Check for updates

Multiple Masculinities

11

James W. Messerschmidt

Abstract

The notion of multiple masculinities was first coined by Raewyn Connell as a necessary part of her formulation of hegemonic masculinity. This chapter first outlines Connell's original perspective on multiple masculinities as well as Connell's and Messerschmidt's reformulation of hegemonic masculinity. The chapter discusses recent scholarly work examining both multiple hegemonic and nonhegemonic masculinities in the global North and the global South. The conclusion of the chapter is that multiple masculinities must be conceptualized as always already embedded in unequal gender relations.

Connell (1987, 1995) conceptualized the notion of multiple masculinities as necessarily a part of her formulation of hegemonic masculinity. Connell understood the latter as one specific form of masculinity in a given historical and society-wide setting that legitimates unequal gender relations between men and women, masculinity and femininity, and among masculinities. Both the "legitimation" and "relational" features were central to her argument, as Connell emphasized that hegemonic masculinity must always be seen as constructed in relation to various nonhegemonic masculinities as well as in relation to femininities. In her initial conception, hegemonic masculinity "embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the *legitimacy* of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (Connell, 1995: 77). And the achievement of hegemonic masculinity occurs largely through discursive legitimation (or justification), encouraging all to consent to, unite around, and embody such unequal gender relations.

For Connell, then, gender relations are structured through power inequalities between men and women, masculinity and femininity, and among masculinities. Accordingly, the concept of emphasized femininity is essential to Connell's (1987: 188) early framework, underlining how this feminized form adapts to masculine power through compliance, nurturance, and empathy as "womanly virtues." But Connell (pp. 183–184) identifies additional femininities, such as those defined "by strategies of resistance or forms of compliance" and "by complex strategic combinations of compliance, resistance and co-operation."

Hegemonic masculinity for Connell becomes ascendant society-wide and thus is constructed in relation to what Connell identifies as four specific nonhegemonic masculinities: first, *complicit* masculinities do not actually embody

J. W. Messerschmidt (✉)
University of Southern Maine, Portland, USA
e-mail: mschmidt@maine.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2018

B. J. Risman et al. (eds.), *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*,
Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76333-0_11

hegemonic masculinity yet through practice realize some of the benefits of unequal gender relations; second, *subordinate* masculinities are constructed as lesser than or aberrant and deviant to hegemonic masculinity; third, *marginalized* masculinities are trivialized and/or discriminated against because of unequal relations, such as class, race, ethnicity, and age; and finally, *protest* masculinities are constructed as compensatory hyper-masculinities that are formed in reaction to social positions lacking economic and political power.

Connell emphasized that hegemonic and nonhegemonic masculinities are all subject to change because they come into existence in specific settings and under particular situations. And for the former, there often exists a struggle for hegemony whereby older versions may be replaced by newer ones. The notion of hegemonic masculinity and nonhegemonic masculinities then opened up the possibility of change toward the abolition of gender inequalities and the creation of more egalitarian gender relations.

Connell's initial perspective found significant and enthusiastic application from the late-1980s to the early 2000s, being utilized in a variety of academic disciplines and areas. Yet despite this considerable favorable reception of Connell's concepts, her perspective nevertheless attracted criticism that concentrated almost exclusively on the notion of hegemonic masculinity. For example, some scholars raised concerns regarding who actually represents hegemonic masculinity; others argued that hegemonic masculinity simply reduces in practice to a reification of power or toxicity; and still others have suggested that the concept maintains an alleged unsatisfactory theory of the masculine subject (see Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). The result of these criticisms was changes in the conceptualization of the concept of hegemonic masculinity, and new research on both hegemonic and nonhegemonic masculinities. I turn first to a discussion of multiple hegemonic masculinities.

