



HWA CHONG INSTITUTION (HIGH SCHOOL SECTION)

HUMANITIES RESEARCH PAPER 2020

Topic: Gender Studies, Queer Theory, Gender Performativity, *Pose*

Slant: Literature

Total Word Count (excluding appendixes, footnotes & references): 5,486 words

Student's (official) Name: Lam Yu Yang

Class: 3i4

Name of Teacher-Mentor: Ms Josephine Phay

Declaration

I declare that this assignment is my own work and does not involve plagiarism or collusion. The sources of other people's work have been appropriately referenced, failing which I am willing to accept the necessary disciplinary action(s) to be taken against me.

Student's Signature :

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lam Yu Yang".

Date of Submission:

Chapter 1: Introductory Chapter

1.1 General Background:

Pose portrays the balls in all its extravagant glory, perhaps to an over dramatised extent.

Femme queens have to look the caricature of femininity, with glamorous makeup, gowns and high heels. On the other hand, butch queens have to portray an extremely masculine version of themselves, sporting singlets and basketball shorts, in addition to chains around their neck and a short haircut, calling it Realness. *Pose* tries to question gender stereotypes of 1980s New York- using exaggeration to poke fun at the archetypes of masculine and feminine. The message is one of mockery and poking fun at the gender performative nature of society, and pushes these stereotypes to the extremes to show how ridiculous this is, all while having fun and playing dress up for others to watch while they express their gender identity. The ballroom is a place for ball walkers to express themselves- and yet, *Pose* is still connected to the network of FX and needs to have as large an audience as possible. Thus, the writers need to make it more conventional in its expressions of gender in *Pose* so it doesn't seem outlandish. This performance of the performance of gender emphasises the concept of gender being for others to watch even more- it's literally on display and twisted in such a way for more people to enjoy and as an entertainment- both for the ball goers in the show and the people in real life streaming *Pose*.

1.2 Rationale:

This research paper will affect the way people view *Pose* in that it helps them see this show in a new light, through the lens of gender performativity. It will also highlight how *Pose* is a show that carries a sentiment that gender is an integral part of one's identity.

“Gender performativity” as coined by Judith Butler is the repetition and the continuous expression of a set of learned behaviours. In addition to this, gender performativity is the idea that gender is to embody certain traits and characteristics that society sets for us. While this has been widely accepted by many academic circles, this theory is not well known among the mainstream. *Pose*, however, is screened on the FX network, an established network owned by the Walt Disney Corporation, with 25 years of history. This background suggests that *Pose* might be able to bring Ball culture and gender performativity further out into the mainstream than ever before. It is also directed by six-time Emmy award winner Ryan Murphy, who directed hit television series such as *Glee*, *American Horror Story* and *Scream Queens*. As *Pose*’s director and the network it is screened on are famous, it will reach more people than any other piece of media about ballroom culture and gender performativity ever. This may start conversations about what it means to be a gender, to express oneself in a certain way for the world to see- and this curiosity is a stepping stone towards bigger things, such as an ideal world where things such as the heteronormative narrative where to be cisgender and heterosexual aren’t assumed “natural” truths, and to be of “deviating” sexual orientations and gender identities are normalised and accepted.

Through the exaggerated nature of ballroom and drag, people will realise how “Realness” is a statement of how society judges one another based on how well they pass—that is to say, how well they display the socially accepted signs of their birth gender. *Pose* therefore foregrounds the idea that gender is not, indeed, inherent, and is instead something that is performed repeatedly, that people are involuntarily conditioned to act a certain way, to do a certain set of behaviours, merely because of their biological sex. These behaviours ingrained into them create their gender identity, how they present themselves to the world- whether it be masculine, or feminine.

