

MULTIPLE MASCULINITIES?
A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF MEN IN THE PRINT MEDIA

By

KRISTIN A. CUTLER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIOLOGY

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Sociology

AUGUST 2007

To the Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the Committee appointed to examine the thesis of
Kristin A. Cutler find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

Chair

MULTIPLE MASCULINITIES?
A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF MEN IN THE PRINT MEDIA

Abstract

by Kristin A. Cutler, M.A.
Washington State University
AUGUST 2007

Chair: Nella VanDyke

Although gender scholars such as Connell (1995) assert that multiple masculinities are a part of American culture very little research has been conducted to empirically validate this contention. This study, through the employment of content analysis, examines advertisements in seven popular men's magazines to determine whether or not multiple masculinities are visibly present. The analyses uncover seven dimensions of masculinity which vary in their levels of compliance to hegemonic molds. Other findings lend further support to the claim that men, much like their female counterparts, are also commoditized and objectified by the media.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PAST RESEARCH.....	5
DATA AND METHODS.....	14
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.....	19
DIMENSIONS OF MASCULINITY (FACTOR ANALYSIS).....	24
DISCUSSION.....	32
CONCLUSION.....	37
TABLES	
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.....	39
DIMENSIONS OF MASCULINITY (FACTOR ANALYSIS).....	41
WORKS CITED.....	45
APPENDIX	
CODING SHEET.....	51
CODE BOOK.....	53

Introduction

The media serve as powerful agents of socialization that help in creating and re-creating our conceptions of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation. The messages that we receive from day to day represent and reinforce the “ideal” according to the dominant culture and provide us with expectations and definitions on how to live. As C. Wright Mills stated many years ago, “the mass media has become the lens of mankind [sic] through which men see; the medium by which they interpret and report what they see. It is the semiorganized source of their very identities” (as cited in Horowitz 1963: 406; Vigorito and Curry 1998: 136-137). Magazines, more specifically, serve as tools for navigating through our sometimes complicated and anxiety filled lives. Whether these anxieties have to do with sexual relationships, health, appearance, careers, or our place in consumer culture more generally, magazines provide us with answers and tips to becoming closer to the ideal; including the ideal man or woman. Beyond the obvious ways that magazines work to reinforce gender roles and norms they also “demonstrate the potential for significant change in gender relations and identities” (Jackson, Stevenson and Brooks 2001).

While much attention has been paid to the way in which women are depicted and consumed in the popular media, only recently has similar attention been given to men and masculinity. Those studies that have attempted to make up for this deficiency have primarily focused on the way in which the male physique or physical body has transformed over the years and

how this transformation has led to the increased objectification and commoditization of men (see Alexander 2003; Dotson 1999; Kolbe and Albanese 1996; Pope, Phillips and Olivardia 2000; Leit, Pope and Gray 2001; Miller 2005; Reichart, Lambiase, Morgan, Carstarphen, and Zavoina 1999) thus putting them on a more level playing field as their female counterparts. While these studies provide us with important insights into the ongoing transformation of what is considered “ideal” and the consequences that result from society’s obsession with outward appearances (e.g. the increasing number of men who are fighting eating disorders, using anabolic steroids, and/or turning to plastic surgery to attain the “ideal”) most fail to look beyond the “objectification factor” to examine the ways in which race, ethnicity, class and sexual orientation *intersect* to form variations in the way in which masculinity is presented in the media. Those few studies where sexual orientation (Rohlinger 2002) and race (Abraham 2003; Bowen and Schmid 1997; Coltrane and Messieno 2000; Orbe 1998; Taylor and Bang 1997) have been incorporated into the discussion inform us that hegemonic definitions remain supreme. In other words, “true masculinity” is said to embrace all that is non-feminine, heterosexual, and white (Anderson 2006; Connell 1995; Donaldson 1993; Kimmel 2005). This solo image, however, does not align with much of the gender scholarship which suggests that our culture presents not a single, but multiple masculinities (Connell 1992, 1995; Zinn, Hondagneau-Sotelo and Messner 2000). Thus, more research must be conducted in order to further explore and validate this insight.

Such research is important because if multiple masculinities are uncovered, especially with respect to non-traditional definitions, then one might conclude that society is becoming more accepting of diversity and that boys and men should feel free to define themselves in various ways without fear of being ridiculed or discriminated against because they do not fit some traditional mold. This fight for defining the ideal in various ways has been an issue surrounding women and girls for ages; boys and men have been virtually absent from this discussion until more recently and deserve the same kind of attention that women facing identity issues receive.

Keeping in line with the aforementioned scholarship and with the importance of such research in mind, it is my intention to expand upon the research on men and masculinity in the media paying specific attention to how men are depicted in the popular print media. Using Connell's (1992) notion of the "prism of difference"—the idea that masculinity is not a static concept but an on-going process of self-formation, a product of situated life experiences whereby class, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation intersect to form various strands of masculinity—I examine how gender is configured through cross-cutting forms of difference (primarily with respect to race and sexual orientation) and determine whether or not these differences are apparent within popular men's magazines. The main questions driving this research are quite simple: Do popular men's magazines reflect multiple masculinities or do they provide a platform whereby hegemonic definitions are employed and reinforced? If multiple masculinities are present, what do they look like? Do

they vary across magazines? In order to address these questions I rely on Erving Goffman's (1976) work, paying particular attention to his discussion on gender displays and commercial realism. Based on this work I content coded 645 advertisements spanning *GQ*, *Maxim*, *Men's Health*, *Sports Illustrated*, *Rolling Stone*, *Ebony*, and *Jet*, in order to identify various characteristics that are associated with popular definitions of masculinity. I then employed exploratory factor analysis in order to determine whether or not multiple masculinities do in fact exist. Before launching into the details of my study, however, it is necessary to take a closer look at the literature surrounding how masculinity is defined and how men have been portrayed in the popular media up until this point.

Research on Men & Masculinity in the Print Media

Goffman (1979) was one of the first scholars to examine the presentation of gender in advertisements. His main research question was quite simple: What causes us to recognize a female as a female and a male as a male? In order to address this question, Goffman, assembled and systematized contemporary “social portraits”—displays of self that are produced and consumed by others—and examined their alignment to prevailing codes of masculinity and femininity. His research showed that certain bodily postures and gestures of self-presentation, represented in isolation, as well as in various social and gendered relationships, reflexively reflected social hierarchies and women's social domination by men in patriarchal culture. More generally, Goffman's work demonstrated that men and women act in accordance with the expectations (or social scripts) that larger society prescribes. And while rebellion and resistance to these “ideal” gender prescriptions might occur most people voluntarily go along with these prescriptions because “the norms and expectations get built into their sense of worth and identity” (Lorber 1998: 42). These beliefs then pervade the way that men and women think, how they feel, and the way that they act (West and Zimmerman 1987).

The current research on gender identity and the media informs us that in today's consumer-based society definitions of masculinity and femininity primarily rest on outward appearances and the ability of the average Joe or Jane to mold and manipulate themselves to fit the “ideal.” More specifically, studies that have examined gender displays in advertising confirm that

outward appearances have become the cornerstone of this industry (see Dotson 1999). In particular, the body itself has become the center focal point and is most often portrayed as a vehicle for pleasure, youth, health and fitness (Jackson et al. 2001). Ultimately, these images and messages are intended to create insecurity by framing masculinity and femininity as problems that require self-regulation and ongoing improvement. Alexander (2003) notes that masculinity and femininity are “rooted in consumer capitalism wherein profit can be produced by generating insecurity about one’s body and then providing consumers with the correct answer or product in articles and advertisements” (551). Advertisements focusing on the masculinity, more specifically, inform us that the masculine ideal has transformed over the years, however, remains closely aligned to its hegemonic roots.

Studies of men in advertisements reveal that male models are most often depicted as taking on attributes associated with hegemonic masculinity and eschewing those attributes that might link them with more subordinate forms of masculinity (Connell 1992). More specifically, men are most often depicted as white, heterosexual, autonomous, unemotional, individuals who occupy roles that stress the importance of work, competition, and physical domination and/or the three P’s—power, position and privilege. In addition to these attributes, studies indicate that the male body has become a primary gauge of one’s masculinity and has become increasingly muscular and powerful over the years (Albanese 1991; Alexander 2003; Connell 1995; Katz 1999; Leit, Pope, and Gray 2001; Pope, Phillips and Olivardia 2000; Reichart,

Lambiase, Morgan, Carstarphen, and Zavoina 1999). For example, Albanese (1996) found that men featured in advertisements are not average, ordinary men. Rather, the majority of male models take on the physique of the traditional male icon—strong and muscular—and exude an upscale conventional appearance. Alexander’s research (2003) on branded masculinity in *Men’s Health* magazine confirms these sentiments. She notes that “a well-toned body, a fashion sense, and an appearance of financial success” (551) were all important components of the masculine ideal.