1 Multiple Hegemonic Masculinities

Twelve years ago Connell and I (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) published a significant reformulation of the concept of hegemonic masculinity. That reformulation first included certain aspects of the original formulation that empirical evidence over almost two decades of time indicated should be retained, in particular the relational nature of the concept (among hegemonic masculinity, emphasized femininity, and nonhegemonic masculinities) and the idea that this relationship is a pattern of hegemony—not a pattern of simple domination. Also well supported historically are the foundational ideas that hegemonic masculinity need not be the most powerful and/or the most common pattern of masculinity in a particular setting, and that any formulation of the concept as simply constituting an assemblage of fixed "masculine" character traits should be thoroughly transcended. Second, Connell and I suggested that a reformulated understanding of hegemonic masculinity must incorporate a more holistic grasp of gender inequality that recognizes the agency of subordinated groups as much as the power of hegemonic groups and that includes the mutual conditioning (or intersectionality) of gender with such other social inequalities as class, race, age, sexuality, and nation. Third, Connell and I asserted that a more sophisticated treatment of embodiment in hegemonic and nonhegemonic masculinities was necessary, as well as conceptualizations of how hegemonic masculinity may be challenged, contested, and thus changed. Finally, Connell and I argued that instead of recognizing simply *one* hegemonic masculinity at only the society-wide level, scholars should analyze empirically existing hegemonic masculinit*ies* and nonhegemonic masculinit*ies* at three levels: first, the *local* (meaning constructed in arenas involving face-to-face interaction of families, schools, organizations, and immediate communities), second, the *regional* (meaning constructed at the society-wide level), and third, the *global* (meaning constructed in the arenas of

transnational world politics, business, and media). Obviously, within any level multiple and often, conflicting hegemonic masculinities will be at play. And links among the three levels exist: global hegemonic masculinities pressure regional and local hegemonic masculinities, and regional hegemonic masculinities provide cultural materials adopted or reworked in global arenas and utilized in local gender dynamics.

Scholars have applied this reformulated concept of hegemonic masculinity by examining, and thereby uncovering multiple hegemonic masculinities at the local, regional, and global levels. An excellent example of one such hegemonic masculinity at the local level is found in the work of Morris (2008), who studied gender difference in academic perceptions and outcomes at a predominantly white and lower-income rural high school in Kentucky. Appropriating the concept of hegemonic masculinity as a specific contextual pattern of practice that discursively legitimates the subordination of women and femininity to men and masculinity, Morris found that although girls generally outperformed boys academically and that they had higher ambitions for post-secondary education, in-school interaction positioned masculine qualities as superior to the inferior qualities attached to femininity as well as to certain forms of subordinate masculinity—this then provided an in-school justification for unequal gendered social action. The article highlighted how in the localized, face-to-face settings of a rural Kentucky high school, gender inequality was legitimated through the construction of hierarchical relations between a particular classed, raced, and sexualized hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity. Morris concluded that the boys' academic underachievement was embedded in these unequal gender relations.

Weitzer and Kubrin (2009) demonstrated in their work how hegemonic masculinity can occur at the regional level. These authors appropriated the concept of hegemonic masculinity as the discursive subordination of women to men and used the concept to examine all the rap albums that attained platinum status (sales of at least 1 million copies) from 1992 to 2000. Weitzer and Kubrin chose platinum albums because their numerical success ensured analysis of a rap-music sample that reached a large segment of the U.S. population, thus justifying regional status.

Weitzer's and Kubrin's study revealed how much of this rap music constructed a regional form of hegemonic masculinity by depicting men and women as inherently different and unequal and by espousing a set of superior/inferior related gendered qualities for each, for their "appropriate" behavior toward each other, and for the necessity of sanctions if anyone violated the unequal gender relationship. This study demonstrated how within popular culture, through the widespread distribution of rap music, gender inequality was legitimated at the regional level, thereby providing a society-wide cultural rationalization for unequal gender relations. Moreover, Weitzer and Kubrin showed how rap music initially had local roots but came to exercise a society-wide regional influence on youth of all racial and ethnic groups.

Finally, at the global level Hatfield (2010) examined the popular U.S.-based television program *Two and a Half Men*. Hatfield concentrated her scrutiny on the way gender is constructed by the two main characters—Charlie and Alan—who are white, middle-class, professional brothers living together. Hatfield also examined the changing gender constructions by Alan's son, Jake. During the twelve years that *Two and a Half Men* was broadcast, the program led the U.S. sitcom ratings in popularity, it was the second most popular (behind *Family Guy*) U.S. television show for males eighteen to twenty-four, it averaged approximately 15 million U.S. viewers per week, and it screened worldwide in twenty-four different countries (which tripled the number of weekly viewers). Thus, this show had extensive regional and global influence.

Hatfield concluded that *Two and a Half Men* offered a media representation of hegemonic masculinity through the gender performance of, and the relationship between, the two main characters. Appropriating hegemonic masculinity as a specific form of masculinity that subordinates both femininity and alternative masculinities, Hatfield found that Charlie constructed

hegemonic masculinity and Alan employed a male femininity, and in the process Alan's femininity consistently was subordinated to Charlie's hegemonic masculinity. Hatfield's study admirably demonstrated how a particular sitcom—which had widespread transnational distribution—was an important example of the global legitimation and rationalization of gender inequality through the depiction of a superior/inferior hierarchical relationship between the two main characters. To be sure, a salient aspect of this sitcom was how it primarily discursively legitimates an unequal masculine/feminine relationship in and through two male bodies.

