

It's a (Wo)Man's World: an Analysis of Hegemonic Masculinity and its Myriad of Destructive Impacts on Contemporary Society

Masculinity as a gendered archetype of societal function reaches a point of stagnation and toxicity only when it derives essentially from the perpetual rejection of any perceived opposition to itself, becoming so pervasive that it detrimentally impacts the community as a whole, and men which have been regarded as its core for so long. Indeed, it may be regarded that, the root of all systemic hatred and discrimination, such as sexism, racism, homophobia, amongst others, stems from the plight of the cisgender heteronormative male afraid of the other, and any attempts that may be made on their position of power. In light of a recent focus on toxic masculinity, this article will explore the foundations of the gendered experience enshrined in all manners of life: family, work, and social, within our inherently patriarchal state. By extension, the widespread detriment faced by various counterparts deemed inferior, such as females, people of colour, and homosexuals, in addition to the self-destruction of the heteronormative white male himself, will be analysed. Without the deconstruction of such an institutionalised model designed to cause and maintain detriment, it is impossible to begin to destroy and then rebuild.

Keywords: hegemonic masculinity, cisgender, toxic masculinity, patriarchal state, heteronormative

Introduction

The inferiority of women has proved intrinsic to the powerful portrayals of humanity, which are still relied upon today, looking to enshrined musings of various philosophers, such as Aristotle, Gramsci and John Stuart Mill, amongst various others (Gardiner, 2005, p.2). However, the quintessential 'twentieth-century male-chauvinist' model is recorded as coming to fruition throughout the Victorian period (Christian, 1994, p.7), characterised as being unemotional, violent and essentially heteronormative and of Caucasian descent. Contemporary society has been perverted by this notion of traditional masculinity. As introduced to the global arena by Raewyn Connell, this ideology of

* Corresponding author. Email: Olivia.Tostivint@uon.edu.au

macho-male superiority and the inferiority of otherness perpetuates the concept of 'hegemonic gender identity' (Beauvoir & Parshley, 1968, p.38).

Stemming from this perception of the patriarchy and its significant reach, the notion of 'toxic masculinity' is one which has also arisen of late, seeking to encompass fundamentally male-established practices, and their detriment on society. Toxic masculinity derives from the wider reach of gender; a societal construction that is 'learnt, crafted and reproduced, through collective interactions' (Berhost, 2018) in order to create divergent characters based on a set of identity traits (Connell, 2005, p.67) and, by extension, to favour a certain position and representation of such. However, it is the normalisation of gender archetypes, and by extension their promulgation and promotion, which seeks to expel any alternative characteristic, role or societal positioning for 'either' the male or the female, allowing for minimal movement in between. Therefore, females are to be beautiful, caring and overarching subversive, to their strong, independent and intelligent male counterpart, with the roles of societal and familial life divided between the two in regards to the former, who must make the bread, and the latter, 'who wins' it. Any methods with which to distance one's self whether deliberately, by way of non-conformance to such salient gender archetypes, or subconsciously, in regards to one's sexuality, is one example amongst many.

Fundamental to the repressive and narrow depiction of manhood presented by way of toxic masculinity, is that men should not express emotions for fear of appearing fragile or vulnerable. Eloquently stated by feminist author, Bell Hooks; 'the first act of violence the patriarchy demands of all males is that they kill off the emotional parts of themselves' (Hooks, 2005, p.66). In this respect, even in the face of emotional trauma or mental illness, the practice of seeking support that is ingrained upon young girls, is neglected from the male syllabus (Hanninen & Valkonen, 2012, p.161). Indeed, a recent study into male depression highlighted that the concept of being diagnosed with a mental illness was threatening to one's masculine identity, and that 'recovery presupposed reconstructing one's self-image' (Ibid).

In addition to ensuring that the gender equality movement is restricted, toxic hegemony is predicated on the devaluation of alternative representations of masculinity (Hutchings, 2008, p.26), especially queer-identifying individuals and other minority groups. According to Connell, it is their 'otherness' which the heterosexual hegemonic masculinity seeks to marginalise and disempower. Suggesting otherwise, however, Judith Butler extends her theories of gender as a performative concept to conclude that the subversion of homosexuality is merely a repression of their own tendencies that have been stifled by dominant straight culture (Butler, 1995, p.524). Regardless, it is undeniably evident that the marginalisation of otherness, whether by way of physical attributes, sexuality, race, or gender, is crucial to the logic of hegemonic masculinity as a model for society.

