

‘That’s what I call a man’: Representations of racialized and classed masculinities in the UK print media

Abstract: According to Connell (1995), "being a man" involves actively positioning one's self in relation to culturally dominant images of masculinity. Yet, crucially, these images change depending on the social and historical context. In this paper, we examine contemporary discourses of masculinity as they are represented in the British press. In particular, we focus on the ways in which masculine representations are both racialized and classed, and how they are positioned in relation to one another within a broader ideological field of gender and power. Analyses are based on a quantitative and qualitative analysis of a large corpus (44.1 million words) of newspaper articles on masculinity that appeared in the UK between 2003 and 2011. Our findings underscore the importance of adopting an intersectional approach to the study of language and masculinity, and provide support for recent critical re-evaluations of the foundational concept of hegemonic masculinity.

Keywords: masculinities, Britain, corpus analysis, discourse analysis, hegemonic masculinity, intersectionality

Introduction

There is not one way to “be a man.” Studies of men and masculinities over the past twenty years have highlighted the range of competing definitions of manhood in a variety of social and historical contexts, and have demonstrated how certain definitions come to be both culturally and politically dominant (e.g., Carrigan, Connell, & Lee 1985; Connell 1987, Connell 1995). More recently, research has also begun to investigate how men themselves understand these competing definitions, and the social and linguistic practices through which they negotiate the construction of gendered identities in their daily lives (e.g., Edley & Wetherell 1997; Wetherell & Edley 1999; Gough 2001). Such research has provided valuable insights into the inner-workings of contemporary discourses of masculinity. Yet at the same time, much of this work has fallen short of providing a comprehensive account of masculinity today (Seidler 2006). This is because, with a few notable exceptions (e.g., Ehrlich & Levesque 2011; Milani 2013; see also the relevant discussion in Milani 2015), research has tended to focus either on the construction of masculinity in isolation, divorced from the other social factors (including race and social class) with and through which masculinity is actually experienced, or on the representations/experiences of a specific type of man (e.g., working-class) to the exclusion of others (e.g., Alexander 1996, 2004; Archer 2001; Hopkins 2009, though cf. Luyt 2012). This is in contrast to much contemporary research in women’s studies, which has adopted an explicitly comparative methodology centred on the notion of *intersectionality* – or the belief that no one category (or sub-category) is sufficient in the analysis of social identity (e.g., McCall 2005; Yuval-Davis 2011).

Our goal in this paper is to begin to address this theoretical and empirical gap by providing a more holistic examination of representations of different masculine identities in the British print media. We do so by adopting an explicitly intersectional perspective that seeks to understand how different racialized and classed masculinities are positioned in relation to one another within a larger ideological field of masculinity in Britain. In our analysis, we view intersectionality as referring to the ways in which dynamic systems of social organisation mutually constitute one another (Choo & Ferree 2010). In other words, we do not subscribe to the view of intersections as simple crossings or “street corners”

(Crenshaw 1991) where static categories like “man” and “working-class” meet. Instead we pursue a process-centred approach (Weldon 2008) that views the discursive production of masculinity as inextricably linked to the production of other relevant social systems. It is this approach that enables us to examine the hierarchical relations of power that obtain among different types of men (what Christensen & Jensen 2014 term *internal hegemony*) and to identify the ideological principles that sustain this hierarchy, thus providing the more comprehensive picture that we believe is lacking in much masculinities research.¹

We begin in the next section by reviewing some of the previous research on representations of masculinity in the British media. We then go on to describe the data and empirical methods employed in the current study, before going on to discuss the findings of two parallel analyses we conducted. One of these analyses involves examining representations of masculine identities in a large corpus of newspaper data (35.5 million words from over 44,000 articles), while the second involves an investigation in a much smaller sub-sample (51 articles) of the original corpus. We conclude by discussing how the different representations identified delineate an ideological field of masculinity in the British context, and describe how our findings can contribute to the development of theories of masculinity and hegemony more broadly.

New Men, New Lads and Other British Male Types

In Britain, scholars have argued that traditional images of men as “heroes” and “breadwinners” (Connell 1995) do not hold as much cultural currency today as they once did. Rather, research has explored the emergence over the past twenty years of two new dominant representations of masculine identity in the British context (Benwell 2003). The first of these, the so-called “new man”, emerged in the 1980s, and refers to a more sensitive, caring and anti-sexist type of man who worries about his own physical appearance and is happy to do his share of domestic labour (e.g., Chapman 1988; Rutherford 1988; Gough 2001; Beynon 2002). The “new man” is viewed as resulting from changes in the workforce, including a greater proportion of women in paid employment, a shift to a primarily service-based economy, and a more general societal acceptance of broadly feminist principles (Gill 2003). The appearance of the “new man” as a dominant cultural image coincided in Britain with the launching of a number of men’s style magazines, including *Arena*, *GQ* and *Esquire*, and an onslaught of new products marketed for “modern, urban men”. This fact has led some scholars to argue that the “new man” is best characterised as both a ‘nurturer’ and a ‘narcissist’ (Beynon 2002:99). While it by no means heralded the end of patriarchy (Segal 1993), the advent of the “new man” represented the creation of a more gender equitable form of masculinity in Britain (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005) that breaks with the traditional masculine tropes of physical power and social dominance and that, to a certain extent at least, challenges the rigid demarcation of gendered practice.

The second new dominant representation of masculinity to emerge in Britain was a direct reaction to the perceived reconceptualization of gender norms provoked by the “new man”. First appearing in the 1990s in magazines such as *Loaded*, *FHM* and *Maxim*, the so-called “new lad” rejects the purported artificial feminisation of the “new man” and seeks instead to reassert male dominance via the privileging of an imagined traditional and “authentic” masculinity based on sexism, homophobia and avoidance of any traits or behaviours deemed “unmanly”. The emergence of the “new lad” can therefore be understood as a backlash against feminism and a reaffirmation in Britain of the principal tenets of patriarchy (Whehelan 2000; Walsh 2010). Yet at the same time, the “new lad” does not embrace all aspects of the traditional patriarchal order. While conventional models of

patriarchy involve men taking responsibility to provide for women and children, the “new lad” also refuses the role of “breadwinner” and expresses a disdain for work and other “serious” undertakings (Jackson, Stevenson & Brooks 2001). Rather, the “new lad” is a man unconcerned with the dominant institutions of adult life and who focuses instead on drinking, partying and engaging in various other hedonistic indulgences. In her discussion of the genealogy of the “new lad”, Gill (2003) notes that this dimension of the “new lad” image is to a large extent grounded in the recent (re-)emergence of a popular, neo-Darwinian approach to gender that views women and men in terms of essentialised biological difference, and stratified patterns of gendered practice as part of our genetic endowment (see also Cameron 2010 on what she terms “new biologism”). According to this perspective, men are inherently seen as aggressive, competitive and driven by the need for sexual advantage (while women are inherently viewed as cooperative and nurturing). The image of the “new lad” capitalises on these beliefs to promote the idea that “laddism” is in fact the true essence of masculinity when unfettered by social constraint, in direct contrast to the inauthentic “new man”.

While the “new lad” emerged in reaction to the “new man”, it is not the case that the former supplanted the latter or that the emergence of the “new lad” can be taken as straightforward evidence of a major cultural shift in British understandings of masculinity (Gill 2003). Rather, both the “new man” and the “new lad” exist as archetypes in the British popular imagination, and both are drawn upon by real men in the variable and everyday construction of masculinity (Wetherell & Edley 1999). There are, moreover, additional meanings associated with both “new lads” and “new men” that ideologically position the identity types in complementary distribution. The most obvious of these is age, with “new lads” imagined as younger whereas “new men” are older. Another distinguishing characteristic is family structure, with “new lads” normatively perceived as single and unattached, whereas “new men” are taken to be fathers and husbands. Finally, “new lads” are often associated with the working-classes and so-called “working class values”, while “new men” occupy a solidly middle-class position.