In addition to multiple local, regional, and global hegemonic masculinities, differences among hegemonic masculinities occur in terms of the significance and scope of their legitimating influence—the legitimating influence of localized hegemonic masculinities (such as in the Morris study) is limited to the confines of particular institutions, such as schools, whereas regional and global hegemonic masculinities (such as in the studies by Weitzer and Kubrin and Hatfield) have respectively society-wide and worldwide legitimating influence.

Research has also examined how hegemonic masculinities are constructed in multiple ways. In my work, I (Messerschmidt, 2016, 2018) have distinguished between "dominating" and "protective" forms of hegemonic masculinities and accordingly differing types of gendered power. For example, high school popular boys who verbally abuse and feminize "other" boys consolidate their localized hegemonic power through *dominating* aggressive bullying; in contrast, I uncovered distinct types of hegemonic masculinities—both locally and globally—that were established through contrasting forms of benevolent *protection*. These are just three examples of differences among hegemonic masculinities. Arguably, then, unequal gender relations are legitimated in multiple ways. Indeed, in my most recent work, I (Messerschmidt, 2016, 2018) found that localized hegemonic masculinities were fashioned through relational *material* practices—such as physical bullying—that had a discursive legitimating influence whereas regional and global hegemonic masculinities were constructed through *discursive* practices—such as speeches, rap albums, and TV shows—that concurrently constituted unequal gender relations linguistically, metaphorically, and thus symbolically.

Recent work on hybrid masculinities reveals another layer to the idea of multiple hegemonic masculinities. Hybrid hegemonic masculinities involve the incorporation of subordinated styles and displays (masculine and/or feminine) into privileged men's identities, in the process simultaneously securing and obscuring their hegemonic power. For instance, Barber (2016) recently demonstrated how class-privileged men's embrace of previously feminine-typed consumption of personal grooming styles actually serves to enhance their positions of privilege in relation to women and to class-subordinated men. When widespread consent supports such a hybrid masculinity formation, a localized hegemonic masculinity emerges, seeming on the surface to signal the emergence of a "new," less rigid masculinity while simultaneously concealing and reproducing gender, race, and class inequalities.

Bridges and Pascoe (2018) have also shown that the appropriation of subordinated masculine practices into constructions of hegemonic masculinities operate to reproduce unequal gender relations and thereby must be understood as expressions of, rather than challenges to, gender hegemony. They argue that hybrid hegemonic masculinities illustrate some of the changes taking place in reproducing gender hegemony, demonstrating that experiencing and justifying privilege has transformed, and in the wake of this transformation new "identity projects" are constructed that increase the flexibility for in particular, privileged white men. Bridges and Pascoe therefore challenge any claim that hegemonic masculinities are decreasing; rather, they are simply changing and new forms are emerging.

Scholarship on hybrid hegemonic masculinities has for the most part concentrated on the global North, yet such masculinities are likewise

constructed in some parts of the global South. For example, Groes-Green's (2012) notion of "philogynous masculinities" in Mozambique illustrates this. Groes-Green discusses what he labels the *bom pico* (meaning, a good lover) heterosexual form of masculinity, which prioritizes women's sexual pleasure and emphasizes caring and attentiveness toward women. However, in prioritizing women's sexual pleasure, *bom pico* men reproduce hegemonic notions of virility, potency, and strength and subordinate men who are seen as being "sexually weak" (that is, unable to perform). Men who practice *bom pico* masculinity then are aligning themselves with hegemonic masculinity even as their practices might seem to distance themselves from it and, therefore, they reproduce masculine power over women and "Other" men in a novel way. And although not analyzing hybrid hegemonic masculinities, Morrell (1994, 1998, 2001) identified three distinct localized hegemonic masculinities in the global South country of South Africa: a *white* hegemonic masculinity constructed by the politically dominant white ruling class men; an *African* hegemonic masculinity fashioned by indigenous male chiefs; and a *black* hegemonic masculinity that existed in the various South African townships.

The above studies are only a few examples of research demonstrating multiple hegemonic masculinities and how they are accomplished differently throughout the world. What these scholars illustrate is that specific hierarchical gender relationships between men and women, between masculinity and femininity, and among masculinities are legitimated—superbly capturing certain of the essential features of the omnipresent reproduction of unequal gender relations. Additionally, these studies reveal in various ways how hegemonic masculinities express models of gender relations that articulate with the practical constitution of masculine and feminine ways of living in everyday circumstances. To the extent they do this, they contribute to our understanding of the legitimation and stabilization of unequal gender relations locally, regionally, and globally.

