

The Problems with Trans-Identification: Examining the Biological, Psychological, and Sociocultural Constructs of Gender Ideology

Author: Kimberly Tumlinson Eaton

kim.eaton@thoughtspring.org

Abstract

Demographic data on transgender identification in the U.S. reveal that white individuals make up the majority of trans-identified adults. However, when adjusted for population size, Black and Latino individuals show slightly higher rates of trans-identification. This pattern suggests that cultural and social influences—not biological determinism—play a key role in shaping gender identity. The disproportionate presence of trans-identification across racial groups supports the idea that exposure to progressive gender ideology, education, and affirmation-seeking behaviors significantly impact identity formation. Recognizing these disparities is essential for understanding the societal and psychological forces driving trans-identification.

This study relies on desk research, systematically gathering, analyzing, and synthesizing data from official sources. Its goal is to identify patterns, summarize existing studies, and construct a new theoretical framework on trans-identification. By examining biological, psychological, and sociological literature, this research challenges foundational claims, exposes contradictions, and evaluates their broader social and scientific implications.

This paper explores the biological, physiological, psychological, and sociocultural barriers to a complete transition between sexes within trans-identification. It examines key biological differences—muscle physiology, skeletal structure, and neurological architecture—highlighting immutable traits that remain unchanged by hormones or surgery. Beyond biology, this analysis unpacks sociocultural

influences, including the pursuit of minority status, affirmation-seeking behaviors, the reinforcement of regressive gender stereotypes, and divisive advocacy tactics.

A novel term, Induced Ideological Maturity (IIM), is introduced to describe the premature imposition of complex sociocultural ideas, such as gender identity, onto young children—raising profound ethical and developmental concerns. The discussion critiques the contradictory language emerging from trans ideology, such as terms like "cisgender lesbian men," which undermine linguistic clarity and societal understanding of gender.

These findings underscore the urgent need to separate subjective gender identity from the unchanging realities of biological sex. This paper calls for a critical reassessment of how biological and sociocultural dynamics intersect in trans-identification, exposing ideological contradictions, advocacy-driven challenges, and developmental risks like Induced Ideological Maturity (IIM). Grounded in an evidence-based framework, this analysis equips policymakers, educators, and clinicians with the tools to navigate trans-identification's complexities and address its broader societal impact.

This paper also critically examines counterarguments that claim gender identity is independent of biology, addressing their logical inconsistencies and empirical shortcomings. Additionally, it explores the role of sociopolitical influences—such as advocacy shifts, medicalization, and media representation—in shaping trans-identification patterns, particularly among individuals experiencing internalized homophobia.

Biological and Physiological Constraints in Trans-Identification

Any discussion on trans-identification must confront the biological and physiological realities that make a complete transition between sexes impossible. While hormone replacement therapy (HRT) and surgical interventions can modify secondary sexual characteristics, they cannot override the fundamental biological differences that define human sexual dimorphism.

Oxygen Consumption and Muscle Physiology

One critical but often overlooked factor is the difference in oxygen consumption between male and female musculature. Female muscles require more oxygen to perform the same tasks as male muscles due to variations in muscle fiber composition and mitochondrial density. Women have a higher proportion of Type I (slow-twitch) fibers, which are more oxidative and fatigue-resistant but less explosive than the Type II (fast-twitch) fibers that dominate male musculature. These physiological differences remain intact despite HRT, as muscle structure, oxygen demands, and fiber distribution do not fundamentally change.

Beyond this, male bodies maintain a higher hemoglobin concentration, improving oxygen transport and overall endurance capacity. Even with HRT, these advantages in oxygen efficiency and muscle performance persist, giving male-to-female (MtF) individuals a retained edge in strength and endurance-based activities. This further supports the argument that HRT does not eliminate male physiological advantages, particularly in competitive or physically demanding environments.

Skeletal Structure and Athletic Performance

Skeletal structure is another biological factor unaffected by hormonal intervention. Men have denser, larger bones, giving them a mechanical advantage in activities requiring leverage, power, and physical force. For example, the male pelvis is narrower and built for efficient locomotion, while the female pelvis is adapted for childbirth, leading to biomechanical differences that impact running, jumping, and overall athletic performance. These structural differences remain unchanged by surgery or HRT, reinforcing the enduring reality of sex-based distinctions.