One characteristic, however, that “new lads” and “new men” share is race, as both are overwhelmingly, if implicitly, viewed as white (e.g., Frosh, Phoenix & Pattman 2001). Black and (South) Asian men, in contrast, are more often represented in ways that recycle dominant racial and ethnic stereotypes. In other words, there exist a set of specifically racialized masculine representations that serve to establish an intra-categorical opposition between what Connell (1995) terms marginalised male types and an unmarked (and purportedly non-racial) white masculine norm. In the case of Black masculinities, this opposition tends to be based on physical differences, and especially a depiction of Black men as inherent possessors of physical and sexual prowess. This representation is in certain cases used to promote a positive image of Black men, as in depictions of athletic achievement (e.g., Jackson 1994), but it is more often deployed in a way that constructs Black men as threatening and prone to violence (e.g., Frosh, Phoenix & Pattman 2000). There is a similar pattern with respect to representations of Asian masculinities, though for depictions of Asian men various imaginings of “culture” often replace the category “race”. Alexander (2004), for example, discusses the dominant representation of young Asian men in the UK as members of ethnically homogenous “gangs” who engage in violence and other criminal activities. This behaviour is depicted as arising from a nebulous Asian “culture” that is itself defined in terms of sexism, religious and ethnic isolationism, and inter-group social conflict (see also Baker, Gabrielatos & McEnery 2013). The masculinities of Black and Asian men in Britain are thus represented as the “natural” result of various racial and ethnic stereotypes, such that gender is in a sense subordinated to race in these imaginings.

Even in the brief overview presented here, it is clear that dominant representations of masculine identities in the UK are strongly intersectional in nature. In certain contexts, that

intersectionality is explicit, as in depictions of Black and Asian men. In other cases, the classed and racialized associations of the different archetypes are only implicitly stated (as is the case with “new men” and “new lads”). In this paper, we seek to map out the topography of this representational terrain by engaging in an inter-categorical examination (McCall 2005) of depictions of masculinity across racial and social class lines. We focus on six masculine identities categories, three racialized (Asian men, Black men, White men) and three classed (middle-class, working-class, upper-class). Our primary research question is to discover how these masculine identity types are presented in the British press and how such representations contribute to the production, elaboration and circulation of gendered discourses. As such, our aim is not to describe the embodied realities of masculinity in the UK, or the ways in which actual men behave. Instead, we seek to develop a more nuanced understanding of the ideological field of masculinity in Britain, including its general structuring principles and the positioning of different male archetypes within that representational space.

Data and Methods

We approach this task by subjecting a large corpus of British newspaper articles to both a corpus-based and a purely qualitative discourse analysis. We triangulate methods in this way in an effort to provide a more robust analysis that is able both to identify frequently articulated representations of masculinity in the corpus and to uncover more latent and socially nuanced ideological patterns (see Baker & Levon 2015 for a fuller discussion of the method and our motivation for using it). A corpus of British newspaper articles about masculinity was built using the online news database Nexis UK. [The database archives all types of articles found in newspapers including hard news, editorials, opinion pieces, reviews and ‘magazine’ type stories.](#) Articles were collected from nine daily national newspapers and their Sunday equivalents between the years 2003 and 2011.²

For inclusion in the corpus, articles had to include at least one of the terms listed in (1) (excluding terms were also used in order to limit article repeats):

- 1) masculine OR masculinity OR macho OR manhood OR manly OR machismo OR manliness OR maleness OR black men OR black man OR asian man OR asian men OR white men OR white man OR working class man OR working class men OR middle class man OR middle class men OR upper class men OR upper class man

[The search term was devised via trial and error. For example, initially, we included the words *man* and *male* in the search term but this resulted in many more articles which did not focus necessarily on either masculinity per se or the six intersectional types of masculinity we were interested in.](#) The resulting corpus was 44.1 million words in size.

The entire corpus was subjected to corpus-based analysis, though it would not have been feasible for a close qualitative analysis to be carried out on the data set. Instead, a down-sampling method was used that reduced the number of articles to a workable amount. As we were interested in the representation of six primary male identity groups, we first created a down-sampled set of articles by identifying those articles that contained the most frequent reference to each group, for example, by locating the article which had most mentions of the terms *black man* and *black men* combined together. This yielded a down-sampled corpus of six articles (one for each group). In addition to being relatively small, this down-sampled set was also somewhat skewed towards broadsheet newspapers, which tended to have longer articles. Therefore, in order to provide a larger and more representative sample of the corpus, we carried out the same exercise again, separately for each of the nine newspapers. This

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

normally would have resulted in a down-sampled set of 54 articles. However, as *The Mirror*, *Sun* and *Star* did not mention upper class men at all, the actual sub-sample came to 51 articles. We feel that this method of down-sampling produces a small set of salient articles for analysis where the particular identities we are interested in are likely to be foregrounded as a topic in themselves rather than simply mentioned 'in passing' (for more details of the sampling and sub-sampling techniques, see Baker & Levon 2015). The corpus-based and qualitative analyses were conducted separately and without any form of collaboration by the first and second authors, respectively. This was done to allow each of the analyses to emerge on their own, without undue influence from findings of the other. Once the separate analyses were complete, the results of each were exchanged and compared.

We approached the corpus analysis "naively", so hypotheses were not formed in advance nor were attempts made to link findings to existing theories or research on masculinity. Instead, we pursued a bottom-up approach in which the corpus analysis software WordSmith Tools 5 was used to identify the strongest collocates of the six identity groups within the entire 35.5 million word corpus. Collocation refers to 'the characteristic co-occurrence patterns of words' (McEnery et al 2006:56), and a word's collocates can be revealing in terms of the ways that its meaning is created. If a word has a set of collocates that are used to imbue a certain attitudinal meaning, then this can be referred to as a discourse prosody. For example, Stubbs (2001: 65) shows how the word *cause* tends to collocate with words like *damage*, *trouble*, *cancer* and *disease*, holding a negative discourse prosody for unpleasant events.

Collocates were obtained using WordSmith's default span of 5 words either side of the target phrase the Dice Coefficient, an effect size statistic that measures strength of association between two words (rather than a hypothesis-testing measure that produces a p value for statistical significance). While WordSmith offers numerous ways of calculating collocates (MI, MI3, Z-score, T-score, log-likelihood and rank by frequency) the Dice Coefficient was chosen because it tends to favour medium frequency collocates which tend to be lexical nouns, adjectives and verbs. Other measures (such as log-likelihood and MI3) can favour high frequency grammatical words like *to*, *the* and *a*, which are not always useful for analytical purposes, while some measures (such as MI) give very low frequency words which do not help us to make generalisations.

Singular and plural identities were considered separately (so for example, collocates of both the phrases *Asian man* and *Asian men* were elicited in two separate searches), and the 20 collocates with the highest Dice score were collected for each search term. This resulted in potentially 40 collocates for each identity, although in a few cases collocates for the singular and plural identities were the same. Concordances (tables which show all of the occurrences of a word, phrase or related pair of words in the immediate context in which they occur) were then used to explore collocational relationships. Often, concordance lines needed to be expanded in order to access more context, which at times involved the reading of an entire article. Collocational analysis allows us to identify situations in which identity groups are frequently associated with a common set of words, and hence to isolate the discourse prosodies associated with each group. We also examined whether discourse prosodies are unique to particular masculine identities or shared between more than one group.

Unlike the "naïve" corpus analysis, qualitative analysis of the down-sampled corpus is situated within a theoretical framework of stance-taking, or the act of linguistically evaluating a contextually relevant object, and, in so doing, positioning one's self (and others) in social space (Du Bois 2007; Jaffe 2009). In the literature, stance-taking is normally viewed as an interactional process, something that people do in naturally-occurring speech. We, however, follow Jaworski & Thurlow (2009) who claim that written discourse, and particularly media texts, can also function as a stance-taking vehicle due to its ability to instantiate an

Formatted: Font: Italic

ideological framework both for the evaluation of social practice and for the association of those practices with pre-defined social categories and roles (see also Kress 1995; Agha 2007). In other words, in much the same way that variation in spoken language provides individuals with a means to adopt different footings with respect to the categories and characteristics referenced through talk, we argue that the textual properties of written discourse serve to encode different socio-interpretive schemata within which relevant social categories and category-affiliated activities are positioned and evaluated. Given this point of departure, the primary aim of the analysis of the down-sampled set is therefore to determine what ideological framework for masculinity the texts serve to instantiate, and to discover how the different masculine identities in question are positioned within this space.

This task was approached by asking three basic questions of the texts in the sample (cf. Du Bois 2007; see also Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992 on *field analysis*): 1) what is the stance object, or the particular category or trait being described and assessed; 2) how is that object evaluated (affectively, epistemically and deontically); and 3) how do these evaluations serve to position that object relationally in social space? Due to the design of the current study, the first question – while often highly relevant with interactional data – is relatively trivial in our sample. The down-sampled set is structured according to frequency of occurrence of the relevant search terms, and so each of these terms (e.g., *Black man/men*, *White man/men*) were taken to be the respective stance objects. The qualitative investigation therefore focuses on resolving the two latter questions, which was accomplished by examining a range of both formal and semantic features, including clause modality, presupposition and implicature, and verbal argument structure.