Violence

Used to reinforce structural male dominance, pre-established masculine behaviours such as aggression, overarching misogyny, and homophobia (Flood & Pease, 2009, pp.125-142) as intrinsically encouraged community-wide, are especially foundational when exploring the inherent struggle of minority groups (Aronson & Kimmel, 2014, pp.531-547). Thus, the very existence of toxic masculinity serves to inform the patriarchy, whilst also acting as a pushback against feminist theory. Growing from the time of suffragettes to the current #MeToo and 'time's up' movements, encouraging the female voice and the harmful culture of sexual assault and harassment, breaking down the barrier of toxic masculinity is the next step towards overall equality. By utilising aspects of public policy, the criminalisation and penalties of certain acts, amongst other key facets of contemporary society, we can confront the reason why certain behaviours occur, and the state's role in perpetuating it as such in order to contribute, however slight, to the growing feminist resistance to such traditional detrimental behaviours and assumptions.

Throughout history, it is undeniable that man shaped and recorded humanity in his 'universal' image, 'in dreaming of himself as donor, liberator, redeemer, man desires the subjection of women' (Beauvoir & Parshley, 1968, p.38). As a result, those who do not subscribe to this baseline image against which others don't 'match', have been perpetually dismissed from all spheres of society: family, workplace, voting and public policy. Indeed, the patriarchy profits from conditioning what it means for women to be consumed by their aesthetic, and how this can be attractive to the opposite sex (Chocano, 2018), whilst neglecting any valid attempts for them to be considered equal outside the realms in which they are placed.

The woman's role within the familial structure

Perceived as the property of, at first, their fathers, and then later in life a man as his wife, the civilised woman has held many roles, none of which have been deemed significant by their male counterpart. However, whilst women are essential to procreation, their importance within the family has often been limited to the nurturing and caregiving role of homemaking. In this respect, females were traditionally unwelcome to disobey their husbands, nor were they able to participate in decision making, whether in the private or public. In regards to the notion of public policy, for example, the 'legal existence of the woman [was] suspended during marriage...or at least incorporated into that of the husband' (Blackstone, 1765, p.442). Here it is clear that the lifecycle of a female is perceived as solely to serve their superior counterpart, from birth to death.

This irreconcilable denouncement of autonomy and choice may be regarded as one of the inherent elements of the feminist resistance movement. However, such oppressive a technique is founded within the heteronormative sphere of family institutions, neglecting analysis of the increasing numbers of homosexual, polyamorous, and non-western formations of these structures. Unfortunately, in light of both time and textual limitations, this piece has not

attempted to broach the lived experience of people of colour to the extent that is necessary, but acknowledges that through the use of Kimberley Crenshaw's intersectionality lens (1989, p.140), the aforementioned family structure is not all-encompassing in any manner.

Women's experience of rape and sexual assault

Therefore, prior to acquiring the right to vote, women's voices were unheard, and by extension, they were stifled, evidenced, for example, by the criminalisation of rape. Until the late 20th century, the notion of marital rape was inconceivable due to the nature of women being the chattel of men. In contemporary society, the act of rape is punished so pitifully, if at all, in addition to the attitudes surrounding it being innately victim-blaming, hence creating an environment in which many of these crimes go unanswered and unreported. Along a similar line of thought, the simple fact that only 20-25% of sexual assaults are reported to police, and only 17% are convicted signifies a fundamental problem with our criminal justice system (ABCNews, 2016). Instead of addressing the root of why men, the majority of perpetrators, continuously commit these crimes, the focus is on the actions and faults of the victim; symptomatic of the all-encompassing patriarchal values, or lack thereof.

Media representation of women and sexual assault

An additional element sustaining this behaviour, is the way in which the media reports on these issues, and in turn garners support for legislative amendments and societal change, albeit rarely in the right direction. First and foremost, it is acknowledged that the public have been made well aware that one woman is killed every week in Australia by their current or former partners (Bryant & Bricknall, 2017, p.36). However, it is not these numbers that are being contested, but their presentation by various news outlets, which is essentially passive, removing all blame from the violent abuser. In this manner, the shift of focus from the attacker to the statistically female victim, who 'has been' murdered, or 'was beaten', removes the accountability on the part of the community and males as a collective, furthered by the prevailing idea that 'it's a women's issue' (Serres, 2016).

