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ABSTRACT

'It's something you do bro': Language and Identity on a Male Erotic Hypnosis Messageboard

by

Eric Nicholas Chambers

Advisor: Cecelia Cutler

Drawing on a seven-year corpus of data (total words N = 86,881) on a publicly-accessible messageboard on which self-identified gay men discuss their experiences undergoing erotic hypnosis, this study applies Critical Discourse Analysis methods to understand how posters understand their sexual identities and those of others. This study identifies the emergence of two main identity-types at-play on OnYourKnees: the jock and the coach. Jocks are generally characterized by a focus on sports and body-consciousness, a disinterest or inability to engage in scholarly/academic pursuits, and a desire to be submissive to others to achieve sexual pleasure. Coaches, on the other hand, are characterized by wisdom, dominance, and a desire to hypnotize others. Using Fairclough’s (1992) three-axis methodology for analyzing the relationships among language, ideology, and power, this study analyzes how participants on OnYourKnees simultaneously overlap numerous ideological frames, each with their own conceptions of power, onto their senses of Self and Other. On one level, jocks and coaches engage in identity practices largely congruent with ideologies of Americanized hegemonic masculinity, which stress the development of a single type of masculinity that is seen as paramount to all others. Through this framework, self-identified jocks and coaches create and maintain a binary-structure system that places some men (coaches) in positions of power, and others (jocks) in positions of willing subordination. This is demonstrated through an in-depth qualitative analysis of posts on OnYourKnees, the development of a specific ‘direct’ style of hypnotic trance that places listeners in positions of limited agency, and the deployment of orthographic tools that index self-identified jocks and coaches (analyzed using Halliday and Mathiessen’s [2004] Systemic-Function Linguistics). On the other hand, participants simultaneously align with a bondage/discipline/sadism/masochism (BDSM) ideology that stresses the importance of consent among all participants involved, and places both jocks and coaches on ideologically equal footing. Ultimately, this study demonstrates how Critical Discourse Analysis-inspired methodologies can be used to identify how multiple ideologies can be interwoven with identity construction to create and maintain complex subject positions.
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Introduction:

(1) Welcome jock slaves. If you've joined, your curious. Submit. Add [RE] to your [contact] list and he will work with you to hypnotize you to serve him and Coach. I am a slave myself, starting this group to help recruit for my master. I would not be doing this if the hypnosis was not working on me. Join, find your place [OnYourKnees]. [RE, 77:1]

Since its beginnings, the virtual world has been a prime environment for the exploration of identity: as Bullingham & Vasconcelos (2013) have noted, "online environments provide their users with the potential to perform and present different identities" (102). These emerging technologies encourage the exploration of different types of identities, where individuals can "constantly negotiat[e] to be identified as a certain type of person in social interactions" (Jackson & Seiler 2018, 764). Whether it be through the discussion of diagnoses of breast cancer (Gibson, Lee, & Crabb 2015), the sharing of coming-out stories that serve to connect rural LGBTQ youth to larger queer communities (Gray 2009), or personal recollections of being diagnosed with bipolar disorder (Jones 2005), online platforms have allowed individuals the possibilities of connecting with others who share like beliefs and experiences, and provide them the possibility to create, assert, and/or challenge identities that they feel are best representative of who 'they' are, and what they wish to be in their lives.

These virtual spaces provide for the development of what Foucault (Foucault, Martin, Gutman, & Hutton 1988) has termed 'technologies of the self,' which "permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality" (18). Asserting oneself (or one's Self) online can potentially allow individuals to talk about themselves, their
beliefs, and their desires in ways that may be denied them in the physical world, ideally allowing people to achieve ultimate happiness and perfection. Thoughts, feelings, and understandings of the world around them—thoughts that may have previously been seen as weird, odd, or dangerous—can be safely (more or less) shared by others regardless of physical distance, creating communities and support systems that transcend the physicality of one's own body.

This seems to be especially true for thoughts about sexual behaviors and desires: as Foucault (Foucault, Martin, Gutman, & Hutton 1988) has observed, "unlike other interdictions, sexual interdictions are constantly connected with the obligation to tell the truth about oneself" (16). When someone reveals something 'sexual' about themselves, be it an attraction or preference in (or out of) the bedroom, it is often interpreted as an intimate invitation into that person's soul, a 'true' reflection of a person's inner world that somehow 'means' more than the admission of a favorite ice cream flavor or pizza topping. As some researchers have observed, the sharing of sexual information can often change how a person is seen by those around them: consider, for example, the act of 'coming out' as non-heterosexual to others, and how the act has been culturally interpreted as an opportunity to view someone in a completely different light, akin to other speech acts that effect a material change within the world (Chirrey 2003).

Consider (1) above, which appeared on March 3, 2007 as the first message posted on OnYourKnees. OnYourKnees began life in 2007 as a messageboard which, as its homepage states, is primarily geared towards "men that enjoy hypnosis to get lean, fit, muscular, or huge; hypno for bodybuilding and muscle worship; and hypnotism for related fantasies (such as serving a coach, dumbing down, or being a jock slave)." This 'mission statement' of the messageboard thus constructs its audience using very specific terms: OnYourKnees is for men (who are assumed to be either gay or sexually attracted to other men) who wish to use hypnosis
for both physical development (i.e., fitness and bodybuilding) and the development of their sexual preferences.

But not just any sexual preference: OnYourKnees, as the last sentence of the mission statement makes clear, is geared specifically towards men who wish to explore particular fantasies, including *serving a coach, dumbing down, or being a jock slave*. Although the mission statement does not define the terms *coach, dumbing down, or jock slave*, the use of these terms aligns with multiple ideologies that dictate acceptable and desired behaviors, feelings, and ways of being. The presence of the word *slave*, for example, suggests that, on some level, the intended audience of OnYourKnees aligns with a sexual ideology that makes explicit contours of domination and submission, which brings the messageboard in line with a larger ideology of bondage/discipline/sadism/masochism (BDSM). The terms *coach* and *jock* reinforce these contours of dominance and submission while also reframing them in terms of both mentor/mentee relationships and an athletic environment. The term *dumbing down*, while also undefined, also alludes to the potential role that intelligence (or lack thereof) plays in the creation of identity among users on OnYourKnees.

Excerpt (1), as the first post contributed by a user of the messageboard, develops the mission statement further. In (1), RE first begins his post by welcoming to the site who he calls *jock slaves*, a phrase repeated in the mission statement. As with the mission statement, RE does not define what a *jock slave* entails, or who can lay claim to this appellation: however, he does concur that if someone has signed up for membership to the board, *your curious* about being one. In this phrase, RE utilizes an non-conventional spelling of the contraction *you're*, instead using the orthographic form aligning with the possessive *your*. He instructs readers to *submit* (though to what is left unclear), and asks readers to add him to their contact list (presumably in the hopes...
of contacting him outside of the confines of the messageboard), stating that he will assist them to hypnotize you to serve him and Coach. Further in his post, he self-identifies as a slave (though, again, he does not define what a slave is), and states that he would not be doing this if the hypnosis was not working on me, suggesting that posting this message (and, presumably, starting the messageboard) would not be something he would do if he was not hypnotized. Finally, he encourages readers to join the messageboard, and find [their] place. Clearly, in (1), RE is welcoming a particular type of poster to the messageboard.

What is particularly striking about RE's post in (1), however, is the lack of definition as to what, exactly, are meant by such phrases as jock slave, submit, and hypnosis. (1) supports the messageboard's mission statement by presenting an idealized user. However, the terms used to describe that user are left vague (intentionally or not), without much explanation or definition. The person who finds himself visiting OnYourKnees is seemingly left to discover what it actually means to be a slave or a master, a jock or a coach, and what the role of hypnosis is in the lives of these members.

When a viewer accesses the messageboard, they encounter additional semiotic information that further clarify the intended audience of the messageboard. The welcome message on the homepage also states that "this site does focus on the lust for muscle and male/male hypnosis, including hypnosis for other areas such as erotic, BDSM, pup play, robots, etc. but with the primary focus being jocks and muscle." Here, the use of the term 'BDSM' to describe some activity on OnYourKnees suggests that the messageboard, and to an extent the posters on the messageboard, identify their participation as part of a larger BDSM experience.

In addition to the above welcome message, an image accompanies the homepage (Image 1-1). This image consists of five separate components juxtaposed to create a single conception.
A black-and-white spiral serves as the background for three images of muscular men. On the left, a younger man wearing a t-shirt cut off just below the waist (exposing his well-developed abdominal muscles) is about to throw a football; he is looking away from the viewer, to his right. On the right is another man, also with well-developed musculature and holding a football; however, he is not wearing a shirt, and he is looking down at the football, smiling. Towards the bottom of the image, a third man is in a kneeling position, wearing a black (what appears to be leather) harness and jockstrap, and with a metal chain attached to a collar; unlike the other two men, he appears to be looking directly at the camera. At the top of the image is the name of the messageboard, emblazoned in red text.

Image 1-1: accompanying image to homepage of OnYourKnees (name of messageboard blurred out):
Each of these components coalesce into a singular (visual) image that neatly supports the 'ideal' identity type described (textually) on the homepage: a man who is into sports, who is sexually available, and who is easily hypnotizable.

