10

CLASS AND MASCULINITY

DAVID MORGAN

Students of gender tend only to see gender; class analysts tend only to see social classes. The research questions are often crudely put as being questions of gender or class instead of asking how gender and class interact in the lives of historically situated social groups.

—Marianne Gullestad (1992, p. 62)

Class is one of a number of social hierarchies or systems of social stratification that have represented core elements in sociological analysis. Other systems include slavery and caste and feudal systems, and these are usually seen as being distinct from class relationships in that they are associated with particular historical epochs or geographical areas. Class stratification is seen as the form most closely associated with industrial and capitalist societies, although elements of other systems may also be present. In addition, there are hierarchies that can overlap and coexist with any of these particular systems of stratification. These can include gender, age, and generation, as well as race and ethnicity; some more recent analyses would argue for the inclusion of hierarchies based on sexualities and forms of ability and disability.

All these sets of differences have some features in common. They are relational in that the various elements (working class, slave, women, black, etc.) cannot be considered apart from other, usually opposed, elements. They refer to some kind of hierarchical organization and inequalities of power. They are structured in that they, to a greater or lesser extent, exist outside individuals and persist over time. And they are, again to varying degrees, seen as significant distinctions in the societies in which they exist. Sociological analysis, until fairly recently, has tended to focus on class and class relationships, although there may be considerable variation in the ways in which these terms are understood. This is partly because of the influence of at least two of the discipline's "founding fathers," Marx and Weber, and partly because of sociology's central interest in the defining and distinctive characteristics of "modern" societies.

It should be noted at the outset that there is a particularly British or European focus in this chapter, although the chapter does not, as we shall see, exclude wider considerations. This is partly because of my own intellectual background as a British academic but also partly because many of the key debates and modes of analysis originated in Britain, although they made use of some of the key theories from other

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 166

parts of Europe. Class has sometimes been seen as a particularly British obsession, and this in part relates to its historical position as the first industrial capitalist society, a point recognized by Marx and many of the early socialists. However, questions of origin are here less important in a chapter that is exploring the interrelationships between masculinities and class, and I hope that, in the course of this discussion, some general principles may be developed that may be found useful in analyzing a wide range of social and historical contexts.

Questions about the relationships between different social hierarchies developed in the last part of the 20th century, and one of the more heated sociological debates has revolved around issues of class and gender, more specifically about whether women have been marginalized in traditional class analysis. Joan Acker (1973), in an influential article, claimed that the relative invisibility of women in class analysis was a case of "intellectual sexism"; John Goldthorpe (1983) presented a vigorous defense of the traditional view. One important issue raised in the course of this debate was whether the individual or the "family" should be treated as the unit of class analysis (Crompton, 1993; Lee & Turner,1996; Morgan, 1996).

As was so often the case when gender was discussed, the focus was almost wholly on women and their marginal position within traditional class analysis. As such, the debate could be seen as part of the wider feminist critique of conventional social science and the way in which, whatever the topic, women were either marginalized or stereotyped. What was not explored in the course of the debate was the position of men within class analysis. Yet a moment's thought would seem to suggest that men and masculinity were heavily implicated in class analysis, where, in British iconography at least, the bowler hat of the upper middle class hangs between the cloth cap of the working man and the top hat of the traditional upper class. Was it simply an accident that led to men being presented as the key class actors, or were the connections between class and masculinity closer than might first have been suspected?

About the same time as the gender and class debate, there was another loosely associated debate concerning the centrality (or otherwise) of class analysis (Devine, 1997; Lee & Turner, 1996; Pakulski & Waters, 1996; Savage, 2000). Toward the latter part of the 20th century, there appeared to be a general impression, at least within the United Kingdom, that class analysis no longer had a "promising future." This was in part a consequence of a recognition of other, at least equally important, social divisions, such as those of gender or race and ethnicity. Class analysis also appeared to be less relevant with the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the erosion of many communist societies. With a developing global perspective, many of the traditional, often eurocentric, class divisions seemed to be less able to explain social inequalities and conflicts all over the world. Class increasingly has global dimensions, and these do not necessarily link easily to categories developed in other times and under other conditions. Even within the countries where class analysis had originated, there was a growing suspicion that although inequalities clearly persisted, the old language of class was inadequate when it came to understanding these inequalities. The development of terms such as "underclass" and "social exclusion" seemed to bear witness to a diffuse sense of unease about traditional class categories. Finally, there was a growing popular perception that class divisions were old-fashioned and that the remaining remnants would be swept away in a fluid, increasingly open, postmodern society.

More recently, however, class analysis seems to have returned, albeit with some important modifications (Devine, 1997; Savage, 2000). One interesting question, however, remains. How far was this apparent erosion—or at least transformation—of class analysis linked to shifts in the gender order and the possible erosion of patriarchal structures? If, as the class and gender debates suggested, class had been fairly strongly linked to themes of men and masculinity, were there links between changes in the gender order and changes in the position of class within the analysis of social structures?

