns. TM characters are highly represented in this manner, both in comparison to their own physical interactions, and in comparison to other characters' psychological head. However, it is believed that these results may have been skewed by the novels comprising the FtM corpus. Both are written with a heavy narrative focus on internal monologues of the main TM protagonists. Whether this is characteristic of TM fiction in general, or just of the corpus, is difficult to say without a larger corpus of transgender fiction to compare to. Both books are written from first person TM perspective, while the MtF corpus consists of one TF first person narrative and one F first person. This raised two issues: first, there were twice as many opportunities for reference to TM internal state and second, psychological use of head was restricted for M characters. Within the confines of this study, conclusions drawn from psychologically coded instances are tenuous at best and this data will therefore not be commented on beyond the point below.

TF and TM characters demonstrate several examples of self-directed negativity, although the extent differs between them. TF sometimes display a negative voice in their heads, and have a focus on replaying or rehearsing events. TM, however, have a negative voice as well as ambiguous negative feeling, such as in (vi). They also demonstrated more intensity, such as 'explodes' (*BM*) and 'screamed... louder than anything' (*JJ*).

(vi) '...no idea what the teacher was talking about, but his head [TM] was starting to swim.'

(*JJ*)

6.3 Knees, shoulders, hands and face.

The primary function of *face* was found to be, perhaps unsurprisingly, as site of emotion. An initial look at concordance lines provided a suggestion of TF being associated with intense fear related reactions such as terror, while F demonstrated a lower level of fear, as well as often being confused. F characters also seemed to be concerned with the preservation of social etiquette: sometimes embarrassed for themselves or others breaking conventions. Cis-males had a rather high representation in facial reactions, which was unexpected considering their limited displays in *leg(s)*, *arm(s)* and *head*. However, most instances seemed to reflect ambiguous reactions, such as in (vi) rather than denote a particular intent. It was theorised that this was due to the narrative style of the corpus: as none of the books were written from a first person M point of view, cis-male emotions were limited to those easily identifiable by the protagonist. Due to the high amount of data, and the complexity of the examples, analysis of *face* would be better conducted by future research with a focus on emotional rather than physical portrayal.

(vi) 'His face [M] is a mix again...' (BM)

Hand(s) were removed from in-depth analysis due to the fact that their primary function is to interact with the world, and thus are possibly more forefront in an author's consideration of lexical choices. Indeed, *hands* were used in 50 different motions, not including their receipt of injury or their use to carry items, two unsurprisingly frequent actions. The plethora of data for this aspect meant that they were afforded only a brief consideration, although they appear to complement the trends discovered and discussed above. TM characters interacted the least, while most dominating movements, such as stopping another, were demonstrated by M. Both TF and F had items taken from their hands, as well as frequently being led, and being the recipient of other's touch. As with their arms, F often pulled hands towards themselves when emotionally distressed, whereas TF withdrew for a range of less intense situations, from discomfort to expectation. For examples, see Appendix 4.

Knee(s) and *shoulder(s)* displayed complementary evidence (see appendix 5) for the previously discussed touch hierarchy, as well as distinct categorisations in injury; M were rarely injured, TM caused self-injury due to lack of control, F were injured by M, and TF caused accidental self-injury. Both F and TF minimised their postures by pulling knees to chests. Trans-females displayed more dramatised reactions such as dropping to their knees in distress, versus cis-females tucking their knees up, and M merely placing their hands on their knees. As with all other body-parts discussed, trans-males displayed little emotional reactions and rarely interacted with others, unless in receipt of F comfort or M violence. Cis-males also often placed their arms around others' shoulders. This carries similar connotations to their *leg(s)* being over an item- both are encompassing actions, with insinuations of control and domination. However, as demonstrated by the analysis of *arm(s)*, *leg(s)* and *head*, a detailed consideration often uncovers the most interesting discoveries and so it is with caution that these body parts are considered to agree with the rest of the findings.