Thus began OnYourKnees, a messageboard that eventually grew to over 2,800 members and over 500 active posters sharing their thoughts and beliefs, engaging in erotic fantasies with each other, and explaining their desires to be certain types of men. The welcome message and image on the board's homepage, as well as RE's initial post, describe a certain type of (gay) man: one who is easily identifiable (or who wishes to identify) as a jock, one who wishes to be submissive to a coach, and one who wishes to use tropes of hypnosis to achieve an idealized sexual identity. As the messageboard grew in popularity, additional posters expanded on the meaning of the terms jock and coach, and what behaviors and ideologies are integral to those identities. Posters discussed the importance of hypnosis in the realizations of their sexual desires, with some users even posting their own hypnotic trances for the messageboard to critique and compliment. Fights broke out about some users' behaviors and messages, which led to larger-scale discussions on what are and are not acceptable topics for discussion. Some users only posted one message to the messageboard, while others continued to contribute throughout its lifespan. Ultimately, a tightly-knit community of practice grew out of OnYourKnees, providing a space for men to share their desires of being a fully-realized sexual being, on their terms.

Language, of course, plays an exceptional role in the creation and maintenance of the OnYourKnees community. As a casual observer reads through the posts on OnYourKnees, they begin to notice certain emergent patterns that remain remarkably consistent among posters.
Some posters are consistent in their usage of 'proper' standard American English orthography, including strict adherence to capitalization rules and spelling conventions, while others revel in the use of non-standard orthography (what would normally be considered spelling and orthographic 'mistakes'). Posters who discuss hypnotic trances seem to favor one particular style over others, characterized by the use of strong modal verbs (or their complete lack) and regular repetition of key phrases. The use of the terms *sir, master,* and *Coach* seem to be entirely reserved for some members of OnYourKnees, while other posters would not dream to be referred to as such.

All of these linguistic patterns, this dissertation will argue, help construct posters on OnYourKnees in specific ways, and allow posters to view themselves and others through very particular lenses. This dissertation will explore the ways in which posters on OnYourKnees engage in the exploration of a particular type of identity: gay men who wish to become jocks, who wish to be sexually submissive to others, and who wish to incorporate hypnosis into their beliefs and practices. On one level, posters use the terms *jock* and *coach* to index a panoply of desires, beliefs, and behaviors that they use to structure their identities, and that many claim are fundamental to who they are. This dissertation, in part, will explore how posters create a world in which jocks and coaches align with a particular view of American masculinity that privileges body-consciousness, an active engagement in sports-like activity, and a marked de-emphasis on intelligence. Simultaneously (and somewhat contradictory), however, self-identified jocks place themselves, and are placed by others, in a subordinate position (both socially and erotically) to coaches: self-identified jocks often actively espouse a strong desire to be submissive to coaches, and to cater to their every (primarily sexual) desire. Jocks, as this dissertation will argue, thus occupy a tenuous position vis-a-vis traditional tenets of masculinity: at once, they espouse both a
love of sports and physical strength, and a strong desire to be subordinate (or, as RE puts it in (1), submit) to coaches.

But looking at the activity solely through constructions of masculinity obscures the way that identity is intricately interwoven with power on OnYourKnees. If jocks construct themselves as subordinate to coaches, and are therefore viewed as powerless, then how can one make sense of conversations among posters that describe appropriate and inappropriate behavior of coaches? On another level, this dissertation will argue that, far from being disempowered, jocks on OnYourKnees demonstrate great agency in determining who they would like to be, and how they would like to accomplish the attainment of their ideal identities. Analyzing how power is claimed and disclaimed by posters on the messageboard, and how erotic desires are discussed and enacted, can provide great insight into how individuals might conceptualize the very notions of power and desire themselves, and how those fundamental conceptions may provide strategies for resisting old ideologies and creating new identities.

To be a successful participant on this messageboard, then, requires that posters know what the 'rules' are of the world they create, and how to successfully apply (or, in some cases, bend) those rules to suit their individual needs. It also requires an understanding of ideologies that exist both within the messageboard itself—ideologies that dictate not only how to be an accepted poster on the messageboard, but also what it means to be a gay male—and outside the world of the messageboard, which may look upon the activity of posters with suspicion and distrust.

The dissertation will be structured as follows. Chapter 1 will provide an overview of ideologies of identity in sociolinguistics, and explain how a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework is best suited to understanding how identities are enacted on OnYourKnees. Chapter
provides a brief overview of both the messageboard itself (including the corpus under study), and the methodologies used to analyze the corpus. Chapter 3 will discuss the role that hegemonic masculinity plays on OnYourKnees, with special concentration on how self-identified jocks and coaches index their subordination and domination (respectively) through the selective use of tenets of hegemonic masculinity. Chapter 4 will incorporate theories of bondage/discipline/sadism/masochism (BDSM) ideology into a discussion of how jocks and coaches, while indexing their subordination and domination, simultaneously create a world in which consent of sexual activity is seen as sacrosanct, and all posters demonstrate power in understanding who 'gets' to post on OnYourKnees. Chapter 5 will discuss how posters incorporate textual tropes of hypnosis into their posts, as tools for both indexing submission and understanding what it means to be a consenting individual on the messageboard. Chapter 6 will look at the textual practices of posters on OnYourKnees, and argue that self-identified jocks and coaches exploit distinct orthographic tools to index their identities, sometimes in creative ways. Finally, Chapter 7 will summarize the findings of the dissertation, and highlight avenues for further research.
Chapter 1: Background research

When first looking at the discourses that posters on OnYourKnees create, and the types of identity work posters engage in, a casual observer will most likely notice two words pop up over and over again: jock and coach. On OnYourKnees, this dissertation will ultimately argue, the terms jock and coach are not merely words that posters use to describe themselves and others: rather, they represent a panoply of behaviors, desires, wishes, attitudes, and orientations towards the world that are fundamental to how posters construct themselves, others, and the world around them. Participants on OnYourKnees use these terms to discuss who they want to be, how they want others to perceive themselves, how they wish to view others, and how they orient themselves towards the world.

The terms jock and coach, however, do not exist merely in a vacuum on OnYourKnees, nor do the attitudes and behaviors they elicit: rather, they are intimately intertwined with larger ideologies of what it means to subscribe to an Americanized jock identity. In many ways, the behavior of posters on OnYourKnees aligns very closely with ideologies of hegemonic masculinity that privilege one particular way of being 'masculine' over others, especially concerning an emphasis on sports and body-consciousness as a key component of posters' identity. At the same time, however, the terms jock and coach suggest a submissive/dominant relationship that seems to be at-odds with traditional conceptions of hegemonic American masculinity: as will be explained in subsequent chapters, many self-identified jocks on OnYourKnees revel in the desire to be submissive to coaches, and actively construct themselves as such. Posters on OnYourKnees therefore negotiate a tricky balance between an adherence to a 'jock' identity on the one hand, and a desire to be submissive to other males on the other.
To make sense of how these terms acquire the saliency that they do, it is important to first situate the activity of posters on OnYourKnees within larger frameworks that take into account relationships between language and identity, ideology, and power. After a brief discussion of sociolinguistic conceptions of identity, this introduction will provide an overview of Critical Discourse Analysis, and justify its use as a framework for this analysis.

Sociolinguistic conceptions of identity:

Within sociolinguistics, studies of identity—often reduced in the general cultural consciousness to 'who you are'—have moved away from earlier paradigms that related individuals' uses of linguistic variables to larger social categories (such as race, class, sex, and gender) that were seen as *a priori* and static. Earlier studies that treated these larger categories as unchanging social 'facts' have gradually given way to more contemporary understandings of identity that acknowledge the social construction of these previously-considered *a priori* categories, and how people use language to not only define themselves and others, but how they participate in the construction and maintenance (and, in some cases, challenging) of these categories. Many sociolinguists (e.g., Ochs 1993; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1995; Bucholtz and Hall 2004, 2009, 2016; Cameron 2005) now understand that identity is performative and flexible, able to be tailored to individual situations and needs: identity is not what someone *is*, but what someone *does*. Bucholtz and Hall (2009) perhaps best capture this conceptualization in their definition of identity as "a relational and socio-cultural phenomenon that emerges and circulates in local discourse contexts of interaction rather than as a stable structure located primarily in the individual psyche or in fixed social categories" (18). Identity is not a 'fixed' quality of an individual, but rather one that is "constituted in particular contexts through particular practices"
(Cameron 2005, 488). The idea that identity is situated in practice recognizes that people participate in multiple (and sometimes overlapping) communities of practice, each with its own demands and expectations of its members. Sociolinguists who study identity focus on understanding how peoples' conception of who they and others 'are' can shift from situation to situation and from community to community, sometimes in drastic and contradictory ways. Language plays an integral role in the creation and maintenance of these conceptions of self and Other, especially when multiple tensions exist between a person's self-ascription (who they assert themselves to be) and identities conferred onto them by others.

In this view, identity then becomes "a practice, rather than a category, an active constructed performance rather than a pre-existing role" (Bucholtz, 1999, p. 7). Many sociolinguists do not deny the very real limitations that such socially-constructed hegemonic categories as 'race,' 'class,' 'gender,' 'ethnicity,' and others exert on the expression of their identities. But understanding identity as an active practice suggests that the 'pre-existing roles' that individuals are often grouped into, and that rely on the existence of these macro-categories, can allow individuals to coalesce around some seemingly shared qualities while simultaneously forcing individuals into socially-constructed categories they may not align with. Individuals, as Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (2007) note, are "thinking, speaking being[s], an active agent within a social world constructed through interaction with others" (478). The creation and maintenance of identity is thus an active, agentive process that is "emergent, contextual, and intersubjective [...and] constantly open to renegotiation" (Davis, Zimman, and Raclaw 2014, 3).