In this chapter, I shall enquire what it was about class, and class analysis, that seemed to encourage a particularly strong identification with men and masculinities. However, this identification was implied rather than explicit, latent rather than manifest. Part of the story is the way in which questions about the gendering of class were avoided or remained invisible for so long. I shall present a fairly closely integrated and relatively stable model closely linking the two and contrast this with a more fluid and open set of

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 167

connections that may be said to be characteristic of late modern times. Before this, however, I shall need to consider what is meant by class and some differences in emphasis and approach within class analysis.

Definitions and Distinctions

Picture a first-year sociology class in, say, the 1980s or even later. The topic for discussion is what we mean by class. Is it income? But what about the rock star or a sports personality who may, at his peak, be earning more than the prime minister? Is it occupation? If so, on what basis do we say that one occupation ranks higher than another? Perhaps it is education. But does this not depend on income and occupation? Then, especially if the discussion is taking place in a British university, someone will raise questions of accent and how a person talks, arguing that you can place individuals as soon as they open their mouth.

Much of the discussion, you conclude, revolves around particularly British obsessions to do with relatively fine distinctions, snobbery, Oxbridge, and the old school tie. The concern seems to be more at the individual level, about how to place that individual in relation to another, rather than more abstract concerns about social structure. When British social critics refer to "outmoded" class distinctions, it is usually these distinctions, which are manifested at the interpersonal level, that are being referred to rather than wider structural differences associated with a capitalist society. But a little reflection on these debates might suggest that it is important to distinguish the particular historical experiences of any one particular society from understandings of class in a more general, structural sense.

In this chapter, I am less concerned with the differences between different theoretical traditions—notably the Marxist and the Weberian—and more concerned with some of the more common features of and issues within class analysis. Thus there will be general agreement that we are dealing with inequalities that are the products of social structure rather than the presence or absence of individual attributes, such as intelligence, physical strength, and so on. There is also a general agreement that in talking about class, we are talking about economic divisions and inequalities. A kind of more or less explicit Weberian analysis would seem to be at the heart of much empirical class analysis. This entails looking at the unequal distribution of life chances in so far as these deal with the ownership or nonownership of different forms of property and different levels of income. Weberians would argue that such a mode of analysis is more inclusive than a more strictly Marxist analysis in that Marxist class and class action remains a potentiality within Weber's categories, although not the only one.

Within class analysis, there are a range of qualifications and distinctions, some of which have a particular relevance when it comes to considering the relationships between masculinity and class:

- *Objective and subjective understandings of class.* This is the distinction between the categories that are established in class analysis and the way in which class is actually understood and experienced by individuals or, indeed, whether the term *class* has any meaning at all.
- *Class in itself and class for itself.* This well-known distinction, deriving from Marxist analysis, contrasts class as a category, a mode of distinguishing and classifying people and class as the basis for some form of collective action. This entails the development of some form of class consciousness, an awareness of some shared fate, and collective experiences, together with some understanding of the possibilities of challenging or even changing the class system.
- *Bipolar models of class and more complex hierarchical models.* This may refer to sociological accounts or social actors' own perceptions of the class structure. Bipolar models may be more or less simple descriptions (mental-manual) or imply some degree of class antagonism (bourgeoisie-proletariat) or fall somewhere in between (them-us). The more complex models see the class structure as a sort of ladder with three or more levels.
- *Class and status.* Although, strictly speaking, this takes us beyond class analysis, it is important, as several popular and social-scientific understandings of class contain elements of both. Roughly speaking, *class* in this instance refers to the unequal distribution of life chances; *status* refers to the social distribution of honor or prestige. It could be argued that the popular and widely used distinction between upper, middle, and working contains elements of both class and status.

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 168

- *Class as based on individuals and class as based on families or households.* This is a distinction with particular relevance for a gendered analysis of class (Curtis, 1986). Much class analysis takes individuals as the units and then aggregates them. However, several sociologists have argued that the family or the household should be the unit of analysis, although the matter becomes complex once one moves away from assuming that the class position of a household is determined by the class of the main (male) breadwinner (Morgan, 1996).
- One final distinction deals with the *historical location of the idea of class.* The Communist Manifesto famously begins with the words "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (McLellan, 1988, p. 21). Much of its actual focus, however, is on classes under capitalism. Sociological analysis has tended, explicitly or implicitly, to limit the idea of class to capitalism and postcapitalism. Thus there is a distinction between an almost timeless notion of class divisions, popularly outlined in terms of the "haves" and the "have nots," and one that is much more historically situated and identified with modernity.

What I have presented here is a highly simplified version of some complex debates. Their relevance for the exploration of the relationships between class and masculinity will, I hope, emerge in the subsequent discussion. One final set of issues remains for clarification. In common with much current discussion, reflected elsewhere in this volume, I shall henceforth write of masculinities rather than masculinity, although I recognize that there are some difficult issues associated with this move. Within this framework, as will appear later, the idea of hegemonic masculinity is important. These ideas are discussed at greater length elsewhere in this volume.

The Masculinities of Class

There is one further distinction that should be made before continuing with the analysis. We may see, as has already been suggested, men as holders of class power. Thus men will be found disproportionately located in the highest levels of political, economic, educational, and cultural organizations. In this respect, we may see men as centrally involved in class practices, as individual or collective class actors. But we may also see men involved in the central discourses about class power. Many of the key theorists of class have been men, and it is reasonable to suppose that their location in gender hierarchies is as important in shaping, if not in determining, their worldviews as their locations within a class system. Of course, in reality, this distinction becomes a little blurred, as discourses and practices are always closely related. Put another way, modes of understanding and researching class may reflect gendered perspectives just as the class practices themselves will also be gendered.