2 Multiple Nonhegemonic Masculinities

Masculinities scholars have not simply examined multiple hegemonic masculinities, they have also researched the various forms of non-hegemonic masculinities—or those masculinities that do not legitimate gender inequality—in specific social settings. In this section I discuss recent research on several differing forms of nonhegemonic masculinities, in addition to the nonhegemonic masculinities initially outlined by Connell.

2.1 Dominant and Dominating Masculinities

Close to twenty years ago, Martin (1998) raised the issue of inconsistent appropriations of the concept of hegemonic masculinity, insightfully observing that some scholars equated the concept with whatever type of masculinity that happened to be dominant at a particular time and place. More recently, Beasley (2008) labeled such inconsistent appropriations "slippage," arguing that "dominant" forms of masculinity—such as those that are the most culturally celebrated or the most common in particular settings—may actually do little to legitimate men's power over women. Similarly, Schippers (2007) argued that it is essential to distinguish masculinities that legitimate men's power from those that do not.

To elucidate the significance and salience of hegemonic masculinities, then, gender scholars must distinguish masculinities that legitimate gender inequality from those that do not, and some researchers have now begun to accomplish this. For example, I (Messerschmidt, 2016, 2018) recently distinguished among "hegemonic," "dominant," and "dominating" forms of masculinities. Following Connell, I define *hegemonic masculinities* as those masculinities that legitimate an unequal relationship (locally, regionally, and globally) between men and women, masculinity and femininity, and among masculinities. In contrast, *dominant masculinities* are not

always associated with and linked to gender hegemony but refer to (locally, regionally, and globally) the most celebrated, common, or current form of masculinity in a particular social setting (see also Beasley, 2008). As an example of dominant masculinities, I (Messerschmidt, 2016) interviewed teenage boys who uniformly identified certain boys in school who were structurally dominant: they were popular, often tough and athletic, attended parties, participated in heterosexuality, and had many friends. In other words, these dominant boys represented the most *celebrated* form of masculinity in the "clique" structure within schools yet they did not—in and of themselves—legitimate an unequal gender relationship. *Dominating masculinities* refer to those masculinities (locally, regionally, and globally) that also do not necessarily legitimate unequal relationships between men and women and masculinities and femininities, but rather, they involve commanding and controlling particular interactions, exercising power and control over people and events: "calling the shots" and "running the show." For example, I (Messerschmidt, 2016) recently examined former President George W. Bush's involvement in the Iraq war, demonstrating how President Bush refused to engage in peaceful geopolitical diplomatic negotiations with foreign leaders, choosing instead to practice "hard diplomacy" and thereby control worldwide geopolitical diplomatic negotiations through a global dominating masculinity. In this particular case, then, President Bush was dominating but he did not legitimate unequal gender relations between men and women, masculinity and femininity, and among masculinities.

Research on such dominant and dominating masculinities is significant because it enables a more distinct conceptualization of how hegemonic masculinities are unique—and indeed complex—among the multiplicity of masculinities, and making a clear distinction between hegemonic, dominant, and dominating masculinities will enable scholars to recognize and research various nonhegemonic yet powerful masculinities, and how they differ from hegemonic masculinities as well as how they differ among themselves.

2.2 Personalized and Positive Masculinities

A number of scholars have also uncovered what may be labeled mundane, run-of-the-mill, "personalized" and "positive" masculinities that are constructed outside the realm of hegemonic and/or dominant masculine relations and often contribute to legitimating egalitarian gender relations (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2012; Messerschmidt, 2016, 2018; Swain, 2006). For example, Swain's (2006) study of 10–11 years old boys in three schools in the United Kingdom, builds on Connell's scheme of multiple masculinities by showing that although some boys are hegemonic, complicit, and subordinate, certain boys construct personalized masculinities that transcend the available masculinities in the sphere of hegemonic relations at school. These boys have no desire to practice in-school hegemonic or dominant masculinities and they are not subordinated nor do they subordinate others (boys or girls). In fact, their masculinities are rather positive in the sense of being practiced in small groups of boys with similar interests (e.g., computers, theatre, band, etc.), they are non-exclusive and egalitarian, and they are nonhierarchical without any clearly identified leader.