An individual's identity is not borne within a vacuum: identity is created through interaction with others. People choose to be members of communities, and that choice allows them to take on or reject the identities that come along with those memberships. Stressing the
creation and maintenance of one's identity as an active process highlights a person's agency in picking and choosing those social categories that are relevant in a particular place in time. This not only holds for individuals who are part of a particular community of practice at a particular point in time, but also for individual life histories, where peoples' conception of Other can extend to both past incarnations of self, and potential future incarnations. Many researchers (i.e., Johnstone 1996; Inoue 2004; Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 2007; Iedema and Caldas-Coulthard 2008) have specifically focused on how individuals' conceptions of self can change throughout history, and how people integrate new experiences and world-views into who they are. As Iedema and Caldas-Coulthard (2008) claim, "we are criss-crossed with meanings, resources, feelings, and regimes of being that reference a multitude of others, other places, other times and other practices" (4). These 'others' constantly inform both who we are and who (we thought) we once were.

Identity is thus an achievement, not an assignment (Bucholtz, 1999): an "interplay between the individual and the social – a meeting point where the discourses of the society meet the voices of the mind through the use of language" (Pietikäinen and Dufva 2006, 205). But even though many researchers dealing with identity highlight its agentive aspect, some critics have maintained that much research on identity still takes for granted the existence of larger, hegemonic social categories that (they theorize) have enormous impact on how people view themselves and others. As Bucholtz and Hall (2004) have noted, "critics have charged researchers of identity with essentialism, a theoretical position that maintains that those who occupy an identity category (such as women, Asians, the working class) are both fundamentally similar and fundamentally different from members of other groups" (374). To critics, these
researchers still rely on easily-recognizable and -nameable categories that they often define in advance, and into which they try to 'fit' subjects.

In an opposite vein, Lemke (2008) criticizes the notion of agency in identity—the idea that individuals are more or less free to choose which aspects of identity they wish to show in a particular communicative moment. He claims that this view of identity "legitimates the dominant ideology of autonomous individuals as morally responsible for their actions and the life-consequences of their cumulative choices" (22). For Lemke, identity-types that can easily be labeled (whether by the community-in-question or by the researchers themselves) can be problematic in that they often lead to the creation of a binarization between two identity-types (e.g., man vs. woman, rich vs. poor, gay vs. straight), that can assign power to one side of the binary over another. This binarization, as Lemke notes, "favours the power of those who benefit from illusory political alliances which group together different coalitions as members of the 'mainstream' or 'majority' or dominant category in each case, even though it is only this small powerful minority which is always included in all these coalitions" (22-23). Researchers who acknowledge the agency of individuals in defining themselves while also using identity categories in their own research inadvertently find themselves in a double-bind: individuals are 'free' to choose whatever identity they wish (so-called 'emancipating' themselves from restrictive identity categories), but researchers constrain those identities by labeling them and parceling out individuals into categories—the same process that is used by those in power to maintain their power to begin with.

Two related points must be made to the criticisms above. First, it may be the case that, in many communities, labeling is a tool used by those in power to justify their own position within the community (such as with the concept of markedness vs. unmarkedness, e.g. Bucholtz and
Hall 2004). But often times, those same labels are eagerly taken on by members of the community and incorporated into their conceptions of self and Other, often in positive and affirming ways. As this dissertation will illustrate, the terms coach and (especially) jock are actively taken on by posters on OnYourKnees, representing attitudes, beliefs, and world-views that they attach positive qualities to and actively work to align themselves with. It is difficult to dismiss these positive feelings towards labels as merely a tool to maintain a particular type of hegemony, even if that is (partially) the result of incorporating such labels into conceptions of identity. Second, labels, and those who use them, are never static: not only can individuals filter in and out of the categories those labels describe, but the meanings of those labels can change with time, and can be used as tools of emancipation from previously-confining meanings. To be 'Black,' 'gay,' or a 'woman,' and to take on identities associated with those labels, is just as much a social act as having those identities inscribed.

But if identity is now viewed as malleable and elusive, how can it still be conceptualized as an object of study? As Bucholtz and Hall (2004) have noted, although many researchers have focused on how individuals construct their identities, consistent frameworks that can be used to study the process of identity formation and maintenance are less likely to be found. Bucholtz and Hall attempt to provide such a framework by claiming that identity, on a fundamental level, is primarily organized around an ideology of sameness and difference: "[sameness] allows for individuals to imagine themselves as a group, while [difference] produces social difference between those who perceive themselves as unlike" (369). Highlighting the importance of sameness and difference as a fundamental hallmark of identity lets two important points emerge. First, what constitutes sameness and difference can vary from community to community, and even historically within the same community: this allows for the possibility of identity to be
fluid, as the parameters of sameness and difference constantly change. Second, sameness and
difference do not (and indeed, can not) happen independently of one another. When one
individual or group declares an identity based on similarity to others, they are necessarily co-
constructing and Other against which their identities are based. Sameness and difference,
ultimately, are two sides of the same coin.

These contours of sameness and difference, Bucholtz and Hall continue, can manifest
along three different axes, which they term tactics of intersubjectivity: adequation and
distinction, authentication and denaturalization, and authorization and illegitimation.
Adequation "involves the pursuit of socially recognized sameness [...where] potentially salient
differences are set aside in favor of perceived or asserted similarities that are taken to be more
situationally relevant" (383). Distinction, on the other hand, occurs when social actors construct
differences along which identities can fall. Often (though not always), axes of adequation and
distinction within a community reflect power relations, in that the ability to decide what
constitutes sameness and difference is reserved for socially-powerful groups. Authorization and
illegitimation "involve the attempt to legitimate an identity through an institutional or other
authority, or conversely the effort to withhold or withdraw such structural power" (386).
Authorization and illegitimation often require the input of larger social/institutional forces that
give those identities social standing, or denies it to them: here, social power also plays a role,
because those groups that influence these social/institutional forces can decide who is authorized
to have a particular identity, and whose identities are illegitimated. Authentication and
denaturalization concern "the construction of a credible or genuine identity and the production of
an identity that is literally incredible or non-genuine" (385). Again, often (but not always)
authentication and denaturalization rely on community members viewing identities as having
certain inalienable qualities integral to them, and understanding what is needed to be possessed (i.e., skin color, socioecocominc standing) by individuals to successfully enact those identities.

Although each of these tactics of intersubjectivity are individually important in the formation of community conceptions of identity, they do not have to be in play at all points equally among community members, and they may fall along different axes among different members and institutions. What is considered 'adequate' criteria for assuming a particular identity (e.g., 'wealthy') may differ considerably among two wealthier individuals (who might joke about a third person being 'poor' when they cannot afford a luxury vacation), or among two individuals of lesser socioeconomic means (whose lack of wealth can manifest in more concrete ways that demonstrate immediate need, such as not being able to afford to feed their family). Here, although the mechanism of adequation/distinction is the same in identities are being ascribed based on wealth, the specific criteria for meeting those identities (i.e., the authetication/denatruialization axis) differ significantly, and a person of lesser economic means may have a difficult time being convinced that someone who cannot afford a luxury vacation is not 'wealthy.' Similarly, axes of authorization/illegitimation may not be particularly relevant in the above discussions among community members, but can have a much greater impact in terms of how the state views those individuals (which manifests, for example, in official 'poverty levels' being calculated and used as thresholds for receiving government assistance).

Regardless of how these tactics of intersubjectivity manifest, language is the medium through which identity and society interact, where individuals engage with their communities through "biographically-ordered repertoires of linguistic resources dynamically shaped by complex life trajectories" (Tagg, 2016, 60). A key goal in many sociolinguistic studies is to highlight the ways in which language is used to shape both one's own identity and the identity of
others. Many sociolinguists, for example, have noted the role that indexicality plays in identity 
formation and maintenance. Indexicality, according to Ochs (1993), occurs when linguistic 
features become linked to extra-linguistic social categories through a chain of association. A 
particular linguistic feature (be it phonological, morphological, syntactic, or even orthographic) 
becomes linked to a particular quality that exists 'outside' of language itself. Over time, and 
through reproduction by others, that linguistic feature becomes associated with that extra-
linguistic quality, marking it as an index of that quality. Indices can be relatively direct (or first-
level ordered), in that they reflect the immediate relationship of one speaker to another (such as 
when a French speaker chooses between tu and vous to address another), or they can be more 
abstract (second-level ordered), reflecting and reifying larger social ideals and categories of race, 
class, gender, nationality, etc. (also see Silverstein 2003). Once this indexical relationship is 
established, it then becomes an available tool that speakers can use, or must negotiate around, 
when they use language.