Representations of British Masculinities

General Patterns

Our analysis is structured according to the six identity categories under investigation: Black man/[men](#), Asian man/[men](#), White man/[men](#), middle-class man/[men](#), working-class man/[men](#), upper-class man/[men](#). For each of these categories, we first provide a corpus analysis of the strongest collocates for that category in the entire 35.5 million word corpus, followed by a qualitative analysis of the discourses about that category that emerge in the 51-article sub-corpus. Adopting this kind of back-and-forth structure allows us to highlight the similarities and differences in representations that the two methods uncover, and opens the way for a more comprehensive, multi-method analysis of masculinity in the British press (see also Baker & Levon 2015).

Before turning to the specific identities categories in question, it is instructive to first consider some general patterns that obtain in the corpus as a whole. Table 1 presents the strongest 20 collocates (i.e., those with the highest Dice coefficient, [with the highest scores first](#)) for each of the six identities analysed. [The number after each word gives the number of times the word collocates with the search term.](#) As noted above, singular and plural identities were searched for separately, resulting in 12 sets of collocates, although the analysis combines the singular and plural sets together for each group. For some of the less frequent words, 20 collocates were not found so only those elicited have been listed.

Table 1. Top 20 collocates for each of the 12 identity categories searched in the corpus.

Search Term	Frequency	Collocates
-------------	-----------	------------

Black man	5117	young 512, white 535, accused 96, President 142, woman 208, skinned 42, raping 39, tall 43, elected 38, aged 63, rape 41, vote 49, America 83, defends 28, custody 29, innocent 32, lawyer 32, stabbed 32, house 109, Obama 58
Black men	2557	young 810, disproportionate 28, prison 49, disproportionately 20, three 174, stereotypes 17, lynched 13, deaths 18, confessed 16, among 57, gang 28, white 159, accents 11, swim 13, accused 22, represented 15, two 225, DNA 16, database 12, women 188
White man	3305	Palais 70, Hammersmith 67, sleeps 53, aged 123, bus 70, seat 64, Alabama 28, described 58, tall 35, toughest 24, middle 86, planet 28, black 263, hunting 29, fastest 22, stupid 29, wearing 47, stocky 15, negro 16, Africa 43
White men	2643	stupid 284, penguin 108, Moore 145, jump 99, aged 125, Michael 158, middle 148, Moore's 35, paperbacks 30, suits 37, applications 20, dominated 33, can't 114, GBP 26, non 41, young 153, wealthy 18, class 61, dead 46
Asian man	982	stalked 23, approached 25, racially 20, trace 13, brawl 8, Zahid 7, attacked 18, bearded 8, stabbed 17, dragged 10, robbed 7, Hannah 9, balbir 5, Bradford 14, Matharu 5, riots 12, murder 37, racist 23, assaulted 6, tube 9
Asian men	1205	grooming 64, gang 91, raped 36, jailed 30, raping 17, abducted 14, targeted 18, Bradford 26, targeting 13, Pollokshields 10, young 217, groomed 17, hunting 17, drugging 8, attacked 16, convicted 17, documentary 17, sentences 10
Working-class man	194	inarticulate 5, Glasgow 8, average 2, lived 6, young 20, class 7, father 9, woman 9, self 35, himself 7, who 42, family 6, he's 5, I'm 7, old 9, an 26, a 177, white 5, from 24, could 7
Working-class men	357	young 62, white 62, women 61, mostly 8, values 7, older 10, class 15, jobs 9, middle 12, who 53, among 12, particular 5, were 28, likely 6, gone 5, of 152, lives 6, their 25, are 34, getting 5
Middle-class man	134	educated 6, aged 8, middle 11, white 25, well 5, who 17, a 128, an 17, would 7, from 14, his 21, with 18, is 25, in 37, about 8, as 15, has 6, he 13, was 14, this 5
Middle-class men	269	discriminated 8, white 110, aged 32, middle 31, upper 11, educated 9, lower 9, dominated 6, who 47, women 24, are 42, against 13, among 7, many 10, were 19, young 9, party 6, by 28, of 100, group 5
Upper-class man	4	(no collocates found)
Upper-class men	27	by 6, to 11, and 11, of 11, the 9

Although all of the search terms contain either the word *man* or *men*, the different sets of top 20 collocates do not overlap very much. The collocate *aged* occurs with *Black*, *White* and

middle-class while *young* appears with all sets except *upper-class*. The *Black* and *Asian* groups share some of the more negative collocates (e.g., *stabbed, raping, gang*), while *White* appears as a collocate for *middle-class, working-class* and *Black* groups. *Women* is a collocate of *Black, working-* and *middle-class* men. However, the majority of collocates are specific to a single group, suggesting that there are quite distinct representational patterns around men in terms of broad racial and social class groups. We use this finding to justify our decision to divide the discussion into six analytical sections, one for each identity. Within each of these sections, the corpus analysis portion presents results of concordance analyses that were used to explore individual representations further and to identify the most typical contexts in which collocates occurred.

As described above, qualitative analyses of the sub-sample of articles are grounded in a theory of stance, and focus on how representations of different types of men are positioned within the broader ideological field of masculinity in Britain. In contrast to the more “naïve” corpus-based approach, accomplishing this task thus necessarily requires us to first delineate the contours of this broader field before we are able to position representations of specific masculine identities within it. We therefore provide an initial qualitative analysis of the general concept of *masculinity* in the corpus, before turning to a more detailed investigation of the individual racialized and classed masculinities in the analytical sections below.

In the sample, *masculinity* is defined in terms of two primary characteristics. The first of these involves a series of different traits and activities that all fall within the semantic domain of PHYSICALITY, and include things like strength and physical prowess, the capacity for violence, courage, and the ability to survive in difficult or dangerous situations. These traits are depicted as icons of “authentic” masculinity, and as something that “real men” possess inherently. The second characteristic includes a series of traits linked to the semantic domain of AMBITION, including energy, passion and a drive for success. Together, the two characteristics delineate an ideological space for masculinity that is organised in terms of both a man’s ability to behave in a particular way (PHYSICALITY) and his desire to engage in such practice (AMBITION). The extract in (2) provides a clear illustration of both of these definitional components:

- 2) There are just some things a man has got to do, not think about, not discuss, not explain, just do. That is honour, that is duty, that is manliness. ... Manliness is courage, it is action in the face of risk, it is heroism. It is a taste for war and a disgust at weakness. Manliness is nobility. A manly man defines his territory and fights for it. A manly man defends women but is not sensitive to them. Manliness is living life by the martial virtues: as one philosopher had it, to live by intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, and obedience to the commands of war. ... With his self-assumed authority he vindicates justice and makes things turn out right or at least enables us to get even. He not only knows what justice requires, but he acts on his knowledge, making and executing decisions that the rest of us even tremble to define. ([Daily Mail, June 24, 2006](#))

Through the poetic repetition of copular equative structures, the extract in (2) explicitly identifies “manliness” with a number of traits within the PHYSICALITY and AMBITION domains, including *courage, action* and *duty*. The use of equative constructions here is telling since it serves to strengthen the epistemic force of the claims, making them appear self-evidently true and not the product of a particular individual’s opinion. Defined in this way, the concept of “manliness” is then deployed in the rest of the extract to describe the *manly man*, who possesses these traits, and in so doing to dually index (Kulick 2005) the figure of the unmanly man, who lacks these definitional characteristics. In other words, the semantic content and the formal structure of the extract in (2) together serve to instantiate a supposedly

“universal” conceptualisation of masculinity that is then used to distinguish between different types of men.

It is also important to note the strong moral underpinning to the definition of masculinity in (2). *Action*, including violence, is explicitly linked to *duty*; *courage*, in the face of risk, becomes *heroism*; and *obedience* is depicted as in the service of a common good. Masculinity in this definition is therefore not simply about possessing the necessary traits of PHYSICALITY and AMBITION. It is also about knowing when to use them, and only using them for sufficiently “honourable” reasons (e.g., *justice*) (see also Wetherell & Edley 1999 on “heroic” masculinities). Though not explicitly stated, we are led to understand that a surfeit of ambition or *private interest*, when not tempered by justice, is “unmanly”. Similarly, violence and physical force are described as *noble* when they are part of a man’s *duty* to maintain the common good. What emerges from the extract in (2), then, is more than just a definition of masculinity, but also a deontic evaluation of different types of men. *Manly men* are those who possess both a desire and a capacity for action, but for whom those qualities are adequately restrained so as to conform to the moral code of society. By implication, “unmanly men” are thus those who either do not possess one or both of these qualities, or possess too much of them. And because of the strong deontic frame within which this definition is set, any deviation from normative masculinity is construed as a moral failing. “Unmanly men” are thus not only inadequately gendered – the texts in the sample also construct them as morally deficient.