Neural and Cognitive Differences

Biological sex differences extend beyond physiology to neurology and cognition. Research shows that male and female brains develop distinct patterns of connectivity and regional activation. While the

social and psychological implications remain debated, sex-specific biology clearly influences certain cognitive and behavioral traits. For example, males tend to excel in visuospatial abilities, while females often demonstrate stronger verbal fluency—differences shaped by prenatal hormone exposure and genetic factors that HRT cannot reverse.

Do Sociocultural Factors Override Biological Constraints in Perception, or Do Biological Constraints Fundamentally Limit Sociocultural Constructs?

- While sociocultural factors significantly influence how individuals perceive and construct gender identity, biological constraints serve as the foundational limit on these constructs.
Biological Constraints as Fixed Parameters: Biological sex is determined by immutable factors such as chromosomal structure (XX/XY), reproductive anatomy, hormonal profiles, and secondary sexual characteristics. No amount of sociocultural influence can alter these fundamental biological realities.
- Society may redefine the meaning of gender roles or create new identity categories, but it does not change the underlying biological limitations that differentiate male and female physiology.
- The attempt to override biological constraints in areas such as sports, medicine, and forensic science often leads to contradictions. For example, despite the cultural push for inclusion, male-bodied athletes competing in female categories retain physiological advantages that cannot be negated through hormone therapy.
- Past attempts to deny biological realities in favor of ideological constructs—such as gender-neutral parenting experiments—have repeatedly shown that biological imperatives reassert themselves over time.

While sociocultural factors shape perception, identity, and societal norms, biological constraints ultimately serve as the defining limits that cannot be overridden.

Behavioral Patterns and Psychological Considerations

Internalized homophobia (IH) significantly influences trans-identification, particularly among those struggling with same-sex attraction. Instead of accepting their orientation, some reinterpret their discomfort as evidence that they were born the wrong sex. This pattern is especially common in environments where homosexuality is heavily stigmatized, pushing individuals toward a socially acceptable alternative identity. In these cases, transitioning can act as a psychological escape from shame, shifting identity struggles from sexual orientation to gender rather than addressing the underlying effects of homophobic conditioning.

The racial distribution of trans-identification in the U.S. highlights the powerful influence of social and cultural factors in shaping gender identity. White individuals, who make up the majority of trans-identified adults, are more frequently exposed to gender ideology through academic institutions, online communities, and activist networks. This supports the argument that trans-identification often arises from external validation, ideological influence, and social reinforcement rather than purely intrinsic factors.

Meanwhile, racial minority groups experience higher-than-expected rates of trans-identification, suggesting that cultural pressures and shifting social norms may reframe gender nonconformity as transgender identity rather than simply a departure from traditional gender roles.

Internalized homophobia plays a significant role in trans-identification, particularly among individuals struggling with same-sex attraction. In environments where homosexuality is stigmatized, individuals may misinterpret their discomfort as a sign that they were born the wrong sex. Instead of accepting their orientation, they may pursue transition as a socially acceptable escape from internalized shame. In such cases, transitioning shifts identity struggles from sexuality to gender, failing to address the deeper impact of homophobic conditioning.

The weak social construction of trans-identity often stems from deficiencies in primary and secondary social identity groups. Primary groups, such as family, shape an individual's core sense of self, while secondary groups, including schools and peer networks, refine social roles and reinforce identity. When these groups fail to provide stable, supportive, or biologically grounded frameworks, individuals may gravitate toward socially constructed identities—like trans-identity—as a way to seek affirmation and belonging.

Without a strong foundation in biological reality and consistent identity development, individuals may experience deepening confusion about their sense of self. This uncertainty often leads to a growing dependence on external validation and ideological narratives, filling the void left by a lack of clear guidance from essential social institutions.

Behavioral patterns in male-to-female (MtF) transitions raise serious psychological and social concerns, particularly regarding dependency-driven behaviors. For some, transitioning—through surgeries, hormone therapies, and social affirmation—can develop into a psychological crutch rather than a resolution for dysphoria. As individuals seek temporary relief, they may become reliant on constant validation and medical interventions, creating a cycle of dependency that intensifies over time. This escalating need for affirmation raises legitimate questions about long-term mental health implications and whether transition truly addresses underlying distress or merely postpones deeper psychological struggles.