Because a strong, hard, body is a central component of the masculine ideal it is important to examine how this image is intimately tied to sexuality. Dotson (1999) notes that “Muscularity is perceived to be more than masculinity; it is also an indicator of sexual desire and perhaps a signal of sexual availability, a display of a male’s search for a mate” (114). The gender of that mate, however, is not negotiable when it comes to defining oneself in hegemonic terms. A large part of being “a man” means embracing all that is heterosexual and rejecting and all that is homosexual(Anderson 2006; Connell, 1995; Donaldson 1993; Kimmel 2005; Messner 2000). As Kimmel (2005) notes,

Homophobia is more than the irrational fear of gay men, more than the fear that we might be perceived as gay. The word ‘faggot’ has nothing to do with homosexual experience or even fear of homosexuals...It comes out of the depths of manhood: a label of ultimate contempt for anyone who seems sissy, untough, uncool...Homophobia is the fear that other men will unmask us, emasculate us, reveal to us and the world that we do no measure up, that we are not real men (35).

This fear of being labeled as untough or uncool has led to what has been termed by Messner (2000) as “doing heterosexuality” or the ways in which men distance themselves from appearing feminine or gay. This includes behaviors such as drinking and watching sports with the guys, telling dirty jokes, and lusting after partially-clad women. Furthermore, both Lorber (1998) and Messner (2000) point to competitive sport and the military as a prime facilitators and reinforcers of the heterosexuality-masculinity link. Messner notes that athletic institutions provide a context in which “peers mutually construct and reconstruct narrow definitions of masculinity” with heterosexuality being considered the foundation of this conception of masculinity (2000: 209). This point is backed by the fact that only six American, male professional athletes spanning football, basketball, baseball, and hockey, have openly admitted to being homosexual and that each of these men waited until retirement or close to retirement to do so (Elliott 2007). In addition, the well known “don’t ask, don’t tell policy” that echoes throughout all branches of the military demonstrates this institution’s aversion to homosexuality. Furthermore, this focus on men in “action” whether through sport or the military also reinforces the centrality of the physical body in defining one’s masculinity. In these arenas the body is seen as an instrument of strength, endurance, and agility and is a legitimate medium for men to unleash their “inherent” violence and aggression (Lorber 1998).

With respect to the print media, studies indicate that men are most often depicted in an “unknown” light when it comes to their sexuality. In other words, consumers are most often unable to positively identify the sexuality of

male models in advertisements, especially when pictured alone. When, however, sexuality can be determined, models are most often identified as heterosexuals. In a current study of magazine advertisements, Rohlinger (2002), found that male models were *never* overtly depicted in a homosexual light. Her findings suggest that the male body is a merely “a blank canvas on which the viewer can project meaning” (2002: 71). This ultimately allows the viewer to imagine the male body in any sexual situation, heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, and ensures that advertisers do not scare away their heterosexual viewers.

While this blurring of sexual orientation might lead some to believe that heterosexuality is not as central to hegemonic masculinity as it once was, in most cases this blurring effect is offset by other ads and articles featuring scantily clad women as to reassure readers that heterosexuality is the sexuality of choice. A prime example of this is the fact that *Sports Illustrated* dedicates an entire issue to showcasing young women in swimsuits that leave very little to the imagination. In addition, some magazines such as *Maxim* and *For Him Magazine (FHM)* reinforce their commitment to defining masculinity in heterosexual terms by including features that could be considered soft-core pornography (Sharkey 2000). These features include, for example, detailed advice on “how to please your woman in bed” or ads for sexual enhancement drugs that feature male and female models engaged in very intimate behaviors. In addition to these overtly heterosexual indicators, both sports and military

ads are often encoded with terms such as “strong”, “powerful” and “bold” as to reinforce their commitment to defining men in hegemonic terms.

In addition to rejecting all that is linked to femininity and homosexuality, hegemonic masculinity also rests upon the exclusion of other marginalized groups: working-class men and non-white men. Of these two groups, race has been a more salient variable than class in the research surrounding masculinity in the media. (This invisibility of class is partly due to the fact that the media, especially advertisers, like to present us with images that reflect luxury, relaxation, and fantasy. This, most often equates to picturing models in upscale environments that exude upscale appearances). More specifically, studies examining Black masculinity in the media have found that Black men are most often portrayed as inherently angry, physically threatening, and sexually aggressive (Coltrane and Messieno 2000; Orbe 1998; Katz 1999). Black males are also linked to several negative thematic concepts such as violent crime, drugs, poverty, prisons, drug addicted babies, AIDS victims, and welfare (Abraham 2003). With respect to the print media more specifically, studies indicate that when featured, Black males are usually depicted as athletes or entertainers (Bowen and Schmid 1997; Brown 1999). These stereotypical roles highlight the fact that in American culture Black men are known and valued primarily for their talented and powerful bodies and/or ability to entertain usually through music (primarily rap) or sport (which Lorber (1998) says, highlights their “inherent” violent and aggressive tendencies). With respect to hegemonic masculinity, these images of Black

seem to fit the hegemonic mold to a certain degree; however, they also downplay the fact that Black men have varied talents, skills, and interests, extending well beyond the entertainment and sports arenas (Bowen and Schmid 1997).

When featured in the media, Latinos, like African Americans, are portrayed in stereotypical roles that most often paint them in a negative light. Chavez (2003) notes the two most common stereotypes associated with Hispanics and Mexican Americans are the *illegal alien* and the *urban criminal*. The illegal aliens are described as those persons who come to the United States to burden the economic and legal systems, whereas urban criminals are described as prototypical “gang bangers” who are involved in drug trafficking and violence. Studies of magazines, more specifically, indicate that Latinos are, rarely, if ever, featured. In the rare instance when they are featured, however, they are shown in primarily business or family settings (Taylor and Bang 1997). These findings, thus, suggest that Latino men might not be represented in stereotypical roles to the extent that their Black male counterparts are, though more research must be conducted in order to further validate this contention. In addition to these findings others have found that minorities are over represented in public service and government-sponsored advertisements (Bowen and Schmid 1997; Chavez 2003; Taylor and Bang 1997).

It is important to point out here, that while Black and Brown masculinities are most often defined in terms of their relation to hegemonic masculinity, and thus, viewed as marginalized masculinities, this theoretical

framework often fails to consider the way in which Black and Brown masculinity are constructed outside of the dominant culture (Summers 2004). It is, therefore, important to consider the role that these men play in the construction of their own identities, within their own communities and relationships, and realize that their definitions of masculinity are not always reactive, responsive, or resistant to the dominant culture as commonly supposed (Summers 2004: 14).

While a few major studies have been done on the representation of men and masculinity in the media, an extension of this research is needed, especially with respect to examining whether or not gender scholars are correct in asserting that our culture presents us with not one, but multiple masculinities. Thus, instead of merely viewing masculinity as that which is non-feminine, white, and heterosexual, gender scholars such as Connell (1992, 1995), suggest that variations in class, race, and sexual orientation, collide in various ways to form various dimensions of masculinity. If multiple masculinities do in fact exist, it is also important to determine what these masculinities encompass and how far they stray from hegemonic molds. As mentioned at the outset of this paper, if in fact non-traditional molds are uncovered, then not only would the theory of multiple masculinities be empirically validated but it would also say something about the evolution of masculinity and the fact that boys and men have a variety of ways to define themselves without necessarily feeling stigmatized, marginalized, and “unmanly.” That is not to say, however, that if different dimension of

masculinity are uncovered that each dimension will be viewed equally; nevertheless, it would prove to be a step in the right direction towards greater acceptance and equality.

The Current Study: Data and Methods

The sample advertisements that I code in this study were drawn from seven male-oriented magazines including *GQ*, *Maxim*, *Men's Health*, *Sports Illustrated*, *Rolling Stone*, *Ebony* and *Jet*. I chose these magazines for inclusion in this study because they ranked among the top one-hundred most circulated magazines of 2004, according to the Audit Bureau of Circulation and AdAge.com. I chose 2004 as the year of analysis because this study began in the summer of 2005; thus, 2004 was the latest year where all twelve issues of each magazine were in circulation. In addition, these magazines have a large and predominantly male readership spanning various age and income brackets and represent a broad range of interests. These interests include personal expression and fashion (*GQ*), general entertainment (*Maxim*), health, (*Men's Health*), sports (*Sports Illustrated*), and music (*Rolling Stone*). Both *Ebony* and *Jet* also fall in the personal expression and general entertainment categories and were included in this study as a means of comparison to the aforementioned predominantly "white" oriented magazines. In essence, these two magazines will help me determine how Blacks construct Black masculinity and how these definitions compare to hegemonic definitions. News magazines, such as *Newsweek* and *Time*, were not chosen for inclusion in the study because men reading these magazines tend to be older (40+) and are not as likely to be affected by the images that they see. Overall, readership ranged from 20.3 million for *Sports Illustrated* to 5.2 million for *GQ* (Simmons Market research, Inc. 20004). More specifically, the percentage of male readership for

each magazine was as follows: *Men's Health* 84.7%, *Sports Illustrated* 79.5%, *Maxim* 77.9%, *GQ* 75.2%, *Rolling Stone* 59.5%, *Jet* 38.8% and *Ebony* 37.0% (Simmons Market Research, Inc. 2004). The median age of male readers ranged from a low of 27.7 years for *Maxim* to a high of 40.4 years for *Jet* while the median household income ranged from a high of \$68,510 for *Men's Health* to a low \$43,692 for *Jet*.