Gender performativity and identity as seen in *Pose* will be analysed. I want to find out exactly what message *Pose* has regarding gender performativity and gender identity, and how the characters in *Pose* show that gender is performative through their flamboyance in the ball scenes. I will be discussing how *Pose* brings across gender as a concept- how it is on a binary and as much a way of self-expression as anything else, and clothes help to express and perform said gender. I will also be discussing the concept of self-reflexivity as seen in *Pose*- how it is a show, or performance, of gender, that performs societal gender stereotypes for the people watching, all while having balls for the people inside the show to express and perform their gender to each other. My thesis will hence bring a fresh take to the academic conversation regarding house and ball culture. *Pose* is a relatively new show, released in 2018 and no one thus far has written papers on it with regards to gender performativity and self-reflexivity. This added analysis with regards to gender performativity thus gives other academics a new take on *Pose* if they were to analyse it as well.

1.3 Research Questions:

1. How is *Pose* deliberately putting forth a message that gender is arbitrary and merely a performance through its portrayal of balls and exaggeration of gender stereotypes? What, then is the significance of this message?
2. Given that *Pose* is a performance of people performing gender, what are the implications of this self-reflexivity in relation to gender performativity?

1.4 Thesis Statement:

Pose shows the balls as exaggerated and flamboyant, all while calling it “realness”, or passing into normal society, to call into question gender stereotypes and using irony to make fun of those who fit into the gender stereotypes.

1.5 Scope of Research / Delimitation(s):

I will be doing my research paper on both seasons of *Pose*, focusing particularly on the ballroom scenes, because that is where most of the performance of gender and self-reflexivity is seen.

Having said that, I will also analyse how the characters express themselves in scenes outside the ballroom, whether through makeup, accessories or clothing. These choices are crucial to analysis of the characters and how they are portrayed with regards to gender as these are the basic tenets of self-expression- it is what one immediately sees and also the first thing that one creates a first impression of when seeing a person. The key concept of gender performativity is that gender is a big part of how one expresses themselves, with a repeated, continuous theme across their actions and expressions. Hence, by analysing the way the producers decide to ensure the continuity of the concepts of each of the characters, I will be investigating how gender is presented, re-presented and contested, showing how gender is indeed performative.

I will thus be using the lens of Judith Butler’s gender performativity and queer theory to analyse how *Pose* uses exaggeration of feminine and masculine stereotypes to question these very stereotypes.

1.6 Significance of Research / Usefulness:

This paper will be about gender performativity and identity as presented in *Pose*, and through unpacking said themes, I will be discussing the impacts of this show on society and academic circles.

While *Pose* does not explicitly use the term ‘gender performativity,’ it can be gleaned through close analysis that *Pose* unconsciously spreads Butler’s theory of gender being performative. An example of this is the very concept of the ballroom- it is a place where people dress up as exaggerated forms of gender stereotypes, and meet up to watch each other perform, with judges judging how well they perform these genders. This makes *Pose* seem very self-aware - *Pose* knows that it is making a statement about how ballroom is an exaggerated version of real life, where one has to fit a certain category to perform, where everyone around oneself, along with the judging panel is judging them for how well they fit into said category, just like in real life where one is expected to fill and perform certain actions and expressions merely based on one’s gender, with people having their eyes on them all the time. The constant references to performance makes *Pose* self-reflexive. *Pose* not only makes it clear that the ballroom is a social commentary on gender performativity in real life, but is itself a performance for the mainstream to see, for the general public to judge how it performs gender identity.

Pose is a relatively new show, released in 2018 and no one thus far has written papers on it with regards to gender performativity and self-reflexivity. This paper thus gives other academics a new take on *Pose* if they were to analyse it as well.

1.7 Limitation(s):

I will make the assumption that gender is indeed on a spectrum and sex is different from gender, as asserted by Butler in *Gender Trouble*. Discounting intersex individuals, sex is indeed a binary truth, while gender on the other hand is not necessarily chained to the two extremes of the spectrum, and is up to an individual to identify however they feel makes them comfortable. Thus, this allows my interpretation of *Pose* to be one that is more unchained from binaries, adding more nuance to the paper.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

1. Gender Performativity

1.1. Definition

When I say ‘masculine,’ the mind immediately jumps to muscles, beer and the gym, with people like Dwayne Johnson holding centre stage. And when I say ‘feminine,’ most people will think of makeup, dresses, and high heels. And yet, in the 17th century, King Louis XIV, the epitome of masculinity, wore heels- something that the word ‘feminine’ would bring up. This example encapsulates one of the key ideas shaping the concept of gender performativity- the notion that gender is an extrinsic concept created by society- a set of societal norms that stick sex and gender together, and through a repeated performance of femininity and masculinity, it becomes a norm that everyone is expected to adhere to. Furthermore, this norm becomes the basis for marginalising individuals who do not fit within the traditional binary genders , and hence are unable to find a place in gender performative society.