Another noticeable pattern is the pursuit of romantic relationships by some MtF individuals with biological women who identify as lesbians. This behavior often serves as a means of seeking affirmation, as these individuals attempt to validate their gender identity through relationships with women who are exclusively attracted to females. However, these dynamics place an unfair emotional burden on lesbian partners, who may feel pressured to affirm their partner's identity at the expense of

their own sexual orientation. This tension highlights the deeper psychological complexities and interpersonal struggles linked to affirmation-seeking behaviors within the transitioning process.

Internalized Homophobia and its Broader Sociopolitical Implications

Internalized homophobia significantly influences trans-identification, particularly among gender-nonconforming individuals struggling with same-sex attraction. While these identity conflicts are often framed as deeply personal experiences, broader sociopolitical forces shape how individuals interpret and respond to their discomfort with gender and sexuality.

LGBTQ+ Political and Advocacy Shifts

In recent years, many LGBTQ+ advocacy organizations have pivoted from promoting the acceptance of same-sex attraction to prioritizing gender identity ideology. This shift has created an environment where individuals—particularly gender-nonconforming homosexuals—feel pressured to identify as transgender rather than as gay or lesbian. In some cases, young people who might have historically identified as same-sex attracted are instead encouraged to transition, reinforcing the idea that gender discomfort necessitates a change in gender identity rather than an acceptance of nontraditional expressions of masculinity or femininity.

Medicalization of Identity

Rather than addressing internalized homophobia through psychological support or social normalization of homosexuality, the medical industry has increasingly positioned transitioning as the primary solution to gender discomfort. The rapid expansion of gender clinics, the widespread prescription of puberty blockers, and the normalization of cross-sex hormones have reframed gender nonconformity as a medical issue rather than a natural variation of human behavior. This medicalization reinforces the belief that individuals who experience discomfort with their gender must take medical steps to align with their perceived identity, rather than being supported in accepting their bodies as they are.

Cultural and Religious Influences

In societies where homosexuality remains heavily stigmatized, trans-identification can function as a socially acceptable alternative to being openly gay or lesbian. In conservative religious communities, individuals who might have otherwise come out as same-sex attracted may instead transition in order to align with traditional gender roles while maintaining the appearance of heterosexuality. This trend is particularly evident in cases where young gender-nonconforming individuals are encouraged to transition rather than embrace their sexual orientation, further illustrating how societal pressures shape identity decisions.

Media and Representation

Modern media often reinforces the idea that gender-nonconforming behavior equates to being transgender, rather than acknowledging the broad spectrum of gender expressions within both heterosexual and homosexual populations. Television, film, and online platforms frequently present narratives where characters who defy traditional gender roles ultimately identify as transgender. This messaging contributes to the erasure of gender-nonconforming lesbians and gay men, replacing them with transgender narratives that promote transition as the expected resolution for those who struggle with gender identity.

It becomes clear that trans-identification does not occur in a vacuum. Instead, it is shaped by broader sociopolitical forces that redirect individuals away from same-sex attraction and toward medicalized gender identities. Recognizing these dynamics is crucial to understanding how external pressures contribute to the increase in trans-identification, particularly among gender-nonconforming individuals who might otherwise identify as gay or lesbian.

Contradictory Language in Trans Ideology

One of the most perplexing aspects of modern trans ideology is the invention of contradictory and paradoxical terms, such as "cisgender lesbian men." These phrases defy established linguistic and

biological norms by combining descriptors that inherently conflict. For example, a "lesbian" is traditionally understood as a woman who is romantically and sexually attracted to other women. Appending "cisgender" or "men" to this term creates confusion, as it merges incongruous identities into a single label.