Similarly, I (Messerschmidt, 2016, 2018) found in my research such personalized and positive nonhegemonic masculinities constructed by certain teenage boys, who frequently reported, for example, hanging out with unpopular groups at school that included both boys and girls who were inclusive and nonviolent, they did not emphasize heterosexuality and accepted celibacy, the boys were not misogynist, they embraced diversity in bodies and sexuality, they were nonhierarchical, and they had no desire to be popular. Members of such groups viewed themselves as different from rather than inferior to the

dominant boys and girls. Consequently, such positive masculinities were not constructed in a structural relationship of gender and sexual inequality, they did not legitimate unequal gender and sexual relations, and they were practiced in settings situated outside stable unequal gender relations.

The boys in Swain's and in my study constructed what is usually considered to be atypical masculine behavior by boys outside the social situation of the unpopular group. However, such gendered behavior is normalized within that group—it is encouraged, permitted, and privileged by both boys and girls—and therefore within that setting it does not call into question their "maleness." These boys are engaging in such positive masculinities authentically as boys —they were not feminized by others nor were they perceived as engaging in femininity. The boys underscored through their social action how egalitarianism and masculinity are not mutually exclusive but rather are lived practices of particular contextual realities. The boys aimed to be seen as boys as well as egalitarian in their gender relations, thus disrupting gender difference through a redefining of what it means to be a boy by constructing positive masculinities.

Messner, Greenberg, and Peretz (2015) recently detailed a different type of personalized and positive nonhegemonic masculinity. Examining certain men's engagements with progressive gender politics from the 1970s to the present —particularly efforts by these men to stop sexual and domestic violence against women—their analysis demonstrates how race, class and gender structural contexts shaped which men engage in political action with feminist women at particular historical moments, and also how these men and women strategize to stop this type of violence. For men who engaged in this activist work in the 1970s and 1980s, for example, they were found to be disproportionately white (often Jewish), college-educated, and attracted to anti-rape and anti-domestic violence work by their immersion in feminist and other radical social movements of the era. Today, men seem to be drawn to this type of anti-violence work in a different way: white, middle-class men commonly begin through university-based activism, women's studies courses, and volunteer or paid work in feminist community non-profits, while men of color attempt to prevent violence against women by working with boys and young men in poor communities around youth gang violence, substance abuse programs, and prison reform. Either way, the research by Messner, Greenberg, and Peretz is valuable in the sense of recognizing and pinpointing certain positive masculine practices that challenge gender hegemony and have crucial implications for social policy.

Personalized and positive masculinities are also constructed in the global South. Broughton (2008) examined how neoliberal globalization in Mexico created a novel northward mass departure from the Mexican southern states by working-age men. In particular, Broughton analyzed how economically dislocated southern Mexican men—mainly because of the North American Free Trade Agreement—negotiated hegemonic masculinity while confronting extraordinary pressure to migrate to the United States. Broughton found that these men constructed three differing masculinities in reaction to migration pressures in neoliberal Mexico. Drawing on a specific localized hegemonic masculinity that emphasized hierarchical gender relations in the family and vigilant fathering, these men deployed what Broughton labeled "traditionalist," "breadwinner," and "adventurer" masculinities, all of which provided differing gendered responses "to realizing both instrumental and identity goals in a time of rapid and wrenching change" (p. 585). The *traditionalist* emphasized maintaining the established local hegemonic masculinity primarily through family cohesion, while the *breadwinner* migrated to the United States to adequately provide for his wife and children. However, for the *adventurer*, the northern border and beyond offered a place to earn considerable money and to "prove" his masculinity in new ways, such as through seeking thrills and breaking free from the inflexibility of rural life. Rejecting the localized notion of hegemonic masculinity, migration to the north presented a progressive, avant-garde means to survive economic disorder by upgrading one's

masculine status and assessing his bravery. It proffered a "new and exciting life away from the limitations of a neglected and declining rural Mexico" (p. 585). However, a caveat is necessarily important to recognize: although the "adventurer" challenges the particular localized form of hegemonic masculinity, he still seemingly draws on masculine privilege to construct this nonhegemonic masculinity; that is, young women of similar age most likely are under stricter parental rule and therefore do not have the same gender freedom as the "adventurer" (thanks to Barbara Risman for helping me recognize this important qualification).

Broughton's study then demonstrated how low-income Mexican men experiencing economic dislocation intrinsic to neoliberal Mexico negotiated with a specific localized hegemonic masculinity and in the process orchestrated old and new hegemonic and new nonhegemonic masculine configurations. One of the important aspects of this article is its demonstration of how specific forms of complicity (traditionalist and breadwinner) with, and personalized resistance (adventurer) to, a localized hegemonic masculinity discourse were constructed under identical neoliberal conditions.