1.2. In the Ballroom

Within the *Pose* ballroom, butch queens are expected to present themselves as very masculine, and femme queens to be extremely feminine. This is ballroom in *Pose* - exaggeration of gender roles, to perform and be extravagant, to be flamboyant and break and twist gender, to exaggerate and change gender stereotypes. Meredith Heller writes “If we accept that drag is, at its definitional core, a projection of bi-gender that contrasts with bi-sex, then a feminine presentation by a female-identified person is not drag. In fact, that feminine presentation by that female-identified person would be an expression of cultural normativity. As such, femininity is easily read as a sign of acquiescence to rather than resistance of sexist stratified gender regulations.

Yet the problem lies not just in the reductive definition of drag, but also in how we use it as a rubric for queerness, an assessment for which expressions bend gender and which do not.” (Heller, 2015). I disagree with this as I feel that drag is an exaggeration, a performance piece, and the gender of the person doing the performance ultimately does not matter- it is about the performance and how the performer plays their part, how they exaggerate the stereotype for the entertainment of the ball goers, and the gender, and sex for that matter, of the performer is completely irrelevant. Drag and ballroom in *Pose* is an exaggeration of gender done by both sexes, for the purposes of entertainment or subconscious poking fun of gender and how arbitrary it is. *Pose*, and it’s self reflexive nature, however, knows that it is exaggerating gender expectations, and shows this through it exaggerated, campy nature- and thus, it can be seen as performance art, as a statement to the arbitrary, performative nature of gender.

1.3. Society’s stereotypes

In society, women are meant to behave in a certain way and men having to follow another set of arbitrary rules. Judith Butler once told students in a lecture in 2009 “The performativity of gender has everything to do with who counts as a life, who can be read or understood as a living being, and who lives, or tries to live, on the far side of established modes of intelligibility.” (Butler, 2009) She implies that if one fits into the gender binary, one is count as a “life”, and if one doesn’t fit into this binary they are exiled to the fringes of society and are seen as “eccentric”. And yet the irony of this is that the outcasts have created a little bubble on the fringe, and are making fun of those on the inside, who fit into the gender binary and its expectations, through an exaggeration of their stereotypes. Despite most people being wary of labels and stereotypes regarding race, the prevalence of these stereotypes with regards to gender is so problematic- and *Pose* hopefully takes the message of gender and sex being two very different things to the mainstream and not merely within the LGBTQ+ and academic community. The irony of ballroom is that not only have the outcasts braved the odds and met their physiological needs, they also have created a little bubble on the fringe, meeting their security and belonging needs. In said bubble, they make fun of those on the inside, who fit into the gender binary and its expectations, through an exaggeration of their stereotypes.

1.4. Impacts of said stereotypes

In the words of Nayak and Kehily, “The production of HIV-positive and gay identities as 'monstrous Others' is an embodied act deployed to provide heterosexual masculinity with the illusion of substance, while unintentionally summoning the abject to life. In the perpetual effort to convey its authenticity, gender identity can only concede its inadequate fallibility.” (Nayak et Kehily, 2006) I completely agree

with their assessment of the heteronormative societies' view on queer individuals.

The general public views queer individuals as creatures to be feared, and an "us" versus "them" mentality is formed.