I analyzed advertisements from the January, April, July, and October issues of each magazine from 2004. If for some reason, however, an issue was not easily available for one of those designated months, as was the case with *Rolling Stone* and *Men's Health*, an issue within the same season was used in its place. For example, in the case of *Rolling Stone*, I used the February 2004 issue in lieu of the January 2004 issue. Advertisements included in this study also met certain size requirements (i.e. those advertisements that are one-quarter length or larger) and contained at least one adult male model. These requirements were based off of standards used in previous research (Rohlinger 2000; Taylor and Bang 1997; Kolbe and Albanese 1996). It is also intuitive that larger advertisements are more likely to catch the attention of consumers.

Measurement and Coding

The coding sheet that I developed for this study (refer to Appendix for the code sheet and code book) was a modification and extension of various other coding instruments used in previous studies that examined the images of men and masculinity in the popular print media (see Rohlinger 2000; Taylor and Bang 1997; Kolbe and Albanese 1996; Goffman 1979). The items I chose to

include in the study are intended to provide a general overview of how men are portrayed functionally, physically and sexually. Functionality includes the role that the model takes on (athlete, military man, husband/lover, family man, consumer, blue collar worker, professional worker, traveler, outdoorsman, urbanite, or entertainer) and the perceived importance of the model within the ad. In other words, I identified whether each model was the main character within each ad or if they took on a minor or background role. I got after how the model is portrayed physically by coding for physique, appearance, clothing style, hairstyle, and whether or not the model was wearing accessories. Lastly, sexuality is tapped into by including categories that capture the model's gaze and touch behavior. If the male model, for example, is engaged in intimate or very intimate touch behavior with a female model it is assumed that he is a "sexually suggestive heterosexual with touch behavior" as listed on the coding sheet under "sexuality." In addition to these themes, I made sure to include coding categories that tapped into whether or not the model is being objectified. These include level of body exposure (listed as "dress" on the code sheet), body position and gaze. I also made sure to identify the race of the model and the product being advertised.

Next, I trained a fellow student on how the coding process works and assigned him to independently code twenty randomly selected advertisements from the June issues of *GQ* and *Maxim*. I chose these two magazines because they contain the highest volume of ads. After we separately coded these advertisements, I ran intercoder reliability tests (see Neuendorf, 2002: 154-158)

on each of the twenty-two variables. Scott's *phi*—the more conservative of intercoder reliability tests—ranged between .77 and 1.00, indicating high levels of reliability. The formula for calculating Scott's *phi* is as follows:

$$\mathbf{Phi = \% \text{ observed agreement} - \% \text{ expected agreement} / 1 - \% \text{ expected agreement}}$$

I employed cross-tabulation and chi-square tests to determine whether or not relationships existed between many of the twenty-two categorical level variables under study. In this study, a chi-square probability of .05 or less is interpreted as justification for rejecting the null hypothesis that the row variable is unrelated (that is, only randomly related) to the column variable. Because this is an exploratory analysis I do not have any specific hypotheses going into the study, however, based on prior research, I anticipate that the cross-tabulation and chi-square tests will reinforce that men in advertisements are being objectified and commoditized much like their female counterparts and that the sexuality of these men (when it can be identified) will be predominantly heterosexual, though these characteristics will vary by magazine. I also speculate that different races will be portrayed taking on different roles and will be utilized in different types of advertisements, perhaps, even reinforcing popular stereotypes. Again, I image that these images will most likely vary according to the magazines they are featured in.

In order to determine what types of masculinities were present in this study I decided to employ exploratory factor analysis, a data reduction

technique that is “useful for reducing a mass of information into an economical description” (Rummel 1970). Unlike with confirmatory factor analysis, exploratory factor analysis does not look to confirm certain hypotheses per se but explores the underlying structure of a group of variables to determine which variables are highly correlated with one another. These results are displayed in matrices which are identified as being either unrotated or rotated. The unrotated factor matrix, “delimits the most comprehensive classification, the widest net of linkages, or the greatest order in the data” (Rummel 1970) whereas the rotated factor matrix delineates distinct clusters of interrelated variables. Only those factor loadings of .15 or greater will be considered significant. While some consider this cut off point too low, I justify using it because with large samples with 300 or more loadings those variables with correlations of .15 can be considered salient (Kline 1994). This study yielded over 7,000 factor loadings. Along with identifying the largest loadings, which help to identify the factors, it is also important to note here that the signs of the factor loadings are relatively not absolutely important. Thus, it would be possible to reverse the signs of a factor without in any way changing its interpretation (Kline 1994). This will be explained further in the analysis and result section below.

Analysis and Results

Descriptive Statistics: Racial Breakdown & Role

Of the 645 advertisements fifty-two percent of the male models were White, thirty-one percent were Black, seven percent were Latino, one percent were Asian and three percent fell into the “other” category (see table 1.1). The data indicate that white models are most frequently featured in *GQ*, *Maxim*, *Men’s Health*, *Rolling Stone*, and *Sports Illustrated*. Of these six magazines *Rolling Stone* and *Sports Illustrated* have the greatest percentage of minority models. One might conclude that this is due to the topic nature of the magazines, which focus on sports and entertainment, the two most common arenas where minorities, especially Blacks, are featured (Bowen and Schmid 1997; Coltrane and Messieno 2000; Katz 1999; Orbe 1998;). The racial breakdowns in *Jet* and *Ebony* are not surprising, with the majority of models in these magazines falling into the Black category.

The top roles taken on by male models in the sample were as follows: consumer, traveler, sports figure, husband/lover, professional worker and family man/nurturer (see table 1.2). When examining role by race, more specifically, the data indicate that there is a bit of variation. Black men are most frequently portrayed as sports figures (21%), consumers (19%) and family men/nurturers (16%). Given that the top role is “sports figure” one might reasonably argue, like other studies have, that the magazines in this study are portraying Black men in the stereotypical role of athlete and are failing to recognize that Black men have varied interests, skills, and talents (Bowen and

Schmid 1997). Nevertheless, this result can also be due to the fact that Black men are most often featured in *Sports Illustrated* and *Rolling Stone* which have sports and entertainment as their main foci. The more interesting finding here is that Black models appear less often as husbands/lovers and more as family men/nurturers. This result might be attributed to the number of men taking on this role in *Jet* and *Ebony*, which both have high female readerships, and can be seen as an effort on the part of these magazines to combat the common stereotype of Black men as absent fathers.

With respect to Latino men, they are most often portrayed as consumers (50%), sports figures (21%) and professional workers (11%). These results are consistent with findings which suggest that Latinos appear more often in advertisements that center around business (Taylor and Bang 1997) than do their Black counterparts. It also counters the popular stereotype that links Latinos with primarily blue collar work. These results are inconsistent, however, with finding that suggest that Latino men are depicted in family settings more often than their Black counterparts (Taylor and Bang 1997). Again, this finding goes against the popular belief that Black men tend to be absent from the home and that Latinos tend to be more family oriented. Finally, whites appear most often as consumers (34%), travelers (16%) and sports figures (14%).

In terms of reinforcing popular definitions of masculinity, the top roles taken on by the male models in this sample emphasize money, status and success. The roles of “consumer,” “traveler,” and “professional worker”

suggest that men should be able to afford the most popular material goods and travels, while the roles of “family man/nurturer” and “husband/lover” suggest that men should be able to provide for their partners and/or family. The role of “sports figure” also reinforces the belief that a “real man” should be both physically and financially sound.

It is important to note that of the 645 models in the sample only seventeen or 2.6% represented blue collar workers. Class differences were thus not highly visible within this sample. This reinforces the invisibility of class within the popular print media. The roles of “consumer” and “traveler” appear so frequently that readers are given the impression that everybody falls somewhere between the middle to upper class and should be able to afford a comfortable life filled with all the latest material goods and the most exciting cultural experiences and travels.

Descriptive Statistics: Objectification & Sexuality

The descriptive statistics inform us that seventy-eight percent of the time the sexuality of the model in the coded advertisements can not be determined. When sexuality can be determined through touch behavior and/or other physical indicators, however, the model is overwhelming heterosexual (see table 1.3). The cross- tabulation of sexuality by magazine reveals that the sexuality of the model and the magazine are not related by chance (Pearson $\chi^2(24) = 73.5874$ Pr = 0.000). In other words, magazine editors are aware of the types of ads that are being used in their magazines and the ways in which the models are being portrayed, especially when it comes to their sexuality. It is

well known that sex sells and that advertisers and editors will include models that reflect the desires of their target audiences. For example, the few models that can be described as “sexually suggestive homosexuals with touch” along with the handful that can be described as “appearing homosexual” are all featured in *GQ*. These findings are not surprising given that *GQ* has recently been labeled by some as an “in the closet homosexual magazine” (Simpson 1994) and features mostly fashion models which are often dressed and made-up in ways that make their sexuality questionable. The men in these ads, therefore, do appear “manly” in the traditional sense and are not pictured in roles or environments that reinforce hegemonic gender norms.