Justification of Sexual Harassment

In these circumstances, police officers and political leaders address the issue, regarded as speaking as the state: 'their words reassert community standards and set the agenda for how a crime is understood' (Maltzahn, 2018). This has all too often resulted in extensive instructions on how potential victims can remain safe, or as 'safe as possible', especially when considering the recent murders of Eurydice Dixon and Qi Yu who took such preventative measures (Alcorn, 2016). However, as noted by Clementine Ford, it isn't up to 'women to modify our behaviour in order to prevent violence enacted upon us' (Ibid).

Effects of violence

In addition, with each sexual and domestic violence perpetrator that leaves court without conviction, or where their value is perceived to outweigh the victim, evident with the case of Brock Turner, the message that toxic masculinity is not

punished, but essentially rewarded, is promoted. It is inherently counterproductive to criminalise the violent acts themselves, and then incarcerate only a small number of 'disproportionately poor men, Indigenous men, other men of colour and men with disabilities' in jail where they themselves will be brutalised (Maltzahn, 2018). As they are currently established in the present state, prisons, too, perpetuate the violent attitudes which allow hegemonic violence to thrive (Ibid).

Masculinised prism of state-supported violence

The swiftness to prevent further fatal one-punch assaults, after the deaths of two young men in two years, in comparison to the extensive numbers of more than one hundred women in the same time from equally violent acts, paints a heinous picture of the values that have been ingrained upon society as a whole. The stagnant overlapping of the media and the manner in which they systemically promote efficient governmental response aids in this inherent hyper-masculinised notion. By introducing severe penalties for men engaging in well-established aggression, inflated by the use of drugs and alcohol, the community outrage as sparked by an all-encompassing news rally, served to ensure political results by way of people power.

Work

Dominant masculinity is also severely threatened by the growing number of women in the workforce, which serves to alter the traditional perceptions of the family structure, and the pre-conceived notion that men have the responsibility of 'bringing home the bacon'. However, rather than responding with the well-established aggression analysed throughout this essay, the ostracising practices enforced throughout the labour market are cleverly disguised to limit the success of 'others'. With the well-documented pay gap, unpaid maternal leave, sexual harassment and the accurately titled exclusive 'boys club', the state, by way of hostile work environments and industries attempts to retrench patriarchal privilege and coerce females to remain within the confines of marriage and motherhood.

The workplace is historically steeped in hegemonic masculinity, elucidated through everyday terminology and 'lexical gaps', such as the 'occupational stereotyping and androcentric assumptions surrounding work generally' (Talbot, 1998:216). The simplest form of this is found in the use of 'man' as a suffix in occupational names: businessman, postman, etc, establishing that the clear occupier of these positions is to be male. Similarly, when women enter the workforce, they are often forced to either hide the existence of their children, or deny their future plans or desire for motherhood in order to have a chance of being hired, or promoted further down the track. This is reflected in the stigmatisation that follows maternal leave, a 'benefit' often unpaid, despite deemed as a human right (Parliament of Australia, 2004).

The current leader of New Zealand, Jacinda Arden, faced said misogynistic inquiries into her desire have children mere hours after her election (2017), and whether that made her unfit for the position. Although more analysis in the right

circumstances, the immediate nature which her and her husband have brought the success and adaptability of the modern family into the limelight, leaving behind the traditional masculine traits and roles of the father figure, is monumental. In addition, openly yet firmly addressing questions that would not be asked of her male counterparts, and recently bringing her child to the UN, for example, the unfounded notion that men are systematically superior, especially in the workplace, is void and obsolete.

Holding positions of power is inherently a double edged sword, without a direct manner through which to resolve, or tread, in light of the various situations faced daily by women, which are exacerbated in regards to those of colour, or outside the realm of heterosexuality. In those, albeit rare, circumstances in which said minorities are able to reach positions of prestige, they are often forced to adopt hard-line and traditionally masculine-associated attitudes, which may label them 'rude' and 'obnoxious', where men exhibiting these characteristics would be congratulated. Simultaneously, these women with prominent roles are criticised by the media and the wide community for any number of personal reasons irrelevant to the job title in order to perpetuate the belief of the workplace as being male-oriented and serving. A prime example of this is epitomised by the ways in which the relatively recent instatement of Australia's first female Prime Minister, Julia Gillard, was discounted as suitable for the role by her opposition, media outlets, and the general community (Woodward, 2013, pp.24-30). These aforementioned parties essentially decided that, based on her gender and her adjacently interacting physical features, clothing and lifestyle factors, she could not lead the nation, irrespective of the actual policies she put into place.