We may see these issues below the surface of the gender-class debate already mentioned. Goldthorpe's (1983) defense of the "conventional view" of class claimed that he was representing the world as it was rather than the world as we might like it to be. If that world be male dominated or patriarchal, then, to simplify considerably, that is how we should represent it. Up to a point, Goldthorpe's argument was correct in its generality, if not in its particularities. In everyday as well as in social science discourse there does seem to be something particularly masculine about the idea of class. And class practices, although much more open to variation, might seem to reflect these discourses, at least for much of what we describe as modern times. Put simply, class is gendered, and men have assumed, or have been allocated, the role of class agents.

How has this identification, albeit often submerged, between men and class come about? There are several overlapping reasons.

If we return to the key elements in the (broadly Weberian) model of class, we find strong connections between property, occupation, and masculinities. In the case of property, we find, historically, strong identifications between ownership of different kinds of property, family and family name, and inheritance and the male line. In the case of occupation, the connections are perhaps less strong, although it can be argued that most occupational titles have strong masculine connotations. Some occupational titles (e.g., policeman) are explicitly gendered, and popular speech still talks of sending for a "man" to come round and repair the central heating or the dishwasher. Other titles have strong historical and symbolic associations with prized masculine characteristics such as physical

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 169

strength or group solidarity, coal mining and steel working, for example. Even less physical occupations, clerical workers for example, or bank clerks, initially were associated with "respectable" men until these occupations became feminized (Lockwood, 1958). The same is true for a whole range of professions, and many of these occupational boundaries were often fiercely defended against the incursions of women through the practices of trade unions and professional associations (Walby, 1986). We can say, therefore, that occupational titles and occupational boundaries were policed by the practices of men and that, insofar as occupation became a key indicator of social class, the identification of masculinities and class can be seen as having deep historical roots. The same is also true in terms of property, the other basis of class distinctions, where the links between property, class, and masculinity were often given legal underpinnings. This is not to say that women did not have occupations or property but that male property and male occupations became the more dominant.

Another set of distinctions reinforced the masculine character of class: those between the public and the private. Conventionally, the terrain of class and class struggle is located in the public sphere, the sphere of employment, where the deployment of wealth and property and politics is easily seen. The public sphere was also the sphere dominated by men as they engaged in employment or class and political action. Women might be seen as backstage or "behind-the-scenes workers" in class struggles, their own class position reflecting that of their husbands (Porter, 1983). In some cases they provided very obvious and significant support, but this was usually defined as "support," secondary to the main action. Only rarely, in the public imagination, did women appear as class actors in their own right.

Drawing together the two last points, we have the development of the idea of "the breadwinner" and "the family wage." Conventionally, or so it emerged from the early 19th century, the head of the household was a man, and he constituted the main or sole provider for his wife and children. It was on this basis that claims were made in terms of "the family wage." In practice, the reality was much more complicated, but the idea of the man as "provider" remains remarkable persistent in a wide range of modern cultures, right up to the present day (e.g., for Warin, Solomon, Lewis, & Landford, 1999; also, Hobson, 2002). It can be argued, in fact, that the idea of the provider is a major element in the construction of masculine identity; it is a moral as well as an economic category. Hence the devastating personal effects of unemployment that have been documented by many researchers over many years.

In a somewhat more abstract vein, we may consider the contribution of the ideological construction, which sees men, in contrast to women, as effective actors. This is partly because the public sphere, as outlined earlier, is not simply different from the private sphere but is also seen as being, in many ways, more significant than the private sphere. The elevation of the economy and the spheres of war and politics are accompanied by the downgrading of the domestic. Thus public statues celebrate warriors and statesmen, and the large-scale heroic canvas is given greater significance than the miniature or the still life. On the one side there is risk and danger, the possibilities for heroic achievement or spectacular downfalls; on the other side there is the routine and the everyday (see Morgan, 2003). The very word "actor" (which has been taken over into sociological analysis) still has some masculine connotations. Wherever the "action" is, it is not in the home. *Action* and *actor* merge with *active*, which in its turn contrasts with *passive*.

Finally we need to emphasize the distinction between production and reproduction, which some writers see to as a key to understanding the masculinization of class. O'Brien (1981), in particular, recognized the contribution to class analysis made by Marx and Engels, but she also demonstrated how the Marxist tradition tended to focus on labor and production and played down reproduction. Indeed, it could be argued that, within Marxism, reproduction tended to be seen in more metaphorical terms (stressing the reproduction of class relationships) rather than as something to do with gendered relationships (O'Brien, 1981).