7. Final Discussion

Independent analysis of keywords and concordance lines demonstrated numerous interesting results, as discussed above. Taken together, several consistently occurring representations can be identified. Cis-male characters rarely interact with others through the use of their body. Their limited interactions revolve around physically influencing another, such as stopping someone. Others do not reject their touch, and M are shown to be physically dominant over TM in particular. Cis-males are prone to aggressive action (e.g. causing injury), and display anger, but little other emotion. In heterosexual romantic interactions, they again dominate contact. It would appear that the representation of cisgender males complements findings in previous studies; they are limited in emotional display (Williams et al, 1987) and display physical dominance (Jackson, 2001). There was no evidence found to support Wharton's (2005) proposal of a male buffoon characterisation, although that could be due to the nature of the corpus as none of these books involved comedic intent.

Cisgender female characters were subject to everyone's touch, required physical aid most frequently, and often minimised their physical presence when distressed by crossing or tucking their legs. They displayed a wide range of emotions, with a tendency towards mild fear and surprise. On the other hand, F also demonstrated a dominance over the conversational floor: they both interrupted and facilitated communication. They were also cast in a nurturing role, offering comfort and guiding or aiding TM and TF characters. Findings are consistent with Evans and Davies's discovery that females were allowed to display certain male traits without being portrayed negatively (2000). Here, cis-females were found to act with confidence, assertiveness, and exerted matriarchal power over transgender characters. However, cisgender females were also frequently displayed as nurturing, needing assistance, and reducing their posture (consistent with Williams et al 1987, Steyer 2014, and Jackson and Gee 2005, respectively).

The biggest discovery of this dissertation was the portrayal of transgender characters. The majority of TF touch revolved around three themes; implicitly requesting physical or emotional assistance (such as seeking comfort), seeking closeness with cis-females, and sexually interacting with cis-males. They were displayed as physically inept, although most injuries were sustained while attempting to minimise their disruption to others (e.g. dehydration caused by walking home rather than asking to be driven). Interestingly, while the majority of their behaviour portrayed TF as vulnerable and submissive, they were remarkably forward in their sexual touch with M partners. It is possible this is a reflection of the corpus rather than representative of transgender fiction as a whole; all M-TF sexual touch examples came from one book (YG). Also, all books in this corpus primarily featured heterosexual relationships. As such, the amount and type of interactions between certain characters was extremely limited. It is beyond the remit of this dissertation to speculate on the specific impacts of other relationships but it is probable that M-TM touch would increase. A final consistent representation of trans-female characters appeared to be an hyper-femininity. Behaviours that cis-females but not cis-males demonstrated (such as cocking heads for emotional reasons) were displayed more frequently or exaggerated by trans-females. Where F brought their knees to their chest in

distress, TF fell to their knees. F tucked themselves up when upset and TF tucked up their legs even in neutral moments. They demonstrated terror when F were merely fearful, and shock when F were surprised. This representation is consistent with Plant et al's (2000) description of females as emotional to the point of overreaction, although it would appear trans-females rather than cis-females were depicted this way here.

Finally, trans-male characters were similar to cis-males in that they rarely used their body to interact. However, they were subject to other's administrations (although not as often as TF and F characters) and overtly placed under the power of M physical attack. Their legs dangled from items, were suggested to be autonomous, and injuries were often caused by lack of self-control. Intensely negative reactions (such as screaming in their head), along with a range of self-inflicted injuries created an impression of aggression. This was, however, directed internally, rather than externally like cis-males. All this combined to display trans-males as physically inept, lacking control over others and themselves. Yet, it must be considered whether this is a profile in itself or the lack of one. While minimal interaction and lack of control serve to portray TM characters in a particular light, the FtM corpus was heavily skewed towards a psychological narrative for TM protagonists and lack of physical interaction may be a direct result of this stylistic choice. The narrative style may arise from author uncertainty of TM physicality, or it may be a portrayal in itself- a representation of trans-males as physically incapable and highly passive. Much further research would be needed to determine this.

While representations of each of the four character groups displayed certain trends, it should be noted that very few behaviours were entirely restricted to one denomination. All characters at some point demonstrated characteristics also displayed by someone with a different gender identity. As such, it cannot be said that *only* cis-males straddle objects, but it is undeniable that certain patterns are identifiable.