This is seen even more frequently among the older generation who saw many queer individuals contract HIV/AIDS, hence automatically associating queer individuals with illness. However, even without the added stigma of AIDS, there are ingrained assumptions made about queer individuals such as the negative stereotypes from mass media, bastardisation from the church, in addition to childhood conditioning from peers and adults to reject people who are different from them. This is characterised from an observation by Nayak and Kehily, where they interviewed some schoolgirls, and they reported that boys tended to be homophobic, and Lucy, one of the interviewees said that "they (the homophobic boys) go, "STAY AWAY!" [demonstrates crucifix sign with fingers]", and everyone backing her up, saying "yes!", with Susan saying "Like as if he's contagious." (Nayak et Kehily, 2006). This small schoolyard bullying, a fear of homosexuality being "unnatural" and that they too could be somehow cursed to become the "Other", a homosexual, – and, even though this is irrational, they still believe it because of conditioning from childhood from parents who steer their children away from other flamboyant boys, or protesting against gay scenes in cartoons. These little actions are what draw the line between "us" and "them"- in my opinion, this is the root of homophobia and hate crimes, the spark in these individuals' childhood that creates an irrational fear of the "other", demonising homosexuals as "sinners" and "evil". This can cause emotional trauma to everyone involved- those who are queer but have internalised homophobia, causing themselves not to fully accept themselves for who they truly are, those who are being

attacked whether via hate crimes or subconscious discrimination, making them want to hide and want to change themselves, creating an emotional impact. And for those doing the hurt, this mindset is incredibly dangerous as this intolerance for fellow human beings may lead them to throw their children out for being queer, commit hate crimes or worse, and this causation of emotional trauma is very harmful for society as a whole. However, with the help of progressive shows like *Pose*, it helps bridge the gap between the general public and queer individuals, hence creating a perception that perhaps queer individuals aren't an evil entity after all, and are just like them, with needs and wants.

2. Gender roles in Ballroom Culture

2.1. Masculinity

Masculinity in Ballroom is split into many different categories, such as White Man Realness, Banjee Realness and the like. To fit in the category of White Man Realness, one has to wear a suit and tie and fit into the stereotypical white man going to the office look, while banjee realness is all about looking the part of a African American slumming it in Central Park. Heller quotes a drag king, Dante DiFranco, as saying “being a drag king only takes saying that you are one.”(Heller, 2015) This is interesting in that it contrasts with my previous assumptions about what a drag king, or butch queen is- it states that as long as you believe you’re a drag king, anything goes because, after all, it’s the performer’s performance and no one gets to tell the performer how to perform. There is also the underlying connotation that ballroom “Some kings present as genderless or gender androgynous. Some kings create male personae that are nonheteronormative or nonmasculine. Heller follows that up by saying “One of my favourite acts, which I call “body breaking,” is when a king

performs in a hegemonically masculine way while exposing what are typically interpreted as female sex characteristics (breasts).” (Heller, 2015) I think that “body breaking” is a perfect example of what ballroom culture is- it takes masculinity, and mashes it with breasts, creating a visual oxymoron, a paradox of society’s perceptions of masculinity. While I admit there is androgyny, a blend of masculine and femininity, it is typically not to the extremes of masculine behaviour and female sex characteristics- androgyny typically is a strange melding of characteristics that society deems as a masculine and feminine, coming from the roots of the Greek tale of Hermaphroditus and Salmacis, who fell in love and was merged into a single, androgynous body. While this androgyny may cause slight confusion to the heteronormative majority, “body-breaking”, as Heller calls it, would cause even more confusion and outrage. That is what the essence of ballroom and drag is, about pushing things to the extremes, making those who don’t know better shocked.

2.2. Femininity

Femininity, on the other hand, is split into face, body and then in these subcategories split into many more categories. An example of a face category is femme queen face, or femme fatale, while an example of a body category would be femme figure. This diverse range of expressions of femininity makes one wonder- what, then, is femininity in and of itself? And this thus begs the question: is ballroom merely attempting to be a safe space for the queer community to come together and walk in clothes they feel comfortable in, or is the ballroom a place where queer people mock the heterosexual majority for fitting right into the stereotypes through over exaggeration of these very archetypes? To me, it is both the latter and the former.