It is in relation to this ideological backdrop of masculinity that we can now understand and position the representations of the particular racial and class-based masculine types that exist in the sample. We treat each of the six sub-types in turn, with corpus analyses devoted to highlighting the semantic prosodies that adhere to these identity types and qualitative analyses concentrating on how these identities are positioned in relation to the structuring axes of PHYSICALITY and AMBITION identified above. Due to space limitations, throughout the analysis only a small number of examples from concordance lines and excerpts from longer articles are given for illustrative purposes.

Black Men

Black man/men are the most frequent type of men referenced in the corpus, suggesting that this identity is the marked “other” (the prototypical man is *not* black in other words). The collocates of *Black man/men* support this hypothesis, eliciting a [negative](#) discourse prosody for crime with a set that positions Black men as suspected (*accused, defends, custody, lawyer, DNA, database*) criminals (*raping, rape, prison, confessed, deaths, gang*).

The collocate *tall* which appears with *Black man* 43 times is used in 25 cases to refer to tall Black men (as opposed to a description of height e.g. 5 feet tall), contributing towards a construction of Black men as physically imposing. Black men are also sometimes described as having Jamaican or South African *accents* (particularly as parts of descriptions of wanted criminals). The collocates *two* and *three* also often occur as part of this “wanted” discourse:

- 3) Police hunting three black men with South African accents, responsible for attacks ([The Guardian, August 15, 2005](#))
- 4) Two black men wearing balaclavas stole two Tiffany bracelets ([The Times, May 2, 2008](#))

Young Black men are also represented as victims of two particularly violent types of crime (*stabbed* and *lynched*), the former referring to current crimes that occur in UK cities while the latter normally appears as part of descriptions of (American) historical injustices:

- 5) ...yet another young black man got stabbed in London ([The Guardian, October 5, 2011](#))
- 6) ...in the Jim Crow south black men were often lynched if suspected of having sex with white women ([The Observer, February 21, 2010](#))

The terms *disproportionate* and *disproportionately* point to a discourse of discrimination and victimhood where Black men are viewed as more likely to be victims of violent crime, incarcerated (and die in police custody), unemployed, subjected to stop and search powers, executed, suffer from mental health problems, fail in education and appear in DNA databases. As well as being constructed as oppressed by society, there is acknowledgement that *stereotypes* surround Black men, with that collocate being used to describe Black men as gangsta rappers, beasts and predators, hyper-masculine misogynists and homophobes, drug dealers, irresponsible fathers and good in bed. Another collocate, *swim* refers to the idea that Black men cannot swim as an absurd theory, racist stereotype or cliché.

Finally, the collocate *women* occurs in the phrase 'Black men and women' in about half of its 188 cases and is simply used as a way of referring to all black people, rather than telling us much about black masculinities. However, other constructions involved Black men dating white women, women paying Black men for sex and Black men raping women. Black men are thus represented as somewhat (hetero)sexually active.

In the qualitative analysis of the sub-sample, two distinct images of Black men emerge. The first, and by far the more dominant, is of Black men as "violent", "unambitious", "destructive" and "lacking in self-confidence". The extract in (7) illustrates this:

- 7) Unless young black men admit that things have gone badly wrong for many of them, I fear they will never be able to regain control of their lives. Instead, they will continue to take the easy option, as I did for many years, and blame everything - from underachievement at school, to laissez-faire attitudes to sex, drugs, crime and the fast-growing gun culture - on racism. ... Having come up the hard way, I think I have the right to talk honestly about what has gone wrong with today's young, black men. After all, I escaped from a life predestined to be one of abject failure. I pulled myself up at the point when I suddenly realised I would either end up dead - or in jail. ([Daily Mail, August 19, 2004](#))

In (7), we are presented with an image of (young) Black men as out of *control*, and whose lives are characterised by *underachievement, sex, drugs, crime, and gun culture*. Rather than asserting these claims outright, the text embeds them as presuppositions of clausal matrix verbs. For example, the author expresses a fear that Black men *will never be able to regain control of their lives*. The use of *regain* presupposes that Black men have already lost control, making that prior propositional assertion resistant to negation. Similarly, the text bemoans the likelihood that Black men will *continue to take the easy option ... and blame everything on racism*, again presupposing the assertion that Black men in fact do take this "easy option" and engage in the various behaviours described. These formal strategies enable the text to claim ultimate epistemic authority, positioning Black men as, by definition, lacking in AMBITION and possessing an overabundance of PHYSICALITY. The author's comments about his own life serve a similar purpose, with the verb *realise* once again encoding a formally undeniable presupposition that Black men are condemned to *abject failure*.

This inevitability is further reinforced by the materialisation in the sub-sample of the second image of Black men, as illustrated in (8):

- 8) For a while I felt I had arrived. ... On Gordon Brown's first day at work as Chancellor of the Exchequer I was one of the few hundred or so Treasury staff who, still riding high on the promise of New Labour, lined the marble steps to welcome him. I even shook his hand. The political landscape had tilted and everything felt right. But of course it wasn't. When I looked around at all the anodyne black men in that fancy building it scared me to death. I was terrified of turning into one of my black colleagues who had been working there for decades, making the same complaints about the illusions of equality within the civil service being worse than the obvious inequality. ([The Guardian, April 10, 2009](#))

The extract in (8) begins by providing an example of a successful Black man, one who is gainfully employed and (literally) present within the corridors of power. This man is, however, immediately identified with what is described as *anodyne black men*, who we are led to understand lack any power, courage or ambition. The “anodyne” Black man is similar to the more stereotypical and violent Black man described above in that they both are depicted as lacking AMBITION.³ What distinguishes them is the extent to which they possess (and make use of) PHYSICALITY. In neither case, however, are Black men discursively constructed as occupying a normative configuration of masculinity; rather Black masculinity is consistently evaluated as deficient.

Asian men

As it did for Black men, the corpus analysis demonstrates that Asian men are the subjects of verbs involving crime and (sexual) violence [with a negative discourse prosody](#) (*stalked, attacked, dragged, grooming, groomed, assaulting, raped, raping, abducted, drugging*). The noun *brawl* is also used in stories which often involve violent clashes between Asian and White men. The verb *approached*, which does not essentially suggest violence or crime is used in all but 1 of its 25 cases as a precursor to a description of an Asian man committing a criminal act:

- 9) Police appealed for an Asian man who had approached Hannah on two occasions in the past ([The Independent, March 20, 2003](#))

Similar to the pattern found for Black men, 11 out of 17 cases of *stabbed* involve Asian men being stabbed, while *robbed* also usually has an Asian man as the victim rather than the perpetrator. Not all verbs have clear-cut preferences, however: *assaulted* occurs 5 times with *Asian men/man* as the subject and another 5 times as the object. A region in Glasgow called Pollokshields is also frequently mentioned due to the fact that a teenager was murdered by five Asian men there. Other verbs indicate processes involved in bringing criminal Asian men to justice (*hunting, convicted, trace, jailed*) along with the plural noun *sentences*. The 17 cases of references to police who are *hunting* Asian men are perhaps indicative of a wild animal metaphor (in the British National Corpus the verb *hunt* collocates with *hounds, deer, whales, foxes, boar, dolphins* and *wolf*).

Both Asian men and Black men are linked to the collocate *gang*. The 91 cases of gangs of Asian men involve 12 references to gang-rapes, as well as attacks (6), abductions (6) and assaults (3). As a comparison, the 23 cases of Black men in gangs involve them as agents of robbed (1), attacked (2), killed (2), raped (1) and seized (2), although there are more references in general to Black men getting involved in gangs. There are 71 cases where *groomed/grooming* collocates with Asian men who are described as grooming (usually white) teenage girls for sex.