A key component to the recognition of an indexical relationship is its citationality: as 
Barrett (2017) notes, indexical signs "succeed only if they are recognized as citations" (16). In 
order for a linguistic form to be recognized as an index, according to Barrett, it must continually 
be re-asserted among a population until it becomes reified (cf. Wenger 1998)–recognized by a 
community as an 'object' that, like a physical counterpart, can be utilized, observed, and 
manipulated. These indices can then become available to for individuals to, for example, take a 
stance towards or against (Dubois, 2007), aligning or disaligning with the values inherent in that 
index. But it is only through this process of repeated citationality that these indices can be 
recognized, and thus stanced towards or against.
Examples of the process of linguistic citationality-at-work can be seen in studies that analyze the interplay between language and desire (e.g., Kulick 2000; Cameron and Kulick 2003a, 2003b). As a sociohistorical construct, desire has its roots in late 19th-century psychoanalytical theory that distinguished between 'desire' (representing individual wants and attachments), and 'Desire,' a more nebulous concept that interacts with and constrains individual manifestations of desire. Cameron and Kulick (2003a) trace these conceptualizes of desire first through Freud's conception of libido, where sexual desire is present from birth and then channeled into socially-acceptable relationships, through Jacques Lacan's understanding of desire as associated with absence and loss, specifically through separation from the mother (when a child realizes they must fend for themselves) and the seemingly never-ending quest to reclaim a sense of wholeness and contentment arising from that separation. For theorists such as Lacan, desire and sexuality become intimately linked because those desires to become 'whole' again are projected onto those we think can satisfy those needs.

However, as Cameron and Kulick claim, the historical linking of desire with sexuality has led to a false understanding of desire that "block[ed] any inquiry into the semiotic processes through which desire, of all kinds (not only homosexual, and indeed not only sexual) is constituted and communicated" (Cameron and Kulick 2003b, 94). Desire is not just about who, but about what—it encompasses desires for food, for comfort, even for inanimate objects. Desire is thus not only limited to the purely sexual: as Cameron and Kulick (2003b) note, "just as sex is not all that is relevant to the construction and communication of sexual identity, sexual identity is not all that relevant to the construction and communication of sexual meaning" (xi, italics in original).
But in order for desire to be understood by a community as desire, it must be recognized as such: desire becomes recognizable through its citationality. This citationality, furthermore, can be constructed on a local level: "the iterability of particular codes signifying desire is what allows us to recognize desire as desire. Because they are iterable, semiotic practices like language are not context-bound, nor are they limited to particular speakers" (Cameron and Kulick 2003b, 127, italics in original). The linguistic citationality of desire circulates in local, regional, and global circles, with each circle contextualizing that desire in particular ways. This citationality can be seen in an episode of the American television show The Simpsons. In one scene, the patriarch of the family, Homer, is laying on his couch and watching a commercial for a candy bar with his daughter Lisa (who has been worried about his health due to his obesity). The candy in question is advertised to be particularly decadent: images are shown of caramel being slowly drizzled onto a chocolate bar, and the breathy voice of an unseen woman explains that the candy bar is coated in chocolate, butter, and three(!) kinds of sugar. Homer is then seen reacting to this commercial by breathing heavily and salivating: when the commercial ends, he slowly exclaims ohhh yeah. It is made clear that Homer is very desirous of the candy bar, but this desire can only be recognized as such if the semiotic tools of both the commercial and Homer's response are recognized by the audience. The woman's breathy voice circulates in an environment where that vocal quality is recognized as a sign of erotic stimulation, while the images of the candy bar juxtaposed over the voiceover contributes to a sense of erotic desire. Homer recognizes the goal of the commercial, and begins to act in ways that correlate with cultural conceptions of (male) sexual arousal (intense concentration, heavy breathing) that culminates with an exclamation that, at least in media representations, accompanies sexual release. Although no sex has taken place within the scene, the audience is meant to understand
that Homer views the commercial as an erotic experience: the audience recognizes this because of the (re)citation of the semiotics of arousal that are transposed onto Homer's viewing experience.

The goal for linguists who work in the field of language and desire, then, is to understand how desires are created and circulated through language, for "language produces the categories through which we organize our sexual desire, identities, and practices" (Cameron and Kulick 2003b, 19). The sociohistorical circumstances of how desire is circulated, dissected, and discussed among global, regional, and local communities of practice must also be understood: larger social ideologies that transcend local levels help shape what (or who) is considered desirable, and who can do the desiring. Much research has been dedicated to more fully understanding how desire is enacted through language (e.g., Billig 1999; Ahearn 2003; Kang 2003; Valentine 2003; Piller and Takahashi 2006; Baker 2008; Manning 2015; Barrett 2017).

Kang (2003), looking at the practice of beauty spells among the Petalangan in Indonesia, claims that their efficacy lies, in part, by the "disclaiming [of] one's own agency as well as by invoking the authority of the ancestors' voices embedded in a specific type of formula" (154). Spells have their power, in part, because they are an effective method of demonstrating one's own agency, specifically because they can deny the agency of others with whom they wish to fall in love; spells also gain their efficacy because they are linked to historical continuities (words of beauty spells are interpreted as being from ancestors) and supernatural realms—without which, the spells would have no power. Ahearn (2003) argues that increased literary practices among Nepali women allow them to better express their desires through writing, a medium which, in itself, was linked to increasing stances towards Westernization. As opposed to previous circulating notions of 'love' as an independent entity that brings two people together (often without their agency),
women began to view love as an empowering force that emanated from themselves and which, ultimately, gave them greater agency. This 'new' version of love, Ahearn argues, was in itself tied to increasingly Westernized notions of success, including "a lifestyle based on formal education, knowledge of English, lucrative employment, the consumption of commodities, and a sense of self founded on individualism" (113).

By recognizing the changing ways in which desire is recognized and (re-)circulated within a community, sociolinguists can also understand how specific instances of desire are sociohistorically located within a larger continuum, and how changing notions of desire can reflect larger shifts within a community through changes in its indexical meanings. But indices do not always have relate the macro to the micro in a one-to-one relationship: indices can also be played with, sometimes in surprising and contradictory ways. Barrett (2017) notes, for example, that oftentimes "a sign (or set of signs) indexes an interactional component that is not normatively associated with the context involved" (17), a phenomenon he termed indexical disjuncture. According to Barrett, indexical disjuncture occurs when individuals (often, but not exclusively, socially disempowered in some way) who are not part of a particular group (often, but not always, seen as socially dominant) appropriate an index associated with that group. This appropriation can sometimes reflect a genuine alignment with the values and ideals of the dominant groups, but can sometimes (and, in many cases, simultaneously) serve to reconfigure the index's meaning and provide strategies for resisting and challenging those ideologies.

Barrett demonstrates indexical disjuncture in his study of the practices of African-American drag queens who appropriated a 'white woman' speaking style (marked by hyper-articulated [r] and end-of-word [ŋ], as well as by exaggerated rising intonations) in their drag presentations. Many of the drag queens in Barrett's study identified as African-American, and
their biographical experiences placed them on the lower end of the socioeconomic spectrum. By appropriating styles of speech that are recognized by the larger (White, Western, affluent) community as culturally-salient indices of a particular race, class, and gender position, and that at the same time are not congruent with their physical appearance, these performers highlight the disjuncture between the experiences of African-Americans and Whites, between men and women, and between wealthy and non-wealthy individuals. In addition, the appropriation of such styles allows for the possibility of shifting between styles, further illustrating the sociocultural production of these indices. As Barrett notes, because drag queens are judged by audiences on their presentation of a particular (White, upper-class) femininity, many in their on-stage performances style-shifted into a masculine (lower-pitched) voice and demeanor to remind the audience that the presentation they are seeing is exactly that—a *presentation*, which brings into focus the performativity and construction of all gender and class presentations.

In order for drag queens' presentations to be successful, then, they must not only be able to skillfully manipulate the various indices that reflect different gender and class positions, but they must also be able to know what those indices are, and present them in such a way that is recognizable and digestible to their audiences. The recognition of these indices, and the ability to recast them in different lights, depends on the recognition of larger-scale, hegemonic ideals (or ideologies) that proliferate throughout a particular population. Although linguists have worked with various definitions of 'ideology,' as Woolard (1998) has claimed, all definitions of ideology tend to encompass the sense of "politically and morally loaded ideals about social experience, social relationships and group membership" (9). For Irvine and Gal (2000), ideologies are "suffused with the political and moral issues pervading [any] particular sociolinguistic field and are subject to the interests of the bearers' social position" (35). Although, in many cases,
ideologies are not readily recognizable to speakers, they may often be consciously aware that the linguistic choices they make reflect a particular ideology: speakers thus have the capacity to demonstrate active agency, often relating their language use (via pre-established indices) to the ways in which they and others should act, display their values, and engage in daily life.

Many conceptions of ideology tend to assume that a single ideology, held by a group of individuals who see themselves (or are seen by others) as having social power, attempts to assert its domination over those held by marginalized groups. However, even within marginalized groups, ideologies can develop that can help determine membership within those groups: in fact, as Barrett (2017) has noted, "the emergence of subcultural identity requires the emergence of normativity within a more local language ideology" (218-9). Subcultures often develop in opposition to larger, hegemonic ideologies, but these subcultures can also develop ideologies about who belongs (and, just as importantly, who does not), and be subject to the same exclusionary ideals that they may have fought against in the first place. African-American drag queens' presentations are effective, in part, because they skillfully highlight the contrasts between the experiences of the stereotypical 'rich white woman' and the biographical experiences of the drag queens: however, this contrast (and, therefore, the performances) is not meaningful unless the performers also tap into an alternative ideology that portrays their experiences as racially/class-ly/gender-ly opposed to that of the 'rich white woman.' Those who may not, or cannot, buy into this ideology (such as White drag queens) may have a more difficult time achieving an authentic performance in the same way. The performances of these drag queens are effective only inasmuch as they do circulate readily-identifiable ideologies of what it means, not only to be a 'rich white woman,' but also to be an African-American drag queen.
The assertion of one's identity, then, is fraught with tension. As individuals try to assert 'who they are,' they must often negotiate a tricky balance between conformity and individuality, and between accepting different ideologies and rejecting them, mediated in large part through the linguistic choices they make. If language is the medium between the individual and society, and identity its output, then the tensions that individuals experience in how to relate to their communities of practice must also be taken into account in any study of language and identity. This often involves not only looking at how individuals negotiate their memberships among multiple communities of practice, but also how they conform to, or confront, larger-scale identity categories (such as race, class, and gender) that fundamentally structure how one should act, and who one should be.

