

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

2015

Privilege and Marginalization in Drag Communities in the United States

Dustin Satterfield

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>



Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Inequality and Stratification Commons](#), [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Satterfield, Dustin, "Privilege and Marginalization in Drag Communities in the United States" (2015).

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers. 4514.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/4514>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

PRIVILEGE AND MARGINALIZATION IN DRAG COMMUNITIES IN THE
UNITED STATES

By

DUSTIN JOHANNA SATTERFIELD

Bachelor of Arts, the University of Montana, 2013

Thesis

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in Sociology, Inequality and Social Justice

The University of Montana
Missoula, MT

May 2015

Approved by:

Sandy Ross, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate School
Graduate School

Kathy J. Kuipers, Ph.D., Chair
Department of Sociology

Daisy Rooks, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology

Elizabeth Hubble, Ph.D.
Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Privilege and Marginalization in United States Drag Communities

Chairperson: Kathy Kuipers

ABSTRACT

Within the gay and lesbian community, there is a smaller community of drag performers. These entertainers make a performance of gender stereotypes. Non-male performers have observed that male privilege is reproduced in this community despite a hyper awareness of oppressions and gender status. Using an online questionnaire I examined male privilege and non-male marginalization in United States drag communities. I asked drag performers about their perceptions of themselves and their perceptions of other performers within their local drag communities. I find that self-perceptions of privilege are highest for male performers and self-perceptions of marginalization are higher for non-male performers. I also find that, overall, perceptions of privilege are highest for drag queens and that perceptions of marginalization are lowest for drag queens.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Introduction.....	1
Oppression and Male Privilege.....	2
Exclusion and Non-Male Marginalization.....	5
Drag Communities and the Unique Position of Drag Kings and Drag Queens	6
Hypotheses	11
Methods.....	13
<i>Recruitment</i>	14
<i>Survey</i>	15
Analysis and Results	17
<i>Descriptive and Independent Variable Measures</i>	17
<i>Dependent Variable Measures</i>	20
<i>Test of Hypotheses</i>	23
Discussion and Conclusion.....	29
<i>Measures</i>	30
<i>Contributions</i>	31
<i>Future Research</i>	31
References.....	35
Appendix A: Survey Instrument	38

Male privilege and non-male marginalization dominate the social world in America (McIntosh 1989, Peterson and Morgan 1995, Reskin 2002). Male privilege, the unearned advantages that men experience and that are unavailable to women, is present in American society through social, economic and political rights and benefits provided to men on the basis of their gender (McIntosh 1989). This is visible in the gender wage gap and the large ratio of male CEOs to female CEOs (Reskin 2002, Peterson and Morgan 1995). Non-male marginalization is realized as non-male genders being left out of the center of social, economic, and political circles. Marginalization is visible in situations where women are excluded from social circles that have power or from access to decision-making authority over their own lives.

Privilege and marginalization may be familiar topics of discussion in the realm of gender, but these concepts affect many other groups including those with non-heterosexual identities. The lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer, questioning, and asexual (LGBT+ or queer) community is a group that lacks heterosexual privilege and is marginalized based on their LGBT+ status. Because of this, LGBT+ people have a need for safe spaces where they can be openly LGBT+. Safe spaces are essential for people who have marginalized sexual orientations or who are gender variant in a heteronormative world. LGBT+ safe spaces are places that these individuals can be out and open without fear of backlash, outing, or discrimination. A safe space is somewhere that queer people feel comfortable being who they are.

Drag shows are often a beacon for a safe space that is open to all members of the queer community. The LGBT+ community has a history of using drag performance to advance goals of activism, visibility, charity work, and more recently, for profit. Communities often form around drag show events, especially amongst performers. Drag shows may be a pageant or contest in which there is a winner, or they may simply be a series of lip synching performances to entertain

audiences. Typically, men perform femininity as drag queens and women perform masculinity as drag kings¹.

Even as a safe place, drag communities may be unable to escape the pervasive oppressions of the larger society. Male privilege is present in American society through social, economic and political rights and benefits provided to men on the basis of their gender. It might be expected that the queer community would be more aware of sexism and oppression as a group that faces marginalization as well and would work to counter this marginalization. While drag communities have been researched in some contexts, male privilege and non-male marginalization in these communities has not.

I asked drag performers to respond to a series of questions in an online survey to learn about male privilege and non-male marginalization in these communities across the United States. This study offers empirical data on a community that is often discussed only theoretically. This empirical research project highlights a group that is not well-understood and studied empirically.

OPPRESSION AND MALE PRIVILEGE

Male privilege is an evident part of social interaction in the U.S. today (McIntosh 1989, Peterson and Morgan 1995, Reskin 2002). Privilege, which is linked with power, arises in many forms. For men, this includes being paid more for the same work, being accepted as the norm or standard, and holding the majority of the positions of power (Petersen and Morgan 1995). In everyday interactions, male privilege can be seen when men's opinions and ideas are taken more seriously than women's, and when others give men their full attention and more completely listen to them, intentionally or due to social cognitive discrimination (Reskin 2002). In numerous

¹ While this is most often the case drag communities also have performers who don't identify as male or female, women who perform femininity (faux queens), and men who perform masculinity (faux kings).

realms of American society, male privilege and misogyny are both inescapable.

LGBT+ people experience oppression when rights and benefits, such as health care from a partner's insurance policy, being able to get legally married, being able to openly and safely discuss their relationships or being able to change their name and gender on legal documents with ease, are denied to them. LGBT+ people are likely more aware of the privileges that are a part of being heterosexual or cisgender (individuals who identify with the gender they were assigned at birth) because of their lived experience as people who are gender and sexually diverse.

Women who are LGBT+ face an intersection of oppressions for being women as well as not cisgender and/or heterosexual. Women are oppressed by men, regardless of their sexual orientation, and gay men are equally capable of exercising male privilege. Kimberlé Crenshaw (1995) introduces the concept of intersectionality to discuss the intersection of racism and sexism. However, she states that “the concept can and should be expanded by factoring in issues such as class, sexual orientation, age, and color [...] when considering how the social world is constructed (1995:180).” Crenshaw (1995) is highlighting the distinctions between being a man with a minority sexual orientation and being a woman with a minority sexual orientation. While there is some commonality between the two, having a gender that is disadvantaged does not just add to the experiences of queer women, but creates a unique situation where a woman who is queer is oppressed because she is queer, because she is a woman and because she is a queer woman. Patricia Hill Collins (2000) refers to these vectors of oppressions as the matrix of domination. Collins (2000) states “the overarching matrix of domination houses multiple groups, each with varying experiences with penalty and privilege that produce corresponding partial perspectives, situated knowledges, and, for clear identifiable subordinate groups, subjugated

knowledges (2000:203).” The intersection of multiple identities, both privileged and not, are important in understanding power in the social world.

Intersectionality is significant when discussing privilege. Race, sexual orientation, and gender each have power structures that create a unique social location for people who identify differently in these categories. A white gay man has race and gender privilege but he experiences privilege very differently than a white heterosexual man because of his sexual orientation. Within the LGBT+ community, the presence of white male privilege is observed in various ways. Han (2008) finds that one way gay white men exercise privilege over gay Asian men is through questioning their masculinity based on their race. Han (2008:20) finds that white gay men “eradicate whatever male privilege gay Asian men may have by relegating them to the feminine position.” In this way, Asian men are presented as and expected to be more feminine, a social location that holds less power and less status than being masculine. This reveals a potential for male privilege to leak into queer spaces for people of all genders because white men are taking power away from non-white men by associating them with femininity and women who hold a lower social location. Coston and Kimmel (2012) find that gay men have less power because they are perceived as having traits similar to women. Instead of using this to foster comradery, Coston and Kimmel (2012) find gay men distance themselves from women in order to be viewed as equal to heterosexual men and to receive the benefits from a patriarchal society that values the oppression and domination of women. Taywaditep (2002), as well as Coston and Kimmel (2012), describes anti-effeminacy attitudes of gay men towards other gay men that are viewed as feminine. Both articles link these findings to misogyny. In these ways, white male privilege threatens potential safe spaces for non-white and non-male LGBT+ individuals.