With respect to the “objectification factor,” I chose to focus in on two variables—body exposure (this is labeled “dress” on the coding sheet) and body position. While other variables such as gaze and touch also capture objectification, these two variables are the strongest indicators of objectification in this sample. When examining body exposure and body position, it is clear that men are being objectified, especially when pictured in *GQ* and *Men’s Health*. Overall, male models in this sample appear fully clothed the majority (82%) of the time. On occasion (10%), however, they appear with their upper bodies exposed (see table 1.4). This typically occurs in ads where they are featured outdoors being active, playing sports, or acting leisurely (i.e. lying on the beach, taking a nap in a hammock, etc.). It is a rarity that men appear with multiple areas exposed (3%) or nude (less than one percent).

Nevertheless, regardless of whether their clothes are on or off the large majority

(80%) of men in these magazines have hard, strong physiques. This finding reinforces the idea that masculinity proceeds from men's bodies (Connell 1995) and that these bodies must exude power and strength.

In addition to the amount of skin that is being shown or "exposure" another prime indicator of objectification is body position (refer to Goffman 1976). The majority of models in the sample were pictured either standing or sitting (see table 1.5). Of these two groups, those models pictured sitting can be said to be objectified the most because they were often positioned in ways that drew attention directly to their crotch area. For example, many models were shown with their legs open and their hands resting on their thighs which tended to draw the researchers' eyes to the crotch area. In addition, it was apparent that in *GQ and Men's Health*, which showed men in their underwear most often, that the genitals were not "smoothed" over and were visible through the material of the underwear. This is consistent with commentary made by Dotson (1999) who states that "men are only desirable if they have bulging genitals and firm, round buttocks" (40) and gets after the old adage that "bigger is better" or should I say more "manly."

In terms of whether one race was more objectified than another, the results are mixed. The chi-square test between race and the exposure variable "dress", the strongest measure of objectification, is significant at the .05 level (Pearson $\chi^2(25) = 42.2249$ Pr = 0.017) . Upon further investigation of this relationship, the results indicate there is a significant relationship between being white and being pictured with multiple areas exposed (Pearson $\chi^2(1) =$

6.5112 Pr = 0.011). Thus, white men in this analysis are being objectified to a greater degree than their Black and Latino counterparts. The relationship between race and body position, the second strongest measure of objectification, is not statistically significant (Pearson $\chi^2(35) = 15.3968$ Pr = 0.998).

Multiple Masculinities?

Now that we have a better idea of how males are being portrayed and objectified with regard to race and sexuality it is also important to examine if any one form of masculinity dominates, or if multiple masculinities exist. In order to determine what types of masculinities were present in this study I decided to employ exploratory factor analysis. Fifty-two factors were retained yielding over 7,000 factor loadings. From these fifty-two factors I identified the seven most theoretically interesting and statistically sound factors or “dimensions of masculinity” and report on both the unrotated and rotated matrices. Note that in addition to the .15 cut off point for significance (refer to the methods section) I decided that each dimension of masculinity must contain a minimum of five significant factor loadings (before rotation) to be considered theoretically relevant. Again, the signs of the factor loadings are relatively not absolutely important. For example, the first dimension I identified was the “lover.” Notice that the factor loadings are negative indicating that any factor coming up positive would fall at the other end of the continuum which for simplicity sake I would entitle your “non-lover.” Note that I only included those factors that remained significant, however, some variables

lost their significance after rotation. Ultimately, the analyses validated the contention made by gender scholars that multiple masculinities are a part of American culture. This is not to say, however, that all these different types of masculinity are created equal. Of the seven masculinities I identified—the lover, the athlete, the military man, the tough guy, the sexy man, the male model, and the pretty boy—only two of these dimensions really strayed from what would be considered more hegemonic molds.

The first dimension of masculinity I identified was the “Lover.” The rotated analysis shows that male models taking on the role of husband/lover are most often displayed lying down and are engaged in intimate touch behavior with female models who presumably represent their “significant others” (see table 2.1) I draw this conclusion based upon the fact that these men are shown wearing wedding rings and are identified as “sexually suggestive heterosexuals engaged in touch behavior.” This dimension of masculinity does not stray from the hegemonic definitions discussed above, especially with respect to sexuality. As Messner (2000) would say, these men are portrayed “doing heterosexuality” and are thus immune from commentary that might imply that they are anything but “real men.”

The next two dimensions of masculinity, “athlete” and “military man” also reflect dominant forms of masculinity. Men falling into the “athlete” dimension have strong hard physiques and are pictured in motion, thus, representing a certain level of physical domination (see table 2.2). These elements demonstrate, as do the results from the descriptive analysis, that

masculinity is tied up in what Connell (1995) entitles “body reflective practices,” or the ways in which masculinity proceeds from the physical body. It also reinforces that sport is both a legitimate and valued outlet for expressing one’s masculinity, especially in front of other men. Models taking on the role of “athlete” are also portrayed in ads for technology and entertainment. These types of advertisements signify that part of being a man’s man means having lots of “toys” such as entertainment centers, computers, and video games, all which symbolize masculinity (McKay et al. 2005).

Another traditionally masculine role is that of the “warrior” or in this case what I have entitled the “military man.” In this dimension models are featured in traditional military garb and are sporting the traditional military crew cut (see table 2.3). Here, as was the case with the “athletes,” models are portrayed with hard, muscular physiques indicating a certain level of power and strength. These bodies can also be said to represent an American institution whereby boys learn how to become men through intense mental and physical challenges. Strength, honor, respect and bravery are all seem to radiate from the physical body. It is interesting to note here that before rotation Black men were identified as part of this dimension. This indicates that there might be something unique about definitions of Black masculinity and being a part of the military, however, the fact that race fell out after rotation suggest that in this sample the link is not strong.

The “tough guy” dimension is the only dimension that has a solid racial component. Here Latino men are portrayed as consumers of

cigarettes/tobacco (see table 2.4). They are dressed in casual attire and are sporting tattoos, backpacks, and unshaven faces. These elements paint a picture unlike those that have been found in previous studies. As stated earlier, when Latino men are pictured they are typically depicted in either business or family settings (Taylor and Bang 1997). One could speculate that if in fact these men were being portrayed in a business setting—which the factor analysis does not specifically indicate—it would most likely be a blue collar setting versus a white collar setting given the casual attire, backpack and more unkempt look. This runs counter to the findings in the descriptive analysis which shows that Latino men are portrayed as professional workers. In addition to relating this dimension back to how Latino men are being depicted with respect work, the tattoos and cigarettes are both signifiers of a “tough guy” image which reinforces traditional gender norms. So while these men are not shown in contexts or attire that link them to positions of power and privilege (like the athlete and military man, thus, suggesting some level of marginalization), the fact that they adorned with tattoos and smoking keeps them tied to traditional definitions of masculinity.

In the “sexy man” dimension models are pictured with strong, hard physiques which are put on display and objectified more so than the men in the previous dimensions (see table 2.5). Instead of being pictured engaged in action like the “athlete” or representing an American institution like the “military man” the bodies on display in this dimension represent fantasy. Here models are pictured in nothing but their underwear and multiple areas of their

bodies are exposed signifying a certain level of objectification. These men are also clean cut, minus their tattoos, and are shown selling health and beauty products. This sends the message that men should be concerned with their appearances and that consuming these products will help them attain the ideal. In addition to these non-hegemonic elements, it should also be mentioned that the unrotated matrix identifies the models as sexually suggestive heterosexuals, however, after rotation this correlation disappears, leaving the sexuality of the model up to interpretation. This might indicate, as did the findings of the descriptive analysis, that the heterosexuality-masculine link is not as strong as it once was. With that said, though this dimension of masculinity strays from more traditional molds and indicates that different types of masculinity are emerging, the fact that models have tattoos (a classic sign of a “bad boy”) and Herculean physiques reinforces that men are still expected to exhibit classical embodiments of masculinity, thus, binding them to more hegemonic molds.

Up until this point each dimension has contained some variables that can be traced back to traditional definitions of masculinity. The next two dimensions, “male model ” and “pretty boy ” (see tables 2.6 and 2.7) seem to represent a new breed of masculinity, though the strength of these dimensions leave us wondering how recognized and accepted these definitions really are, especially with respect to “male model.” Before rotation, the “male model” is identified as a sexually suggestive homosexual who is pictured sitting with his eyes averted (see table 2.5). This indicates that he is being defined in counter-

hegemonic terms with regard to sexuality and is also being depicted in a highly vulnerable position. Averted eyes represent a certain level of passivity (see Goffman 1976) while the sitting position most likely means that attention is being centered on the crotch area, thus signifying a certain degree of objectification. None of these variables (sexually suggestive homosexual, eyes averted, and sitting), however, remain significant after rotation. As a matter of fact after rotation all that is left is a clean-cut white guy who is selling clothing or your prototypical “male model.” There is absolutely nothing unusual or counter-hegemonic about that! The “pretty boy” dimension, on the other hand, seems to be a better representation of a new form of masculinity.