It can also be argued that class contributed to both a unified sense of masculinity and more diffused, perhaps more conflictual, models of masculinities. On the one hand, we have the identification of men, all men, with the public sphere, the sphere of production, which contained those areas in society where the action

was. Many men, whatever the amount or source of their income, could identify with the provider role and the sense of moral responsibility that this implied. But at the same time, class experiences and practices pointed to different ways of being men, different ways of being constituted as effective social actors. These differences (which will be explored in more detail later) could be polarized between "them" and "us" or become embodied in a range of finer distinctions, such as those between "mental" and "manual," "skilled" and "unskilled," or even workers in different departments or offices. Other masculine themes that might be woven into class analysis are notions of collective solidarity (traditionally associated with the working class) and individual achievement and risk taking, associated with the classic bourgeoisie, or the middle classes. Yet again, we can contrast a sense of masculinity that derives from having authority or control over others and the solidarities of the shop floor or the coal face.

Representations of class struggle and class differences traditionally drew from masculine imagery. Although the rhetoric might refer to "working people," the representations of the working class frequently included masculine symbols (such as the hammer or clenched fists) and emphasized collective solidarity. At the very least, such representations of solidarity dissolved gender differences in a large class identity and frequently went further than this to convey collective, embodied masculinity. The language was the language of struggle, of class war and conflict. Representations of the opposition also deployed masculine, if negatively valued, images of wealth and luxury.

Media representations of industrial disputes in the latter part of the 20th century frequently seemed to play on these understandings. On the one hand, we have the raised arms of the mass meeting; on the other, we have men in suits, more individualized, leaving or entering cars or making public statements in an abstract language of rationality (Philo, 1995). Here, in contrast to the working class images, workers were presented as sheep who were easily led by politically motivated leaders or group pressure. Management, on the other hand, was presented as dealing with some of the key issues in the national economy. However valued, both sets of representations drew on different strands in the construction of masculinities, and it could be said that the class struggle was represented in terms of these contrasting versions.

Within the writings on men and masculinities, class and gender converge in the concept of "hegemonic masculinity" (Connell, 1995). The main argument here is that the recognition of a diversity of masculinities should not obscure the fact that in a particular social formation, certain masculinities are more dominant, more valued, or more persuasive than others. In part, these refer to characteristics that have little directly to do with class, such as heterosexuality or responsibility. But in part, they also have strong connections with class. A good example of this is the idea of rationality. However defined (and this is clearly a complex, multistranded concept), rationality is associated with the practices of men and, increasingly, with the public life and with those most visibly or actively involved in public life. It is associated with the abstract logic of the market, the dominant principles of bureaucratic organization, and the general conduct of private life. The idea of rationality is an ideological theme that brings together both class and gender, forming a core feature of modern hegemonic masculinity.

The Class of Masculinity

One of the earliest books in the recent flood of texts on men and masculinities specifically placed class and class differences at the centre of its analysis (Tolson, 1977). To a large extent, Tolson takes it for granted that class provides a major framework within which masculine experiences and contradictions may be explored. Thus he begins a section titled "Working-class masculinity" with these words: "The paradox of masculinity at work is most apparent within the experience of manual labor" (p. 58).

A later section within the same chapter focuses on the distinctive features of middle class masculinity. As already noted, we can see two contrasting ways of "doing" masculinity, and these are easily recognized within certain constructions of social class. The one is collective, physical and embodied, and oppositional. The other is individualistic, rational, and relatively disembodied. These can be broadly described as working class and middle class masculinities, respectively. Of course, more detailed probing will reveal complexities and

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 171

ambiguities. There are, for example, the middle class (and often embodied) solidarities of clubs, sports teams, public schools, and so on. And there are working class individualities represented in popular social types such as "Jack the lad," "the cheeky chappie" and "the hard man." It is, indeed, difficult to come to terms with some of the contradictions within constructions of masculinity without taking on board some sense of class distinction. Masculinities are both solidaristic and individualistic, both embodied and disembodied. An understanding of class and of historically constructed class differences helps us to explore some of the tensions and ambiguities of masculinity.

Up to now, we have tended to focus on a bipolar, largely oppositional model of class, and it may be argued that this focus on struggle or opposition conforms to one influential model of masculinity. However, there are other models of class and class differences that point to three or more classes. Clearly, the very notion of the "middle" class implies at least three classes, although much sociological analysis that uses class classifications tends to leave out the upper class, largely because the numbers involved are assumed to be too small to influence analysis of, say, health or voting patterns. However, more structural analysis should include the upper class (or power elite or any alternative term), as it is clearly highly influential, if numerically small. Moreover, such a class is both constructed by and has a major role in constructing dominant or hegemonic notions of masculinity to do with control, the exercise of power, rationality, and so on. C. Wright Mills' (1959) *The Power Elite*, for example, can be read as a study of masculinities.