Drag communities are supposed to be a safe space for all members of the LGBT+

community, but if unchecked male privilege is prevalent, it is not a safe space for women. Drag queens are revered in drag communities and recognized beyond the queer community, but this paper explores the concern that drag kings may be disadvantaged because of their gender. These performers may still be viewed as female even though they are performing masculinity. The marginalization experienced by women in the larger society will bleed into these communities and status patterns where males are privileged and females are marginalized may be over-emphasized as male and female gender roles are solidified by performance.

EXCLUSION AND NON-MALE MARGINALIZATION

While marginalization is related to privilege, the two are not opposites. A lack of privilege, as well as discrimination and oppression result in marginalization. Marginalization means being left out economically, politically, socially, and culturally. Marginalized people are excluded and pushed by the dominant privileged group to a powerless position or one in which they have little agency (Wu 2004). Privileged groups contribute to the marginalization of underprivileged groups. Women experience marginalization in American society, as do LGBT+ people. For example, the marginalization of women is demonstrated by larger numbers of women than men experiencing poverty, and the marginalization of LGBT+ people is demonstrated by queer people having difficulty finding locations that are accepting to practice religion. Both are underrepresented in the political sphere (Eagly and Karau 2002).

While LGBT+ individuals and groups are objects of marginalization, they also may be the source of marginalization of others. Crenshaw's (1995) and Collins' (2000) dialogue on the matrix of domination and intersectionality establish that it is possible to be in a central group due to one attribute while being in a marginalized group due to another attribute. Multiple researchers have shown that the gay community is capable of marginalizing people based on

their race (Han 2008), and that the LGBT+ community marginalizes women, cis and trans, who are HIV positive and seeking treatment and education (Logie et al. 2012). The lesbian, bisexual, queer and transgender (LBQT) women who are marginalized consequently experience greater risk of HIV infection as well as less access to care resources and support (Logie et al. 2012). The positioning of HIV/AIDs as a disease that only affects gay men is detrimental to gay men, yet many resources that are specific to gay men have formed as a result. In contrast, LBQT women are excluded from those resources before and after having been infected with HIV. This form of marginalization directly affects the life span of LBQT women.

DRAG COMMUNITIES AND THE UNIQUE POSITION OF DRAG KINGS AND DRAG QUEENS

The LGBT+ community presents drag shows as a safe place for all genders, including women, who are gender and sexually diverse. Although researchers Han (2008), Coston and Kimmel (2012), Logie et al. (2012) and Taywaditep (2002) have examine privileged and marginalization in LGBT+ communities, there is little research on drag communities. The oppression of women needs to be addressed in all areas, particularly groups that represent minority populations and groups that are touted as progressive and politically forward. If male privilege is present in drag communities, it is possible that this privilege could result in women being disadvantaged and men being central to the community while women are pushed to the edges, becoming marginalized. Just as the LGBT+ community has been examined for privilege and marginalization, drag needs to be investigated with a critical eye.

Some authors have shown that male privilege needs to be discussed when considering drag culture. One author, Judith Butler (1990), provides some insight into a feminist view of drag. While Butler famously highlights drag as an example of gender performativity, she states that drag is “an uncritical appropriation of sex-role stereotyping from within the practice of

heterosexuality (1990:187).” If drag is not critical of the restrictive gender binary or heterosexuality, it has the potential to reproduce the privileges and oppressions of these institutions. Kelly Kleiman (2000) believes this is the case. In her article, “Drag = Blackface,” Kleiman (2000) finds that drag queens are appropriating femininity while prescribing patriarchal ideas of how women are supposed to look and behave. Rupp et al. (2010) describe the way that drag queens interact with audiences in a more masculine than feminine manner, emphasizing their male privilege. Kate Bornstein argues that drag, both kings and queens, “on stage as a gimmick, a *sh*tick*, is an appropriation; it’s different than living a transgendered life (1995:92).” Kleiman (2000) goes as far to say that men performing as drag queens, regardless of their sexual orientation, are equal to whites performing in blackface. She presents both drag and blackface as a privileged group dressing as the group they hold power over to further the oppression of the powerless group and ascribe acceptable ways to be black or to be a woman (2000). However, Kleiman does make the distinction between men performing drag and women performing drag saying that the comparison of women cross-dressing to men cross-dressing is “separate and unequal (2000:675)” because when women dress as men they are “dressing up, seeking power, privilege, or even protective camouflage from male violence (2000:683).” In contrast, men cross-dressing as women reproduces stereotypes of women that are insulting, hurtful, and enforce gendered power dynamics (Kleiman 2000). Drag queens have the ability to dress like women in an exaggerated manner, perform femininity, poke fun at women and receive praise for it all the while still having male privilege. At the end of the evening, a drag queen takes off her wig, washes off her makeup and goes to work the next day to earn a male’s wages and take advantage of his male privilege. Even while a queen, under the dress, he is a man and he can be sure that in interactions his voice will be heard and taken seriously.

Drag queens do not have the same experiences that women do. Halberstam (1998) discusses male privilege as something unavailable to women whose gender expression is masculine. Halberstam (1998) finds that women who perform masculinity as drag kings are still disadvantaged because of their feminine gender. Torr and Bottoms (2010) also find that because of the power men hold over women, women dressing in masculine drag is not nearly the same as men dressing in feminine drag.

If gay men's embrace of female drag can be read as an explicit rejection of masculine power status, and a kind of celebratory affirmation of their 'feminized' marginalization, it makes less obvious sense – conversely – for women to mimic the sex responsible for their relative disempowerment (2010:26).

Here Torr and Bottoms (2010) acknowledge that society views gay men as more feminine than heterosexual men and are therefore feminized and marginalized because of it, but in the same sentence they state that women's disempowerment by men is "relative." Nonetheless, Torr and Bottoms (2010) illustrate that drag king performance remains unequal to drag queen performance. They also mention that because women are in a lesser position in society when they do a role reversal, women are attempting to increase their power, upset the power structure, thus providing a reason why male impersonation is not equal to female impersonation (Torr and Bottoms 2010).

In addition to bringing power, male privilege enforces the perspective that masculinity is natural and femininity is artificial. Halberstam (1998) agrees with the societal distinction of natural masculinity and artificial femininity. She finds that because femininity is viewed as artificial and masculinity as natural, drag kings cannot perform gender in the same "camp" way that drag queens do (Halberstam 1998). Masculinity, especially cisgender, white, middle class, heterosexual masculinity, is presented as something that is simply and only an intrinsic property of maleness. Men derive power from the impression

that cisgender, white, middle class, heterosexual masculinity is true masculinity. This power is particularly evident in situations in which another's masculinity is questioned as unnatural and can therefore be challenged as untrue masculinity. Halberstam (1998) supports this claim with evidence that minority masculinities are seen as performative, including gay and black masculinities. Drag king performances reflect this phenomena as drag kings often perform gay, working class, or black masculinities as these masculinities "have already been rendered visible and theatrical (1998:235)." Privileged masculinities are seen as natural, while femininity and minority masculinities are considered unnatural. This idea is also found in the roots of drag in female and male impersonation in theatre. Even within this history, women did not impersonate men in the same way that men impersonated women. Women could only play young boys or immature men while men could play women of any age, again demonstrating gatekeeping into true, mature masculinity (Halberstam 1998, Torr and Bottoms 2010). Halberstam describes this lack of symmetry by saying, "if boys can play girls and women, but women can play only boys, mature masculinity once again remains an authentic property of adult male bodies while all other gender roles are available for interpretation (1998:233)." For one to achieve "real" masculinity, a very specific type of maleness is required. Halberstam even places the kings with more "natural" masculinity over the ones that make their drag too theatrical saying "femme pretenders" perform drag that is "deliberately overdone [...] loudly theatrical [...] possibly less interesting [and] offers a reassurance that female masculinity is just an act (1998:249)." These distinctions make drag king performance inherently different from drag queen performance.