The collocate *racist* occurs in all but 2 of its 23 cases as referring to Asian men who have been victims of racist abuse or violence, while the related word *racially* has an similar pattern (20 cases where 11 refer to racially motivated violence and abuse). Finally, the collocate *beards* is used as part of a more subtle discourse around (Islamic) terrorism (or at least suspicion), as in the following two cases, the first which straightforwardly uses beards as an indicator of likely guilt, the second which is more reflective and self-aware of the problems around racially profiling possible terrorists:

- 10) Yesterday neighbours of the doctor in a quiet cul-de-sac were stunned by the massive police operation in their road. They said the doctor and his wife had hardly any visitors during their year in the cul-de-sac. But in the past two weeks two Asian men with long beards had turned up in a car on several occasions and stayed the night. ([The Sun, July 2, 2007](#))
- 11) Waiting for a train, I stand back from the platform in the corridor, thinking I'd avoid the blast. I still scan the faces of Asian men, their luggage, beards, evaluate whether they could possibly commit jihad if they have an iPod, a trendy jacket, a take-out Starbucks. Yet the 7/7 inquest reveals that a person about to blow up a Tube carriage does not even have an easy-to-spot facial expression. ([The Times, October 16, 2010](#))

As in the corpus analysis, the qualitative analysis of representations of Asian men reveals certain similarities with those of Black men. Like the representations of Black men described above, two distinct images of Asian men also emerge in the sub-sample, differentiated by their positioning with respect to the axis of PHYSICALITY. Unlike Black men, however, Asian men are consistently depicted as being *ambitious* and *entrepreneurial*. The difference between the two Asian male types is found in terms of the (physical) means with which this ambition is realised, and where a purported surfeit of PHYSICALITY among some Asian men is depicted as morally deviant. Consider, for example, the extract in (12):

- 12) A RACE-hate investigation has been launched after allegations that an Asian gang has sparked a turf war with white window cleaners. ... In one incident, a father of two claims he was cleaning an upstairs window when he was shaken from his ladder by two Asian men. ... Window cleaner Dave Lester says he was threatened by Asian men at 10.40am on Thursday. He was called "white trash" and told to quit his round. A third window cleaner says he had his ladders stolen by two Asian men. ([The Express, November 27, 2004](#))

The Asian men in (12) are set in oppositional to a series of (presumably more "respectable") White men. While the Asian men are explicitly identified with gang membership, the White men are described in terms of their families (*father of two*) and their employment (*white window cleaner*). From a formal perspective, it is interesting to note that the Asian men in (12) are repeatedly positioned as the agents of passivized violent actions and explicitly referenced within a *by*-phrase (*shaken from his ladder by two Asian men, threatened by Asian men, stolen by two Asian men*). As Ward & Birner (2001) argue, the inclusion of an explicit NP in a passive *by*-phrase serves to instantiate a partially-ordered-set (poset) relationship between the *by*-phrase subject and the syntactic subject (in this case, White men) such that the two are depicted as alternative members of some larger set. In other words, the repeated appearance of *by Asian men* in the extract in (12) has the effect of asserting that White men and Asian men are distinct and non-overlapping types of men. From an evaluative perspective, Asian men are positioned as a dispreferred type, given their association with violent and "anti-social" behaviour.

The establishment of a White/Asian dichotomy is not found, however, in depictions of the other type of Asian man found in the sub-sample. Instead, this man is consistently described in terms of the business he owns (*newsagents, convenience store, hairdressers, restaurant*), and is positively evaluated for his “success” at integrating a “British way of life” (*they are happy to think their children will be more British than their relatives in Bradford and Birmingham, who are attending schools that are overwhelmingly Asian*). Implicit in these comments is the notion that Asian men who abandon their “foreign” values and norms can achieve gendered normativity. In some cases this idea is made explicit, and “violent” Asian men are characterised as being *torn between cultures*. The construction of two types of Asian men in the sub-sample is thus a product of the intersection of normative conceptualisations of masculinity and broader discourses of Britishness and multiculturalism.

White & Middle-Class men

We discuss White and middle-class together since they are collocates of one another and the representations of them in the corpus are fairly similar. At first glance, the collocates of *White man/men* do not appear to involve overtly criminal or violence discourses, although the 29 cases of *hunting* are used in a similar way to that of Asian men and the 58 cases of *described* are almost always used in police descriptions of suspected criminals. Additionally, 41 out of 47 cases of *wearing* are involved in descriptions of wanted White men, while *stocky* also co-occurs in descriptions of a suspect. White men are thus represented as involved in crime, but unlike Black and Asian men, they are not so exclusively associated with particular criminal acts (verb collocates like *assaulted, raping* and *groom* are missing).

Some collocates reference quite specific contexts, such as film-maker and activist Michael Moore’s paperback book *Stupid White Men* (a critique of the Bush administration, big business and economic inequality) – the collocates *Penguin* and *paperbacks* also refer to this book. One set references a comedy sports film called *White Men Can’t Jump* (1992). Another specific case is reference to the piece of music, *White Man Sleeps*.

Linked to Moore’s book, other collocates indicate a discourse of privilege – the collocate *dominated* (33 cases) is always used to describe how powerful institutions are usually dominated by (old) White men. Similarly, *wealthy* refers to a class of White men who are viewed as privileged and powerful. An interesting intersection is between *class* and *white* (61 cases), with White men more likely to be categorised according to social class than Black and Asian men (although 90% of such cases refer to middle-class White men) who are again viewed as privileged. The collocate *suits* also (somewhat critically) indexes powerful White men:

13) It was virtually all Oxbridge male, white men in suits. There was a lot of Latin flying around. Women were permanently secretaries as opposed to permanent secretaries, which is what they are now. ([The Times, December 17, 2011](#))

The collocate *dead* links to the same discourse, with 30 out of 46 cases referring negatively to the historical privilege of dead white men:

14) ...definition of a museum as ‘a conspiracy of dead white men’ ([The Times, December 19, 2003](#))
15) Isn’t history just stuff about dead white men? ([Daily Telegraph, November 22, 2003](#))

Another set of collocates reference historical racism, with retellings of the story of Rosa Parks who refused to give up her *seat* on an *Alabama bus* to a White man and helped trigger the civil rights movement. However, the collocate *applications* suggests criticism of “positive discrimination” against White men by describing cases where job applications by White men had been (sometimes illegally) rejected because of their race and gender.

The two superlative adjectives, *toughest* and *fastest* are used in specific cases. *Toughest* refers to a biography of Big Joe Egan described as ‘the toughest white man on the planet’. Presumably the qualifier *white* here implies that non-White men are actually tougher, although the fact that all the cases of *toughest* refer to Big Joe Egan does not really suggest this is evidence of an especially widespread discourse. However, there are 18 references to various sportsmen as being the ‘fastest White man in the world/on the planet’ (*planet* is also a collocate), which again are suggestive that non-White men are faster. Taken alongside the constructions of Black men in terms of their heterosexual prowess and large size, this perhaps suggests a construction of White men as physically less impressive than Black men.

As with *White* (with which it collocates), middle-class men are discussed in terms of political privilege, particularly with the collocates *dominated* and *party*, which are used to be critical of their participation in the Conservative Party and other organisations. Middle-class men are also described as well-educated, university-educated, Cambridge-educated or just *educated*. These constructions serve to make the point that middle-class men’s education is not explicitly attributed to anything on their part and is instead something that happened (or was done) *to* them (cf. the discussion below of the prefix *self-* to describe working-class men). Similarly, middle-class men are often described using adjectival constructions with *well-*, such as *well-known*, *well-educated*, *well-dressed* and *well-fed*. Such descriptors access a discourse of privilege. *Middle* itself is a collocate of *middle-class man/men*, due to the fact that the phrase *middle-aged[,]* *middle-class man/men* occurs 40 times in the corpus. Again, such men are described as dominating politics and corporate boardrooms, as well as sitting in ivory towers, being manipulative and promoting their own interests. But they also are constructed as having a mid-life crisis, trying to relive their youth and realising that adulthood has not turned out as well as they had hoped. And, as with White men, a minority counter-discourse suggests that middle-class men are *discriminated against*:

- 16) Jeremy Paxman said last year that white middle-class men are the most discriminated against group in television. ([The Express, April 13, 2009](#))
- 17) Discrimination against older, middle class men is still rife. ([The Express, October 28, 2010](#))

The idea that White and middle-class men are discriminated against is also the most striking feature of the qualitative analysis of the depictions these types of men. In the sub-sample, White and middle-class men are consistently described as having been unfairly *banned*, *shunned*, *rejected*, *overlooked* and *excluded*, and through no fault of their own. Structurally, both White and middle-class men are most often referenced as the subjects of passive constructions (e.g., *White men were banned*), which serves to underscore their supposed lack of agency. Moreover, since syntactic subjects of passive constructions always denote discourse-given information (Birner 1996), the consistent referencing of White and middle-class men in this position has the effect of strengthening the epistemic force of their reported exclusion, presenting as a foregone conclusion the idea that it is White/middle-class men who are *banned*, *shunned* or *excluded* (and not some other type of man). Interestingly, and in contrast to the depictions of Black and Asian men described above, depictions of White and middle-class men in the sample involve little to no mention of either the PHYSICALITY or the AMBITION dimensions. Instead, the focus is placed almost exclusively on

the men's experience of *unjust exclusion*. We would argue that the absence of any other defining characteristics in discussions of White and middle-class men serves to position these types of men as the norm – as the bearers of the kind of normative masculinity outlined above. This contributes to the depiction of White/middle-class men's *exclusion* as *unjust*, and ultimately a representation of the men themselves as *beleaguered*.