Meredith Heller writes that “female-femmeing” in the drag scene “bends gender” in three ways. Female femmeing bends the performers gender identity, changes ideologies about femininity, beauty, body and sexuality, in addition to exploring their femininity as a shifting site of possibility. (Heller, 2015) This implies that gender is either a performance for others, or a statement to tell others how femininity is not what people believe it to be, and it is fluid and nebulous and shifts with societal expectations. I disagree with the first statement but completely agree with the latter two assertions. *Pose* shows that *drag* is a form of self-expression and exaggeration, and one does not have to identify as male to be a drag queen, nor does one have to identify as a female to be a drag king. It is all about what makes one comfortable, what allows one to perform and express what words are unable to. I agree with her statement that drag and femininity is amorphous and changes along with the times- it is defined by what is trending at the time, what the frontrunners in fashion, beauty define femininity to be- and with this assessment from them, it slowly trickles down to the general population to form mindsets of what femininity and masculinity should be like.

Chapter 3: Methodology

I will be using the literary theory of Gender Performativity, the concept that Gender is not something within oneself but as something one identifies with and acts it out via self expression, in addition to Queer Theory, the concept of sexuality and binary deconstruction and the opposition to heteronormativity. I will also do close analysis of the wardrobe, hair and makeup choices in *Pose* to see how it makes use of visuals to show the concept of gender on each character, especially contrasting how they look walking the balls in contrast to in day to day life. The dialogue in *Pose* regarding the judges’ critiques of the ball walkers’ clothing

will also be taken into account in my close analysis of *Pose*. How the show is edited, including the cinematographic techniques such as the point of view of the “viewer” and when scenes start and end will also be taken into account.

Chapter 4: Discussion and Interpretation

Self-reflexivity is a large part of *Pose*, and its portrayal of gender performativity.

In episode 1, the way the main characters are introduced very accurately sums up what the gist of *Pose* is all about. Elektra’s narcissism in taking credit for Blanca’s idea is very reflective of how Elektra is portrayed throughout most of the season, and the robbery of the museum also foreshadows how campy and dramatic *Pose* intends to be. Pray’s voice echoing over the officers making the arrest saying “And that, is how you do a ball!”, shows how over the top *Pose* is, and this theme of being flamboyant and in your face is carried on throughout the series. This relates to gender performativity in that it is clear that *Pose* intends to be a performance and feast for the eyes, and is aware of this- the way Pray says “that is how you do a ball” sets the tone for how performative the entire show is going to pan out. It seems self-reflexive, and a pat on the back for Murphy even before the series has even started.

This unrealistic tone that the series uses also highlights how the series is meant to be self-reflexive. Not only do the characters act, dress and portray themselves as over the top, *Pose* itself is nonsensical and has major plot holes, which thus shows how *Pose* doesn’t take itself seriously. An example of this is the murder of one of Elektra’s clients in Season 2, Episode 3. Despite Elektra accidentally murdering someone and telling her friends, they deliberate over whether to go to the police or to hide the body for what seems like two days before deciding to go to Ms Orlando, who makes light of the situation, even commenting “Are we going to do this, or not? I... I have a hair appointment at 10.”, which is followed by

Candy rolling her eyes. This sentence is so comically ridiculous it can be seen that *Pose* does not seem very serious about a very serious issue, the accidental murder of a man after Elektra left him tied up after letting him consume drugs. After which, they sew the corpse up in a bag after pouring lye over it. Thus, the issue is wrapped up in a single episode, the corpse only being alluded to in passing, and no one involved- not Candy, not Elektra nor Blanca seems deeply emotionally traumatised by the fact that there is a rotting body in Elektra's closet. They certainly did not go to therapy to unravel the trauma that they must have had from hiding the murder of one of Elektra's clients, and yet they seem completely fine. In any other show, this would have been a major plot point- but not for *Pose*. This complete unrealistic depiction of reality shows how *Pose* is not only a performance on the ballroom, but also a performance on our screens- it is not meant to be taken as something that is true to reality but instead a performance of the world of Ballroom.