8. Conclusion

The main aim of this dissertation was to consider how transgender characters were represented in children's fiction, specifically considering how the use of the body conforms to stereotypical presentation of cis-gender females and males. A keyword analysis demonstrated that the use of the body was a salient concept within books featuring a transgender protagonist, particularly those body parts that either directly interacted with the world (such as *leg(s)* and *arm(s)*) or were associated with psychological development (*head* and *face*). Considering the keywords within the context of the narrative, through concordance line analysis, identified several consistent trends regarding the representation of transgender and cisgender characters. Namely, that cis-males were portrayed as aggressive and dominant and cis-females were well-rounded, but ultimately nurturing. Trans-females were highly feminine and passive, reminiscent of 80s and 90s representations of cis-females, while trans-males were removed from interaction and lacked control.

While this was but a brief foray into a relatively unstudied aspect, several avenues for future consideration were identified. All protagonists were involved in heterosexual relationships, so certain interactions were completely restricted, while others may have been limited as a secondary effect. Several interesting differences in the presentation of emotion, mainly through *face* and *head*, also deserve a detailed analysis not afforded them here. Perhaps most importantly, the representation of transgender men needs further attention to determine whether their lacklustre portrayal reflects an uncertainty regarding their physical identity, and their place in society, or was merely an unexpected skew caused by the narrative style of the corpus.

9. References

Sources

Beam, C. (2011). *I am J*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Cronn-Mills, K. (2012). *Beautiful Music for Ugly Children*. Minnesota: Flux.

Peters, J. (2004). *Luna*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Russo, M. (2016). *If I Was Your Girl*. London: Usborne Publishing Ltd.

American Library Association. (1999). *Association for Library Service to Children* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.ala.org/alsc/awardsgrants/bookmedia/caldecottmedal> [Accessed 30 April 2018].

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5*. Vancouver: American Psychiatric Association.

Anthony, L. (2007). *AntConc* [Computer Software]. Version 3.2.1W. Tokyo: Waseda University. Available from: <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software> [Accessed 01 May 2018].

Anthony, L. (2014a). *AntConc* [Computer Software]. Version 3.4.4. Tokyo: Waseda University. Available from: <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software> [Accessed 01 May 2018].

Anthony, L. (2014b). *AntConc Help File Version 001*. Tokyo: Waseda University.

Baker, P. (2004). Querying keywords: questions of difference, frequency, and sense in keywords analysis. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 32(4), 346-359.

Baker, P. (2006). *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Baker, P. and Levon, E. (2015). Picking the right cherries? A comparison of corpus-based and qualitative analyses of news articles about masculinity. *Discourse and Communication*, 9(2), 221-236.

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravini, M., Krzyzanowski, M., Mcenery, T. and Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse and Society*, 19(3), 272-306.

Barclay, L. (1974). The emergence of vocational expectations in preschool children. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 4(1), 1-14.

Bem, S. (1983). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: raising your gender-aschematic children in a gender-schematic society. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 8(4), 598-616.

Campbell, P. and Wirtenberg, J. (1980). How books influence children: what the research shows. *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin*, 11 (6), 3-6.

Crabb, P. and Bielawski, D. (1994). The social representation of material culture and gender in children's books. *Sex Roles*, 30(1), 69-81.

Dickman, A. and Murnen, S. (2004). Learning to be little women and little men: the inequitable gender equality of non-sexist children's literature. *Sex Roles*, 50(1), 373-385.