Homophobia

It is becoming apparent that the increasing visibility of females, and their subsequent rights, present a challenge to the systemic patriarchy of the state. By addressing patriarchal preaching which teach men that their 'need for love and respect can only be met by being masculine, powerful and ultimately violent' (Serres, 2016), it is clear that any revolt of gendered personality traits, roles and responsibilities exacerbates this undermining of the stranglehold of hegemonic masculinity. Hence, in order to ensure the continuation of powerful hegemony, whether consciously or unconsciously (Ibid), men are taught to engage in aggressive hate-fuelled behaviour, further perpetuating the cycle of toxic masculinity. This viewpoint also contributes to the significant number of male bystanders who do little to prevent such violence, and the key factor that when these acts occur, the behaviour of the victim is examined, rather than that of the perpetrator themselves. Therefore, whether the state is defined by feudal patriarchies or liberal capitalism, the way in which its subjects are gendered render the notion of equality unattainable until the deeply rooted seeds of toxic masculinity are addressed.

In essence, the allegedly-inferior portrayals of what a man should be are perceived to threaten the structure of the hegemonic nuclear family model, used to further patriarchal values through the privatisation of dependency (Cossman, 2005, p.415), by way of heteronormative marriages. Hence the immense pushback

by members of all societal groups in response to the plebiscite to legalise same-sex marriage in Australia, which took place in 2017. Whether individuals informed their opposition to the statutory change based on religious teachings on behalf of the patriarchy, worry over the welfare of potential children, or that it defeated the sanctity of marriage, despite almost half ending in divorce (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2017), the resistance was undeniable. With such a small number of Australians actively religious, and thus the negative pushback cannot solely be attributed to good old-fashioned biblical homophobia, one journalist pegged the overall attitude perfectly when he noted that there's 'great cultural discomfort with people 'not doing their gender right' (Forster, 2017). Nevertheless, the battle to legalise same-sex marriage began its slow victory, when, on the 15th November, 2017, 61.6% of voters approved the legislative adaptation in Australia (Karp, 2017). Deemed 'unequivocal and overwhelming' by Prime Minister of the time, Malcom Turnbull (Ibid), parliament enacted the more inclusive marriage legislature less than a month later, despite years of procrastination and overall avoidance of the twenty-three bills dealing with matter (Parliament of Australia, 2018).

There are a variety of factors that contribute to the counter-hegemonic perception of male homosexuality in particular: the association with effeminacy, the pleasure derived from associated acts is deemed subversive, and homophobia itself is essentially fundamental to the patriarchal agenda (Donaldson, 1993, p.5). Despite the fact that sexuality is being recognised as more and more fluid, and applicable to individuals of all characteristics, the innate crux of toxic masculinity must reject any representation outside of its confines. In the hyper masculine lens, "real men" are 'tough and hard' (Plan, 2011), contrasting significantly with their general perceptions of homosexual males and transgender people.

In the same individualist approach that is used to explain that each person is unique from the next, so too is a universal depiction of the queer community. Regardless, structured male members of this group are viewed as being exclusively sensitive and flamboyant, whilst the definitive females as butch and tomboyish, all of which conflict directly with the gendered archetypes of the hegemonic patriarchy. Whilst it neither scientifically, nor in any other way, wrong to embody any of the aforementioned characteristics, although few subscribe to the standard and homogenised image of a 'gay man' for example, to do so infringes on the perpetuation of overarching masculinity. As a result, any form of social or systemic undermining is addressed by the umbrella ability to possess a distaste towards members of this often politically and socially subjugated group. In addition to relentless physical harm that may, and does, occur, such widespread persecution experienced by this group collectively has oft led caused aggravating mental illnesses, social isolation, homelessness, substance abuse, and also increased suicide attempts (Sánchez et al., 2009).