Once we move beyond the bipolar model, a range of possibilities become open to us. There is, first, the possibility of three or more classes, usually based on some classification of occupations. Occupations are implicated, in different ways, in the classifications developed by the British Registrar General, Goldthorpe, and Erik Olin Wright (see, e.g., Marshall, Rose, Newby, & Vogler, 1989, pp. 13-62). The trouble with many of these classifications is that they do not necessarily map easily into class experiences; the fact that certain occupations may be grouped together for the purposes of analysis does not necessarily mean that the individuals so grouped will understand their commonalities in class terms. Class, once we move from bipolar models, comes to be seen as something that is played out in different sites that do not necessarily have much to do with each other. Divisions at the workplace, in terms of skills, pay, privileges, and so on do not necessarily carry over into the areas where these individuals live their family lives or enjoy their leisure activities. Class as experience needs to be filtered through particular agencies, such as housing, residential area, educational experience, and so on. Further, although masculinities may be shaped by or play a part in shaping these differences, this is by no means inevitable. Some divisions, indeed, such as the divisions between the "rough" and the "respectable" working class or the fine gradations recorded by Robert Roberts (1971) in his account of *The Classic Slum* may be as much maintained by the work of women as by the occupational status of men.

Further, one of the key features of a class system, as opposed to feudalism or a caste system, is its relative openness and the degree of mobility, both social and geographical, which is allowed. Recognizing the possibilities of social and geographical mobility does open up the possibility for more complex masculinities and their relationship to class. Here we have the "failed" masculinity of the downwardly mobile individual whose failure in class terms may be read as indications of a weakness of character, which might also be gendered (lack of ambition, alcoholism, etc.). Here we have the defensive and uneasy masculinity of the recent arrival into middle class occupations, localities, or lifestyles. This may contrast with the apparently more stable masculinities of those who have managed the easier passage from the middle class family, through school and university, into a middle class occupation and a lifestyle enhanced by an appropriate marriage and the "right" location. This may also contrast with the, probably dwindling, traditional working class communities that provide another basis for the reaffirmation of masculinities through shared experiences and lifestyles. Geographical mobility (with or without social mobility) may also play its part in blurring or sharpening masculine identities. Community studies have explored differences between the "established" and the "outsiders" that, to some extent, cut across class divisions (Elias & Scotson, 1994).

Watson developed the useful term "spiralist" to describe those who are both geographically

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 172

and socially mobile (Watson, 1964). Such mobilities may now, increasingly, take on a global dimension. Whether such complexities contribute to an overall eroding of hegemonic masculinity or whether they open up the possibilities for a much wider range of masculine practices is a matter for further investigation.

It might also be argued that the experience and practice of mobility itself is related to the construction of masculinity in opposition to femininity and the experiences of women. Thomson (1997), using more qualitative oral historical material, argues (in the British context) that the generation of men born in the 1930s and 1940s experienced some modest improvements in the course of their life. This was not the case with the women in the sample. For women, marriage often has a depressing effect on social status. Thompson argues for the importance of considering the interplays between family, occupation, and gender in exploring the processes of social mobility and the numerous, often unrecognized or unacknowledged ways in which women assist in men's experiences of upward mobility.

We may reach an interim conclusion at this point. We have seen a two-way interaction between class and gender, with particular reference to masculinities. Masculinity remains a relatively underexplored aspect in the examination of class practices. Yet the position that class analysis plays, or at least has played, in sociological analysis as a whole and the continuing importance of class as a social division may in part derive from this close but largely unrecognized masculine character of class. Conversely, one of the reasons why it has been found necessary to pluralize "masculinities" is that ways of doing masculinity are always mediated through other social divisions, of which class remains one of the most important. The connection between class and masculinity is an intimate one. When I see a middle class man, I do not see someone who is middle class and then someone who is a man, or vice versa. I see both at the same time. The major social divisions—class, gender, ethnicity, age, and so on—may be likened to primary colors, which are more often seen in their many combinations than individually.

Up to now I have suggested a relatively close association between class and masculinity, although the last few paragraphs have pointed to some possible complexities. In very broad terms, a relatively tight association between class and masculinity may be characteristic of modern or capitalist societies (for a historical analysis, see Davidoff & Hall, 1987). Some of the relevant features of these societies are relatively clear distinctions between home and work, clear and relatively stable occupational titles, the dominance of a male breadwinner model, and the continuing importance of heavy and manufacturing industry. With a return to more blurred distinctions between home and work, the decline of clear occupational titles and jobs or careers for life, the decline of the male breadwinner model, and the growth of a service economy, we may also have a weakening of the relationship between masculinity and class. This will be explored in the next section.

Masculinity and Class in Late Modernity

> *The last three decades has seen a subtle reworking of the relationship between class, masculinity and the individual.*
>
> Mike Savage (2000, p. xi)

Probably one of the most significant influences on the changing relationship between class and masculinity has been the decline of the male breadwinner model in practice and, although perhaps to a lesser extent, in ideology. In the past, it might be argued, men were more strongly "classed" than women because they had closer associations to the key practices and institutions that maintained class. For many men, of course, this might be an illusion; nevertheless it might be possible for the more weakly "classed" men (perhaps because of unemployment, disability, or simply having a wife who was the main breadwinner) to continue to derive some class identity from their more fortunate brothers. Hence there was some partial justification for the traditional practice of locating a household in terms of the class of its head and for women to be allocated class positions on the basis of their husband's or father's class position. With a weakening of men's attachment to the labor market and a strengthening of women's attachment, some revision was clearly necessary.