- Donnelly, K. and Twenge, J. (2017). Masculine and feminine traits on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, 1993-2012: a cross-temporal meta-analysis. *Sex Roles*, 76(1), 556-565.
- Donnelly, K., Twenge, J., Clark, M., Shaikh, S., Beiler May, A. and Carter, N. (2015). Attitudes towards women's work and family roles in the United States, 1976-2013. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(1), 1-14.
- Eggs, S. and Ledema, R. (1997). Difference without diversity: semantic orientation and ideology in competing women's magazines. In: Wodak, R. ed. *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage Publications.
- Evans, L. and Davies, K. (2000). No sissy boys here: a content analysis of the representation of masculinity in elementary school reading textbooks. *Sex Roles*, 42(3), 255-270.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and Power*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Routledge.
- Gender Recognition Act 2004 (UK).
- Gill, R. and Herdieckerhoff, E. (2006). Rewriting the romance: new femininities in chick lit? *Feminist Media Studies*, 6(4), 487-504.
- Glick, P. and Fiske, S. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56(2), 109-118.
- Goatly, A. (2004). Corpus linguistics, systemic functional grammar and literary meaning: a critical analysis of Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone. *Ilha do Desterro: A Journal of English Language, Literature in English and Cultural Studies*, 46(1), 115-154.
- Gooden, A. and Gooden, M. (2001). Gender representation in notable children's picture books: 1995-1999. *Sex Roles*, 45(1), 89-101.
- Halliday, M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th edn. London: Routledge.
- Hunt, S. (2015). Representations of gender and agency in the Harry Potter series. In: Baker, P. and McEnery, T. eds. *Corpora and Discourse Studies: Integrating Discourse and Corpora*. Advances in Language and Linguistics Series. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jackson, S. (2001). Happily never after: young women's stories of abuse in heterosexual love relationships. *Feminism and Psychology*, 11(3), 305-321.
- Jackson, S. and Gee, S. (2005). 'Look Janet', 'No you look John': constructions of gender in early school reader illustrations across 50 years. *Gender and Education*, 17(2), 115-128.
- Jeffries, L. (2007). *Textual Construction of the Female Body*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leech, G., Johansson, S., Garside, R. and Hofland, K. (1981-1986). *The Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen Corpus* [Corpus]. Version POS-tagged. Lancaster University, University of Oslo and University of Bergen. Available from: <http://ota.ox.ac.uk/> [Accessed 10 May 2018].
- Mackiewicz, J. and Thompson, I. (2016). Adding quantitative corpus-driven analysis to qualitative discourse analysis: determining the aboutness of writing centre talk. *The Writing Centre Journal*, 35(3), 187-225.
- Mautner, G. (2009). Checks and balances: how corpus linguistics can contribute to CDA. In: Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. eds. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edn. London: Sage. pp. 122-142.

Motschenbacher, H. (2009). Speaking the gendered body: the performative construction of commercial femininities and masculinities via body-part vocabulary. *Language in Society*, 38(1), 1-22.

Plant, A., Hyde, J., Keltner, D. and Devine, P. (2000). The gender stereotyping of emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24(1), 81-92.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steyer, I. (2014). Gender representations in children's media and their influence. *Gender Representations*, 31(2), 171-180.

Stokoe, E. and Smithson, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse and Society*, 12(2), 217-244.

The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust. (2018). *Gender Identity Development Service Statistics* [Online]. NHS Foundation Trust. Available from: <https://tavistockandportman.nhs.uk/about-us/news/stories/what-does-a-doubling-in-referrals-to-our-gender-identity-development-service-mean-about-how-societys-view-of-gender-is-shifting> [Accessed 12 January 2018].

Trepanier-Street, M. and Romatowski, J. (1999). The influence of children's literature on gender role perceptions: a re-examination. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 26(3), 155-159.

Tsao, Y. (2008). Gender issues in young children's literature. *Reading Improvement*, 45(3), 108-114.

Weatherall, A. (2000). Gender relevance in talk-in-interaction and discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 11(2), 286-288.

Weitzman, L., Eifler, D., Hokada, E. and Ross, C. (1972). Sex-role socialization in picture books for preschool children. *American Journal of Sociology*, 77(1), 1125-1150.

Wharton, S. (2005). Invisible females, incapable males: gender construction in a children's reading scheme. *Language and Education*, 19(3), 238-251.

Williams, J. et al. (1987). Sex-role socialisation in picture books: an update. *Social Science Quarterly*, 68(1):48-56.

10. Appendix

Appendix 1: MtF Top 20 Body Parts

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Freq</u>	<u>Lemmas</u>									
41	452	eye	eye	57	eyed	13	eyeing	2	eyes	380	
59	330	hand	hand	190	handed	27	handing		4	hands	109
70	286	head	head	249	headed	25	heads	12			
90	215	face	face	201	faced	4	faces	10			
108	176	arm	arm	112	armed	1	arms	63			
140	131	shoulder	shoulder	80	shouldered				1	shouldering	4
		shoulders		46							
147	125	hair	hair	124	hairs	1					
191	95	foot	feet	75	foot	20					
193	91	finger	finger	26	fingers	65					
203	87	lip	lip	31	lipped	1	lips	55			
233	73	chest	chest	72	chests	1					
234	73	heart	heart	71	hearts	2					
263	63	mouth	mouth	53	mouthed		4	mouthing		1	mouths 5
274	61	cheek	cheek	26	cheeks	35					
286	59	ear	ear	35	ears	24					
361	47	leg	leg	17	legged	6	legs	24			
391	44	stomach		stomach		44					
431	39	neck	neck	39							
476	34	eyebrow		eyebrow		8	eyebrows	26			
490	33	knee	knee	6	knees	27					