Working-class men

Despite the temptation in the corpus analysis to view the collocate *inarticulate* as a commonly cited characteristic of working-class men, it only ever collocates (along with *Glasgow*) in a repeated quote that is attributed to the then Labour chairman, Ian McCartney, who says 'When you're basically described, and the best way of paraphrasing, as an inarticulate working class man from Glasgow who's very liked but ain't that much good, you know it's a caricature too far'. The quote does indeed suggest *inarticulate* is seen as a characteristic of being working-class, but more evidence would be needed to support this as being a well-known discourse.

Interestingly, the collocate *self* occurs in a range of different constructions: working-class men are said to be *self-important*, *self-declared*, *self-employed*, *self-made*, *self-proclaimed*, *self-educated*, *self-taught*, *self-confident*, *self-motivated*, *self-radicalised* and *self-improving*. What seems to be notable here is that working-class men are constructed as relying on themselves for their education, confidence or employment – with the implication that this is something that they have not had given to them by some outside agent (cf. White and middle-class men above). The collocate *himself* has a similar tendency to refer to self-sufficiency:

18) Michael is a working-class man who got himself an education whereas Bally is a youth with baggy clothes and a fondness for spliffs. ([The Guardian, July 6, 2007](#))

There is also a sense of (sometimes rueful) pride in disclosing working-class status, with working-class man being the only identity that has *I'm* as a collocate:

19) "I'm just a working-class man who has done well for myself. These players don't work hard enough and don't make the sacrifices necessary to win a world title." ([The Sun, December 28, 2006](#))

20) "I kept getting into fights," he grins. "I'm a working-class man, and when two blokes are looking over, bogging me, or people are sat opposite, filming on their mobile phone, without asking, that upsets me and I react." ([The Observer, March 29, 2009](#))

Similarly, working-class man is the only identity to have *values* as a collocate, and these are also seen as a source of pride:

21) We've got to be vigilant and say we represent those values. Your working-class man doesn't go to spray parlours and spray himself up to go to work. We want to get back to basic working values and do something to get back to our culture. ([Daily Telegraph, November 12, 2011](#))

22) My dad was at least partially responsible for my socialist values. A working-class man, he earned little, accepting the fact that others were born into money. ([The Guardian, July 18, 2009](#))

The collocate *average* is used to refer to the life expectancy or wage of the average working class man (although this collocate does not occur with other groups). It is perhaps implied then there is thus something intrinsically average about being working-class in itself. The collocates *jobs* and *gone* suggest that working-class men are disadvantaged in comparison to other groups:

- 23) ...women who would otherwise have been housewives had taken university places and well-paid jobs that could have gone to ambitious working-class men. ([The Guardian, April 8, 2011](#))
- 24) Those whose livelihoods were devastated were given no time to adapt, leaving well-paid working-class men with no jobs or chances for their children or for their communities to adapt gradually to new skills. ([The Guardian, October 20, 2006](#))

Finally, the lives of working-class men are described as dangerous or tedious:

- 25) ...the hopeless prospects, drunkenness, casual fights and drab sex lives of young working-class men of that era. ([Daily Telegraph, April 26, 2010](#))
- 26) ... the victims of mesothelioma are mostly old, working-class men who spent their lives exposed to the dust in factories ([The Independent, April 27, 2010](#))

Many of the same themes emerge in the qualitative analysis of representations of working-class men as do in the corpus analysis, though in the qualitative analysis the general connotation is somewhat more negative. While we once again find a depiction of them as “self-made” and as possessing unique “values”, those traits are presented in the sub-sample as making them responsible for their own current status. Rather than being presented as lacking in agency or as “victims” of societal exclusion (like the White and middle-class men are), reference to working-class men is most often found in the subject position of active verbal constructions (*working-class men are more likely to die early, working-class men are struggling to get on*). Textually, this sets working-class men apart from other “beleaguered” types of men, and positions them as (at least partially) responsible for their own failings. This more implicit textual positioning is coupled with explicit reference, primarily via adjectival modification, to working-class men as *unemployed* and *unsuitable*. Their alleged “unsuitability” is depicted as arising primarily from adherence to certain “values” that include an over-abundance of violence and PHYSICALITY and an almost total lack of AMBITION, as illustrated in (27):

- 27) IT is my passionate belief that knife carrying in Glasgow and across Scotland is not a "cultural trait" or "tradition", but a deeply corrosive and dangerous social cancer. Being "tooled up" is not cool or gallus, it's dangerous and daft. Hundreds of working class men, predominantly young, stab, slash and scar other working class men. ([The Mirror, October 13, 2005](#))

The idea that working-class men are violent is presented in (27) as irrefutable fact, embedded as a presupposition of the author’s claim that such violence is not in fact *cool*. The violence is also specifically aligned with a surfeit of PHYSICALITY, as indexed by the term *gallus*, a Scottish slang word for daring and self-confidence. The combination of explicit statements such as those in (27) with the more implicit positioning of working-class men as “beleaguered” has the effect of producing a discourse of working-class men in the sub-sample as “forgotten” members of society who, as a result, have come to occupy a morally deviant space within the ideological landscape of masculinity.

Upper-class men

With only 27 citations of *upper-class man/men* in the whole corpus, there are no collocates that are especially revealing of discourses. Instead, a direct examination of all 27 concordance lines was carried out, although it should be borne in mind that perhaps the most notable construction of upper-class men in the press is the absence of the term.

Tellingly, the term tends to occur in historical contexts rather than being part of a “current” identity:

28) My grandfather was a typically upper-class man ([The Observer, June 11, 2006](#))

29) In the Sixties, The Australian pub in Milner Street, Chelsea, was a meeting place for miniskirted “dolly birds” with cut-glass accents and “debs' delights”, young upper-class men kitted out in velvet flared trousers from the boutiques of the nearby Kings Road. ([The Times, August 29, 2008](#))

Upper-class men are sometimes constructed as having bad manners, ‘their natural self-confidence coming across as arrogant’, they are described as engaging in ‘drunken roaring’ and having ‘fewer manners’ than working-class women. There is also discussion of their relationships and particularly an insinuation that they may be gay with one case referencing their ‘romantic friendships’ while another refers to an actor who has played ‘rotund (and often homosexual) upper-class men’.

The findings of the corpus analysis are very similar to those of the qualitative analysis, which finds that upper-class men are depicted throughout the sub-sample as morally deviant and hence normatively “unmanly”. Representations of upper-class men evince a discourse of these men as both lacking in AMBITION and PHYSICALITY:

30) Upper-class men are often full of neuroses about women, escaping to male-only institutions and only able to relax with them when boosted by a large quantity of alcohol, but Matt was refreshingly direct. He also had unshakeable self-belief. ... I've had my share of well-connected and generous boyfriends. My last boyfriend, a marquis, introduced me to the country's most aristocratic families and wooed me during weekends at his palatial country pile. It was fun at the time, but I've no desire to return to that lifestyle. So much of that world is based on money and status, not character. ... Indeed the lack of testosterone at many upper-class soirees is so alarming one wonders how they breed at all. Matt may not buy me jewels or fancy meals, but when I sold my car he bought me a second-hand bike for a fiver ... and fixed it up so it's as good as new. He is a man of action. ([Daily Mail, July 11, 2006](#))

In the extract in (30), the author compares Matt, her current non-upper-class boyfriend, with her previous *well-connected* partners. This form of juxtaposition is common in discussions of upper-class men in the sample, and allows for an image of upper-class men to emerge without it necessarily being explicitly stated (e.g., Kulick 2005). For example, the text describes Matt as *refreshingly direct*, presumably in contrast to more “manipulative” and “serpentine” upper-class men. Similarly, Matt is described as having *unshakeable self-belief* and as *a man of action*, thus positioning upper-class men (i.e., not Matt) as lacking in both confidence and vigour. When upper-class men are explicitly referenced (both in (30) and elsewhere), they are described as *effete*, *boastful*, *insecure* and *immoral*. Via both juxtaposition with more “appropriately” gendered men and derisive adjectival modification, upper-class men in the

sample are evaluated negatively and positioned as existing outside the moral centre of normative masculinity due to their lack of both AMBITION and “manly” PHYSICALITY.