Unlike the “male model,” the “pretty boy” still remains pretty unique after rotation. Post-rotation the “pretty boy” is defined as clean cut, sexually ambiguous man, wearing business casual attire. He is also accessorized with a necklace and a pinky/thumb ring and is pictured sitting, inviting a certain level of objectification (see table 2.6). I labeled men in this dimension “pretty boys” because they easily fit that image given that they represent men who care about their physical appearance (they are clean cut and dressed nicely) and are adorned in accessories that can be defined as “trendy.” They are also featured in ads for jewelry/accessories which we tend not to equate with a “man’s man” like we do with ads for technology/entertainment and sports. Notice before rotation, however, the modes in this dimension were wearing wedding rings and were gazing at a female counterpart, thus, indicating their heterosexuality. So unlike the “male model” dimension which loses its unconventional edge

after rotation, this dimension seems to lend more credence to the argument that non-traditional definitions of masculinity are becoming more widely recognized and accepted.

Once these dimensions of masculinity were identified I transformed them into new variables to determine which dimensions were most prominent in each of the magazines under study. I only report the significant findings here. Chi-square tests indicate there is a significant relationship between the “sexy man” dimension and being featured in *Maxim* (Pearson $\chi^2(1) = 6.3403$, $Pr = .012$) and *Men’s Health* (Pearson $\chi^2(1) = 5.7303$ $Pr = 0.017$). It can be concluded, therefore, that both of these magazines, objectify men to a certain degree (featuring them partly-clad) and place them in situations that fall outside of purely hegemonic molds (e.g. featuring them in advertisements for health and beauty products). The only other significant relationship found was the relationship between the “athlete” dimension and being featured in *Sports Illustrated* (Pearson $\chi^2(1) = 10.9945$ $Pr = 0.001$). This comes as no surprise given the content of this magazine centers on sports.

In terms of significant racial differences, chi-square tests indicate that there is a significant relationship between being black and the “military dimension” (Pearson $\chi^2(1) = 3.8510$ $Pr = 0.050$). While the rotated factor analysis dropped black from the military dimension, this result lends more support to the notion that there is a connection between being black and being featured in advertisements for the military. The results also indicate that there is a significant relationship between being white and the “male model” (Pearson

chi2(1) = 12.0933 Pr = 0.001) and “pretty boy” (Pearson chi2(1) = 3.7246 Pr = 0.054) dimensions.

Discussion:

The exploratory factor analysis uncovered several dimensions of masculinity and thus provides some of the first empirical support demonstrating that multiple masculinities are present and to a certain extent accepted within contemporary American culture. In this study, those dimensions that reinforce hegemonic definitions of masculinity are clearly the most salient. The first three dimensions “lover”, “athlete” and “military man,” reinforce editors and advertisers commitment to defining masculinity in more traditional terms. Men in these three dimensions represent heterosexuality, strength, power, and position. They are also engaged in certain homosocial enactments such playing sports and being a part of the military which help bind them to the traditional gender order.

The “sexy man” dimension represents a combination of both traditional and nontraditional definitions of masculinity and closely aligns with the new classification of man known as the “metrosexual.” Metrosexuals are defined as straight men who “endorse equal opportunity vanity through cosmetics...hair care products... designer fashion...cosmetic surgery...and deodorants” (Miller 2005: 112). In addition to representing an emerging form of masculinity, this dimension also lends support to the growing body of evidence that men are being increasingly pressured to mold and manipulate their bodies to reach perfection, resulting in what has been termed the “Adonis Complex.” According to Pope et al (2000) the Adonis Complex describes the array of secret body image concerns that boys and men face. These range from a preoccupation

with attaining the ideal muscular physique, to the use of anabolic steroids, fat loss supplements, and plastic surgery (Alexander 2003, Pope et al. 2000). These preoccupations have also been linked to various eating and body image disorders which until the last decade would not have been mentioned in the same sentence as men and masculinity.

Before rotation the “male model” dimension seemed to represent the greatest departure from hegemonic molds, especially because it was the only dimension that identified the model as overtly homosexual. After rotation, however, this variable no longer remained a significant part of the “male model” dimension. All other signifiers of non-traditional masculinity, such as averted eyes, a sign of passivity, also disappeared after rotation. The end result yielded a picture of a white, clean-cut man, modeling clothing. This dimension, thus, went from representing a non-hegemonic form of masculinity to representing a more conservative, or traditional form of masculinity. The “pretty boy” dimension, thus, ended up being the most unconventional dimension of masculinity.

Overall, the last three dimensions (sexy man, male model, and pretty boy) indicate that new definitions of masculinity are emerging; however, they are not strong enough at this time to really threaten more traditional definitions of masculinity. Editors and advertisers might feel comfortable putting men on display and objectifying them in subtle and not so subtle ways (especially *GQ*, *Maxim*, and *Men’s Health*) much like their female counterparts;

nevertheless, they are not going as far as to feature men in ways that directly link them feminine roles or that paint them in a purely homosexual light.

A few findings within the factor analysis and subsequent analyses uncovered racial differences. The unrotated factor analysis that makes up the “military” dimension and the chi-square test between race and the military dimension inform us that there is a link between Black men and the military. This supports findings by others (Bowen and Schmid 1997; Taylor and Bang 1997) that suggests that minorities are used in public service announcements and government advertisements more often than their white counterparts; nevertheless, the military dimension also confirms that Black men are being portrayed in ways that keep them linked to hegemonic molds. The factor analysis paint Latino men in a semi- hegemonic light. They are part of the “tough guy” dimension which includes some “manly” signifiers—cigarettes and tattoos—though these signifiers might also be linked to negative stereotypes (such as rebel and gang banger). White men are linked to the “male model” and “pretty boy” dimensions. This is interesting, in that these two dimensions include variables that place white men in what could be considered more vulnerable or subordinate positions than their Black and Latino counterparts. Thus, according to the factor analysis, Black and Latino men are being depicted as less resistant to hegemonic definitions of masculinity than are whites! This could also be interpreted as a way of showing that white men set the tone in terms of defining what masculinity is and what it is not. Thus, if white men are shown taking on less traditionally hegemonic traits than the

definition or definitions of what is considered masculine changes to fit these molds. Ultimately, however, the analyses suggest that men of all races are being linked to masculinity in similar ways—those that emphasize more traditional masculine traits.

The descriptive analyses reaffirms previous findings that men are becoming more of a “commodity for viewing” (Reichert et al. 1999: 16) and that a major part of being “manly” is tied up in the presentation (i.e. muscular, strong, fit) of the physical body. Of the 645 models coded in this analysis, 488 (80%), had strong, muscular physiques. It is interesting to note that when males are pictured partly clad (which is about 14% of the time), they are not merely posing provocatively for the camera but are involved in some activity that justifies taking off their clothes. This finding, therefore, emphasizes that men are not mere objects for consumption (unlike what the literature suggests about their female counterparts) but serve some “purpose” even when their body is on display.

The descriptive analyses also supports Rohlinger’s (2002) findings that men in the print media are most often depicted in an unknown light with respect to their sexuality, giving readers room to project their own sexual preferences upon the models. As Rohlinger (2002) states, “The viewer is free to imagine the male body in any sexual situation, heterosexual or homosexual, and advertisers do not offend the heterosexual male viewers” (71). This was true in that the sexuality of seventy-eight percent of the models in this sample could not be determined. When and if sexuality could be determined through

touch behavior, gaze, and other visible indicators, heterosexuality remained supreme. To me these mixed findings suggest that while heterosexuality remains tied to hegemonic definitions of masculinity that editors and advertisers are not going out of their way to make sure that models can be clearly identified as heterosexual.

Finally, the descriptive statistics also uncover some interesting findings with respect to race, especially with respect to how Black masculinity is being constructed across magazines. Without *Jet* and *Ebony* in the mix, Black masculinity is tied to sports supporting the contention made by Brown (1999) that Black men in our society are valued primarily for their talented and powerful bodies. When these two magazines are thrown into the analysis, however, Black masculinity is more directly linked to being a family man/nurturer than anything else. This signals that Black masculinity is being constructed differently in Black magazines versus white magazines. In addition, this finding links Black men to the more feminine role of “nurturer.” With respect to Latino men, the descriptive analysis reinforces that they are not being depicted very often, however, when they are depicted they are not being depicted in stereotypical roles, such as blue-collar worker, rather they emulate consumers and professional workers indicating a certain level of financial soundness.

Conclusion:

Overall, the results of this study confirm to a certain degree that gender scholars are not far off in terms of suggesting that multiple masculinities exist. Granted, the analyses reveal that masculinity is still being defined in predominantly hegemonic ways; however, there seems to be some indication that this is slowly changing and that new definitions of masculinity are seeping into and becoming more accepted by American society. Future studies of this kind are needed to further our understanding of this changing phenomenon.

It must also be recognized here that although messages are relatively fixed consumers can interpret them in ways that are unintended or unaccounted for in the encoding process (McKay et al. 2005; Jackson et. al, 2001). In other words, audiences read messages differently on the basis of gender, race and social class. Although some females, non-whites, and gay males read the magazines under examination future studies also need to include magazines that have predominantly female, Latino, and homosexual audiences/readership to determine whether or not men are being depicted in a similar fashion and/or if different masculinities are present. Television and film should also be analyzed to determine whether masculinity is represented differently across these different media outlets. From mere observation it seems as though homosexuality is both more visible and accepted within these arenas. In addition, other coding categories should be added, especially those that get after class more effectively and perhaps those that capture the mood or

emotions of the model. After all, according to traditional gender norms, real men are not supposed to show their emotions or be vulnerable.