Candy also comes back from the dead to talk to everyone at her funeral in Season 2 Episode 4. Maybe it was a figment of the character's imaginations, maybe it was a stylistic choice by Murphy to include the episode, however, it was portrayed in a very dreamlike fashion, and seemed very disconnected from the rest of the show. For one, she appeared to Pray Tell when he specifically hated her, dragging her through the mud throughout both seasons. He confided in her and told her how he was jealous of her confidence and ability to be unapologetically who she wanted to be while he is unable to "live his truth", as it were. However, Pray is mostly portrayed as confident and able to sling insults at everyone- why then, would Murphy choose to include this bit? In my view, there is a simple explanation- the performativity of the show. The show wanted to fit in a bit on the troubles that transgender sexual workers, and what better way to do it than kill off a transgender character who did sex work? However, they needed a way to give the viewers closure, an end to Candy's arc, and hence they decided to use her ghost going around and comforting those who are still alive,

and for the sake of convenience, had Pray tell her he was jealous of her confidence although that was clearly not the case. Another issue is that of Lulu's method of mourning. At first, she thought "Girl, I can't believe you're gone", and slowly changes to "You were a... You were a thieving bitch! That's my brooch!" before ripping it off her suit, then proceeding to steal her hat off of her head. Although this can be chalked down to denial of Candy's death, it is very unlikely for Lulu, who was portrayed as Candy's bosom buddy, to outright steal from her corpse- it is very unlike her character. This disconnect from reality in this episode shows how performative the world really is- it isn't really about the characters and the development of their arcs, but instead of how they wanted to close of Candy's story. The rushed nature of the episode is very self-reflexive in that it knows it is rushed and hence leans into it and owns it, going to the extreme of Lulu stealing off of Candy's body even if they were portrayed as close friends in the previous episodes. This campiness makes *Pose* not only self-aware, but also adds to the sense of flamboyance, further suggesting that the show is a social critique of normative conventions, showing how foolish one is to follow them.

The character "models" for each of the characters also show how gender performativity is present throughout *Pose*, using stereotypes and common tropes to depict characters. While at first it may seem like *Pose* is merely picking at low hanging fruit, on further analysis, there are deeper implications to the caricaturist nature of the characters in *Pose*. Take Esteban, for example. His model is the "ghetto, black, lesser educated" man. This is shown through his constant use of African American Vernacular English (AAVE), which is very much associated for "ratchet", black culture. It draws on this heavily, almost to the point of it being his only defining characteristic. This, in addition to his being an illegal drug dealer, are most of what his character stands for, with his only character development being him turning over a new leaf and choosing not to deal drugs. Another point to note is his almost excessive masculinity- he dresses exclusively in singlets and loose fitting collared

shirts, and that in addition with the drawl that comes with AAVE, it seems too much- and this may be on purpose in that *Pose* wants to make use of his extreme stereotypical behaviours to prove a point- that society sees black people who use AAVE, as merely “ghetto, black, and less educated” people who are unable to do anything except for doing illicit activities. *Pose* uses Esteban to allow viewers to be self-aware of how this stereotype is harmful to our view on black men, and that not everyone who is black and a man is like him. While it may come off as problematic and slightly racist, the show is undoubtedly black-positive as seen by the large cast of black people, and this would never fly by them. Thus, it can be read as a self-aware piece of literature that makes use of stereotypes to raise awareness of the problematic nature of these stereotypes- or, if nothing else, how these “stereotyped” peoples are just as valid as any other people, with people they love and care about as well.