Summary

With regard to the specific methodological choices made, we feel that our techniques were successful in terms of achieving what the two approaches can do well. We should note that as a model for other studies, we would not necessarily advocate that analysts take exactly the same path as we did. For example, in corpus linguistics decisions about which collocational measure to use, or how many collocates to examine can be dependent on factors such as corpus size or lexical diversity within the corpus. The measures we used were based on initial experiments to determine a set of results which yielded enough of interest, without becoming repetitive.

Overall, the corpus-based and purely qualitative analysis of the dataset uncovered a set of largely shared findings. Both found dominant representations of Black and Asian men as *violent* and *criminal*, whereas White men were largely characterised as being *unfairly excluded* from society. Similarly, both analyses reveal discourses of middle-class men as *privileged* and (unfairly) *discriminated against*, whereas working-class men and upper-class men are represented as existing outside the moral centre of masculinity. In those instances where the results of the corpus analysis and the qualitative analysis do not overlap, the findings are complementary and yield no contradictory conclusions. The qualitative analysis, for example, tentatively illustrates the existence of additional representations of both Black and Asian men as *anodyne* and/or *respectable*, representations that are presumably too infrequent to be picked up in the corpus analysis. Conversely, the broader scope of the corpus analysis allows for the discovery of additional discourse of Black and Asian men as *victims* of violence in addition to being perpetrators. In both of these cases, the additional representations identified serve to broaden our understanding of the various discourses of masculinity that exist and how the different male identity types are positioned in relation to one another. Figure 1 offers a schematic representation of these positionings.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

[Insert Figure 1 here]

Figure 1. The ideological field of masculinity in the British print media

In Figure 1, the eight different male types that emerge in the sample (six different categories, with double representations of Black Men and Asian Men) are plotted against the axes of PHYSICALITY and AMBITION. In addition, each of the quadrants is defined by the source of that positioning as it is constructed in the corpus. In the upper-left (high PHYSICALITY and low AMBITION) we find “violent” Black men and working-class men who are both depicted as residing in this space due to various socio-structural constraints (e.g., racism, class oppression). In the upper-right are “predatory” Asian men, who are characterised by high levels of ambition and physicality due to a purported excessive grounding in “foreign” Asian cultural norms. In the lower-left reside upper-class men and “anodyne” Black men, both of whom have low levels of physicality and ambition due to learned behaviours (e.g., “empty chivalry”, and lack of “conviction”) which serve to render them not only “deficient” in terms of masculinity, but also “inauthentic”. Finally, in the lower-right quadrant are placed “respectable” Asian men, White men and middle-class men. The representations of these male types are similar in that they are constructed as displaying “appropriate” amounts of AMBITION and, in the case of White men and middle-class men, (the

capacity for) PHYSICALITY. As such, these male types are located in the “morally central” space of the field (indicated by the dashed lines). The source of this moral centrality is depicted throughout the corpus as arising from an assimilation of dominant cultural norms, which, particularly for White men and middle-class men, is described as instinctual and inherent.

It is interesting to note that throughout the corpus (as summarised in Figure 1), normative masculinity is defined in very traditional terms. PHYSICALITY and AMBITION are both characteristics identified by Connell (1987, 1995), among others, as typical of hegemonically masculine forms, and there is little evidence throughout our dataset of either “new men” or “new lads”. The only instances in which “new men” are mentioned are those in which they are roundly dismissed in favour of a more conventional normative articulation of masculine identity (such as in the extract in (2) above). While this could be indicative of a pattern of ideological change in Britain over the past decade, it may also simply be due to the sampling method employed in the current study and further investigation of this question would be required. The representations of racialized and classed masculinities in the corpus, in contrast, parallel much of what has been identified previously, with Black, Asian and working-class men, in particular, depicted as both morally and socially deviant.

Overall then, Figure 1 is useful both because it summarises the various positionings of the different male types in the sample, and because it helps to elucidate the intersectional connections between these subject positions. Explicit discussions of the intersection of race and social class are largely absent from the corpus, yet we would argue that the resonances between the positioning of these subject types and the imagined sources of those positionings (as depicted above) help us to understand the ways in which race, class and gender are ideologically presumed to interact in the British context. We conclude, in the next section, with a brief discussion of these intersectional connections and their implications for theories of masculinity more generally.

Before getting to that, however, two caveats regarding the generalizability of our findings are in order. First, it is important to highlight that our evidence for the structuring axes of PHYSICALITY and AMBITION as well as the existence of the more “minority” representations of “anodyne Black men” and the “respectable Asian men” emerges principally from the analysis of the sub-sample of 51 articles. This is admittedly a relatively small corpus, and subsequent research is necessary to confirm our results in this regard. Nevertheless, we believe that the down-sampling method we employ (i.e., selecting those articles from each publication with the most frequent mention of the identity terms in question) helps to guarantee that these are in fact “true” representations in the dataset, even if they are obscured in the larger corpus and only emerge in a close reading of the sub-sample. The second caveat to note is that the field of masculinity proposed in Figure 1 (not to mention the various representations we describe above) are by no means intended to exhaust the various depictions and imaginings of masculinity in the UK. We take it as given that a multiplicity of other understandings of masculinity also circulate in British society, and particularly in the various communities in question (i.e., among Black men, Asian men, etc.). What we describe here are only those representations that emerge in the national print media in Britain. While we acknowledge that these representations therefore represent only one among many possible representations in society ([and are likely to be influenced by the identities of the text producers themselves](#)), we nevertheless believe that, by virtue of appearing in the press, the representations we describe above have a certain dominant (and even hegemonic) force. For this reason, we would argue that our findings are important in helping us to better understand the ways in which masculinities are structured and positioned in British society as a whole, despite the obvious limitations of scope inherent in our dataset.

Discussion

The two caveats above notwithstanding, we argue that the positioning of the different masculine types we propose in Figure 1 serves simultaneously to reaffirm and to complicate Connell's (1995) well-known distinction between the *hegemony-subordination* and *authorisation-marginalisation* dimensions of masculinity. For Connell, the *hegemony-subordination* dimension refers to an ideological axis internal to the gendered order that serves to organise different articulations of masculinity. In the British context considered here, we argue that *hegemony-subordination* is elaborated in terms of PHYSICALITY and AMBITION, such that masculinities that are associated with "appropriate" levels of each reside within a morally dominant position in the ideological landscape. *Authorisation-marginalisation*, in contrast, is an intersectional dimension, one that captures 'the relations between the masculinities in dominant and subordinated classes or ethnic groups' (Connell 1995:80). In our analysis, the *authorisation-marginalisation* dimension is reflected in the existence of a moral centre of masculinity populated primarily by White and middle-class men, and a moral periphery in which Black, Asian, working- and upper-class men reside. In short, the distribution of masculine identity types in Figure 1 supports Connell's assertion that the societal organisation of masculinity requires a consideration of both *hegemony-subordination* and *authorisation-marginalisation*.

Yet at the same time, it is not as easy as Connell's framework would suggest to tease these two formative dimensions of the ideological field of masculinity apart. This is because, as least in the texts examined here, the *authorisation-marginalisation* dimension is structured according to the same basic principles as the *hegemony-subordination* dimension. In other words, Black, Asian, working- and upper-class men are marginalised not (or not only) because of their race or social class, but because of the gendered connotations of these racial and social class positions. Similarly, the defining characteristics of *hegemony-subordination* (i.e., PHYSICALITY and AMBITION) are themselves raced and classed in specific ways. That normative masculinity is represented as White and middle-class, for example, is not coincidental. It is instead a product of the fact that PHYSICALITY and AMBITION are themselves also aspects of dominant discourses of race and class. What this means is that it is impossible to isolate *hegemony-subordination* from *authorisation-marginalisation* and to examine their effects separately. Gender is raced and classed in specific ways, and to the very same extent that race and class are gendered. Understanding the ideological organisation of masculinities in a given social context therefore requires us to adopt a truly intersectional perspective, one that goes beyond simply trying to identify the combined, additive effects of multiple systems of social organisation and instead works to model the ways in which these systems structure, and are structured by, one another (Choo & Ferree 2010).