The proliferation of such terms not only undermines linguistic clarity but also complicates societal understanding of sex and gender. These contradictions can obscure meaningful discussions by introducing subjective definitions that shift based on individual interpretation, rather than relying on consistent biological or sociological frameworks. Such language exemplifies the ideological emphasis on personal identity over shared, objective definitions. Contradictory terms like these dilute the significance of established identities. For instance, "lesbian" has historically represented a clearly defined sexual orientation, rooted in biological sex, with boundaries that foster a cohesive community. Paradoxical phrases such as "cisgender lesbian men" weaken these boundaries, leaving individuals within these groups feeling misrepresented or alienated. This linguistic inconsistency not only creates confusion but also diminishes the authenticity of historically significant identities, hindering productive dialogue on gender and sexuality.

Reinforcing Regressive Stereotypes

Trans-identification often reinforces the very sex-based stereotypes it claims to dismantle. For instance, individuals who deviate from traditional gender norms—like girls who prefer climbing trees or boys who enjoy pink—may be encouraged to adopt transgender identities rather than simply embracing their individuality. Ironically, this response strengthens outdated and regressive ideas about what it means to be male or female.

Instead of expanding the range of acceptable behaviors for both sexes, trans ideology often narrows identity to rigid, socially constructed roles tied to sex-based expectations. This regressive framework undermines progress, creating a feedback loop where nonconformity is treated as proof of a misaligned

identity rather than a natural variation in personality or preference. As a result, both individual development and societal understanding of gender suffer, as identity becomes increasingly defined by restrictive norms rather than liberated from them.

Addressing Counterarguments: Is Gender Identity Independent of Biology?

A central claim within gender ideology is that gender identity is a purely subjective, internal experience that exists independently of biological sex. Advocates argue that self-identification should be the primary determinant of gender, even in contexts such as legal documentation, medical treatment, and social classification. However, this perspective lacks empirical grounding and introduces logical inconsistencies when applied to policy and scientific discourse.

Key Arguments Supporting Gender Identity as Independent of Biology

1. Brain Sex Theory:

Some proponents claim that transgender individuals have brain structures more aligned with their identified gender rather than their biological sex. However, research in neuroscience remains inconclusive. While minor structural variations have been noted, these findings frequently show overlap between male and female brain characteristics rather than definitive sex-specific neural patterns. Additionally, brain plasticity suggests that social conditioning and lived experiences influence brain development, making it difficult to establish causation between brain structure and gender identity.

2. Subjective Identity as a Determinant of Reality:

Many argue that because gender is experienced internally, it should be recognized as equally valid as biological sex. However, this argument is philosophical rather than scientific. While individuals may experience gender dysphoria or identify outside traditional sex classifications, subjective perception does not override objective biological structures such as chromosomes,

reproductive anatomy, and hormone profiles. Allowing self-perception to dictate biological classification leads to contradictions in medicine, athletics, and policy-making.

3. Intersex Conditions as Proof of a Spectrum:

A common claim is that intersex variations prove sex is a spectrum rather than a binary classification. However, intersex conditions represent biological disorders, not additional sexes. These cases occur in a very small percentage of the population and do not negate the fundamental reality that humans are sexually dimorphic. Intersex individuals often still fall closer to one sex or the other, rather than existing in a separate third category.

4. Social Transition Success Stories:

Some transgender individuals report psychological relief after transitioning, which is cited as evidence that gender identity exists separately from biology. However, this demonstrates the impact of social affirmation rather than proving an inherent biological basis for gender identity. Psychological distress may be alleviated through social support, but this does not validate the idea that self-identification alone defines biological reality.

Identifying as a Role or Persona

The concept of "identifying" as a different gender lacks a basis in human biology and is better understood as the adoption of a role or persona rather than an intrinsic biological state. Human biology is defined by immutable characteristics such as chromosomal makeup, reproductive anatomy, and physiological systems that are not subject to change through personal identification or external interventions.

The act of identifying as a gender distinct from one's biological sex often relies on the subjective interpretation of gender as a socially constructed concept. However, this perspective disregards the evolutionary and reproductive foundations of sex, which are deeply rooted in biological necessity. For

example, chromosomal configurations and primary reproductive functions are not only immutable but also essential to the survival of the species. Attempts to redefine or dismiss these core aspects of biology through identification overlook the role of evolutionary pressures in shaping sex-based differences, further distancing the discussion from empirical realities. This is a relatively recent sociocultural phenomenon, emerging predominantly in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. It lacks the longitudinal scientific scrutiny necessary to establish itself as a robust field of study. Unlike established biological sciences, which rely on empirical evidence and reproducible outcomes, the idea of gender identity is rooted in subjective self-perception and sociological theories rather than measurable, biological markers.