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 173

As has already been noted, two analytical strategies emerged in response to the growing involvement of married women in the labor market and the related decline in relevance (but not always in ideological importance) of the male breadwinner model. The first was to state clearly that the unit of class was the individual rather than the household. Various consequences followed. Both men and women could be seen as units within the class structure, although men tended to occupy higher class positions than women. It is also likely that the issues around which everyday class struggles were fought became more various. Notions of "the family wage" became less important and issues to do with working conditions, hours of work, parental leave, and so on came more and more to the fore. It would not be true to say that class itself became feminized, but it could certainly be argued that it became less masculine.

The other strategy was to take seriously the idea of the household as a unit and to explore the consequences of this. However, there were also shifts in the idea of the household as a unit so that new models no longer treated the household as an undifferentiated "black box" and came to take account of differences within the household. For example, an interest in "cross-class marriages" (in which husbands and wives were, in terms of occupation, of different classes) developed, and the consequences of these differences were explored in a variety of ways (McCrae, 1986). Particular attention was paid, as might be expected, to those households wherein the wife was of a higher social class than her husband. One might argue that this might further lead to the weakening of the association between class and masculinity or serve to remind us that, in interactional terms, the impact of class and the elaboration of class-based identities might vary according to the different sites within which an individual was involved. Thus a working class man married to a middle class women might have a different sense of class at home than at work, where some of the more traditional solidarities might still be relevant.

Such conclusions, however, may be premature. For one thing, the class differences within many cross-class households were relatively small and were based on occupational criteria that might not necessarily be of any relevance, certainly outside the workplace. In short, the objective measures of class might not necessarily translate into more subjective processes of class experiences and identities. However, the presence of cross-class households constituted one piece of a larger jigsaw that, when completed, would show a much more complicated relationship between class and gender.

One relatively underexplored theme might be mentioned. Classically, class (based on economic criteria) was distinguished from status, where issues of prestige and esteem were central. However, as both were aspects of social stratification, it was frequently the case that the distinctions became blurred. Status considerations could reinforce class distinctions (as in cases where we get a merging of economic and cultural capital) or could cut across them and, presumably, weaken their political effectiveness. In the male breadwinner model, it could almost be said that class and status frequently overlapped and, further, that the distinction between them was gendered. Thus men tended to be to the fore in matters of class and class struggle, and women were involved in maintaining and reproducing everyday status distinctions through their domestic labor, their parenting, their organization of consumption, and their general moral demeanor within the local community. Partly as a result of the changes already discussed, men come to be more involved in status work and women in class work, and the distinction between the two modes of stratification, always difficult to maintain in practice, becomes even less easy to maintain.

It is likely, in fact, that the tensions between class and status have always been present and that a gendered understanding of stratification, especially one that takes masculinities seriously, might highlight some of these. Thus it can be argued that different ways of doing masculinity or of "being a man" can themselves constitute status divisions. This, indeed, is one of the consequences of thinking about hegemonic masculinities. One complex set of examples may be derived from considering issues of sexualities. Studies of young men, in particular, have shown how a notion of aggressive heterosexuality may be the basis of positive and negative status (Mac An Ghaill, 1994). However, sexual status hierarchies might not necessarily correspond to conventional notions of heterosexuality or homosexuality, as Lancaster's (2002) study of Nicaraguan men indicates that what is often

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 174

more important is a distinction between taking the active or passive role rather than the gender of the sexual partner. Clearly, such distinctions take place within conventional class divisions, although they do not necessarily undermine them.

What of the alleged decline in the centrality of class and its possible impact on hegemonic masculinity or patriarchy? Speaking very generally, it is possible to talk about a late-modern development whereby class and class divisions became less central and more complex. Alternatively, we may talk of a late-modern development in which class has become more simplified. In terms of the first, the lines of argument have already been indicated. This includes a decline in the overall salience of class (especially as related to occupation); a growing emphasis on other social divisions; a fragmentation of class divisions, identities, and the sites where class work is performed; and a blurring of the distinction between class and status. This last reflects a context within which consumption and leisure assume greater importance. We may also note organizational changes; for example, the development of "flatter" hierarchical structures, which might be seen as having the consequence of a reduction of class and status divisions at the place of work. These factors, in combination, might contribute to a weakening of patriarchal structures in general but will certainly undermine the masculinity of class. However, these finer, more complex class and status divisions might still be important in exploring the varieties of masculinities present in a late modern society.

A more simplified model, however, emerges if we take the idea of "life chances" seriously. Here we look at different combinations of economic and cultural capital and assess the consequences of these for the life chances of individuals. Theoretically, a large number of combinations may be possible, but in practice, we may talk of three major divisions. At the highest level, we have those with considerable amounts of cultural and economic capital and who are at the highest level of private organizations and state bureaucracies. This is clearly a minority, but also, increasingly, a global minority. For the most part, we are talking about men so that there are clear interactions between masculinities and class and status situations. One only has to look at the photographs of international top-level gatherings to become aware that we are dealing with the practices of men and the reproduction of hegemonic masculinities.