It is also important to further examine the impact that the messages the media is sending out has on boys and men. As mentioned above the number of boys and men turning to plastic surgery and other extreme measures to attain the ideal is steadily increasing. The measures being employed to deal with such issues should also be examined. For example, Dove™ has recently developed a multimillion dollar campaign targeted at women that summons society to recognize “real beauty”—to recognize that beauty comes in all shapes, sizes, colors and ages. My question is, what about the men? They too need more reassurance that being a real man does not necessarily mean fitting some hegemonic mold. Lastly, future research should examine how men have been depicted over time. As noted at the beginning of this paper, masculinity is not a static, unchanging concept, rather it is a dynamic process that responds to shifts in culture.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1.1 : Descriptive Statistics for Race

Race	Frequency	Percent
White	335	51.94
Black	198	30.70
Latino/Hispanic	44	6.82
Asian	8	1.24
Native American	0	0.00
Other	18	2.79
Unable to Determine	42	6.51
Total	645	100.0

Table 1.2: Descriptive Statistics for Role of Model

Role of Model	Frequency	Percent
Sports Figure	102	15.81
Military Man	10	1.55
Outdoorsman	7	1.09
Family Man/Nurturer	40	6.20
Husband/Lover	62	9.61
Blue Collar Worker	17	2.64
Professional Worker	46	7.13
Consumer	188	29.15
Urban Man	3	0.47
Traveler/Leisure	103	15.97
Entertainer	33	5.12
Other	27	4.19
Unable to Determine	7	1.09
Total	645	100.0

Table 1.3: Descriptive Statistics for Sexuality

Sexuality	Frequency	Percent
Heterosexual w/Touch	91	14.11
Homosexual w/Touch	2	0.31
Heterosexual	47	7.29
Homosexual	0	0.00
Can't Infer Sexuality	500	77.52
Appears Homosexual	5	0.78
Total	645	100.0

Table 1.4: Descriptive Statistics for Exposure (i.e, Dress)

Exposure	Frequency	Percent
Fully Clothed	528	81.86
Upper Body Exposed	65	10.08
Multiple Areas Exposed	20	3.10
Nude	2	0.31
Other	1	0.16
Unable to Determine	29	4.50
Total	645	100.0

Factor Analysis Results

Table 2.1: Unrotated and Rotated Factor Loadings for the "Lover" Dimension

Variables	Unrotated	Rotated
Husband/Lover	-0.51726	-0.83566
Traveler/Leisure	-0.20132	-0.00335
Medication	-0.17279	-0.37987
Health Products	-0.18364	-0.06772
Casual	-0.22563	-0.05988
Underwear	-0.23402	-0.12446
Multiple Areas Exposed	-0.22963	-0.12222
Touch w/ Female	-0.63108	-0.85929
Simple Touch	-0.31213	0.25221
Intimate Touch	-0.31796	-0.68502
Very Intimate Touch	-0.27384	-0.27202
Gaze at Female	-0.45836	-0.59092
Strong & Hard Physique	-0.34789	0.02065
Sitting	-0.14895	0.07598
Lying Down	-0.23230	-0.23141
Waist- Up	-0.17761	0.06141
Sex. Sugg. Hetero w/Touch	-0.62513	-0.89372
Sex. Sugg. Hetero	-0.14829	-0.02731
Wedding Ring	-0.21254	-0.18222

Table 2.2 Unrotated and Rotated Factor Loadings for the "Athlete" Dimension

Variables	Unrotated	Rotated
Sports Figure	0.34011	0.83020
Technology/Entertainment	0.35629	0.66120
Public Service	0.03630	0.16803
Recreational/Athletic Style	0.31680	0.83890
In Motion	0.18660	0.48000
Hard and Strong	0.24830	0.15750
Scruffy/Rugged Appearance	0.40703	-0.02530
Earring	0.33712	0.09010

Table 2.3 Unrotated and Rotated Factor Loadings for "Military Man" Dimension

Variables	Unrotated	Rotated
African American	0.32177	0.09112
Military Figure	0.42051	0.83591
Public Service	0.37556	0.75755
Uniform	0.30881	0.57503
Hard & Strong	0.36274	0.20280
Crew Cut	0.37975	0.47041
Major Role	0.30991	0.00905

Table 2.4 Unrotated and Rotated Factor Loadings for "Tough Guy" Dimension

Variables	Unrotated	Rotated
Hispanic	0.26091	0.75530
Consumer	0.07620	0.18081
Cigarettes/Tobacco	0.22850	0.15860
Casual	0.02060	0.15461
Self-Gaze	0.17920	0.03462
Waist-Up	0.18000	0.03311
Few Days Growth	0.06261	0.30730
Mustache	0.16990	0.19833
Earring	0.14683	0.05142
Tattoo	0.18591	0.17420
Backpack	0.00862	0.17901

Table 2.5 Unrotated and Rotated Factor Loadings for "Sexy Man" Dimension

Variables	Unrotated	Rotated
Body/Face/Hair Products	0.14494	0.15282
Health Products	0.23808	0.42278
Underwear/Bathing Suit	0.15452	0.37133
Multiple Areas Exposed	0.2498	0.31649
Hard & Strong	0.15448	0.15480
Standing	0.24304	0.15711
Clean Cut	0.26190	0.34430
Sexually Sugg. Hetero	0.24581	0.00084
Earring	0.15559	0.13280
Wedding Ring	0.22104	0.07563
Tattoo	0.18851	0.17989

Table 2.6 Unrotated and Rotated Factor Loadings for "Male Model" Dimension

Variables	Unrotated	Rotated
White	-0.15194	-0.15019
Consumer	-0.38446	0.00513
Clothing	-0.37211	-0.28559
Dressy	-0.25475	-0.05068
Business Casual	-0.25475	-0.03764
Fully Clothed	-0.43875	-0.03764
Self Touch	-0.38756	0.00482
Simple Touch	-0.23642	-0.03358
Eyes Averted	-0.56564	-0.11934
Standing	-0.19899	-0.05504
Sitting	-0.23203	0.06508
Clean Shaven	-0.18964	-0.35736
Clean Cut	-0.29610	-0.47348
Sex Sugg. Homo	-0.25230	-0.02222
Major Role	-0.23324	-0.03897

Table 2.7 Unrotated and Rotated Factor Loadings for "Pretty Boy" Dimension

Variables	Unrotated	Rotated
Consumer	0.15283	0.15887
Jewelry/Accessories	0.09100	0.17425
Dressy	0.19891	-0.00187
Business Casual	0.21569	0.15152
Sitting	0.20018	0.15317
Gaze @ Female	0.16479	-0.03493
Clean Shaven	0.27261	0.5517
Pinky/Thumb Ring	0.07399	0.17990
Necklace	0.03001	0.22578
Watch	0.09177	0.23862
Wedding Ring	0.28227	-0.10805
Can't Infer Sexuality	0.08744	0.21245

References

- Abraham, Linus. 2003. Media Stereotypes of African Americans. In Paul M. Lester and Susan D. Ross (Eds.), *Images That Injure: Pictorial Stereotypes in the Media*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Alexander, Susan M. 2003. Stylish Hard Bodies: Branded Masculinity in *Men's Health Magazine*. *Sociological Perspectives*, 46(4): 535-554.
- Anderson, Eric. 2005. Orthodox and Inclusive Masculinity: Competing Masculinities Among Heterosexual Men in a Feminized Terrain. *Sociological Perspectives*, 48(3): 337-355.
- Baker, Christina N. 2005. Images of Women's Sexuality in Advertisements: A Content Analysis of Black-and White Oriented Women's and Men's Magazines. *Sex Roles*, 52(1/2): 13-27.
- Bettie, Julie. 2004. *Women Without Class: Girls, Race and Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 2000. Women Without Class: Chicas, Cholas, Trash, and the Presence/Absence of Class Identity. *Sigms: Journal of Women in Culture in Society*, 26(1): 1-35.
- Bird, Sharon R. 1996. Welcome to the Men's Club: Homosociality and the Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity. *Gender and Society*, 10(2): 120-132.
- Bowen, Lawrence and Jill Schmid. 1997. Minority Presence and Portrayal in Mainstream Magazine Advertising: An Update. *Journal of Mass Communication Quarterly*, 74(1):134-146.
- Chavez, Ramon. 2003. Ethnic Stereotypes: Hispanics and Mexican Americans. In Paul M. Lester and Susan D. Ross (Eds.), *Images that Injure: Pictorial Stereotypes in the Media*, Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Chodorow, Nancy J. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Connell, Ronald W. 1998. R.W. Connell's "Masculinities": Reply. *Gender and Society*, 12(4): 474-477.
- _____. *Masculinities*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