But how can one go about studying how these ideologies affect language and identity? Bucholtz and Hall (2009) note that "identity encompass (a) macrolevel demographic categories; (b) local, ethographically specific cultural positions; and (c) temporary and interactionally specific stance and participant roles" (21). Bucholtz and Hall stress the importance of focusing not only on the larger social categories that participants use to structure their identities, but also simultaneous attention to how those macro categories are reflected in participants' use of language. Participants have a vast array of semiotic tools, located on the macro level, that they can use in the formation of those identities, but they also have an equally-vast set of linguistic tools, manifested on the micro level and in interaction with others, that are just as important in the formation and maintenance of identity. It is important, then, to not only pay attention to how participants formulate their identities (and identities of others) through tactics of intersubjectivity, but also how those tactics can manifest within the language itself. This dissertation will argue that tools developed within Critical Discourse Analysis, specifically those
dealing with manifestations of power within language, can be crucially important in analyzing how messageboard participants formulate and discuss their identities on OnYourKnees.

Critical Discourse Analysis:

At its core, Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth referred to as CDA) "raises awareness concerning the strategies used in establishing, maintaining and reproducing (a)symmetrical relations of power as enacted by means of discourse [...and which contribute] to the fabric of discourse in which dominant ideologies are adopted or challenged, and in which competing and contradictory ideologies exist" (Hidalgo Tenorio, 2011a, p. 184). CDA is based on the idea that any text that is created and circulated within a population (be it written or spoken) carries with it ideologies of a particular group that are reflected throughout every aspect of the text, both in the linguistic structures present within the text and in readers' making sense of them. The term 'ideology' in CDA can best be defined as "significations/constructions of reality (the physical world, social relations, social identities) which are built into various dimensions of the forms/meanings of discursive practices, and which contribute to the production, reproduction or transformation of the relations of domination" (Fairclough 1992, 87). From a CDA perspective, ideologies constitute a set of practices and beliefs that "iron out' the contradictions, dilemmas, and antagonisms of practices in ways which accord with the interests and projects of domination" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 2007, 26). The key word in the above definitions is 'domination': in this view, all texts carry with them a view of 'reality' that, on some level, promotes the interests of a particular group at the expense of others: often times, this view is meant to be seen as the 'natural' and 'inevitable' order of things (Ainsworth and Hardy 2004). By privileging the experiences and viewpoints of one group over others, and by locating those
groups in positions of domination, ideologies become "the prime means of manufacturing consent" (Fairclough 2001, 3). Discourse, which reflects these ideologies, plays an integral part in justifying (or, in some cases, challenging) social orders that reflect who should control, who should be controlled, and why that order is (or, indeed, must be) the case.

Much of the theoretical basis for CDA has been borrowed from critiques of capitalist structures, and the hegemonic influence of capitalism in traditionally non-capitalist spheres (such as mass media, education, and politics, e.g. Chouliaraki and Fairclough 2007). As Wodak (2001) has explained, CDA can be historically situated within a larger context of critical theory that arose out of the Frankfurt School, a group of philosophers and social theorists who, beginning in the mid-20th century, criticized traditional Marxian approaches to the development of socialism, while remaining critical of capitalism and capitalist social structures. Among the influential theories of the Frankfurt School is a critique of what has sociohistorically been considered 'knowledge,' i.e. a set of observations and beliefs that are grounded, in some fundamental way, on a notion of 'truth' about the world. Adherents of the Frankfurt School understand 'truth' as, in itself, a sociohistorical construct that can often be manipulated to serve the aims of one group over others. Certain 'truths' become taken-for-granted within larger socioeconomic institutions and form the basis of systems of domination, while other 'truths' are marginalized. The ability to construct what is 'truth,' then, becomes a vital locus for control. CDA, as a sub-discipline of this critical theoretical viewpoint, arose in the 1970s, where greater attention was paid not necessarily to linguistic features of discourse, but to the power relations that undergird linguistic choice and difference.

CDA also reflects viewpoints present in the works of such theorists as Michel Foucault and Mikhail Bakhtin. Foucault (1978), for example, envisioned a dialectic between power and
knowledge existing within all social institutions, where systems of domination are intricately intertwined with the creation and maintenance of socio-ideological systems that justified this domination. Foucault's understanding of knowledge, as Jäger (2001) points out, included "all kinds of contents which make up a consciousness and/or all kinds of meanings used by respective historical persons to interpret and shape the surrounding reality" (33). Reality— including the ways in which we experience the world, and the meanings we subscribe to those experiences— is not an objective 'fact,' but becomes 'fact' through the mediums we use to interpret those experiences. Foucault argues that throughout the history of social science, certain types of information, and certain viewpoints through which to understand that information, were privileged as 'fact' and reconfigured as socially-neutral 'knowledge' grounded in discourses of truth, as 'just how things are'. This knowledge, and perhaps more importantly, the structures used to legitimate knowledge, allowed certain institutions and viewpoints to locate themselves in positions of domination to others. The growth of psychiatry as a science in the 19th century, for example, led to the construction of certain types of sexuality as 'normal' and 'natural,' while others (such as homosexuality) were seen as deviant from this norm, and therefore 'unnatural' and in need of intervention. As psychiatry developed and became accepted as a legitimate scientific field of inquiry, it gave the construction of homosexuality-as-deviance a 'scientific' justification which subsequently filtered through the general public consciousness and helped to legitimate the idea of same-sex attraction as ultimately threatening to the existing social order.

Knowledge, then, is not objective: it is shaped through the discourses used to examine, justify, and/or refute that knowledge. Discourse, as Jäger notes, "as a whole is a regulating body; it forms consciousness" (2001, 35). If discourse structures knowledge, and if knowledge is intimately related with power, then examining the structure of a particular stretch of discourse
should illuminate the power relations that structure such knowledge. A successful CDA analysis, then, should succeed

in not just describing discursive practices, but also showing how discourse is shaped by relations of power and ideologies, and the constructive effects discourse has upon social beliefs, identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and belief, neither of which is normally apparent to discourse participants. (Fairclough, 1992, p. 12)

Two important points are worth mentioning regarding the above. First, texts must originate somewhere: they are produced (sometimes by a single person, more often by multiple people) in particular sociohistorical circumstances, and they often work to effect some sort of change in the minds of readers. This effect is manifested both in content (what is being said) and form (how it is being said), and both work together to establish a particular ideological viewpoint that is then disseminated and consumed by an audience. When a reader engages with a text, their own viewpoints are thus (ideally) shaped by it. But this is not simply a top-down approach: in order for a text to be made sense of by readers, readers must be able to identify themselves within the text and position themselves for or against the ideologies present within it. This identification with the text can take on many forms: readers, for example, may be called upon to imagine themselves against a constructed Other that threatens the social order, a strategy that has been illustrated in many discourses that have been claimed to perpetuate racist ideologies (e.g., van Dijk 2008). In other cases, readers might be led to accept some forms of knowledge as more 'valid', and therefore more 'truthful,' than others. Jaekel (2016), for example, analyzed how students at a university with a majority White and Christian population demonstrated written resistance strategies to a documentary that placed LGBTQ issues within a larger framework of Christian tolerance and acceptance. She argues that many students used declarative sentence structures in their writings that framed the topics addressed in the documentary as abnormal, untruthful, and at odds with traditional Christian beliefs: this positioning reinforced the students'
knowledges as reflective of a 'privileged' (i.e., White, heteronormative, Christian) status that divided the world into a simple binary opposition between 'right' and 'wrong' thinking. By doing so, they "resist[ed] engaging in critical thought by positioning themselves as information correctors and truth-tellers of what is normal, what is true, and what is right [...] in essence, by indicating they are sole givers of truth, they further their power" (854).

However, if subjects are able to find themselves within a particular text, they might do so without realizing it. This speaks to Fairclough's second point above: the effects of ideology in shaping particular texts and its interpretations are not readily apparent to readers. As Wodak (2001) notes, "dominant structures stabilize conventions and naturalize them, that is, the effects of power and ideology in the production of meaning are obscured and acquire stable and natural forms: they are taken as 'given'" (3). The discursive strategies of texts perpetuate hegemonic ideals, in part, because they often do not make their ideological bases explicit: consumers of a text (and perhaps even its producers) may be unaware that texts are created and read with an ideological agenda in mind. The fact that these biases are not picked up on by most readers, in fact, can serve to strengthen their impact by presenting them as natural and without challenge: as Fairclough (1992) is careful to note, "ideologies embedded in discursive practices are most effective when they become naturalized, and achieve the status of discourse" (87). These ideologies, if effective, can gain the status of 'common sense' (Fairclough 2001), gaining the status of objective social facts that are (obviously) known to everyone.