2.3 "Female" Masculinities

Research has demonstrated that masculinity is not determined biologically and thus not exclusively coupled with people assigned male at birth. Almost twenty years ago Halberstam (1998) examined the diversity of gender expressions among masculine women, uncovering a hidden history of "female" masculinities. This work lead some masculinities scholars to identify and examine masculinities constructed by those assigned female at birth. For example, Miller (2001, 2002) shows in her important book *One of the Guys,* that certain gang girls identify with the boys in their gangs and describe such gangs as "masculinist enterprises." These girls differentiate themselves from other gang girls by engaging in "gender crossing" and "embracing a masculine identity that they view as contradicting their bodily sex category (that is, female)" (Miller, 2002: 443). Similarly, my (Messerschmidt, 2012) life-history study of adolescent assaultive violence—reported in my book *Gender, Heterosexuality, and Youth Violence*—discovered numerous gender constructions by violent girls and found that some girls "do" masculinity by in part displaying themselves in a masculine way, by engaging primarily in what they and others in their milieu consider to be authentically masculine behavior, and by rejecting outright most aspects of femininity.

More recently, I (Messerschmidt, 2016) found that under particular social situations masculinity by specific individual's assigned female at birth becomes the primary foundation of their identity while "sex" is transformed into the qualifier. The coherence of one's initial fundamental sex and gender project may be altered whereby masculinity becomes primary and "real" and "sex" is transmuted to epiphenomenon. Additionally, I found that individuals assigned female at birth who practiced masculinity may experience specific contradictions between their bodies and masculinity, and through the discursively sexed meanings of certain bodily developments (such as breasts and menstruation) as well as the fact that culturally their bodies were expected to be congruent with femininity, not masculinity. People assigned female at birth then often experience a degree of bodily anxiety in constructing masculinities, especially when embedded in cultural conceptions of "two and only two sexes" and its accompanying discursive assertion that "men have penises and women do not." For such individual's masculinity can be experienced in certain situations, such as sexual situations, as a disembodied phenomenon that impacts future practice, such as heteromasculinity.

Arguably, then, some girls and women who practice masculinity disrupt gender difference. The notion of "female" masculinities provides evidence of the complicated and diverse nature of sex/gender embodiment and moves us beyond the masculine/feminine dichotomy toward the recognition of alternative gender dimensions.

Such masculinities disturb the view of solely two oppositional gender categories and challenges perspectives that conflate sex and gender.

Finally, I should note that recent research suggests that dominant gender constructions by adolescent girls in North America and Europe no longer center on such embodied practices as submissiveness, docility, and passivity. Instead, today such gender qualities as self-control, self-entitlement, self-reliance, determination, competition, individual freedom, and athleticism, combined with being attractive and exhibiting heterosexual appeal—the "heterosexy athlete"—form the primary markers signifying dominant adolescent femininity (Adams, Schmitke, & Franklin, 2005; Bettis & Adams, 2005; Budgeon, 2014; Gonick, 2006; McRobbie, 2009; Ringrose, 2007). This new "hybrid" gender construction by adolescent girls—consisting of conventional feminine *and* masculine qualities—disrupts but does not challenge hegemonic masculinity and gender inequality. As Shelley Budgeon (2014: 325) has shown in her review of the literature, such "hybrid femininities"—like the "hybrid masculinities" discussed above—promote a de-gendered dynamic that maintains by obscuring gender hegemony.

2.4 Globalization

Earlier I provided examples of masculinities (both hegemonic and nonhegemonic) in the global South, but academic work on masculinities from the 1950s to the 1990s in the global South added a significant dimension to the notion of multiple masculinities by demonstrating the unique relationship among globalization, colonialism, and masculinity (Mernissi, 1975; Morrell, 1994, 1998, 2001; Nandy, 1983; Paz, 1950). By the early 2000s, the empirical base of research and theoretical development on globalization and masculinities was greatly diversified to include, for example, studies on Japan (Roberson & Suzuki, 2003), Australia (Tomsen & Donaldson, 2003), Latin America (Gutmann, 1996; Viveros Vigoya, 2001), the Middle East (Ghoussoub & Sinclair-Webb, 2000), and China (Louie, 2002).