There are a limited number of studies that examine the tension between these two groups, but there are a few examples within the current literature that begin to touch on this. Based on a

small panel of drag performers, Rupp et al. (2010) sought to find similarities between kings (in their study kings included a drag king troupe of trans men, trans women, and cis women performers performing as any gender) and queens. Kings often consciously consider and utilize feminist and queer theories in their performances and Rupp et al. (2010) argue that while queens rarely consider the implications, queer and feminist theory can be applied to the queens' performances as well. Rupp et al. (2010) find that both kings and queens play with gender fluidity, sometimes revealing a different gender partway through their performance (Rupp et al. 2010). However, Halberstam (1998) finds that changing gender in a performance is specific to kings and it is linked to maintaining an unthreatening femininity. Of the few authors that compare kings and queens, Rupp et al. (2010) are a rare case that concludes that queens, in addition to kings, are critical of the institutions of heteronormativity and gender.

However, Rupp et al. (2010) also find that the performers did feel there are large differences in the attitudes between kings and queens, stating that the kings found the drag queen performances to be problematic and potentially sexist. In *Mother Camp*, Newton (1979) discusses how the female impersonators² she studied viewed women and lesbians. She finds a stark separation between gay men and lesbians and a lack of drag kings in the community she studied. Newton (1979) finds that slurs such as “faggots” and “dykes” are used negatively in the community against the other group, demonstrating that there was not only a disconnect between gay men and lesbians at this time, but open hostility as well. One female impersonator told Newton that she did not like “women, broads or fish” but often times when she asked them about racism, they told her that as members of the gay community they “couldn't afford” racism (1979: 26). While the female impersonators were unwilling to marginalize other gay men based on their

² In her study, Newton found that most of the performers in her research preferred “female impersonator” to “drag queen.”

race, they had no qualms about blatant misogyny towards women, including lesbians, yet they impersonate the feminine gender in their performances. With examples such as these, is there room for lesbians, transgender women, bisexual women, or other queer women in the drag community?

Even in communities of people who have less power in American society, privilege and marginalization can and does occur. For example, LGBT+ communities have power structures with certain groups holding power and others being marginalized. Drag communities, as a subculture of the queer community, have the potential to reflect these patterns as well. When these communities have been studied previously, often the researcher focuses strictly on either queens or kings, only providing a limited view of this diverse community. In this study, I have included performers of all genders to address these gaps in the literature and describe what male privilege and non-male marginalization looks like in drag communities.

HYPOTHESES

I suggest that male privilege is inescapable in American society, and it is likely reproduced in drag communities, leaving non-male genders with a disadvantage, potentially marginalizing non-male performers. Despite a heightened awareness of diversity, sexism, and sexuality in drag communities, the male privilege that exists in the larger society will be replicated and observed in drag communities.

H1: Male drag performers will have higher self-perceptions of their own privilege. Non-male drag performers will have lower self-perceptions of their own privilege.

In order to determine if male privilege exists in drag communities, I conducted a survey with performers in these communities throughout the United States. I measured self-perceptions of privilege of the performers. Men as a collective group receive various invisible

accommodations and social advantages linked to their gender. This is male privilege, and while gay men do not have access to every privilege granted to heterosexual men, they do not lose their male privilege status just because of their sexual orientation. In the drag community, I expect to see this materialized in instances of disrespect towards women by not placing as much importance on using the kings' stage names or the proper pronouns compared to the use of queens, stage names and the proper pronouns. Additionally, I expect that queens will hold themselves and other queens in much higher esteem. I also expect that gendered titles (and positions in the hierarchy of the drag community) such as emperor and empress, while they emulate heterosexuality, will often be held by two cisgender gay men, one as a drag queen and another as a faux king (a man who performs masculinity), indicating that males continue to be privileged by being chosen for higher status positions. I expect that men will rate themselves higher on the privilege scale, while non-male performers will rate themselves lower on privilege.

H2: Non-male drag performers will have higher self-perceptions of marginalization than male drag performers.

I suggest that the male performers hold the most power and influence in the drag community, and I expect to find that this pushes non-male performers to the edges of their performance community. The marginalization of non-male performers is related to male performers exercising their male privilege through their behavior. This likely means that non-male performers are less likely to be included and that they are viewed as having less value in the drag community. I expect to see marginalization in instances such as when kings are denied equal access to highly valued performance slots and other advantageous positions or activities in the drag community. I expect male performers, primarily drag queens, to indicate that they are central, while non-male performers, primarily drag kings, to indicate that they are marginalized.

H3: Performers will perceive drag queens as having higher privilege than other performers.

H4: Performers will perceive drag kings as being the most marginalized performers.

I expect other performers to report higher levels of privilege and lower levels of marginalization among drag queens. I am interested in self-perceptions of privilege and marginalization, however, privileged individuals don't commonly recognize or acknowledge that they are in a position of power so I asked a series of semantic differential questions about four performer groups to measure all of the participants' perceptions of performer groups' privilege and marginalization. Additionally, those who don't experience privilege or marginalization are not necessarily unaware of its practice within the community and in order for one group to be privileged or marginalized, the participation of all groups makes it possible.

METHODS

To determine if there are perceptions of male privilege and non-male marginalization in the drag communities, I used the online survey software Qualtrics to build and disperse an internet survey to drag performers throughout the United States. A survey was essential to this study because various drag communities may have different structures. While Montana's drag community has more drag queens than drag kings, kings are frequently title holders. However, other drag communities in the Pacific Northwest have mostly male title holders. Therefore to accurately capture an understanding of drag communities across the country, an online survey is the best method to reach a variety of communities that have different configurations.

Recruitment

The International Court System (ICS) encompasses a nonprofit body that puts on drag shows to raise money for charity across Canada, the United States, and Mexico. It is the only nationwide drag oriented non-profit organization in the U.S. On the ICS website, they list 68 chapters, 56 of which are located in the United States. The 56 U.S. chapters are located in 24 states and the District of Columbia. For the purposes of this research, only the chapters located in the U.S. were contacted. The website for ICS includes a chapter directory with a contact email for each chapter. Using the contact email for each chapter, I used Dillman's three email contact strategy (Dillman et al. 2009) over two months, asking each chapter to distribute the information about the survey throughout their local chapter using social media and email lists. I emailed each U.S. court and received seven failure to send messages. Email contact generated 27 responses, and due to the failed emails and low number of completed surveys, I turned to social media recruitment.

I then distributed the survey through two popular social media sites: Facebook and Tumblr. I chose these two sites for their visible LGBT+ and drag communities. Chapters of ICS and for profit drag production companies often have Facebook pages and groups to stay connected. The link to the online survey was posted in Facebook drag groups and shared through connections to drag performers, asking them to share the link on their page so other performers could see the link. On Tumblr, the link was submitted to sociology, LGBT+, and drag related blogs so users could spread the link to users throughout the site. The use of social media in addition to email helped reach performers that were not associated with a chapter of the ICS. Because of the hard-to-find nature of this community and the recruitment method, random or representative sampling was not possible and the results are not generalizable.

Respondents were told that the survey was a study about drag communities in the United States and was for people who had performed in drag shows. The requirements for the respondents were that they must have performed in a drag show, they must be 18 years or older, and they must reside in the United States. There were no requirements about the frequency of performances. The age requirement was instated to prevent minors from taking the questionnaire due to restrictions from the Institutional Review Board. Because most drag shows take place in venues with age requirements, such as bars, drag performers typically must be above the 18 or 21 age requirements to perform, so this likely did not exclude any drag performers. To avoid multiple responses from a single participant, I told the software to “prevent ballot stuffing” allowing only one survey per person. The participants were given instructions and reminded they could skip any question that made them uncomfortable. They were informed that the software made the survey completely anonymous, not even collecting IP addresses of the respondents. The survey and all recruitment materials are available in the appendices.