However, none of this is to say that texts carry with them a single ideological agenda, nor are subjects merely passive receivers of such information. As ideologies inherent within texts are able to be absorbed and internalized by readers (perhaps as part of their habitus, e.g., Bourdieu 1991), readers are just as capable of recontextualizing and, in some cases, outright rejecting
those ideologies. As Chouliaraki and Fairclough (2007) note, "subjects are subjected [...] but subjects also act (as agents) constrained by these positions yet in ways which transform them" (25). In addition, texts do not often reflect a single ideology, but rather numerous, sometimes contradictory ones: as Fairclough (1992) notes, texts are made up "of forms which past discursive practice, condensed into conventions, has endowed with meaning potential. The meaning potential of a form is generally heterogeneous, a complex of diverse, overlapping and sometimes contradictory meanings [...] so that texts are usually highly ambivalent and open to multiple interpretations" (75). Meaning-making—the positioning of a subject in such a way to 'make sense' of the text—is never complete and absolute because of the presence of these competing ideologies, and the totalizing effect of ideologies are always only partially successful in their attempts to sustain relations of power and dominance. If subjects are produced within texts, then subjects themselves (and, by extension, readers) can become imbued with these multiple, contradictory interpretations. Subjects are thus both simultaneously created through the text, and able to transform it and allow for new possibilities of meaning-making: they "have the apparent paradoxical properties of being socially determined, yet capable of individual creativity; obliged to act discoursally in preconstituted subject positions, yet capable of creatively transforming discourse conventions" (Fairclough 2001, 140).

In this respect, CDA shares many affinities with the ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin's (1981) studies of the development of the novel. Bakhtin argued that the development of the novel as a literary genre signaled a fundamental shift in the history of literature, blending distinct and individual voices of characters and situating them within particular times and places in a way that no previous genre had done. In his analysis of the novels of Dostoyevsky and Rabelais, he understood their use of language as not merely the idiosyncracies of individual authors (which,
he argued, was how previous analysts had dismissed them), but rather as building upon and recombining features of previous literary genres (such as particular forms of poetry and the epic), recontextualizing their styles into previously-unseen blends. Since these previous historical forms, he argued, carried with them particular ideologies of how the world, and the actors within it, should be viewed, the recontextualization and blending of these features within the novel allowed for the juxtaposition and competition of multiple world-views (often reflected through the quoted voices of characters, which he argued was a key innovation of the novel). The proper linguistic analysis of the novel, then, lay squarely in how these ideologies and world-views competed with and challenged each other. He encapsulated this idea in his term heteroglossia, which he defined as "the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the past and the present, between differing epochs of the past, between different socioideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles, and so forth, all given a bodily form" (291).

The use of any linguistic form thus necessarily reflects a certain value and view of the world that necessarily enters into constant competition with other linguistic forms, and it is that competition that becomes the unit of linguistic analysis.

Thus, for CDA analysts, it becomes important to understand how multiple ideologies are woven within texts, and how they can provide sites of both conformity and resistance. Chouliaraki and Fairclough (2007) argue that how ideologies are present within a discourse can illuminate potential sites of resistance against domination. These methods can include colonization/appropriation (how one discoursal practice can be seen as being enforced from above, or uptaken from below, to achieve specific political ends), globalization/localization (how 'super'-orders of discourse are overlaid and/or reconfigured onto local populations), reflexivity/ideology (the manner in which larger ideologies are taken for granted or dissected),
and identity/difference (how individuals within a text are presented as like some, but unlike others). Analyzing how ideologies assert themselves, or are challenged, through these prisms, Chouliaraki and Fairclough argue, can ultimately serve to promote greater rights for all, and provide sites of resistance against dominant forces.

But how does one actually do CDA work? Many researchers who identify as CDA analysts (e.g., Fernández Martínez 2007) share Meyer's (2001) understanding that "there is no guiding theoretical viewpoint that is used consistently within CDA" (18). CDA welcomes both a variety of viewpoints and methodologies for undertaking a CDA analysis, a quality that has received extensive criticism. Some theorists, such as Wodak (2001), take a discourse-historical approach to CDA analyses, incorporating how different texts and genres have been deployed and (re-)contextualized within a particular population. Others (e.g., van Dijk 2008) introduce cognitive mental models into their analyses, adding a psychological component to their work.

This dissertation draws on the CDA methodological framework originally formulated by Fairclough (1992), later amended by Chouliaraki and Fairclough (2007). Fairclough (1992) argues that any text must simultaneously be viewed through three distinct, yet related, axes: an "analysis of the text, analysis of discourse processes of text production and interpretation (including the question of which discourse types and genres are drawn upon, and how they are articulated), and social analysis of the discursive 'event' in terms of its social conditions and effects at various levels (situationally, institutionally, socially)" (50). Because CDA assumes that the ideologies and subject positions interwoven within a text are intimately interrelated to the form that discourses take, it can sometimes be very difficult to divorce one axis from the other two in a clear and concise manner. However, it is important to further elaborate on what
each of these axes entail, beginning with the broadest and working to the most (discourse-specific):

**analysis of the discursive 'event':** Texts are not created in a vacuum: they are created and consumed by individuals who simultaneously occupy multiple social positions. The ideologies present within individual examples of discourse often reflect those of larger social forces and institutions that stand apart from, but also work themselves into, them. It is important, then, to understand how some of these larger forces contribute to the meaning-making of a document, and how they may influence the structure of a text. Many times, the ideologies woven into a discourse contradict one another, which can be both a source of conflict and resistance: identifying these larger forces can help to understand how individuals make sense of how discourses contribute to domination of one group over others. Jaekel's (2016) observation that the students in her study use declarative sentences as a strategy for resisting ideologies of LGBTQ tolerance may only be somewhat interesting in itself, but becomes more telling when placed within larger contexts that motivate those particular choices. Declarative sentences, according to Jaekel, align with a larger (White, heteronormative) Christian strategy that derives truth from biblical writings, and uses those writings as the basis for what is acceptable within a society and what is not. Conversely, the use of such knowledge presents conflicts within a larger university setting, where students are often expected to think 'critically' and examine their own beliefs (and, potentially, prejudices that support those beliefs). Students who use declarative sentences to justify their beliefs based on Biblical teachings thus both support and resist competing ideologies presented to them: supporting Biblical teachings (which they see as the
pursuver of 'truth') against an institution whose mode of pedagogy is constructed to be
diametrically opposed to such beliefs.

In a similar vein, Lozano-Verduzco's (2015, 2016) studies of the self-reported life
histories of gay men in Mexico argue that strong historio-cultural ideals of masculinity (as
exemplified by the idea of machismo) heavily influence the transition of his interviewees into
both self-acceptance and acceptance into gay social groups. He notes that, as his interviewees
became aware of their attraction to and desires for other men, they reflected their ideas of feeling
'different' through a discourse of femininity, because "there [was] no other concept that may refer
to homoerotic desires within a masculine identity" (2015, 452). Faced with a culture in which
discourses of heterosexuality and masculinity were intimately intertwined, Lozano-Verduzco's
interviewees initially identified their same-sex desires as falling outside of what was typically
'expected' of them as Mexican males: confronted with a strong binary-gendered system that
aligned desires for men with femininity, they typically reframed their desires, and often times
themselves, as 'feminine.' Only when his participants interacted with other gay men and began to
form gay social groups did an alternative ideology develop in their minds that weakened the link
between homosexuality and femininity. They were able to construct, if not necessarily fully, an
alternative view of masculinity that allowed for same-sex desires to exist within an otherwise
largely 'masculine' framework.

The studies above demonstrate that it is important to analyze how a particular discourse
(be it a reaction paper, a self-reported biography, or a co-constructed text on a messageboard),
both in its construction and in its understanding, is shaped by the discourses around it. By
understanding how larger-scale discourses provide frameworks within which to understand a
particular piece of text, the ways that individuals make sense of their experiences and identities through the text can also be better understood.

**analysis of discourse processes of text production:** Just as it is important to locate a discourse within a larger social web of conflicting and contradictory ideologies, it is just as important to understand what 'makes up' the discourse: what the discourse in question actually is, what other forms of discourse might be incorporated into the discourse-in-question (including those of genres, which Chouliaraki and Fairclough (2007) define as "a type of language used in the performance of a particular social practice" (56)), and how those different discourse-types interact with each other. Here, the idea of order of discourse becomes important, which focuses on "the socially ordered set of genres and discourses associated with a particular social field, characterised in terms of the shifting boundaries and flow between them" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 2007, 58). If text is heteroglossic, in that it reflects a pastiche of different voices and genres, then it makes sense to consider that some genres may be of particular importance to a community of practice, which are then deployed in a particular discourse to achieve a particular effect.

The deployment of orders of discourse becomes especially important when considering how readers can 'make sense' of texts, and how they, as subjects, are reflected through it. What is nominally considered to be a 'newspaper article,' for example, conforms to a particular genre that, as van Dijk (2008) notes, "ha[s] a conventional schematic structure consisting of such categories as summary (headline + lead), main events, background (previous events, context, history), comments and evaluation" (111-112). This 'conventional' structure identifies a particular piece of text as belonging to a 'newspaper report' genre—a genre which, it is often
assumed in the general cultural consciousness, to be impartial and unbiased. Thus, information presented in this manner may be seen by many readers to be unbiased, especially if the text of the article leads the (presumably uninformed and unassuming) reader to particular conclusions about its subjects. Each sub-section of a newspaper article, in addition, has its own standardized conventions: headlines, for example, are often only a few words long, are presented in larger font above the text of the article, and are intended to give the reader an idea of what they are about to read. Even in such a pithy, structured text, however, ideological biases can be seen: as van Dijk notes about a study of headlines of articles involving immigrants in Dutch newspapers, "not a single one was positive when it involved minorities as active, responsible agents" (112).