At the lowest level, we have those with relatively little economic and cultural capital (certainly little economic capital!) and with highly uncertain life chances. Terms such as *underclass* or *the socially excluded* have been developed to capture this group, although both terms have their problems. Thus Devine (1997, pp. 220-221) concludes, along with numerous other commentators, that the idea of an "underclass" is flawed, although it is possible to recognize the growth of a sizable minority (sometimes estimated as around 20%) of people in poverty in both the United States and the United Kingdom. This is, clearly, not an exclusively masculine group, and, indeed, it is often the case that the burdens rest more heavily on women, whether as single parents or as workers in low-paid, uncertain jobs. The dominant characteristics of this "class" become magnified when seen through a global lens.

It is doubtful whether there is a single masculinity that can be identified with the socially excluded, although certain public representations are highly gendered. Thus media representations stress themes of masculine violence, either collective (as in rioting) or more individualistic. Or there are themes that concern absent fathers and the lack of a stable adult male role model. Dominant themes are those to do with either a failed masculinity, the lack of opportunity to live up to what is expected in terms of being a provider, or stigmatized forms of masculinity. Thus Savage (2000) writes: "working-class work has been constructed as 'servile' work, which no longer bestows mastery or autonomy on its incumbent" (p. 153). However, even attempts to live up to hegemonic models of masculinity (as in the case of asylum seekers who might otherwise be characterized as heroic individuals) also become stigmatized.

Between these two extremes, there is the more fluid class situation characterized by different mixes of economic and cultural capital and different life chances. The middle group (which is not the same as some theoretical notion of "the middle class") may, for example, be ranged in terms of relative stability, and certainty of life chances, from the very stable or predictable at the top to the highly uncertain

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 175

at the bottom. It is here that the links between masculinities and class are becoming more various or more fluid. Although there are considerable differences within this broad middle category, whether these differences coalesce into class differences is a little more difficult to determine. Clearly, there are some occupations that are still shaped around strong constructions of masculinity; on both sides of the Atlantic, fire-fighters constitute one such occupational identity (Baigent, 2001). But whether members of such occupations construct themselves in terms of wider class identities remains open to question. The same might also be said of some newer occupational identities, such as "bouncers" or doormen, associated with developing leisure industries.

Up to now, apart from a few passing references, the analysis has been based largely in material and theories developed in the United Kingdom and, to a lesser extent, the United States. In terms of traditional class analysis, there might be some justification for this, as has already been argued. However, there are good reasons to doubt whether such an analysis can be straightforwardly transplanted to countries outside Europe and Anglophone nations. For example, Scott (1996) argues for a variety of capitalist classes and suggests that the variations as such the "Latin" model might be shaped by familistic and kinship ties to a greater degree than late-modern models in the West. Such models of the capitalist class also deploy different constructions of masculinity. Bertaux (1997) argues that most studies of social mobility (the kinds that have proliferated in Britain and the United States) tend to assume a relatively stable political order, within which such class movements take place. However, notions of mobility become much more problematic for those countries (such as the formerly communist nations of Eastern Europe) that experienced revolutionary upheavals that challenged notions of privilege and inequalities. The gendered implications of these major transformations have not been explored to any large extent.

A further challenge emerges when we abandon the implicit assumption that the nation-state is our unit of analysis and, instead, begin to explore flows and movements on a global scale (Urry, 2000). It remains an open question as to whether the class models, developed from the core writings of Marx and Weber and reflecting very particular historical events, can simply be translated to this more global framework. Similarly, it is doubtful whether a simple upgrading of the class struggle from the national to the global arena can be anything more than a first approximation of what is an increasingly complex situation. Thus Waters (1995), in a useful survey of globalization theories, argues against the strong model for the development of transnational classes. There are, however, an increasing variety of transnational class experiences (which also have relevance for the constructions of masculinities). A more fruitful line of analysis would seem to be to explore the different interpenetrations of the global and the local and the ways in which these shape and are shaped by classed and gendered experiences. For example, Waters notes how processes of consumption and production mingle in global cities: "Under globalization, migration has brought the third world back to the global cities where its exploitation becomes ever more apparent" (p. 93). Such meetings do not necessarily undermine the close associations between masculinities and other social divisions; indeed, they may well intensify it.

Conclusion

This chapter has argued that there has been a relatively underexplored theme in the analysis of social class; namely, its association with the construction of masculinity. Very broadly, it could be argued that in the early stages of industrial capitalism and up until the late 20th century, there was a relatively strong association between class and class practices and masculinities. As we move close to our own times, these connections have, in some cases, perhaps become more apparent, although in other cases, the links have become more obscure. The growing uncertainty in class analysis perhaps reflects and has an impact on what is sometimes, rather too loosely, called the crisis of masculinity.

This is not the place to elaborate on the problematic idea of that "crisis," which is discussed elsewhere in this volume. However, very simply, we may identify a model of stable masculinity against which any sense of crisis might be measured. Such a model would include a relatively high degree of congruence between public discourses about masculinity and the public and

private practices of masculinity. For individual men, there would be a sense of ontological security—a relatively stable sense of "being in the world." Even where a man may feel that he has fallen short of his responsibilities as a man (reflected, perhaps, in notions of dishonor or unmanliness), the standard by which he is seen to have fallen short remains relatively clear.