Survey

The survey asked several demographic or sorting questions to categorize respondent’s social location. Gender was the most important question to understand the dynamics of privilege and marginalization in drag communities. Because transgender individuals may experience drag communities differently than people who are cisgender, I made five distinctions for gender: transgender woman, cisgender woman, transgender man, cisgender man, and an “other” option for respondents whom none of the four options described their gender adequately. The first four options included a short description for individuals who were not familiar with the distinctions between cisgender and transgender in the format of “Cisgender Man (Assigned male at birth and

identify as a male).” These gender options helped me describe these communities’ full gender diversity more accurately.

To learn about self-perceptions of privilege in drag communities, I asked respondents about social interactions and atmosphere in the drag community. When I broke the surveys down by gender, I was able to see which groups reported that their voices are taken seriously and that they are respected in the community, as well as which groups report they don’t feel this way.

To understand self-perceptions of marginalization in drag communities, I asked participants questions about how “central” they felt they were in their drag community. The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate whether they strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with a list of statements about their local drag community. This statement measures self-perceptions of privilege, “I often have access to a satisfactory time slot during drag shows,” and self-perceptions of marginalization, “I feel excluded from my local drag community.” Table 1 lists the research questions and what survey questions are related. Additionally, I used a semantic differential to measure perceptions of privilege and marginalization of drag queens (men who perform femininity), drag kings (women who perform masculinity), faux kings (men who perform masculinity), and faux queens (women who perform femininity). I used standard semantic differential questions about status (low status/high status) and power (powerful/powerless) to learn about perceptions of privilege. I also included a semantic differential that I created to measure privilege by getting at perceptions of prestige or fame (renowned/ordinary) and two of my own semantic differential scales to learn about perceptions of marginalization: marginal/central and included/excluded. I used these two measures to learn about perceptions of marginalization because they inform on how each performer category is viewed by all performers.

Table 1: Survey Questions Used to Measure Variables

Variable	Coordinating Survey Questions
Self-Perception of Privilege	Q6-9, Q6-12, Q6-18, Q6-23, Q6-24, Q7-1, Q7-2, Q7-3, Q7-4, Q7-5, Q7-6, Q7-8, Q7-11, Q7-12, Q7-13, Q7-14, Q7-15, Q7-17
Self-Perception of Marginalization	Q6-22, Q7-9, Q7-16, Q7-19, Q7-20, Q7-22, Q7-23, Q7-24, Q7-25, Q7-26, Q7-27, Q8
Perceptions of Privilege	Q9-1, Q9-5, Q9-6, Q9-7, Q9-9, Q9-10, Q9-11
Perceptions of Marginalization	Q9-2, Q9-20

Following the completion of surveys, I used Qualtrics to transfer the data into SPSS for analysis. To fully understand privilege and marginalization, I examined self-perceptions and perceptions of both privilege and marginalization.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

There were 96 total responses collected, and 46 responded to the question on gender and the semantic differential questions. The majority of the incomplete surveys only answered one or two questions; it is not possible to determine if they came back later to finish or if they discovered that the survey did not apply to them at that point. The 46 respondents who answered the gender question will be used as the total valid sample in discussing the data. These numbers do not represent the makeup of all drag communities in the United States because the size and self-selected nature of the sample.

Descriptive and Independent Variable Measures

Tables 2 and 3 describe the responses to the survey questions about drag persona and gender. Of the 46 valid cases, 23 (52.3%) stated that their drag persona was a drag queen, and 9 (20.5%) stated that their persona was a drag king.

Table 2: Number and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Drag Persona Categories

	N=44	Frequency	Percent
Drag Queen		23	52.3
Drag King		9	20.5
Other		6	13.6
Faux King		3	6.8
Faux Queen		3	6.8
Total		44	100

More than half of the respondents (65.2%) were men; of the total respondents, 56.5% were cisgender men and 8.7% were transgender men. Of the 46, 19.5% were women; 15.2% of the participants were cisgender women and 4.3% were transgender women. The remaining 15.2% of respondents answered “other” as their gender, indicating that they did not identify as any of the above categories, and they wrote in genders such as non-binary and genderqueer meaning that they are neither male nor female genders. When asked in the form of a write-in about sexual orientation, there were a variety of answers such as gay, lesbian, gray asexual, bisexual, pansexual, and two-spirit; however, only one indicated that they identified as heterosexual.

Table 3: Number and Percentage of Respondents' Self-identified Gender

	N=46	Frequency	Percent
Cisgender Man (Assigned male at birth and identify as a male)		26	56.5
Cisgender Woman (Assigned female at birth and identify as a female)		7	15.2
Other		7	15.2
Transgender Man (Assigned female at birth and identify as a male)		4	8.7
Transgender Woman (Assigned male at birth and identify as a female)		2	4.3
Total		46	99.9*

*Due to rounding error

Table 4 shows the responses to the survey question about race. Based on a “check all that apply” race question, this sample was 86.4% white, 9.1% black, 6.8% Native American, and 4.6% other, including a participant who indicated they were “mixed.” Six respondents (13.6%)

indicated that they were of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin. In a comments portion of the questionnaire, one individual commented specifically on the lack of racial diversity of kings. When asked “would you like me to know anything further about yourself, your local drag community, or drag communities in general?” they responded “drag kings of color are, from my experience as a black drag king, still largely unheard of in my own community and among other kings I've talked to. Performers of color, in general, aren't nearly as common as white performers.” Their experience mirrors the results of the data.

Table 4: Number and Percentage of Respondents’ Race and Ethnicity

N=44	Frequency	Percent
White	38	86.4
Black or African American	4	9.1
American Indian, Native American or Alaskan Native	3	6.8
Other	2	4.6
Higher frequency and percent due to “check all that apply”		
Are you of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin?		
Yes	6	13.6

Respondents were from 13 different states from across the country, with the largest percentage from Montana (20.5%), where the researcher is based and the survey originated.

Table 5: Number and Percentage of Respondents' Location by State

	N=44	Frequency	Percent
Montana		9	20.5
California		6	13.6
Texas		6	13.6
Colorado		5	11.4
Ohio		4	9.1
Idaho		3	6.8
Rhode Island		3	6.8
Illinois		2	4.5
Iowa		2	4.5
Minnesota		1	2.3
New Jersey		1	2.3
New York		1	2.3
Wisconsin		1	2.3
Total		44	100

Dependent Variable Measures

To determine if self-perception of privilege and marginalization are present in my sample, I ran a factor analysis to create a Privilege scale and a Marginalization scale. I chose to measure each variable with four items and used a correlation matrix to ensure a cohesive factor analysis.

Self-perception of privilege. Based on the operational definition of privilege (given status and power, being well-known and well-regarded in the community), the face validity of the items, and the correlation scores, the following four items were chosen to create the Privilege scale:

Table 6: Correlations of Self-Perception of Privilege Items

N = 41 \diamond	1	2	3	4
(1) I have a lot of prestige in my community	-	.694	.699	.710
(2) My voice is taken seriously as a member of my local drag community		-	.786	.664
(3) I have access to more preferred time slots during drag shows			-	.667
(4) I have many fans who support me				-

*N for cell 1x3 = 40

In order to develop a privilege scale from the four items, I had to complete several preliminary steps. First, I checked frequency distributions for complications within the data. All of the data were in the expected range and there was no substantial missing data. Items were reverse coded by transformation so that higher numbers reflected higher privilege. Once this was corrected, I ran a correlation matrix to confirm there were no weak correlations (less than .29). The four scale items were not weakly correlated with each other, as displayed in Table 6. Each correlation is either moderate (.30 to .69) or strong (.70 to 1.0), which is essential for the strength of the scale. Next, I ran a reliability test. The Cronbach's alpha for these items is .902, which indicates a strong reliability. Because of the results from these tests, unidimensionality is demonstrated. The factor loading scores are given in Table 7.