Ideologies of immigrants as being threatening to the social order (an ideology that serves a conservative agenda) become 'hidden' within standardized conventions, which are then analyzed as 'truth' by readers.

The choice of which orders of discourse to deploy, as well, can have consequences when looking at how subjects are presented through texts. Myketiak (2016), for example, analyzed how discourses of masculinity were presented through an autobiographical manifesto left behind by a mass shooter who killed multiple individuals (three women and one man) before killing himself. Myketiak argues that the shooter's writing privileged a particular form of masculinity that, despite what he saw as his best efforts, was ultimately unattainable to him while seemingly realized by others who he though were undeserving. As a self-identified half-White, half-Asian male, in his writings he often exploited racist ideologies that positioned the attainment of a 'White, blonde' girlfriend as an ideal goal that he felt he was more deserving of (because of his status of half-White) than others who were not White. The frustration he felt with his inability to achieve what he saw as a benchmark of success, in his manifesto, justified his violence towards
himself and others. But what seems to be just as important as the justification for his actions is
the vehicle through which he chose to express those motivations: an autobiographical manifesto.
By writing an autobiographical account of his motivations, he was able to construct a trajectory
of his own life that positioned himself as a victim of social forces around him, where "he alternat[ed] between referring to himself as an invisible, weak, good guy and a magnificent, superior god that posits that a beautiful, blonde girlfriend will provide him with recognition from others" (289). By claiming these two positions for himself through the genre of an autobiography, he constructed a (however unbelievable) identity for himself that served, at least in his mind, to justify his own actions and portray himself as the 'good guy'—a position he may not have been able to compile for himself through another genre.

The deployment of orders of discourse, then, becomes an important tool in constructing meaning-making within a text. The exploitation of genres within a text can guide the reader into viewing its subjects (and, by extension, the reader themselves) in particular ways that may be independent of the lexical choices used to describe those subjects. Newspaper headlines that portray immigrants in negative terms gain additional salience when presented in an order of discourse sociohistorically associated with 'truth' and 'neutrality.' Similarly, a mass murderer's manifesto portrays their actions and motivations in a particular light that reaches out to discourses of autobiography as a person's own 'truth.'

**analysis of the text:** Finally, a CDA analysis attunes itself to the specifics of the text under study, looking at how various linguistic structures are deployed to position subjects. In this regard, many CDA analysts use M.A.K. Halliday's (2004) systemic-functional theory of linguistics to look at what types of linguistic structures are present within a text, and how they
can be used to reflect ideologies. Halliday's systemic functional theory concerns itself with "how people utilize language together to achieve everyday social life and how social worlds are, in exchange, established in and through language" (Kazemian and Hashemi 2014, 1179). Key to a systemic-functional linguistics is the idea of choice: speakers of a language have a vast array of linguistic structures that allow them to make sense of the word around them, and speakers demonstrate great agency in choosing which structures best convey their experiences. These choices ultimately help speakers in "making sense of our experiences, and acting out our social relationships" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 29),

In his work, Halliday suggests that language possesses three metafunctions that help its users position themselves and others, and make sense of the world around them: he calls these ideational, interpersonal, and textual. The ideational metafunction of language concerns "the 'content' of a discourse: what kinds of activities are undertaken, and how participants in these activities are described, how they are classified and what they are composed of" (Huang and Wang 2014, 57). The interpersonal function of language deals with how individuals position themselves vis-a-vis each other and the world around them. Ideational functions, which represent "an interactive event involving speaker, or writer, and audience" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 106), include mood (how the speaker positions themselves and others within a given clausal structure) and modality (a speaker's/writer's degree of certainty about a propositional truth expressed within a clause). Textural functions concern how a message or text is organized, and is often discussed through the concepts of theme (what comes first within a clause) and rheme (what comes after). Each of these three metafunctions interact with each other to produce a particular reading of a text that orients subjects and participants in particular ways, and leads to one particular 'reading' of a text over others.
Within a CDA framework, a systemic-functional linguistic analysis allows for an understanding of how ideologies can be reinforced through particular grammatical constructions, that can then lead readers to understand texts, and the subjects presented within those texts, in particular ways. Many CDA analysts have used some of Halliday's ideas in their analyses, to illustrate how certain textual functions position individuals and groups in particular ways. Bentley and Hildago-Tenorio (2015), to take but one example, use Halliday's notion of transitivity to analyze how homosexuality is portrayed in English-language Irish newspapers. Transitivity focuses on how individuals within a text are experiencing a phenomenon or enacting some sort of agency, and whether they are causes or experiencers of those phenomena. Through a systematic study of newspaper-style reporting in English-language Irish newspapers, they observe that when queer individuals are put in positions of agency within a sentence, they are often constructed as enacting some kind of negative change within society: this contributes to a reading of texts that support a conservative ideology where "silence, discrimination, persecution, exclusion, violence, rights violations, disease and death are patently manifested in the representation of gays [...and where] homosexuals are demonised, victimised" (24). Huang and Wang (2014) note a similar use of transitivity in their analysis of reports of disputes between China and Japan concerning the Diayou Islands, as reported in two major newspapers (the China Daily and the Washington Post). They found that Chinese entities (citizens, travel agencies, and China as a nation) were often represented as belligerent actors who enacted a change, often towards Japanese groups and businesses, that was seen as undesirable and combative. This stance, they argue, was further reinforced in the ways that Chinese and Japanese agents were quoted within the newspapers: quotes by Chinese participants in the dispute were often accompanied by strong verbal processes such as urged and warned, while quotes by Japanese
participants were more often than not accompanied by more neutral words such as *wrote* and *reported*. These textural strategies, they conclude, helped to shape an ideology that portrayed China as the unambiguous aggressors in the dispute, and Japan as the victims.

The three-step process discussed above provides a distinct framework through which to understand how larger-scale ideologies are present within a text, how individuals can locate themselves as subjects (and other individuals and groups as Others), and how these might be challenged and ultimately upended. However, it is important to note that the process described above assumes that they are distinct from one another, and rather easy to neatly parse out. In reality, each level of analysis both influences and is influenced by the other two, which can make it difficult to ascertain exactly on what level a particular discursive feature is relevant. The weakness of this three-step process in determining which discursive activity belongs to which level has been pointed out by critics of CDA (e.g., Slembrouck 2001). Indeed, although Critical Discourse Analysis methods have been used to illustrate the many ways in which power, ideologies, and language use are interrelated, CDA has also come across its fair share of criticism (e.g., Breeze 2011; Slembrouck 2001; Hammersley 1997; Blommaert 2015; Haig 2004; Verschueren 2001; Luke 2002; Martin 2004). These criticisms range from perceived faults in its theoretical foundations, to issues with its methodology.

First, and perhaps most importantly, CDA has come under scrutiny for its theoretical underpinnings, which some critics claim has been unsystematically applied to studies of language and ideology. As Breeze (2011) argues, CDA analysts draw upon a wide corpus of theorists (beginning with Marx, and incorporating such theorists as Gramsci, Giddens, Bakhtin, Foucault, and Halliday) who hold complex and somewhat competing views about the nature of
power within society and language, and who do not, at first glance, seem to be particularly compatible with one another. According to Breeze, CDA analysts have often been accused of uniting these thinkers "seemingly without ever perceiving the need to justify this eclecticism, or to systematize its intellectual base, other than by linking these notions vaguely to the phenomena associated with late modernity (consumer capitalism, marketisation, achievement and consolidation of hegemony through ideological manipulation)" (501). Hammersley (1997) also makes this point in his argument that much CDA work "takes much for granted and adopts relatively crude positions on a variety of issues" (245), such as assuming a simplified view of power that draws broad dividing lines between (a predetermined) oppressor and oppressed in an easily-defined social field, and domination as the single tool separating the two. Such an approach, he argues, mitigates the complex positions individuals might find themselves in within a given social field (if those 'fields' are able to be distinctly identified at all).

CDA has thus often been accused of adhering to a simplistic view of power relations that ignores complexities of how power operates within a society. Blommaert (2001) voices a similar view in his observation that many CDA analysts view 'power' in and of itself as an amorphous, ill-defined concept:

in much CDA work, a priori statements on power relations are used as perspectives on discourse (e.g., 'power is bad,' 'politicians are manipulators,' 'media are ideology-reproducing machines'), and social-theoretical concepts and categories are being used in off-hand and seemingly self-evident ways (e.g. 'power,' 'institutions,' also 'the leading groups in society,' 'business' and so on). This leads to highly simplified models of social structures and patterns of action - politicians always and intentionally manipulate their constituents, doctors are by definition always the powerful party in doctor-patient relationships, etc. - which are then projected on to discourse samples. Power relations are often predefined and then confirmed by features of discourse (15).
In the excerpt above, Blommaert argues that such 'a priori statements’ as 'power is always negative', 'politicians are by their nature manipulative', etc. are too simplistic to hold any explanatory power. These far-reaching statements are often taken for granted within CDA analyses, which can leave unexplored alternative conceptions of power. The language use that results from these 'simplified models’ of power—between politicians and their constituents, or between doctors and patients—are in constant danger of being analyzed as mere tautologies with little explanatory power: politicians manipulate, so therefore their language manipulates as well.