Gender performativity, and its impact on society is shown through the outfit designs at the balls. A prime example is in Season 1 Episode 6, and Elektra is wearing what looks to be a silk bathrobe with a leg slit and a rolled up towel tied to the side of her head. Next to her, Lulu is wearing a red spaghetti strap top and a scarlet feathered off the shoulder jacket. These are the more toward the feminine end of the gender spectrum, with Lulu’s being more seductive and Elektra’s being more glamorous. This shows the femininity that one is expected to portray when in the ballroom despite not walking. However, this is not the most important part of this scene- this goes to a man named “Sebastian”, wearing nothing but a pair of jean shorts pouring water down his front, who then proceeds to get 10s across the board in addition to grand prize for the category he is walking. This in contrast to women needing at least 4 inch heels, can be seen as a critique by the producers on how in the real world, one does not need to do much to get recognition, while women have to work twice as hard for the half the amount of validation. However, this can also be seen as making fun of the expectations of men to be overly masculine and “dripping” in water, and shirtless- thus

poking fun of masculinity in heteronormative society. No matter which way this is read, it can be said that this is a thought provoking scene, not only for gender expectations but how ridiculous they are.

Even outside the balls, gender performativity is still very much present. A good example of this is Elektra. She is glamorous, and looks like a rich businesswoman at all times, even after her transgender surgery. In Season 1 Episode 5, in the hospital, she is seen wearing a spiral gold earring, and a silk nightgown with a purple and green design along the neckline. Silk and gold is traditionally associated with ostentatiousness and femininity. Even after a surgery, Elektra dresses to impress, showing how the set designers had a vision for Elektra, one of extravagant femininity- and they have, indeed made it a reality. This scene is even more poignant in that this was the peak of Elektra's femininity- she finally becomes a "full" woman, with female and not male genitalia, with the subtle femininity of her gold earrings showing how she finally felt fully feminine and needed some way to express it. Even when Elektra was down on her luck, needing to stay with Blanca in the last episode of Season 1, she still managed to look ostentatious and beautiful. At dinner, she stood out among the Evangelista's in a gold satin top and tailored white suit jacket. Although suit jackets are traditionally associated with masculinity, she still managed to exude femininity and power at the same time, something very difficult to do while in a rundown flat. The significance of this scene is that despite the circumstances, Elektra manages to exude her "true self", and is still "performing" gender- even when no one is looking, in her hospital room. This shows how gender performativity is deeply encoded in our society, and pointing out how it impacts us in our lowest and highest points, and it is ever present in everything that we do.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

All in all, I feel that gender performativity is greatly alluded to in Ryan Murphy's *Pose*. Although this may not be intentional, it is still present- which thus further proves my point that gender performativity is subconscious and many a time is weaved into our assumptions and viewpoints.

Bibliography

Albert, A., & Porter, J. (1988). Children's Gender-Role Stereotypes: A Sociological Investigation of Psychological Models. *Sociological Forum*, 3(2), 184-210.

Ayim, M., & Houston, B. (1985). The Epistemology of Gender Identity. *Social Theory and Practice*, 11(1), 25–59. doi: 10.5840/soctheorpract19851112

Burke, P. J., & Tully, J. C. (1977). The Measurement of Role Identity. *Social Forces*, 55(4), 881. doi: 10.2307/2577560

Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1981). The Link Between Identity and Role Performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44(2), 83. doi: 10.2307/3033704

Butler, J. (2009). Performativity, Precarity and Sexual Politics. *AIBR. Revista De Antropología Iberoamericana*, 04(03). doi: 10.11156/aibr.040303e

Butler, J. (1988). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519. doi: 10.2307/3207893

Heller. (2015). Female-Femmeing: A Gender-Bent Performance Practice. *QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking*, 2(3), 1. doi: 10.14321/qed.2.3.0001

Nayak, Anoop, and Mary Jane Kehily. "Gender Undone: Subversion, Regulation and Embodiment in the Work of Judith Butler." *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2006, pp. 459–472., doi:10.1080/01425690600803038.

Palan, K., Areni, C., & Kiecker, P. (1999). Reexamining Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Identity Scales. *Marketing Letters*, 10(4), 363-377.

Stets, J. E. (1995). Role Identities and Person Identities: Gender Identity, Mastery Identity, and Controlling Ones Partner. *Sociological Perspectives*, 38(2), 129–150. doi: 10.2307/1389287

Valocchi, S. (2005). Not Yet Queer Enough: The Lessons of Queer Theory for the Sociology of Gender and Sexuality. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 750–770.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205280294>