Such an ideal, typical model of masculinity could clearly accommodate and interact with hierarchies based in social class. Class divisions may have underlined the fact that there were different ways of "doing" masculinity (collective versus individual, hands versus brains, and so on), and these different modes of masculinity were reinforced by clear distinctions at work and between communities. To some extent, however, these differences might be seen as variations on a theme; the "respectable" breadwinning working man and the sober, rational member of the bourgeoisie might have a lot in common in terms of a sense of what it is to be a man, despite the large differences and oppositions in class terms. Put another way, class might be seen as a problem in terms of Marxist contradictions or more liberal notions of citizenship and social justice, but masculinity was not seen in this light. Hence class analysis remained ungendered for a long period of time, and it has been only in relatively recent times that any discussions of gender and class have come to focus on the practices of men rather than on those of women.

It is part of the argument of this chapter that the undermining of a relatively stable sense of masculinity (at least in its more public discourses) was associated with growing uncertainty about the nature and significance of class. Thus, the growing "presence" of women in all areas of social, political, and economic life presented a problem for conventional class analysis, just as it presented a problem for established or hegemonic masculinities. Both class and gender became challenged by the recognitions of other social divisions, such as race and ethnicity, age, sexualities, disabilities, and abilities. A great sense of fluidity in social life, brought about by flexibilities in working practices and the various complex strands of postmodernity and globalization, provided yet further challenges to both class and gender. More detailed historical and social analysis will be required to unravel the connections between class and masculinities, but it is hoped that this chapter makes clear that such a program would be worthwhile.

References

Acker, J. (1973). Women and social stratification: A case of intellectual sexism. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*(4), 936-945.

Baigent, D. (2001). *One more last working class hero: A cultural audit of the UK fire service.* Cambridge, England: Fire Service Research and Training Unit, Anglia Polytechnic University.

Bertaux, D. (1997). Transmission in extreme situations: Russian females expropriated by the October Revolution. In D. Bertaux & P. Thompson (Eds.), *Pathways to social class: A qualitative approach to social mobility* (pp. 230-258). Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Crompton, R. (1993). *Class and stratification.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Curtis, R. E. (1986). Household and family in theory on inequality. *American Sociological Review, 51*, 168-183.

Davidoff, L., & Hall, C. (1987). *Family fortunes.* London: Hutchinson.

Devine, F. (1997). *Social class in America and Britain.* Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

Elias, N., & Scotson, J. L. (1994). *The established and the outsiders* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Goldthorpe, J. H. (1983). Women in class analysis: In defence of the conventional view. *Sociology, 17*, 466-488.

Gullestad, M. (1992). *The art of social relations: Essays on culture, social action and everyday life in modern Norway.* Oslo, Norway: Scandinavian U. P.

Hobson, B. (Ed.). (2002). *Making men into fathers: Men, masculinities and the social politics of fatherhood.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lancaster, R. (2002). Subject honor, object shame. In R. Adams & D. Savran (Eds.), *The masculinity studies reader* (pp. 41-68). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Lee, D. J., & Turner, B. S. (Eds.). (1996). *Conflicts about class: Debating inequality in late industrialism.* Harlow, England: Longman.

Lockwood, D. (1958). *The black-coated worker.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Mac An Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

10-Kimmel.qxd 3/5/2004 6:21 PM Page 177

MacCrae, S. (1986). *Cross-class families: A study of wives' occupational superiority.* Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Marshall, G., Rose, D., Newby, H., & Vogler, C. (1989). *Social class in modern Britain.* London: Unwin Hyman.

McLellan, D. (Ed.). (1988). *Marxism: Essential writings.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The power elite.* New York: Galaxy Books.

Morgan, D. H. J. (1996). *Family connections: An introduction to family studies.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Morgan, D. H. J. (2003). Everyday life and family practices. In E. B. Silva & T. Bennett (Eds.), *Contemporary culture and everyday life.* Durham, NC: Sociologypress.

O' Brien, M. (1981). *The politics of reproduction.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Pakulski, J., & Waters, M. (1996). *The death of class.* London: Sage.

Philo, G. (Ed.). (1995). *Glasgow Media Group reader* (Vol. 2). London: Routledge.

Porter, M. (1983). *Home and work and class consciousness.* Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

Roberts, R. (1971). *The classic slum.* Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

Savage, M. (2000). *Class analysis and social transformation.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Scott, J. (1996). Patterns of capitalist development. In D. J. Lee & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Conflicts about class: Debating inequality in late industrialism* (pp. 159-170). Harlow, England: Longman.

Thompson, P. (1997). Women, men and transgenerational family influence in social mobility. In D. Bertaux & P. Thompson (Eds.), *Pathways to social class: A qualitative approach to social mobility* (pp. 32-61). Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Tolson, A. (1977). *The limits of masculinity.* London: Tavistock.

Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond societies: Mobilities for the twenty-first century.* London: Routledge.

Walby, S. (1986). *Patriarchy at work.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Warin, J., Solomon, Y., Lewis, C., & Langford, W. (1999). *Fathers, work and family life.* London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation/Family Policy Studies Centre.

Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization.* London: Routledge.

Watson, W. (1964). Social mobility and social class in industrial communities. In M. Gluckman (Ed.), *Closed systems and open minds: The limits of naivety in social anthropology* (pp. 129-157). Edinburgh, Scotland: Oliver & Boyd.