In various recent publications, Hearn and colleagues (Hearn, Blagojevic, & Harrrison, 2015; Ruspini, Hearn, Pease, & Pringle, 2011) have noted that most studies of men and masculinities have concentrated their research efforts within the boundaries of individual national contexts, leaving unexamined the multiple masculinities in terms of globalization and transnational situations. Following Connell's (1998) suggestion that masculinities scholars move beyond the "ethnographic moment" by examining the relationship between globalization and masculinities, Hearn similarly suggests the development of international, transnational, and global perspectives. Hearn (2015) argues that various forms of "transnationalization" have created new and changing material and representational gender hierarchies—or what Hearn refers to as "transnational patriarchies"—that structure men's transnational gender domination. For Hearn (2015), some contemporary arenas involving transnational gender inequalities and thus multiple masculinities include: transnational corporations and government organizations with men in almost exclusive positions of power; international trade, global finance, and the masculinization of capital; militarism and the arms trade; international sports; migrations and refugees; information and communication technologies; and the sex trade.

Recently, Connell (2014) outlined a strategy for conceptualizing the relationship between globalization and masculinities based on North/South relations. In examining masculinities scholarship in both the global North and the global South, Connell notes how scholars in the latter often rely on theories and research developed in the former because of the structure of knowledge production in the global economy of knowledge, which has made it difficult to fully comprehend masculinities constructed in the global South. Connell chronicles a rich archive of examinations of masculinities from around the

global South that provide a foundation for understanding the relationship among multiple masculine constructions in both the North and the South. Connell concludes that the global formation of masculinities must be conceptualized through an understanding of worldwide processes of colonial conquest and social disruption, the building of colonial societies and the global capitalist economy, and post-independent globalization (see also, Connell, 2016a, 2016b).

3 Conclusion

In this chapter I initially discussed Raewyn Connell's original perspective on hegemonic masculinity and its associated multiple masculinities. After noting the criticisms lodged against that early formulation, I summarized the reformulation of hegemonic and nonhegemonic masculinities by Connell and myself. That reformulation specifically recognized empirical research supporting the idea of multiple hegemonic masculinities at the local, regional, and global levels. To be sure, although identifying a single ascendant hegemonic masculinity at each level may be possible, no one to date has successfully done so. This is probably the case because it is extremely difficult to measure such ascendancy and thereby determine which particular masculinity—among the whole variety in the offering at each level—is indeed *the* ascendant hegemonic masculinity. Until a method is devised for determining exactly which masculinity is the hegemonic ascendant at each level, we must speak of hegemonic masculinity wholly in plural terms, analyzing hegemonic masculinit*ies* at the local, regional, and global levels.

Scholars have also built on and expanded our understanding of Connell's original idea of multiple nonhegemonic masculinities. Although research continues to uncover complicit, subordinate, and protest masculinities, studies have revealed additional nonhegemonic masculinities. Distinguishing hegemonic from dominant and dominating masculinities allows scholars to "see" the complexity of the former as an ascendant legitimating cultural influence, and how it differs from simply celebrated and common forms of masculinities that do not legitimate gender inequality. Moreover, personalized and positive masculinities—as well as some "female" masculinities—are significant for their oppositional qualities and value. Finally, the identification of hegemonic and nonhegemonic masculinities globally, and in particular in the global South, has prodigiously increased our knowledge of multiple masculinities.

References

Adams, N., Schmitke, A., & Franklin, A. (2005). Tomboys, dykes, and girly girls: Interrogating the subjectivities of adolescent female athletes. *Women's Studies Quarterly, 33*(1/2), 73–91.

Barber, K. (2016). *Styling masculinity: Gender, class, and inequality in the men's grooming industry*. USA: Rutgers University Press.

Beasley, C. (2008). Re-thinking hegemonic masculinity in a globalizing world. *Men and Masculinities, 11*(1), 86–103.

Bettis, P., & Adams, N. (2005). *Geographies of girlhood: Identities in-between*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bridges, T., & Pascoe, C. J. (2018). Gender hegemony in transition: On shifts in the practical and ideological supports of gender and sexual inequality. In J. W. Messerschmidt, P. Martin, M. Messner, & R. Connell (Eds.), *Gender reckonings: New social theory and research*. New York: New York University Press.

Broughton, C. (2008). Migration as engendered practice: Mexican men, masculinity, and northward migration. *Gender & Society, 22*, 568–589.

Budgeon, S. (2014). The dynamics of gender hegemony: Femininities, masculinities, and social change. *Sociology, 48*(2), 317–334.

Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Connell, R. (1995, 2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R. (1998). Masculinities and globalization. *Men and Masculinities, 1*, 3–23.

Connell, R. (2014). Margin becoming center: For a world-centered rethinking of masculinities. *Norma: International Journal for Masculinities Studies, 9*, 217–231.