- Coltrane, Scott and Melinda Messineo. 2000. The Perpetuation of Subtle Prejudice: Race and Gender Imagery in 1990s Television. *Sex Roles*, 5(6): 363-389.
- Donaldson, Mike. 1993. What is Hegemonic Masculinity? *Theory and Society*, 22(5): 643-657.
- Dotson, Edisol W. 1999. *Behold the Man: The Hype and Selling of Male Beauty in Media Culture*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Elliott, Stuart. 2007, March 12. Gay Athletes Slowly Enter the Endorsement Arena. *The New York Times*.
- Gates, Henry L. 1992. TV's Black World Turns—but Stays Unreal. In Margaret L. Anderson & Patricia H. Collins (Ed.), *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology*, 310-316. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Gaylin, Willard. 1991. *The Male Ego*. New York: Viking
- Goffman, Erving. 1976. *Gender Advertisements*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hamilton, Lawrence C. 2004. *Statistics With Stata*. Canada: Thomson
- Harrison, Neil E. 2001. All Consuming Desire: Advertisers Prey on Our Sexual Insecurities to Mass-Market products and Services. *Alternatives Journal*, 27 (3): 24-28.
- Horowitz, Irving L. 1963. *Power Politics, and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills*. New York: Ballantine.
- Jackson, Peter, Nick Stevenson, and Kate Brooks. 2001. *Making Sense of Men's Magazines*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Katz, Jackson. 1999. *Tough Guise: Violence, Media, and the Crisis in Masculinity*. Video Recording. Media Education Foundation, Northampton, MA.
- Kaufman, Michael. 1995. The Construction of Masculinity and the Triad of Men's Violence. In Michael Kimmel and Michael Messner (Eds.), *Men's Lives*. New York: Macmillian.
- Kimmel, Michael S. 2005. *The Gender of Desire*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- _____. 1998. "What Do Men Want?" In Amy S. Wharton (Ed.), *Working in America: Continuity, Conflict and Change*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Kline, Paul. 1994. *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kluegel, James R. and Lawrence D. Bobo. 2001. Perceived Group Discrimination and Policy Attitudes: The Sources and Consequences of the Race and Gender Gaps. In Alice O'Conner, Chris Tilly, and Lawrence Bobo (Eds.), *Urban Inequality: Evidence from Four Cities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kolbe, Richard H. and Paul J. Albanese. 1996. Man to Man: A Content Analysis of Sole-Male Images in Male-Audience Magazines. *Journal of Advertising*, 25(4): 1-20
- Leit, Richard A., Harrison G. Pope, and James J. Gray. 2001. Cultural Expectations of Muscularity and Men. The Evolution of Playgirl Centerfolds. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 29(1):90-93.
- Leverenz, David. 1986. Manhood, Humiliation, and Public Life: Some Stories. *Southwest Review*, 71 (1).
- _____. 1991. The Last Real Man in America: From Natty Bumppo to Batman. *American Literary Review*, 3 (1).
- Lorber, Judith. 1998. Men's Gender Politics. *Gender and Society*, 12(4): 469-472.
- Marable, Manning. 2000. The Black Male: Searching Beyond Stereotypes. In Maxine B. Zinn, Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Michael A. Messner (Eds.) *Gender Through the Prism of Difference*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Miller, Toby. 2005. A Metrosexual Eye on the Queer Guy. *Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 11(1): 112-117.
- McGuffey, Shawn C. and Lindsay B. Rich. 1999. Playing in the Gender Transgression Zone: Race, Class, and Hegemonic Masculinity in Middle Childhood. *Gender and Society*, 13(5): 608-627.
- McIntosh, Peggy. 2000. White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack. In Maxine B. Zinn, Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Michael A. Messner (Eds.) *Gender Through the Prism of Difference*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- McKay, Jim, Janine Mikosa and Brett Hutchins. 2005. "Gentlemen, the Lunchbox has Landed: Representations of Masculinities and Men's Bodies in the Popular Media." In Michael S.Kimmel, Jeff Hearn and R.W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- McMahon, Anthony. 1999. *Taking Care of Men: Sexual Politics in the Public Mind*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Messner, Michael A. and Jeffery Montez de Oca. 2005. The Male Consumer as Loser: Beer and Liquor Ads in Mega Sports Media Events. *Signs*, 30(3): 1879-1909.
- Messner, Michael A. 2000. Becoming 100% Straight. In Maxine B. Zinn, Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Michael A. Messner (Eds.), *Gender Through the Prism of Difference*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Moss, Phillip and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill, and Hiring in America*. NY: Russell Sage.
- Neuendorf, Kimberly A. 2002. *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nye, Robert A. Locating Masculinity: Some Recent Work on Men. *Signs*, 30(3): 1937-1962.
- Orbe, Mark P. 1998. Construction of Reality on MTV's "The Real World": An Analysis of the Restrictive Coding of Black Masculinity. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 64(1): 32-47.
- Pope, Harrison G., Roberto Olivardia, John J. Borowiecki III, and Geoffrey H. Cohane. 2001. The Growing Commercial Value of the Male Body: A longitudinal Survey in Women's Magazines. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 70(4): 189-192.
- Reichert, Tom, Jacqueline Lambiase, Susan Morgan, Meta Carstarphen, and Susan Zavoina. 1999. Cheesecake and Beefcake: No Matter How You Slice It, Sexual Explicitness In Advertising Continues. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76(1): 7-20.
- Rohlinger, Deana, A. 2002. Eroticizing Men: Cultural Influences on Advertising and Male Objectification. *Sex Roles*, 46(3/4): 61-74.
- Rummel, Rudolph J. 1970. *Applied Factor Analysis*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

- Sharkey, Alix. 2000. New Media, New Men. In Giannino Malossi (Ed), *Material Man: Masculinity, Sexuality, Style*, 170-179. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.
- Simpson, Mark. 1994, November 15. Here Come the Mirror Men. *The Independent*.
- Stern, Barbra B. 2003. Masculinism(s) and the Male Image: What Does it Mean to be a Man? In, Tom Reichert & Jacqueline Lambiase (Ed.), *Sex in Advertising: Perspectives on Erotic Appeal*, 215-227. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Taylor, Charles R. and Hae-Kyong Bang. 1997. Portrayals of Latinos in Magazine Advertising. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 74(2): 285-303.
- Vigorito, Anthony J. and Timothy J. Curry. 1998. Marketing Masculinity: Gender Identity and Popular Magazines. *Sex Roles*, 39(1/2): 135-152
- West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 1(2): 125-151.
- Zinn, Maxine B., Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Michael A. Messner. 2000. Preface. In Maxine B. Zinn, Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Michael A. Messner (Eds.) *Gender Through the Prism of Difference*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

APPENDIX

CODING SHEET

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Today's Date _____</p> <p>3. Magazine Date _____</p> <p>5. Color of Ad _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Black & White 1 Color 2 Both <p>7. Product Being Advertised _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Clothing 2 Shoes 3 Jewelry/Accessories 4 Body/Face/Hair Products 5 Credit Cards 6 Hardware/Tools 7 Alcohol 8 Cigarettes/Tobacco 9 Cars 10 Travel 11 Technology/Entertainment 12 Sports Gear 13 Food 14 Drink other than alcohol 15 Medication-general 16 ED medication 17 Insurance 18 Public Service 19 Health Products 90 Other _____ <p>9. Clothing Style _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Dressy 2 Business Casual 3 Casual 4 Recreational/Athletic 5 Uniform 6 Underwear/Bathing Suit 7 Unable to Determine 90 Other _____ <p>11. Touch _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Self 2 w/Female 3 w/Male 4 w/Both 5 Not engaged 6 Unable to Determine | <p>2. Magazine Title _____</p> <p>4. Page # of Advertisement _____</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>8. Role/Function of Male Model _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Sports Figure/Athlete 2 Military Figure 3 Outdoorsman 4 Family man/Nurturer 5 Husband/Lover 6 Blue Collar Worker 7 Professional Worker 8 Consumer 9 Urban Man 10 Traveler/Leisure 11 Entertainer 12 Unable to Determine 90 Other _____ <p>Comments:</p> <p>10. Dress _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Fully Clothed 2 Upper Body Exposed 3 Multiple Areas Exposed 4 Nude 5 Unable to Determine <p>12. Type of Touch/Contact _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Simple 2 Intimate 3 Very Intimate 4 None 5 Unable to Determine |
|---|---|

Comments:

13. Gaze _____

- 1 At Self
- 2 At Female Model
- 3 At Male Model
- 4 At Both
- 5 Eyes Averted
- 6 Facing Camera
- 7 No Gaze/Face is Obscure
- 90 Other _____

15. Body Position _____

- 1 Standing
- 2 Sitting
- 3 Lying Down
- 4 Bending Forward
- 5 Bending Backward
- 6 In Motion
- 7 Unable to Determine
- 90 Other _____

17. Hair _____

- 1 Long (Chin Length +)
- 2 Medium Shaggy
- 3 Short Over the Ear
- 4 Crew Cut
- 5 Shaved Head
- 6 Receding/Male Pattern Baldness
- 7 Cornrows
- 8 Dreadlocks
- 9 Unable to Determine
- 90 Other _____