Table 7: Factor Loading Scores for Self-Perception of Privilege $\alpha = .902$

Item	Factor
I have a lot of prestige in my local drag community.	.851
My voice is taken seriously as a member of my local drag community	.890
I have access to more preferred time slots during drag shows.	.885
I have many fans who support me.	.901

These series of tests demonstrated that the items are highly correlated and therefore reliable. Given this analysis, I created the privilege scale using the mean score of the four items. Scores range from 1 (low privilege) to 6 (high privilege) based on how respondents answered the questions (Q7-1, Q7-4, Q7-8 and Q7-12 in the online questionnaire, see Appendix A).

Self-perception of marginalization Based on the operational definition of marginalization (perceiving oneself socially on the outer edge of a community), the face validity of the survey

items, and the correlation scores, the following four items were chosen to create the marginalization scale:

Table 8: Self-Perception of Marginalization Item Correlations

N = 41 \diamond	1	2	3	4
(1) When my drag community considers making changes, my opinion will have weight in making that decision	-	.597	.457	.673
(2) No one really cares what I think about the drag community and drag show performance		-	.370	.555
(3) I am not totally integrated into my local drag community			-	.621
(4) I am at the core of my local drag community				-

*N for cell 1x3 = 40

In order to develop a marginalization scale from the four selected items, I had to complete several preliminary steps. Several items were reverse coded so that higher numbers reflected higher marginalization. Then I created a correlation matrix to confirm that there were no weak correlations (0.0 to .29). The correlations are displayed in Table 8. There were no weak correlations among the four items. Correlations ranged from moderate (.30 to .69) to strong (.70 to 1.0), which is essential for the creation of the scale. Next, I ran a reliability test. The Cronbach’s alpha for these items is .819, which demonstrates a strong reliability.

The results of these tests further confirmed that the marginalization scale is a legitimate scale. These series of tests demonstrated that the items are highly correlated and reliable. The data are unidimensional, and a rotation was not necessary because only one factor was extracted. The factor loading scores are in Table 9.

Table 9: Factor Loading Scores for Self-Perception of Marginalization $\alpha = .819$

Item	Factor
When my drag community considers making changes, my opinion will have weight in making that decision.	.753
No one really cares what I think about the drag community and drag show performance.	.829
I am not totally integrated into my local drag community.	.870
I am at the core of my local drag community.	.772

Given this analysis, I created the Marginalization scale using the mean score of the four items. Scores range from 1 (low marginalization) to 6 (high marginalization) based on how respondents answered questions on marginalization (Q6-22, Q7-19, Q7-25, and Q7-27 in the online version of the questionnaire, Appendix A).

Tests of Hypotheses

Perceptions of privilege. Table 10 displays the results for the self-perception of privilege scores of all of the male performers, all of the female performers, and the performers who are other genders. Where a score of 1 is low and 6 is high, the comparison across the three gender groups (men, women, and other) shows that male drag performers have a higher self-perception of their own privilege. Non-male performers had lower levels of self-perceived privilege. These results confirm my first hypothesis that male drag performers have a higher self-perception of their own privilege, while non-male drag performers have lower a self-perception of their own privilege.

Table 10 also displays the results for the marginalization scores of all of the men, all of the women, and those who are other genders. Based on the results of this study, I find support for my second hypothesis that non-male drag performers have a higher self-perception of marginalization than male drag performers. I find that non-male drag performers had a higher self-perception of marginalization than the male drag performers. The comparison across the three gender groups (men, women, and other) shows that non-male drag performers reported higher levels of self-perceived marginalization. Women indicated higher levels of self-perceived marginalization than men.

Table 10: Self-Perception of Privilege and Marginalization by Gender

	Men (Cis and Trans)	Women (Cis and Trans)	Other Genders
N	27	7	6
Privilege	4.44	3.68	3.88
Marginalization	2.63	3.36	3.50

Using a semantic differential scale, I asked all performers to rate drag queens (men who perform femininity), drag kings (women who perform masculinity), faux kings (men who perform masculinity) and faux queens (women who perform femininity) on a series of opposite adjectives (Q9-Q12 on the questionnaire, see Appendix A). On a seven-point semantic differential scale, performers rated members of the four group's perceptions of each group's privilege. I assessed performers' explicit beliefs about the privilege of each group using three semantic differential scores (renowned vs. ordinary, powerful vs. powerless, and high status vs. low status.) I reversed the coding of several of the scales so that higher scores would reflect higher perceptions of privilege.

The results from the renowned/ordinary semantic differential are displayed in Table 11. Renowned was equal to a score of seven and ordinary was equal to a score of one. A score of four would indicate that the respondent thought the performer category was an even split between renowned and ordinary. All of the semantic differential questions follow this form. Performers' perceptions of drag queens as renowned or ordinary have a mean score of 4.36, indicating that drag queens are perceived to be more renowned than ordinary. Drag kings are perceived as the next most renowned (3.41), followed by faux queens (3.08), and then faux kings (2.73).

To determine if these differences were statistically significant, I conducted a one way analysis of variance³. The ANOVA did find a statistically significant difference between at least two groups. The results from the ANOVA test are displayed in Table 11. After running a Bonferroni post hoc test to determine which groups are statistically significant, I found that perceptions of drag queens’ level of renownness are statistically different from the other three groups. There are not significant differences in the levels of power between each set of the other three performer categories. Respondents perceive drag queens as significantly more renowned than what would be expected by chance. This is one measure used to understand privilege and, therefore, drag queens are perceived to be more privileged than each of the other performer categories.

Table 11: Mean Scores for Perceptions of Privilege

	Drag Queens N=44		Drag Kings N=41		Faux Queens N=39		Faux Kings N=37	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Ordinary/Renowned	4.36	1.69	3.41	1.83	3.08	1.87	2.73	1.76
Powerless/Powerful	4.68	1.21	3.34	1.51	3.44	1.71	3.46	1.76
Low/High Status	4.70	1.17	2.90	1.47	3.03	1.77	3.03	1.60

ANOVA Results (F-Values)	
Scale	By Performer Category
Ordinary/Renowned	6.42**
Powerless/Powerful	7.21**
Low/High Status	13.97**

* p<.05 ** p<.01

The means of the semantic differential powerless/powerful are displayed in Table 11. Drag queens are perceived to be the most powerful with a mean score of 4.68. Drag kings are perceived to be the most powerless (3.34), and faux kings (3.46) and faux queens (3.44) are perceived to be slightly more powerful, but still not as powerful as drag queens.

³ My sample did not meet all of the assumptions required for an ANOVA test. The n is small and the groups sizes are uneven. These results cannot be generalized to a larger population but I am using this statistical test to assess whether the difference is greater than what would be expected by chance.

To determine if these differences were statistically significant, I conducted a one way analysis of variance. The ANOVA did find a statistically significant difference between at least two groups. The results from the ANOVA test are displayed in table 11. After running a Bonferroni post hoc test to determine which groups are statistically significant, I found that perceptions of drag queens' level of power are statistically different from the other three groups. There are not significant differences in the levels of power between each set of the other three performer categories. Respondents perceive drag queens as significantly more powerful than what would be expected by chance. Power is one part of privilege and drag queens are seen as being more powerful than the other performer categories.

Table 11 also displays the results from the means of the low status/high status semantic differential. Performers' perceptions of drag queens have a mean score of 4.70, which is higher than every other performer category. The scores of the faux kings and faux queens are slightly lower than the middle score of four, and the score of drag kings falls below the middle score with a mean of 3.90. Drag queens were perceived to have higher status than drag kings by a mean difference of 1.80. Status is another part of privilege and drag queens are seen as having more privilege than those in other performer categories based on this measure of the privilege variable.

To better understand the differences between these groups, I ran a test of ANOVA. These results are in table 11. This test did indicate that there was a statistically significant difference between at least two groups. After conducting a Bonferroni post hoc test, I found that perceptions of drag queens were significantly different from perceptions of the other groups and that perceptions of other groups was not significantly different from each other. Status is another part of privilege and, again, drag queens are perceived to have more status than other performer categories.