Connell, R. (2016a). 100 million Kalashnikovs: Gendered power on a world scale. *Debate Feminista, 5*, 3–17.

Connell, R. (2016b). Masculinities in global perspective: Hegemony, contestation, and changing structures of power. *Theory and Society, 45*(4), 303–318.

Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19,* 829–859.

Ghoussoub, M., & Sinclair-Webb, E. (Eds.). (2000). *Imagined masculinities: Male identity and culture in the modern Middle East*. London: Saqi Books.

Gonick, M. (2006). Between 'Girl Power' and "Reviving Ophelia': Constituting the neoliberal girl subject. *NWSA Journal, 18*(2), 1–22.

Groes-Green, C. (2012). Philogynous masculinities: Contextualizing alternative manhood in Mozambique. *Men and Masculinities, 15,* 91–111.

Gutmann, M. (1996). *The meaning of macho: Being a man in Mexico City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hatfield, E. F. (2010). 'What it Means to Be a Man': Examining hegemonic masculinity in two and half men. *Communication, Culture & Critique, 3,* 526–548.

Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2012). 'What's Next for Masculinity?' Reflexive directions for theory and research on masculinity and education. *Gender and Education, 24*, 577–592.

Hearn, J. (2015). *Men of the world: Genders, globalizations, transnational times*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hearn, J., Blagojevic, M., & Harrison, K. (Eds.). (2015). *Rethinking transnational men: Beyond, between and within nations*. New York: Routledge.

Louie, K. (2002). *Theorizing Chinese masculinity: Society and gender in China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, P. (1998). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Reflections on Connell's masculinities. *Gender and Society, 12*(4), 472–474.

McRobbie, A. (2009). *The aftermath of feminism: Gender, culture and social change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mernissi, F. (1975). *Beyond the vail: Male-female dynamics in modern Muslim society*. London: Saqi Books.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2012). *Gender, heterosexuality, and youth violence: The struggle for recognition*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2016). *Masculinities in the making: From the local to the global*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2018). *Hegemonic masculinity: Formulation, reformulation, and amplification*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Messner, M. A., Greenberg, M. A., & Peretz, T. (2015). *Some men: Feminist allies and the movement to end violence against women.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, J. (2001). *One of the guys: Girls, gangs, and gender*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Miller, J. (2002). The strengths and limits of doing gender for understanding street crime. *Theoretical Criminology, 6*(4), 433–460.

Morrell, R. (1994). Masculinity and the white boys' boarding schools of Natal, 1880–1930. *Perspectives in Education, 15,* 27–52.

Morrell, R. (1998). Of boys and men: Masculinity and gender in southern African studies. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 24,* 605–630.

Morrell, R. (Ed.). (2001). *Changing men in Southern Africa*. London: Zed Books.

Morris, E. W. (2008). 'Rednecks', 'Rutters', and 'Rithmetic': Social class, masculinity, and schooling in a rural context. *Gender & Society, 22*, 728–751.

Nandy, A. (1983). *The intimate enemy: Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Paz, O. (1950). *The labyrinth of solitude*. New York: Penguin.

Ringrose, J. (2007). Successful girls? Complicating post-feminist, neoliberal discourses of education achievement, and gender equality. *Gender and Education, 19*(4), 471–489.

Roberson, J. E., & Suzuki, N. (Eds.). (2003). *Men and masculinities in contemporary Japan*. New York: Routledge.

Ruspini, E., Hearn, J., Pease, B., & Pringle, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Men and masculinities around the world: transforming men's practices.* London: Palgrave.

Schippers, M. (2007). Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory & Society, 36*(1), 85–102.

Swain, J. (2006). Reflections on patterns of masculinity in school settings. *Men and Masculinities, 8*(3), 331–349.

Tomsen, S., & Donaldson, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Male trouble: Looking at Australian masculinities*. London: Pluto Press.

Viveros Vigoya, M. (2001). Contemporary Latin American perspectives on masculinity. *Men and Masculinities, 3,* 237–260.

Weitzer, R., & Kubrin, C. E. (2009). Misogyny in rap music: A content analysis of prevalence and meanings. *Men and Masculinities, 12,* 3–29.

James W. Messerschmidt is professor of sociology and women's and gender studies at the University of Southern Maine. His research has covered such diverse areas as gender and crime/violence, genderqueers, intersectionality, and global political masculinities. Messerschmidt is the author of a number of books, including *Gender Reckonings: New Social Theory and Research* co-edited with Patricia Martin, Michael Messner, and Raewyn Connell and, most recently, *Hegemonic Masculinity: Formulation, Reformulation, and Amplification*.