Identifying as a role or persona may serve psychological or social functions, providing individuals with a sense of community, validation, or relief from dysphoria. However, these experiences do not equate to a fundamental alteration of biological sex. This perspective underscores the need to distinguish between personal identity, which is fluid and subjective, and biological realities, which are fixed and objective.

The characterization of gender identity as a "role" or "persona" aligns with observations that gender expression often involves performative aspects influenced by cultural norms and individual psychological needs. This framework helps contextualize gender identity within broader discussions of human behavior and societal roles, rather than framing it as a biological or scientific phenomenon.

Pursuing Minority Status as a Mechanism for Validation

Trans-identification often operates as a sociopolitical strategy to secure minority status and its associated privileges. This pattern mirrors other cases where individuals adopt niche religious or cultural identities to gain special recognition. Identifying as a gender different from one's biological sex is not always just a personal expression—it frequently serves as a way to reject societal norms and

position oneself within a "protected" oppressed minority group.

Beyond its strategic function, this behavior borders on sociopathic tendencies, particularly in cases where individuals manipulate identity for social gain without genuine personal conviction. Classic sociopathic traits—such as deception, lack of empathy, and calculated self-interest—become evident when trans-identification is used as a tool for social mobility rather than a deeply felt experience. By prioritizing validation and special status over objective reality, this phenomenon raises ethical concerns about the extent to which identity can be redefined for personal or political advantage.

The case of Brigida in Bolivia, who transitioned not only in gender but also in ethnic identity, underscores the broader implications of allowing subjective identity claims without empirical basis. If gender identity is fluid and self-determined, yet ethnicity is often viewed as immutable, this contradiction exposes inconsistencies in ideological narratives surrounding identity. Brigida's transition illustrates how identity categories can be strategically utilized for social, political, or personal validation, further demonstrating that trans-identification often functions as a social role rather than an inherent biological reality.

Claiming minority status often heightens an individual's sense of significance and validation, as society prioritizes the voices and rights of protected groups. This shifts trans-identification from a personal experience to a calculated strategy, allowing individuals to secure recognition, evade criticism, and gain perceived protections. These behaviors not only distort public discourse but also raise ethical concerns about the authenticity of identity claims and their broader societal impact.

The pursuit of niche minority status poses serious risks to mental health, fostering psychological dependency on external validation and weakening self-worth. Moreover, incentivizing identity-based classifications diminishes the legitimacy of real oppression, eroding credibility for historically marginalized groups and diluting society's understanding of genuine discrimination.

These trends demand a critical reassessment of how identity, politics, and social norms intersect.

Without this scrutiny, policies and social frameworks will continue to endorse identity claims driven more by social advantage than by authentic self-expression.

Advocacy Challenges and the Role of Bullying

A major problem in trans-activism is its dependence on bullying tactics to silence dissent and enforce ideological conformity. Social intimidation, public shaming, and ostracization are common strategies used to shut down opposing viewpoints, replacing evidence-based debate with coercion and fear. This culture of hostility doesn't just stifle meaningful discussion—it creates a chilling effect that prevents legitimate concerns about trans-identification policies from being addressed.

Social media platforms like Twitter and Reddit consistently showcase intimidation and shaming tactics designed to enforce ideological conformity (Personal Observations, 2023-2024). These divisive strategies distort public discourse, discouraging individuals from voicing valid criticisms or questioning the long-term consequences of trans-activism-driven policies.

Ironically, these bullying behaviors also harm members of the trans community who challenge prevailing narratives or push for more nuanced discussions. Those who deviate from the accepted orthodoxy often face ostracization and hostility from within their own ranks, deepening internal fractures and silencing diverse viewpoints. This cycle of coercion punishes dissent, leaving little room for authentic representation or meaningful progress.

At a societal level, bullying tactics weaken trans-activism's credibility, shifting attention from legitimate issues to aggressive enforcement. This approach alienates potential allies, fuels skepticism, and erodes public trust in trans-activist goals. Instead of fostering constructive solutions, these strategies deepen polarization and shut down meaningful debate on gender identity.