I find that drag queens are perceived by others to hold more privilege than other performer categories based on these three scales. I hypothesized that performers perceive drag queens to have higher privilege than other performers. Perceptions of drag queens were statistically different from all other performer categories, supporting this hypothesis.

Perceptions of marginalization. Utilizing a semantic differential scale, I asked performers to rate drag queens, drag kings, faux kings and faux queens on a series of opposite adjectives (Q9-Q12). There were seven points in between the paired words for the performers to indicate where they perceived the groups of performers. To measure performers’ perceptions of marginalization for each group, I examined the results from two semantic differentials.

The results from the semantic differential for central/ are displayed in Table 15. Drag queens are perceived to be the most central group with a score of 1.73. Faux queens are perceived to be the next most central group (3.47), followed by faux kings (3.51), and lastly, drag kings, with a score of 3.60, are perceived to be the least central, most marginal, group.

Table 15: Mean Scores for Perceptions of Marginalization

	Drag Queens N=44		Drag Kings N=42		Faux Queens N=40		Faux Kings N=37	
N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Central/Marginal	1.73	1.44	3.60	1.61	3.47	1.59	3.51	1.63
Excluded/Included	1.91	1.22	3.22	1.82	3.15	1.75	3.45	1.84
ANOVA Results (F-Values)								
Scale	By Performer Category							
Marginal/Central	14.29**							
Included/Excluded	7.36**							

* p<.05 ** p<.01

To determine if these differences were statistically significant, I ran an ANOVA test for the marginal/central semantic differential scale. The results of this test, were statistically significant. These four groups of performers are perceived to have different levels of

marginalization in their community. The ANOVA demonstrates that there are significant differences between at least two groups on the means for perceived levels of being central versus marginal. I ran a Bonferroni post hoc test to examine which groups were significantly different. This test shows that the differences between drag queens and each other groups are significant. However, when comparing the other three groups to each other, there is not a statistically significant difference. Respondents perceive that drag queens are significantly more central, and less marginal, than what would be expected by chance.

I also asked respondents to indicate how included or excluded they thought each performer category was. The results of the means for this semantic differential are in Table 15. Drag queens are perceived to be the most included performer category with a score of 1.91. Faux queens have the next most included score, 3.15. Drag kings (3.22) fall in between the faux queens and faux kings, who are perceived to be the most excluded (3.45).

To better understand the differences among these four groups for inclusion/exclusion, I utilized an ANOVA test. This test indicated that that was a statistically significant difference between at least two groups based on perceived level of exclusion. A Bonferroni post hoc test indicated that perceptions of drag queens were significantly different from perceptions of each of the other three groups. However, the other three groups of performers were not significantly different from each other based on perceived level of exclusion.

I hypothesized that performers perceive drag kings as having higher marginalization than other performers. Using the two scales, I find that drag queens are perceived by others to be more central than other performer categories.

While drag kings were perceived by others to be more marginalized than drag queens, they were not perceived by others to be the most marginalized performer category. Perceptions

of the most marginalized performer category varied between faux queens and faux kings. However, drag queens were perceived by others to be the most central group and this difference was statistically significant. Perceptions of drag queens were statistically different from all other performer categories. Perceptions of drag kings were not statistically different from all other performer categories, not supporting this hypothesis.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to test hypotheses about the relationships between gender and self-perception of privilege, gender and self-perception of marginalization, performer category and perceptions of privilege, and performer category and perceptions of marginalization.

Based on the results of my privilege and marginalization scales for self-perceptions, my hypothesis H1 is supported. Self-perception of privilege is highest with the males in this sample of United States drag communities. I find that male performers (both cisgender and transgender) perceive their own privilege as higher than non-male genders perceive their own privilege.

I also find that male performers report levels of self-perceived marginalization that are lower than non-male performers. This supports my hypotheses H2, that male performers view themselves as more central than other genders do even in communities of oppressed people. Because male performers are perceived as being closer to the center of the community, they may benefit the most from what it has to offer while non-male performers are perceived to be more marginalized, therefore unable to have full access.

Based on the results of the semantic differential scales, my hypothesis on perceptions of performer's privilege, H3, was supported. There were statistically significant differences in each one of the semantic differentials discussed to illustrate perceptions of privilege. Each semantic differential demonstrated that drag queens had statistically significant differences from each of

the other performer groups based on level of centrality and level of power. Based on performer's perceptions, drag queens are the most privileged performer group.

H3, was not supported; drag kings were not perceived to be the marginalized performer group, however, drag queens were found to be the most central. There were statistically significant differences in each one of the semantic differentials discussed to illustrate perceptions of marginalization. Each semantic differential demonstrated that drag queens had statistically significant differences from each of the other performer groups based on level of status and level of being included. Based on performer's perceptions, drag queens are the most central performer group. This is noteworthy because while I predicted that drag kings would stand out as the most marginalized group, the only thing that mattered was that performers were not drag queens.

Measures

The high status/ low status and powerful/powerless semantic differential scales have been previously tested and used in other research on status but the renowned/ordinary, central/marginal, and included/excluded were created for this study to measure privilege and marginalization. The results of the renowned/ordinary scale did fit with my hypothesis and were consistent with the other measures but it important to consider different interpretations of renowned and ordinary that may be unrelated to fame. Additionally, the two (renowned and ordinary) are not quite opposites. The measure worked in this study but it may require some modification in future research. In contrast, the central/marginal and included/excluded scales very clearly measured marginalization with little room for respondents to misinterpret the meanings of the adjectives.

Contributions

In a community where femaleness is the lowest level in perceptions of status, being a non-male gender overrides dressing as a female in determining one's social status. These results are consistent with the limited literature that is available on the topic. Han (2008) found that gay white men cast gay Asian men as more feminine, taking away power from the Asian men in relationships. Han (2008), Coston and Kimmel (2012), Logie et al (2012) and Taywaditep (2002) demonstrate that the LGBT+ community is not immune to the oppressions of larger American society, and I predicted that these power structures would be reproduced in the drag community.

Kleiman (2000), as well as Torr and Bottoms (2010), discuss how drag queens hold power and drag kings have less access to this power. Torr and Bottoms (2010) found that gay men are feminized compared to heterosexual men and that this less powerful status means they become marginalized. However, in drag communities, wearing feminine drag does not result in marginalization, but having a gender that is not male does. The results of my empirical study are in line with their theories. Because this study is one of the first of its kind to collect and analyze data on drag shows and performers it makes a unique contribution to the sociological field. Though I am unable to generalize to all drag communities, this study provides quantitative evidence that the external status structure is reproduced within this community. Male performers, as drag queens, have privilege (as perceived by themselves and others) and female performers, as drag kings, are on the outer, less valued position in this community.

Future Research

More cisgender men took the survey than all of the other genders put together. Because this study had a self-selected sample of performers, this may indicate that other genders have already been edged out of their drag communities or that cisgender men were more willing to

speak about their experiences in drag communities because they feel more connected to their communities. It is difficult to know why the sample included so many cisgender men, but it is important to consider this for future research. Equal probability of selection method (EPSEM) sampling may be necessary to conduct sound statistical tests and to make accurate comparisons.

In future research on this topic, it would be helpful to see a large, random sample of performers. A large, random sample would mean the results of the statistical tests would be generalizable beyond the sample. A study on a larger scale would be more telling about drag communities and more representative of diverse drag communities from different regions of the United States.

Collecting data from audience members should be another direction for future research. Audience members could inform researchers on community wide norms. They could also provide a different perspective of the performers. Does the audience appreciate all genders? Do they attend to only see one type of performer? Additionally, it would be useful to know if the audience has similar or different perceptions of privilege and marginalization than the performers.

This research could also take a qualitative direction, utilizing focus groups or ethnographic observation to learn more about the experiences of performers and interactions with audience members.