This harm is not merely suffered by those facing the directly discriminated against individuals, but also as an undercurrent instigates a process of internalised shame and homophobia to many others who are so enslaved by the beast of hegemonic masculinity. In this manner, masculinity and its perpetuated model, is emotionally stunted; society exaggerates this with the culture that

shames men for the slightest of emotional displays. Indeed, although the deeply entrenched patriarchal values pose a fundamental threat to the health and wellbeing of unconventional 'other' groups, the root of toxic masculinity and its associated behaviours appears to be the consistent disregard for the heteronormative male struggle. As a result of the confines to which man is historically assumed to exist, the 'expectations of stoicism and masculinity' (Ford, 2018), the male species puts the collective at risk, especially in the face of societal change, which does not occur to be halting any time soon.

The homophobic model can be seen as translating also to the inherent rejection of anal sex, as traditionally utilised by homosexual males. For those that oppose it, the superficially satisfying reasoning that it removes the aim of procreation and at a baseline removes the ability to objectify women, which are equally at the centre of the hegemonic agenda, is enough to justify the rejection of an entire community. However, whilst some perceive that the contemporary decoupling of such a practice with the sphere of homosexuality as hinting towards societal change (Anderson & McCormack, 2018), the fact that men are less likely to be labelled 'gay' or 'queer' in 2018 for partaking, or refusing to do so, in a certain activity, such as the current topic, is the crux of toxic masculinity. Whether or not someone is attracted to the same sex, the opposite sex, all sexes, or is asexual, it is undeniably peculiar that a form of consensual sex can be considered societally wrong in the eyes of the patriarchal state. This is especially true when analysing the recent trends of pop culture which tend to suggest that heteronormative cisgender males will often provoke their female partners, although this undue pressure does not always occur, into engaging in a traditionally 'gay' exercise, without facing the ramifications that are placed on the queer community for the same practise.

Male victims of violence

In light of the aforementioned condemnation of females who report and go through the trial process of indicting their attacker, it is essential to recognise that males, heteronormative and otherwise, are also targets of sexual and violent assaults. On these occasions, the concept of emasculation through reverse-domination threatens their ability to report, and to be supported in the aftermath. Indeed, it is the maintenance of this venomous attitude that ensures the continuation of violent acts throughout society, and be held responsible for the stigmatisation of mental health issues faced by males throughout western society.

Conclusion

It is undeniable that, until society as a whole is forced to halt the pattern of collective denial and pathetic excuses for toxic masculinity, the pervasive and systematic toxic masculinity cannot be dismantled. Indeed, the myriad excuses made for the negative behaviour of men show how little decency and growth that the collective thinks they are capable of, when indeed it is not feminism that hates men, but the patriarchy. Although all individuals and groups contribute to the masculinist state in some form, it is inherently the responsibility of men to re-balance the scales of society. As males are inherently in control of the resources

that are essential to inform public discourse on discrimination and inequality, they must address their actions and attitudes, and develop them towards better understanding of gender profiles. Therefore, the deconstruction and revisioning of masculinity and gender construction is the only way to empower young people to deconstruct the patriarchy, to prevent and address societal indoctrination.