To counter this, it is essential to expose and reject intimidation tactics while promoting open, evidence-based discussions that prioritize facts over coercion. Restoring credibility in gender identity discourse

requires acknowledging the harm caused by these divisive methods and fostering an environment where critical engagement replaces ideological enforcement.

Inappropriateness of Introducing Transgender Ideologies to Young Children

Exposing young children to transgender ideologies raises serious ethical and developmental concerns. To define this phenomenon, I introduce the term Induced Ideological Maturity (IIM)—the premature imposition of complex and subjective sociocultural concepts, like gender identity, on children who lack the cognitive and emotional maturity to process them critically.

This term highlights the harmful effects of exposing children to ideologies that distort their sense of identity, creating confusion and potential long-term psychological damage. Introducing gender identity concepts at an early age risks misinterpreting normal developmental exploration as proof that a child was "born in the wrong body." This premature framing can lead to unnecessary psychological stress, increased social pressure, and even early medical interventions, steering children toward identities that may not naturally align with their development.

Embedding transgender ideologies in early education undermines parental authority in shaping their children's understanding of gender and identity. Many parents rightfully object to exposing children to these concepts at an impressionable age, as it clashes with their cultural, religious, and personal values. This interference disrupts the family's role in providing a stable foundation for a child's self-perception and worldview.

Introducing such ideologies inappropriately encourages them to question their gender, misinterpreting normal developmental exploration as proof they were "born in the wrong body." This can trigger unnecessary psychological stress and lead to serious long-term consequences, including social pressure to adopt specific identities or even early medical interventions.

Scientifically, the lack of longitudinal studies on the effects of early exposure to transgender ideologies

raises serious concerns about implementing these educational practices without sufficient evidence.

Advocates for caution stress the importance of allowing children to explore their identities naturally, free from ideological influence that contradicts established developmental and biological science.

Induced Ideological Maturity (IIM): Scope, Mechanisms, and Implications

Scope:

Induced Ideological Maturity (IIM) refers to the premature introduction of complex sociocultural ideas—particularly gender identity—onto children at an age when their cognitive and emotional development is not sufficiently matured to critically evaluate such concepts. This phenomenon is prevalent in early childhood education and social institutions that promote gender identity ideology without a nuanced understanding of developmental psychology.

Mechanisms:

Early Exposure to Gender Identity Concepts: Young children are increasingly encouraged to explore gender identity beyond traditional sex-based norms through school curricula, media, and activist-driven educational policies.

Social Affirmation and Reinforcement: The institutionalization of gender identity discussions in early education and peer groups leads to affirmation-seeking behaviors, where children feel encouraged to adopt non-conforming identities in response to external validation.

Medical and Psychological Influence: Early exposure increases the likelihood of engaging with psychological or medical interventions, such as puberty blockers or social transitioning, before a child has fully developed a stable self-concept.

Implications:

Cognitive and Psychological Concerns: Introducing gender identity concepts prematurely may create identity confusion, leading to anxiety, distress, and unnecessary medical interventions.

Ethical and Parental Rights Issues: The role of educators and policymakers in shaping a child's self-

perception raises concerns about undermining parental rights and bypassing natural developmental processes.

Potential for Ideological Manipulation: IIM suggests that children's understanding of self-identity is being shaped not by innate experience but by ideological and social pressures, making them more susceptible to externally influenced identity formation.

Implications for Trans-Identification

Persistent biological differences undermine the claim that transitioning can fully align a person's physical and physiological traits with their identified sex. Beyond biology, the societal, psychological, and advocacy-driven challenges tied to trans-identification expose deeper complexities in the debate. Gender identity is often entangled with broader sociocultural forces, including the pursuit of minority status and the use of divisive advocacy tactics to enforce ideological conformity. Understanding these layers is necessary for crafting informed policies and facilitating genuine, constructive dialogue on the issue.