Future research should also address the question of earned versus unearned privilege. It would be important to know if male performers do spend more time or money on their performances than non-male performers. It may be also be important to consider the role of the gender wage gap especially for performers who volunteer their own time and money to do drag.

The largest group of performers who participated in this study were from Montana. This is not representative of the make-up of performers nationwide and it may be that this region of drag communities are different than other regions drag communities. Most importantly, drag communities with smaller populations are often forcibly integrated while drag communities with more performers and larger audiences may have separate drag king and drag queen troupes, venues, and communities due to more demand for this kind of entertainment and the availability of more performers. Future research should compare different regions of communities or keep this in mind when conducting a study similar to this one. Additionally, in areas that are more urban than Montana's drag community, drag performers are not necessarily volunteers but paid performers working with for profit production companies. In this case, queens are more often contracted individuals while kings tend to form troupes with other non-queen performers. If performers are being paid to perform, some may be paid more than others, creating further hierarchies and offering another measure to consider. Future research might incorporate the differences between different regions. Either a comparison of these groups or controlling for location could be useful in informing us more on differences in drag communities in the United States.

In conclusion, the results raise questions about the availability as a safe place of drag communities for performers who are not male performers. Performers who are male had the highest self-perceived levels of privilege and the lowest self-perceived levels of marginalization. In general, perceptions of drag queens were that they were the most privileged and the most central performer category. While non-heterosexual males may find a sanctuary in drag communities, this is a sanctuary that is unavailable in the same way to females and other genders.

For drag communities, these results mean that their messages about being inclusive need to be backed up by actions. A similar message can be articulated to multiple pockets of marginalized people throughout our society. Safe places for women are necessary for all social movements and the exclusion of women and other marginalized genders needs to end in all arenas. For women or others with multiple marginalized identities, safe places are already limited, and activists need to ensure that marginalized individuals are not further marginalizing others.

If drag performers wish to present their art as progressive and their communities as safe places for all LGBT+ individuals, they need to address the male privilege and non-male marginalization that has been reproduced in these communities.

References

- Bornstein, Kate. 1995. *Gender Outlaw: On Men, Women, and the Rest of Us*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Connell, R.W. 2005. *Masculinities*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Coston, Bethany M. and Michael Kimmel. 2012. "Seeing Privilege Where It Isn't: Marginalized Masculinities and the Intersectionality of Privilege." *Journal of Social Issues* 68(1): 97-111.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1995. *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*. New York: New Press.
- Dillman, Don A., Jolene D. Smyth, and Leah Melani Christian. 2009. *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Eagly, Alice H. and Steven J. Karau. 2002. "Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice toward Female Leaders." *Psychological Review* 109(3): 573-598.
- Halberstam, Judith and Del LaGrace Volcano. 1999. *The Drag King Book*. London: Serpent's Tail.
- Halberstam, Judith. 1998. *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hammer, Corie J. 2008. "Is it Really Just About Being More Like a Fag? Confronting the Gay Male Model Mantra." *Sexuality & Culture* 12(3): 151-168.

- Han, Chong-suk. 2008. "No Fats, Femmes, or Asians: The Utility of Critical Race Theory in Examining the Role of Gay Stock Stories in the Marginalization of Gay Asian Men." *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice* 11(1): 11-22.
- Harris, Angelique C. 2009. "Marginalization by the Marginalized: Race, Homophobia, Heterosexism, and "the Problem of the 21st Century." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 21(4): 430-448.
- Kleiman, Kelly. 2000. "Drag = Blackface." *Symposium on Unfinished Feminist Business* 75 (3): 669-686.
- Logie, Carmen H, LLana James, Wangari Tharao, and Mona R Loutfy. 2012. "We Don't Exist": A Qualitative Study of Marginalization Experienced By HIV-Positive Lesbian, Bisexual, Queer And Transgender Women In Toronto, Canada." *Journal of International AIDS Society* 15(2):1-11.
- McIntosh, Peggy. 1989. "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." *Peace and Freedom*, 10-12.
- Newton, Esther. 1979. *Mother Camp: Female Impersonators in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Petersen, Trond and Laurie A. Morgan. 1995. "Separate and Unequal: Occupation-Establishment Sex Segregation and the Gender Wage Gap." *The American Journal of Sociology* 101(2): 329-365.
- Reskin, Barbara. 2002. "Rethinking Employment Discrimination." Pp. 218-44 in *The New Economic Sociology: Developments in an Emerging Field*. Edited by M. F. Guillen, R. Collins, P. England, and M. Meyer. New York: Russell Sage.

- Rupp, Leila J., Verta Taylor and Eve Ilana Shapiro. 2010. "Drag Queens and Drag Kings: The Difference Gender Makes." *Sexualities* 13:275-294.
- Shapiro, Eve. 2007. "Drag Kinging and the Transformation of Gender Identities." *Gender and Society* 21(2): 250-271.
- Sinfield, Alan. 2004. *On Sexuality and Power*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Taywaditep, Kittiwut Jod. 2002. "Marginalization Among the Marginalized." *Journal of Homosexuality* 42(1): 1-28.
- Torr, Diane and Stephen J. Bottom. 2010. *Sex, Drag, and Male Roles: Investigating Gender as Performance*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wu, Fulong. 2004. "Urban Poverty and Marginalization under Market Transition: The Case of Chinese Cities." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28(2): 401-423.

Appendix A
Survey Instrument

Drag Communities in the United States

Question 1.

Thank you for your interest in this survey! I am a Sociology graduate student at the University of Montana, Missoula and I am a member of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer, and asexual (LGBT+) community and often attend and perform at drag shows in Missoula. Currently, I am conducting research on the social dynamics of drag communities.

The purpose of this survey is to learn from people who perform at drag shows (drag kings, drag queens, faux kings, and faux queens) what drag communities look like across the United States. I am interested in social interactions in a special community where gender and sexuality are particularly meaningful. Please answer each question to the best of your knowledge based on your experience as a drag performer.

Please do not respond to this questionnaire unless you have performed in drag shows in the United States. You must be 18 years or older to participate in this survey.

Your responses will be anonymous so please do not put your name or any identifying information in any of the answers to open-ended questions. All survey responses will be kept strictly anonymous per the ethical standards of the American Sociological Association and the University of Montana. This project has been approved by UM's Institutional Review Board and the software, Qualtrics, will not attach any identifying information to your survey responses nor will I collect any information that would identify participants in the informational survey. If you wish to be included in the drawing, you will be directed to a separate survey, not linked to your previous answers, where you may leave your email address for me to contact the winners of the drawing for the \$50 Amazon gift card.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey.

Dustin Satterfield, BA
Principal Investigator and Graduate Student
Department of Sociology
University of Montana

Kathy J. Kuipers, PhD
Project Chair and Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
University of Montana

Q2. Instructions:

1. Your privacy and confidentiality are important to the researcher. Your name and any personal information will never be attached to your answers here.
2. This survey takes approximately 20 minutes to complete.
3. Please read each item carefully and answer as honestly as possible.
4. This survey is voluntary. You may skip questions that you may not be comfortable with and you may stop taking the survey at any time.
5. You may request a copy of the final report after completing the survey.

Q3. Have you read the instructions (or had someone read them to you) and do you agree with the terms of participation?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Q4. Have you performed in drag shows?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Q5. Which best describes your drag persona?