References

- Alcorn, G. (2018, June 19). Eurydice Dixon: how one woman's death put focus on 'male rage' in Australia. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2018/jun/19/eurydice-dixon-death-male-rage-australia-women-men-attitudes>
- Anderson, E. & McCormack, M. (2018.) Inclusive Masculinity Theory: Overview, Reflection and Refinement. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27(5), 531-547.
- Anonymous (2016, September 3). How the justice system lets sexual assault victims down. ABC News. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-09-02/brock-turner-justice-system-sexual-assault-victims/7801784>
- Aronson, A. & Kimmel, M. (Eds.) (2014). *The Gendered Society Reader* (5th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2017). *Marriages and Divorces, Australia, 2017* (No. 3310.0). Retrieved from <https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/3310.02017?OpenDocument>
- Beauvoir, de S., & Parshley, H. (1968). *The Second Sex*, New York: Bantam Books.
- Berhost, K. (2018). *The History and Health Consequences of Toxic Masculinity in the U.S*. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@kristianberhost/the-history-and-health-consequences-of-toxic-masculinity-in-the-u-s-82dfbc53f1ca>
- Blackstone, W. (1898). *Commentaries on the Laws of England: In Four Books*. Retrieved from <https://heinonline-org.ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/HOL/Index?index=beal/clegiv&collection=beal>
- Bryant, W. & Bricknall, S. (2017). *Homicide in Australia 2012-2014: National Homicide Monitoring Program report*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Butler, J. (1995). Melancholy gender - refused identification. In M. Berger, B. Wallis & S. Watson (Eds.), *Constructing Masculinity* (pp. 21-36). London and New York: Routledge.
- Chocano, C. (2018, September 18). Jameela Jamil is in a Much Better Place Now. *ELLE*. Retrieved from <https://www.elle.com/culture/movies-tv/a23289305/jameela-jamil-the-good-place/>
- Christian, H. (1994). *The Making of Anti-Sexist Men*. London: Routledge.
- The History of Patriarchy. (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.colorado.edu/wrc/2015/02/13/history-patriarchy>
- Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Cossman, B. (2005). Contesting Conservatism, Family Feuds and the Privatization of Dependency. *Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law*, 13(3), 415-509.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989, 139-167.
- Devlin, H. (2015, May 15). Early men and women were equal, say scientists, *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2015/may/14/early-men-women-equal-scientists>
- Donaldson, M. (1993). What Is Hegemonic Masculinity?, *Theory and Society*, Special Issue: Masculinities, 22(5), 643-657.
- Ford, Clementine (2018). 'Boys will be boys' [Radio interview] New Zealand.
- Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors Influencing Attitudes to Violence Against Women. *Trauma Violence Abuse*, 10(2), 125-142.
- Forster, T. (2017). Australia's Toxic Blokeyness Is Preserving A Unique (And Dangerous) Type Of Homophobia. Retrieved from <http://junkee.com/homophobia-australia-toxic-blokeyness/132135>

- Gardiner, J. (2005). 'Men, Masculinities, and Feminist Theory'. In R.W. Connell, J. Hearn and M. Kimmel (Eds.), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Gatens, M. (1991). *Feminism and Philosophy: Perspectives on Difference and Equality*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goldberg, S. (1991). *Feminism Against Science*. *National Review*, 43(21), 11.
- Hanninen, V. & Valkonen, J. (2012). Narratives of Masculinity and Depression. *Men and Masculinities*, 16(2), 161.
- Hutchings, K. (2008). Cognitive Shortcuts. In J. L. Parpart & M. Zalewski (Eds.), *Rethinking the Man Question: Sex, Gender and Violence in International Relations* (pp. 23-46). London: Zed Books.
- hooks, b. (2005). *The Will to Change: Men, Masculinity and Love*. Washington Square Press, New York.
- Jacinda Ardern and Mark Richardson clash over questions about her baby plans. (2017, August 2). Retrieved from <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/95351648/jacinda-ardern-and-mark-richardson-clash-over-questions-about-her-baby-plans>
- Karp, P. (2017, December 7). Marriage equality law passes Australia's parliament in landslide vote. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2017/dec/07/marriage-equality-law-passes-australias-parliament-in-landslide-vote>
- Maltzahn, K. (2018, June 20). This is what police should say after an act of gendered violence. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/jun/20/this-is-what-police-should-say-after-an-act-of-gendered-violence>
- Parliament of Australia. (2004). Paid Maternity Leave. Retrieved from https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/Publications_Archive/archive/maternityleave
- Parliament of Australia (2018). Chronology of same-sex marriage bills introduced into the federal parliament: a quick guide. Canberra: Author
- Sánchez, F., Greenberg, S., Liu, W. & Vilain, E. (2009). Reported effects of masculine ideals on gay men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(1), 73-87.
- Serres, D. (2016). *Why Patriarchy Persists (and How We Can Change It)*. Retrieved from <https://organizingchange.org/patriarchy-persists-can-change/>
- Talbot, M. (2010). *Language and Gender* (2nd ed.), Malden: Polity Press.
- Van der Gaag, N. (2011). *Because I am a Girl: The State of the World's Girls 2011 – So, What About Boys?* Woking, UK: Plan International, Because I am a Girls Series.
- Woodward, M. (2013). *Ditch the Witch: Julia Gillard and Gender in Australian Public Discourse* (Unpublished Honours thesis). University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.



© 2019 The Author. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.