An additional advantage of adopting the kind of intersectional approach described here is that it helps to further clarify Connell's foundational concept of *hegemonic masculinity* itself. In the original formulation, hegemonic masculinity is defined both as that form of masculinity that dominates others via a combination of coercion and consent, and as that form of masculinity that serves to perpetuate patriarchy (or men's domination over women). The duality of this definition has come under significant critical scrutiny over the years (see, e.g., Groes-Green 2012; Christensen & Jensen 2014 for reviews) with many scholars arguing that the two sides of the definition need to be de-linked. Christensen & Jensen (2014), for example, suggest a framework that separates the domination of some types of men over others (*internal hegemony*) from the domination of men over women (*external hegemony*), and argue for an empirically-driven intersectional approach to both. Similarly, Hearn & Morell (2012) describe the possibility of there being multiple hegemonies that exist

at different levels of social organisation and that are linked to the exercise of particular types of power. Hearn & Morrell's characterisation is particularly apt in the British context considered here given that upper-class men, for example, may wield significant amounts of both social and material power over both women and other men even if upper-class masculinity is represented as a gender-deviant type. Likewise, Black and Asian masculinities may be able to realise a "patriarchal dividend" in certain contexts, despite the fact that they are dominated within the ideological field of masculinity as a whole. In short then, an intersectional analysis of masculinity like the one described above is able not only to provide a more comprehensive picture of how representations of masculinity are organised, but it can also trace the different vectors of power produced by specific configurations of gender, race and social class.

Notes

- * The research presented here was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Centre for Corpus Approaches to Social Science, ESRC grant reference ES/K002155/1. Thanks also to Tommaso Milani and two anonymous reviewers for helping comments on an earlier version of this piece. All errors and shortcomings are, of course, our own.
- 1 It is important to reiterate that we are not claiming that masculinities research has entirely failed to engage with intersectionality (see, e.g., Milani 2015). Instead, we claim that research in this area has tended to adopt a "content specialization" (Choo & Ferree), or "intra-categorical" (McCall 2005), approach that focuses on ever more specific intersecting articulations of identity (e.g., white man, white middle-class man, older white middle-class man). We believe that what is lacking, at least in work on masculinities in Britain, is a more comprehensive, inter-categorical approach, in which a full typology of intersecting categories of race, social class and gender are examined. In this article, our goal is to provide an initial attempt at such a typology.
- 2 The newspapers examined are: *The Express*, *The Mail*, *The Mirror*, *The Star* and *The Sun*, which could be viewed as tabloids, and *The Guardian*, *The Independent*, *The Telegraph* and *The Times* which are broadsheets. ~~*The Guardian*, *The Independent*, *The Mail*, *The Mirror*, *The Star*, *The Sun*, *The Telegraph* and *The Times*.~~
- 3 A reviewer points out that the so-called "anodyne Black men" being described here could in fact be demonstrating a high level of ambition by conforming to a dominant neo-liberal discourse of "identity politics" and so refraining from speaking out against institutional racism in order to succeed in their jobs. We agree that this is entirely possible, and that the real men described in the extract could have a variety of motives for behaving as they do. Nevertheless, we argue that they are represented by the author of the text as being disempowered (i.e., anodyne) and lacking the ambition to combat the injustices they suffer. We believe that it is this representation that is important for our argument here (as opposed to the actual motivations of the men involved), though we nevertheless concede that our arguments regarding the positioning of "anodyne Black men" require further justification and support given that they occur so fleetingly in our data.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

References

Agha, A. (2007). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Alexander, C. (2004). Imagining the Asian gang: ethnicity, masculinity and youth after “the riots.” *Critical Social Policy* 24: 526–49.
- Alexander, C. (1996). *The art of being black: The creation of black British youth identities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Archer, L. (2001). “Muslim brothers, black lads, traditional Asians”: British Muslim young men’s constructions of race, religion and masculinity. *Feminism & Psychology* 11: 79–105.
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., & McEnery, T. (2013). Sketching Muslims: A corpus driven analysis of representations around the word “Muslim” in the British press 1998–2009. *Applied Linguistics* 34: 255–78.
- Benwell, B. (2003). Introduction: Masculinity and men’s lifestyle magazines. In B. Benwell (ed.), *Masculinity and men’s lifestyle magazines*, 6–29. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Beynon, J. (2002). *Masculinities and culture*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Birner, B. (1996). *The discourse function of inversion in English*. New York: Garland.
- Du Bois, J. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse*, 139–82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cameron, D. (2009). Sex/gender, language and the new biologism. *Applied Linguistics* 31: 173–92.
- Carrigan, T., Connell, R., & Lee, J. (1985). Towards a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society* 14: 551–604.
- Chapman, R. (1988). The great pretender: Variations on the new man theme. In R. Chapman & J. Rutherford (eds.), *Male order: Unwrapping masculinity*, 225–48. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Choo, H. & Ferree, M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory* 28: 129–49.
- Christensen, A.-D. & Jensen, S. (2014). Combining hegemonic masculinity and intersectionality. *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies* 9: 60–75.
- Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity : Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society* 19: 829–59.

- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43: 1241–99.
- Edley, N. & Wetherell, M. (1997). Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identities. *Discourse & Society* 8: 203–17.
- Ehrlich, S. & Levesque, S. (2011). The strategic marginalization of working class masculinity in a batterers' treatment programme. *Gender & Language* 5: 271–301.
- Frosh, S., Phoenix, A., & Pattman, R. (2000). Cultural contestations in practice: White boys and the racialisation of masculinities. In C. Squire (ed.), *Culture in psychology*, 45–56. London: Routledge.
- Frosh, S., Phoenix, Ann, & Pattman, Rob (2001). *Young masculinities: Understanding boys in contemporary society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gill, R. (2003). Power and the production of subjects: A genealogy of the New Man and the New Lad. In B. Benwell (ed.), *Masculinity and men's lifestyle magazines*, 34–56. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gough, B. (2001). “Biting Your Tongue”: negotiating masculinities in contemporary Britain. *Journal of Gender Studies* 10: 169–185.
- Groes-Green, C. (2012). Philogynous masculinities: Contextualizing alternative manhood in Mozambique. *Men and Masculinities* 15: 91–111.
- Hearn, J. & Morrell, R. (2012). Reviewing hegemonic masculinities and men in Sweden and South Africa. *Men and Masculinities* 15: 3–10.
- Hopkins, P. (2009). Responding to the “crisis of masculinity”: The perspectives of young Muslim men from Glasgow and Edinburgh, Scotland. *Gender, Place & Culture* 16: 299–312.
- Jackson, P. (1994). Black male : Advertising and the cultural politics of masculinity. *Gender , Place & Culture* 1: 49–59.
- Jackson, P., Stevenson, N. & Brooks, K. (2001). *Making sense of men's magazines*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jaffe, A. (2009). Introduction: The sociolinguistics of stance. In A. Jaffe (ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*, 3–28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaworski, A. & Thurlow, C. (2009). Taking an elitist stance: Ideology and the discursive production of social distinction. In A. Jaffe (ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*, 195–226. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G. (1995). The social production of language: History and structures of domination. In P. Fries & M. Gregory (eds.), *Discourse in society: Systemic functional perspectives. Meaning and choice in language: Studies for Michael Halliday*, 115–40. Westport: Ablex Publishing.

Kulick, D (2005). The importance of what gets left out. *Discourse & Society* 7: 615–24.

Luyt, R. (2012). Constructing hegemonic masculinities in South Africa: The discourse and rhetoric of heteronormativity. *Gender and Language* 6: 47–77.

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs* 30: 1771–1800.

[McEnery, A., Tono, Y. and Xiao, R. \(2005\) *Corpus-Based Language Studies: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge.](#)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Milani, T. (2013). Are “queers” really “queer”? Language, identity and same-sex desire in a South African online community. *Discourse & Society* 24: 615–633.

Milani, T. (2015). Theorizing language and masculinities. In T. Milani (ed.), *Language and masculinities: Performances, intersections, dislocations*. London: Routledge.

Rutherford, J. (1988). Who's that man? In R. Chapman & J. Rutherford (eds.), *Male order: Unwrapping masculinity*, 21–67. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Segal, L. (1993). Changing men: Masculinities in context. *Theory and Society* 22: 625–41.

Seidler, V. (2006). *Transforming masculinities: Men, cultures, bodies, power, sex and love*. London: Routledge.

[Stubbs, M. \(2001\). *Words and Phrases: Corpus studies of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.](#)

Walsh, F. (2010). *Male trouble: Masculinity and the performance of crisis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ward, G. & Birner, B. (2001). Discourse and information structure. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis*, 119–37. Oxford: Blackwell.

Weldon, L. (2008). Intersectionality. In G. Goertz & A. Mazur (eds.), *Politics, gender and concepts: Theory and methodology*, 193–218. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetherell, M. & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary Positions and Psycho-Discursive Practices. *Feminism & Psychology* 9: 335–56.

Whehelan, I. (2000). *Overloaded: Popular culture and the future of feminism*. London: Women's Press.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2011). *The politics of belonging: Intersectional contestations*, London: Sage.