- a. Drag King
- b. Drag Queen
- c. Faux King
- d. Faux Queen

Q6. First I would like to ask you about your impressions of drag communities. Please indicate your agreement with each of the following items. (Statements were be randomized, options were strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, disagree, strongly disagree)

1. Drag queens spend more time than drag kings preparing for a performance.
2. In my drag community, only gay men come to see the drag queens perform.
3. In my drag community, only lesbians come to see the drag kings perform.
4. The true attraction at drag shows are the drag queens.
5. More drag kings would participate if they were better respected at shows.
6. Drag kings are much better performers than drag queens.
7. Drag kings put more effort into their performances than drag queens.
8. Drag kings attract more audience members to the shows than drag queens.
9. My local drag community actively works to combat sexism in our community.
10. My local drag community has a diverse audience.
11. My local drag community actively works to combat racism in our community.
12. My local drag community supports all of its performers.
13. My local drag community is made up of people that are from very similar backgrounds.
14. Title holders are typically men (drag queens, faux kings) in my local drag community.
15. My local drag community actively works to combat homophobia in our community
16. My local drag community celebrates diversity.
17. My local drag community is led by both men and women.
18. My local drag community actively works to combat misogyny in our community.
19. My local drag community actively works to combat biphobia in our community.
20. My local drag community has far more male performers (drag queens and faux kings) than female performers (drag kings and faux queens).
21. My local drag community actively works to combat transphobia in our community.
22. When my drag community considers making changes, my opinion will have weight in making that decision.
23. My drag community makes sure that I feel like I want to perform at shows.
24. I'm treated unfairly by my local drag community.

Q7. Now I would like to ask you about how you see yourself in your local drag community. Please indicate your agreement with each of the following items. (Statements will be randomized)

1. I have a lot of prestige in my local drag community.
2. I have fans who come to shows specifically to see me perform.
3. Other performers encourage me to perform.
4. My voice is taken seriously as a member of my local drag community.
5. When I perform drag queens are enthusiastic.
6. When I perform drag queens tip well.
7. When my drag community considers making changes, my opinion will have weight in making that decision.
8. I have access to more preferred time slots during drag shows.
9. My drag community ensures that I feel welcomed.
10. I am resistant to performing multiple numbers during a show because I do not want to take up other performers' available slots.
11. Drag kings use my correct name and pronouns for my drag persona.
12. I have many fans who support me.
13. I perform multiple numbers during a show because the audience loves me.
14. When I perform drag kings are enthusiastic.
15. When I perform drag kings tip well.
16. I feel unwelcome by those who are at the center of my drag community.
17. Drag queens use my correct name and pronouns for my drag persona.
18. My drag community does not care if I miss performing at a show.
19. No one really cares what I think about the drag community and drag show performance.
20. I'm sought out for my opinion by other performers about the drag community and drag show performance.
21. Other performers support me.
22. I am pushed to the edges of my local drag community.
23. Other performers are more important to my local drag community than I am.
24. I do not have full access to my local drag community.

25. I am not totally integrated into my local drag community.
26. I am assigned to a position of no power in my local drag community.
27. I am at the core of my local drag community.

Q8. Below is a list of reasons that someone may be excluded from their community of drag performers. Please rank order the following reasons that performers would be excluded from their drag community. 1 is the most likely basis for exclusion and 5 is the least likely basis for exclusion.

1. A person's disability state
2. A person's gender
3. A person's transgender or cisgender status
4. A person's race
5. A person's sexual orientation

Q9. Now I would like to ask you about your impressions of different drag performers. For the following pairs of adjectives, indicate the point on the scale which YOU believe best describes the behavior and characteristics of drag queens. For this study, drag queens are men who perform feminine characteristics in a drag show setting. Please give YOUR most accurate impression of drag queens.

1. Disadvantaged	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Advantaged
2. Marginal	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Central
3. Arrogant	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Humble
4. Self-centered	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unselfish
5. Admired	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Criticized
6. Talented	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Untalented
7. Renowned	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Ordinary
8. Worthy	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unworthy
9. Respected	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Not Respected
10. Powerful	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Powerless
11. Low Status	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	High Status
12. Leader	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Follower
13. Competent	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Incompetent
14. Incapable	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Capable
15. Inconsiderate	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Considerate
16. Unpleasant	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Pleasant
17. Unlikeable	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Likeable
18. Friendly	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unfriendly
19. Cooperative	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Uncooperative
20. Included	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Excluded

Q10. For the following pairs of adjectives, indicate the point on the scale which YOU believe best describes the behavior and characteristics of drag kings. For this study, drag kings are women who perform masculine characteristics in a drag show setting. Please give YOUR most accurate impression of drag kings.

1. Disadvantaged	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Advantaged
2. Marginal	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Central
3. Arrogant	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Humble
4. Self-centered	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unselfish
5. Admired	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Criticized
6. Talented	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Untalented
7. Renowned	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Ordinary
8. Worthy	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unworthy
9. Respected	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Not Respected
10. Powerful	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Powerless
11. Low Status	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	High Status
12. Leader	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Follower
13. Competent	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Incompetent
14. Incapable	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Capable
15. Inconsiderate	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Considerate
16. Unpleasant	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Pleasant
17. Unlikeable	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Likeable
18. Friendly	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unfriendly
19. Cooperative	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Uncooperative
20. Included	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Excluded

Q11. For the following pairs of adjectives, indicate the point on the scale which YOU believe best describes the behavior and characteristics of faux kings. For this study, faux kings are men who perform masculine characteristics in a drag show setting. Please give YOUR most accurate impression of faux kings.

1. Disadvantaged	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Advantaged
2. Marginal	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Central
3. Arrogant	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Humble
4. Self-centered	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unselfish
5. Admired	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Criticized
6. Talented	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Untalented
7. Renowned	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Ordinary
8. Worthy	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unworthy
9. Respected	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Not Respected
10. Powerful	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Powerless
11. Low Status	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	High Status
12. Leader	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Follower
13. Competent	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Incompetent
14. Incapable	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Capable
15. Inconsiderate	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Considerate
16. Unpleasant	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Pleasant
17. Unlikeable	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Likeable
18. Friendly	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unfriendly
19. Cooperative	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Uncooperative
20. Included	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Excluded

Q13. For the following pairs of adjectives, indicate the point on the scale which YOU believe best describes the behavior and characteristics of faux queens. For this study, faux queens are women who perform feminine characteristics in a drag show setting. Please give YOUR most accurate impression of faux queens.

1. Disadvantaged	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Advantaged
2. Marginal	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Central
3. Arrogant	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Humble
4. Self-centered	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unselfish
5. Admired	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Criticized
6. Talented	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Untalented
7. Renowned	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Ordinary
8. Worthy	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unworthy
9. Respected	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Not Respected
10. Powerful	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Powerless
11. Low Status	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	High Status
12. Leader	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Follower
13. Competent	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Incompetent
14. Incapable	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Capable
15. Inconsiderate	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Considerate
16. Unpleasant	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Pleasant
17. Unlikeable	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Likeable
18. Friendly	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Unfriendly
19. Cooperative	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Uncooperative
20. Included	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Excluded

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

Q14. What gender do you identify most closely with?

- a. Cisgender Man (Assigned male at birth and identify as a male)
- b. Transgender Man (Assigned female at birth and identify as a male)
- c. Cisgender Woman (Assigned female at birth and identify as a female)
- d. Transgender Woman (Assigned male at birth and identify as a female)
- e. Other: _____

Q15. Please describe your sexual orientation:

Please answer both of the following questions about Hispanic origin and race.

Q16. Are you of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Q17. What is your race? Check all that apply.

- a. White
- b. Black or African American
- c. American Indian, Native American or Alaskan Native
- d. Asian or Pacific Islander
- e. Other: _____

Q18. In what year were you born?

Drop down menu with years

Q19. Where is your drag community, the community that you described in this survey, located?

Please answer with a city or town.

Q20. Where is your drag community, the community that you described in this survey, located?

Please answer with a state.

Drop down menu with states including District of Columbia.

Q21. Would you like me to know any thing further about yourself, your local drag community, or drag communities in general?

Q22. Do you have any feedback about the questionnaire?

Thank you for participating in this survey!

If you would like to provide feedback, receive a copy of the results, or have any questions, please contact the principal investigator at dustin.satterfield@umontana.edu.

If you are interested in entering the drawing for the Amazon gift card, please click on the following link. You will be directed to a separate survey where I will ask for your email information. The two surveys will NOT be linked to each other.

Survey #2

In order to be entered for the \$50 Amazon gift card, please enter your email below. Thank you for your participation.