19. Overall Appearance _____

- 1 Clean Cut
- 2 Scruffy/Rugged
- 3 Unkempt
- 4 Unable to Determine
- 90 Other _____

21. Sexuality _____

- 1 Sexually Suggestive Hetero w/Touch
- 2 Sexually Suggestive Homo w/Touch
- 3 Sexually Suggestive Heterosexual
- 4 Sexually Suggestive Homosexual
- 5 Can't Infer Sexuality
- 6 Appears Homosexual

Comments:

14. Physique _____

- 1 Thin & Weak
- 2 Fat & Round
- 3 Strong & Hard
- 4 Unable to Determine
- 90 Other _____

16. Accessories _____

- 1 Wedding Ring
- 2 Pinky/Thumb Ring
- 3 Watch
- 4 Bracelet
- 5 Necklace
- 6 Earrings
- 7 Tattoo
- 8 Glasses/Sunglasses
- 9 Backpack
- 10 Man Bag
- 11 Hat/Skull Cap
- 12 None
- 90 Other _____

18. Facial Hair _____

- 1 Clean Shaven
- 2 5 O'clock Shadow/Light Stubble
- 3 Few Days Growth
- 4 Full Beard
- 5 Mustache
- 6 Sideburns
- 7 Goatee
- 8 Unable to Determine
- 90 Other _____

20. Body Focus _____

- 1 Full Body
- 2 Head Shot
- 3 Chest Up
- 4 Waist Up
- 5 Chest Down
- 6 Waist Down
- 90 Other _____

22. Perceived Importance _____

- 1 Major Role
- 2 Minor Role
- 3 Background

CODE BOOK

The ads included for analysis will be drawn from six popular male-oriented magazines (GQ, Maxim, Sports Illustrated, Rolling Stone, Men's Health and Jet). Only those ads that include male models and that are one-quarter page and larger will be coded.

Color of Ad

Here the color of the ad will be identified and coded.

Race of Man

Here the race of the male model will be identified and coded.

Product Being Advertised

Here the product being advertised will be identified and coded. Only those categories that might be a bit confusing to the coder are defined here.

Jewelry/Accessories: includes watches, sunglasses, etc.

Body/Face/Hair products: cologne, body spray shaving cream, razors, hairspray, gel, shampoo, conditioner, hair dye, soap, lotion, etc.

Travel: hotels, plane tickets, vacation destinations,

Technology/Entertainment: electronics, television, music, DVD's, video games

Sports gear: golf clubs, bikes, exercise equipment, apparel tailored to the athlete

Public service: higher education, military recruitment,

Health products: vitamins, supplements

Role/Function (adopted from Rohlinger 2002)

Sports figure/athlete: the model is depicted playing sports and/or is identified as a sports figure.

Military figure: the model is depicted as being involved in the military

Outdoorsman: the model is depicted in nature (i.e camping, rock climbing, etc.)

Family Man/Nurturer: the model is depicted as an active participant with children as a father, family member or coach.

Husband/Lover: the model is depicted in a relationship with another adult model. This can be determined through touch behavior, wedding ring, etc.

Man at Work: the model is engaged in his profession or area of expertise. This category is broken down into:

Blue Collar worker: model is depicted in a blue collar work role (i.e. plumber, electrician, janitor, etc.)

Professional worker: model is depicted in a professional work role (i.e. businessman, accountant, etc.)

The Consumer: the model is the average man, who is either using the product being sold, or is positioned as a satisfied customer of the advertised product.

Urban Man: the model enjoys the luxuries and offerings of the big city.

Traveler/leisure: the model is either engaged in light recreational activity, in tourism, or is completely inactive. This also includes models depicted in a social setting such as a party, a BBQ, etc.

Entertainer: the model is depicted as a musician, rapper, on stage, etc.

Clothing Style (adopted from Kolbe and Albanese 1996)

Dressy: tuxedo, classic-styled suit or sportcoat, dress pants, tie, dress shirt, and dress shoes

Business casual: unbuttoned dress shirt, casual slacks, sweater, sportcoat with jeans, polo with kakis, casual Friday attire

Casual: blue jeans, polo's with jeans, t-shirts, sweatshirts, sneakers

Recreational/athletic: jogging suit, running shorts, spandex, lounging pants, etc.

Uniform: team uniform, work uniform, military uniform, etc.

Underwear: the model is depicted in his underwear

Unable to determine: the coder can not determine clothing style due to the camera angle/body focus.

Dress

Fully clothed: the male model is fully clothed (this includes shorts)

Upper body partially exposed: this includes clothing which partially exposes the upper body such as unbuttoned shirts or muscle shirts

Multiple areas exposed: the model is coded as having multiple areas exposed if he is depicted in a bathing suit or underwear

Nude: if the suggestion of nudity is present (such as holding a towel or if the photograph is concealed so that genitals are concealed) or if the model appears to be nude but is in silhouette

Touch

Touch refers to whom the model is touching. It should be noted that touch behavior only relates to whether or not the model is touching another adult model. Thus, touch with children is not included = none.

None: the model is not engaged in touch behavior

Self: the model is engaged in self touch

With female: the model is engaged in touch with a female model

With male: the model is engaged in touch with another male model

With both: the model is engaged in touch with both a female model and another male model

Undetermined/Unknown: the coder is unable to determine touch

Type of Touch/Contact

Simple: holding hands, shoulder hold, leaning against one another

Intimate: kissing, embracing, playful wrestling, sexy/seductive gaze

Very intimate: the depiction or suggestion of sexual intercourse or behavior

No contact: the model is not engaged in touch behavior

Gaze

Gaze refers to where or whom the model is looking at.

Self: the model is looking at himself

at Female model: the model is looking at one or more female models.

at Male model: the model is looking at one or more male models.

at Both: the model is looking at at least one male and one female model

Eyes averted: the model is looking at an unknown audience; the model is in a state of mental drift

Facing camera: the model is looking directly at the camera.

No gaze/face is obscure: in this case the coder is unable to see the model's face and therefore can not determine gaze.

Physique

Physique refers to how the model is physically built.

Thin and weak: the model appears to be underdeveloped (muscularly) and weak

Fat and round: the model appears to be overweight and out of shape, soft,

Strong and hard: the ideal body type, strong and hard, well proportioned, a triangular aesthetic

Unable to determine: the coder is not able to determine the model's physique

Body Position

Body position refers to how the model's body is positioned in the ad. Is he:

Sitting

Standing

Bending forward

Bending backward

In motion

Other

Accessories:

The extras the model is wearing. Bling, bling!

Hair

Hair refers to the length and/or style of the model's hair.

Facial Hair

Facial hair refers to the type of hair growth on the model's face.

Overall Appearance

Overall appearance refers to the physical aura of the model. Is he:

Clean cut: the model is well groomed, squeaky, you can almost smell the freshness. Note that models with a 5'oclock shadow or a little stubble on the face and perhaps medium-long hair can still be considered clean-cut. As long as he is well manicured he is clean cut.

Scruffy/rugged: the model has some unmanicured facial growth, hair is a bit messy, he is rugged looking.

Unkempt: the model is ungroomed, facial hair, looks greasy, sloppy

Unknown: the model's face is obscure, the coder is unable to determine appearance

Body Focus

Body focus refers to how much of the model's body is shown in the ad. Is it a:

Full body shot: if the model is depicted from the knees up it is considered a full body shot.

Head shot (shoulders and up)

Chest up shot

Waist up shot

Chest down shot

Waist down shot

Sexuality (adopted from Rohlinger 2002)

Visible signs of sexual orientation are used to determine sexuality.

Sexually suggestive heterosexual with touch: if male model is displayed with one or more female models and is engaged in touch behavior that can be described as intimate/sexual. This includes: embracing, kissing, holding hands, laying on or next to each other, touching in any way that suggests sexual intercourse is occurring or is about to occur, etc.

Sexually suggestive homosexual with touch: if the male model is displayed with one or more male models and is engaged in touch behavior that can be described as intimate/sexual. This includes: embracing, kissing, holding hands, lying on or next to each other, touching in any way that suggests sexual intercourse is occurring or about to occur, etc.

Sexually suggestive heterosexual: if the male model is displayed with one or more female models and is engaged in behavior that can be construed as sexually suggestive. This includes: leering, body language, facial expressions, etc.

Sexually suggestive homosexual: if the model is displayed with one or more male models and is engaged in behavior that can be construed as sexually suggestive. This includes leering, body language, facial expressions, etc.

Can not infer sexuality: if the male model is alone and/or there are not definitive signs of his sexuality.

Model appears to be homosexual: if the male model appears to be homosexual. Homosexuality can be determined if the model is wearing rainbow wear, or if what is being advertised is specifically geared at homosexual men. For example, a gay cruise or a gay resort, etc.

Perceived Importance (adopted from Taylor and Bang 1997)

Major role: the model is very important to the advertising theme or layout, shown in the foreground or shown holding the product

Minor role: the model is of average importance to the advertising theme or layout. Generally, these characters are not spotlighted in the ad and do not hold the product, but they are not difficult to locate in the ad while casually looking at it.

Background role: the model is difficult to find in an ad (i.e., not likely to be noticed by a reader glancing at an ad) and is not important to the theme or layout