Conclusion

A rigorous, evidence-based analysis of trans-identification exposes the biological, physiological, psychological, and sociocultural realities that directly challenge the claim that transitioning can fully align an individual with the opposite sex. While hormonal and surgical interventions may alter outward appearance and modify some secondary characteristics, they cannot erase immutable differences in muscle physiology, skeletal structure, or neurological architecture, all deeply rooted in human biology. Beyond biology, the sociocultural forces driving trans-identification—including the strategic pursuit of minority status, affirmation-seeking behaviors, divisive advocacy tactics, and the premature introduction of transgender ideologies to children—carry significant societal and ethical consequences. These issues demand urgent scrutiny and transparent debate to prevent further harm to both individuals

and society.

By systematically dismantling the claim that gender identity exists independently of biology, this paper exposes the contradictions within gender ideology and the dangers of allowing subjective identity claims to override objective biological realities. The analysis of sociopolitical forces—ranging from advocacy shifts to media influence—reveals how external pressures reinforce trans-identification, particularly among those struggling with internalized homophobia. Confronting these systemic influences is essential to ensuring that medical, legal, and educational policies remain rooted in scientific evidence rather than ideological constructs.

Instead of endorsing subjective identity claims that reject biological reality, policymakers and educators must recognize the consequences of these ideologies and counter them with evidence-based strategies. Meeting this challenge requires rejecting coercive advocacy tactics, restoring the primacy of objective science, and safeguarding the developmental well-being of future generations.

References:

- Absi, P. (2023). From identity to ID card: Becoming a woman (and) Indigenous in Bolivia. *The University of Chicago Press*. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/epdf/10.1086/727724>
- Crossman, A. (2024, September 14). What are primary and secondary groups in sociology? *ThoughtCo*. <https://www.thoughtco.com/primary-and-secondary-relationships-3026463>
- Flores, A. R., Brown, T. N., & Herman, J. L. (2016, October). *Race and ethnicity of adults who identify as transgender in the United States*. UCLA School of Law. <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Race-Ethnicity-Trans-Adults-US-Oct-2016.pdf>
- Garcia, J., Vargas, N., Clark, J. L., Magaña Álvarez, M., Nelons, D. A., & Parker, R. G. (2020). Social isolation and connectedness as determinants of well-being: Global evidence mapping focused on LGBTQ youth. *Global Public Health*, 15(4), 497–519. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2019.1682028>

Goldman, B. (2022, September 21). How men's and women's brains are different. *Stanford Medicine Magazine*. <https://stanmed.stanford.edu/how-mens-and-womens-brains-are-different/>

Haizlip, K. M., Harrison, B. C., & Leinwand, L. A. (2015, January). Sex-based differences in skeletal muscle kinetics and fiber-type composition. *Physiology (Bethesda, Md.)*.

<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4285578/>

Harris, K. M., & McDade, T. W. (2018). The biosocial approach to human development, behavior, and health across the life course. *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 4(4), 2–26.

<https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2018.4.4.01>

JL., W. K. C. (2013). Correlates of homophobia, transphobia, and internalized homophobia in gay or lesbian and heterosexual samples. *Journal of Homosexuality*.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23952924/>

Murphy, W. G. (2014). The sex difference in hemoglobin levels in adults—mechanisms, causes, and consequences. *Blood Reviews*. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24491804/>

Rehman, R. (2023). "Intersex" does not violate the sex binary. *The Linacre Quarterly*, 90(2), 145–154.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00243639231155313>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2020, August 4). Sex differences in brain anatomy. *National Institutes of Health*. <https://www.nih.gov/news-events/nih-research-matters/sex-differences-brain-anatomy>

Voracek, M., Kaden, A., Kossmeier, M., Pietschnig, J., & Tran, U. S. (2018). Meta-analysis shows associations of digit ratio (2D:4D) and transgender identity are small at best. *Endocrine Practice*, 24(4), 386–390. <https://doi.org/10.4158/EP-2017-0024>

White, J., Moore, L., Cannings-John, R., Hawkins, J., Bonell, C., Hickman, M., Zammit, S., & Adara, L. (2023, May). Association between gender minority status and mental health in high school students. *The Journal of Adolescent Health: Official Publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*.

<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10824667/>

Williams, J. (2020). The corrosive impact of transgender ideology. *Civitas*.

<https://civitas.org.uk/content/files/2454-A-The-Corrosive-Impact-of-TI-ppi-110-WEB.pdf>