Appendix 2: FtM Top 20 Body Parts

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Freq</u>	<u>Lemmas</u>								
83	242	hand	hand	132	handed	16	handing	4	hands	90
100	208	eye	eye	31	eyed	1	eyeing	2	eyes	174
113	188	head	head	173	headed	1	heads	14		
124	163	face	face	149	faced	2	faces	12		
199	94	hair	hair	93	hairs	1				
249	70	arm	arm	34	arms	36				
275	63	foot	feet	42	foot	21				
289	59	mouth	mouth	54	mouthing		1	mouths	4	
332	51	shoulder			shoulder	34	shoulders	17		
355	47	chest	chest	45	cheded	1	chests	1		
358	47	heart	heart	47						
365	46	brain	brain	45	brains	1				
433	39	lip	lip	13	lips	26				
468	35	leg	leg	15	legged	1	legs	19		
515	31	ear	ear	12	ears	19				
531	30	dick	dick	26	dicks	4				
536	30	knee	knee	17	knees	13				
546	29	finger	finger	14	fingers	15				
568	28	stomach			stomach	28				
598	26	muscle	muscle	5	muscled		3	muscles	18	

Appendix 3: Arms

(These tables should be understood to display the agent across the top and the recipient down the side)

<u>5.3b OFFER COMFORT</u>	TM	M	TF	F
TM				2
M		1		
TF				2
F	1		1	

<u>5.3c OFFER ROMANCE</u>	TM	M	TF	F
TM				
M			3	
TF		2		1
F		4		

<u>5.3d OFFER INTIMACY</u>	TM	M	TF	F
TM				
M		1/child		1
TF				1
F		1	1	2

Appendix 4: TF and F Hands

You want my number?" I put my hands[TF] in my lap. Blood pounded in my temples. (YG)

I put my hands[TF] on the back of my neck and pushed my head[TF] down, speaking into my lap (YG)

'Could I get high first?' I said, my hands [TF] balled in my lap. (YG)

'So anyway,' I said, clasping my hands[TF] behind my back... (YG)

I fell back on the bed, stared at the ceiling, and crossed my hands[TF] over my heart. (YG)

Clasping her hands[TF] in her lap, she said, "Dad, I'm a transsexual." (L)

He blinked from his fetal position on the bed, hands[TF] folded flat under his cheek. (L)

I reach for her hand[F]. She jerks back like I scalded her. "I liked you. I really did." (BM)

"What? Nothing." She pulls her hand[F] away and looks out the window. "You don't like it?" (BM)

"Why?" She is actually wringing her hands[F]. (BM)

Anna buried her face[F] in her hands[F] and groaned. "This is a mistake. What if they find..." (YG)

"Christ. Do you have a brain tumor or somethi—Oh God." Her hands[F] covered her mouth. (L)

Appendix 5: Knees and Shoulders

KNEES TOUCHED	TM	M	TF	F
Sexual	F		M	
Receive comfort	F/M/M			
Intimacy	M/M/M/F/ F(fail)/F(fail)	TF(fail)		TM/TM/TM (fail)
Apology	F			TM (fail)

SHOULDERS TOUCHED	TM	M	TF	F
X around shoulders	M/M/M/F/F/F		M/M/M/TF/M	TF/M/M/M/F/TM/M/M
Touched by TM		1		1
Touched by M	6		3	3
Touched by TF		1		5
Touched by F	3	2	3	4
Grabbed by X with force			M/M/F/M	

Knees and Shoulders Injury

TM	M	TF	F
M shove	Fake sword	Self- Scraped on tree	Weight of M jacket
Self- boxing		Self- Bruise	
Self- bang on desk		M attack	
		Self- Hug	
		Self- Ache from walking	