By bringing attention to such simplified idealizations of power, Blommaert highlights an under-explored avenue of CDA: exploring potential disconnects between larger sociohistoric discourses that might shape power relations between groups of people (akin to Fairclough’s macro assessment of discourse) and the relationships existing between the actual participants within a text (Fairclough's meso assessment). It is not hard to consider, for example, a situation where a shy doctor, fresh out of medical school and making her first rounds in a new hospital, acquiesces to an overzealous and demanding patient who insists that the pain in his stomach is caused by a tumor, and not by a meal he ate the night before. If it is accepted (as Blommaert would claim) that doctors are privileged in doctor-patient relationships, what might researchers make of this situation? Perhaps the patient is a known and bothersome 'troublemaker’ among doctors at a particular hospital, and he is given to the new doctor because no others want to interact with him. In this case, hierarchical relations among doctors within the hospital would have to be taken into account. In another interpretation, the patient's insistence might be part of a larger, more localized sociocultural discourse that privileges personal 'hunches' as a form of knowledge more valued than the impersonal 'science' of medical professionals. Who would hold the 'power' in this instance, the patient who knows his own body, or the doctor who spent so
much time and effort on a useless education? Such differences in ideologies of power between participants, and the extent to which those participants are shaped by macro-level ideologies, must be considered in any effective CDA analysis: conducting an analysis where "power relations are often already established before the actual analysis of discourse can start, by means of—all in all very 'uncritical'—contextual narratives" (Blommaert 2015, 16) can ultimately obscure the real effects of power on discourse participants.

Amongst these criticisms, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (2007) do make it clear that when CDA analysts often speak about power, they are speaking of "power in the sense of domination [...] a view of power that acknowledges the overdetermination between 'internal' and 'external' practices, and establishes causal links between institutional social practices and the positions of subjects in the wider social field" (24). In this sense, what is meant as 'power' through a CDA lens is the ability of larger social institutions to enact a particular change, or transmit a particular viewpoint, among a particular group of subjects, and to position them in terms of domination or subordination to that social institution.

It is important to note, however, that this hierarchical power structure is the not the only way in which 'power' can be conceptualized. Newmahr's (2006, 2010a, 2010b, 2011) work examining the role of power among BDSM (bondage/discipline/sadism/masochism) individuals understands power in a somewhat different light. 1 Much erotic activity among BDSM-identified individuals revolves around power exchange, the transmission of power from one participant to another within a particular BDSM 'scene' (defined as an instance of BDSM

---

1 Indeed, understandings of power relations among BDSM participants is an important factor to consider with the OnYourKnees messageboard community, especially since many participants view themselves, and the activities in which they engage, as part of a larger spectrum of BDSM. The links that participants make to BDSM activity, and the ways in which ideologies of trust and consent complicate traditional ideas of domination and resistance, will be the focus of Chapter 4.
activity). She notes that power exchange in BDSM activity can best be conceptualized as a "dynamic of an interaction, an idea rather than a thing or a resource, and certainly not a possession wielded by one party over another" (Newmahr 2006, 41). Newmahr opposes herself to more traditional sociological notions of power, which either conceptualize it as a personal property someone possesses (and can thus be wielded over others), or a singular enactment that results in a particular outcome (resulting in a situation where one person is dominating another in one respect or another). Within a BDSM framework, as Newmahr argues, the notion of 'power' can better be understood as interaction-dependent and flowing from one participant from another, resulting in "the exchange of the feeling of powerfulness for the feeling of powerlessness, and vice-versa" (49).

Understanding power as interaction-dependent and flowing can help to make sense of how BDSM practitioners enact power exchange during a scene, and how these conceptions of power help to 'make sense' of a scene in ways that hierarchical conceptions of power do not. As an example, two individuals are about to engage in a scene involving rope-play (where one individual is immobilized by another through the use of ropes and intricate, artistic knot-tying). One individual (the 'top') is responsible for placing another individual (the 'bottom') in a position where they are unable to move. A traditional hierarchical notion of power would understand the 'top' in this position to be the wielder of dominance over the 'bottom,' in that the actions of the 'top' enact a (in this case, negative) change on the bottom; the bottom is thus understood to be in a position of submission to the top.

But what a strictly hierarchical power structure would also assume is that the, throughout the duration of the entire scene, the top would remain in a position of dominance over the bottom. This, according to Newmahr, does not seem to be the case for the BDSM relationships
she studied. Instead, she observes that, in many scenes, it is often the bottom who has more power in directing the scene. Although, in the scenario illustrated above, the top is the one doing the immobilization, the bottom gives the specifics as to how they would like the scene to unfold (i.e., how tightly they would like to be immobilized, in what positions they would like to be tied up, etc.), and it is the top's responsibility to listen to the bottom and adjust their behavior according to the needs of the bottom. Because they are the ones enduring the 'pain' of immobilization being inflicted upon them, they are more likely to be the ones who control what is acceptable behavior from the top, and what is not. Thus, as Newmahr notes, it is often the bottom who ultimately wields power over the scene: "since they are the ones being enacted upon, they have 'discretion over the capacity for action'" (2006, 46).

Ultimately, this 'discretion over the capacity for action' inherent in the position of the bottom provides a potential 'alternative' framework through which conceptions of power can be explored. If power can be thought of, at least in some instances, an exchange between individuals, it counters the idea of power as forced upon a subordinated individual or group from a 'dominant' group. It also opens up the possibility that power can be played with, taken on in certain instances and rejected in others, weakening the idea of power as a purely hegemonic force that has historically shaped so much of CDA analysis. If power can be played with, then what does its value become? What happens when a particular text carries with it multiple discourses of power that may compete with one another, and where do sites of resistance become potentially located? These questions will be considered in subsequent chapters of this analysis.

As CDA has been criticized for not exploring its theoretical foundations and 'alternative' conceptions of power, it has also been criticized for its methodologies on numerous fronts. Haig (2004) has noted that CDA often "includes relative little detailed description of formal textual
features: it reflect a commitment to connecting texts to the widest possible social contexts" (133). As Breeze (2011) argues, aside from Halliday's systemic-functional framework and the occasional lip service to such vague notions as nominalization and ideational functions, much CDA work does not often incorporate enough linguistic knowledge into their analyses. By not fully exploring theories of hegemony in systematic ways, and by not exploring well-established challenges to those ideas, CDA often runs into the danger of being vague and unconvincing with their analyses, and especially vulnerable to criticisms among both social theorists and linguists.

Verschueren (2001) takes this argument one step further by noting that much CDA analysis works from a paradigm that assumes texts are suffused with particular ideologies that are meant to keep dominant structures in power: as such, analysts are likely to analyze the data in such a way as to support this notion, even when data exists within the text to suggest otherwise. This leads to a situation where "what seems to be transpiring through the interpretative explanatory and evaluative conclusions is likely to be the product of conviction rather than the result of a careful step-by-step analysis that reflexively questions its own observations and conclusions." (65) This 'cherry-picking' of data, Verscheuren notes, traps many CDA analyses that allow their ideology to control their data interpretation, rather the reverse.

Even if data is analyzed step-by-step, however, it often leads to a situation where "findings tend to be predictable [and...] a gap emerges between textual analyses and conclusions [...] as soon as the question of evidence is asked. Texts are simply made into carriers, as it were, of what one already assumes to be the case" (Verscheuren 2001, 69). If this is the case, then, why bother working from a CDA paradigm if it only leads to 'so what?' results, concluding from text samples what can just as easily be concluded from the larger setting? The 'fact' that a British higher educational text draws upon economic-capitalist discourses to advertise itself can be
concluded to participate in the transformation of education as an arm of capitalism, for example, can according to Verschueren just as easily be made sense of when analyzing the history of education in Britain in the late 20th century, and its adaptation to a growing capitalist environment, without appealing to clues within texts.

Against this argument, it is important to note that many CDA analysts necessarily see their work as taking an activist stance, and proclaim as much in their work. Meyer (2001) points out that "CDA scholars play an advocatory role for groups who suffer from social discrimination [...CDA] endeavours to make explicit power relations which are frequently hidden, and thereby to derive results which are of practical relevance" (15). Chouliaraki and Fairclough (2007) argue that part of the importance of CDA is its 'criticalness', in that "a critical theoretical practice aims to unpick the relations which constitute social practices and so identify the mechanisms which produce antagonisms and struggles, also making explicit its own position in these struggles" (27, italics mine). Part of what is built into the theoretical foundations of CDA, then, is advocacy for disempowered and marginalized groups: by showing how ideologies are enacted through language within a text, CDA can show how disempowered groups are thought of as such. In addition, CDA is partially built on the belief that all text, regardless of source, carries with them ideologies: this includes so-called 'neutral' research that claims to take a distant stance on its object of study, yet participates in the legitimization of their knowledge by claiming an absence of bias. As Jäger (2001) has noted, all analysts are part of a sociohistorical institution that, in itself, legitimizes a certain type of knowledge as more 'truthful' than others. No analysis is therefore 'neutral': CDA just makes its stances explicit.

But if CDA takes an activist stance towards disempowered individuals and groups, and if CDA assumes that texts are saturated with sites of resistance as much as they are with sites of
domination, then CDA should be able to identify where readers resist ideologies and create new meanings of texts and discourses for themselves. Another criticism that has historically been leveled against CDA is the idea that, although CDA may be able to demonstrate strategies of domination in much of its work, analysts working within it are much less likely to illustrate how texts are reconfigured to become sites of resistance. Breeze (2011) notes this when she claims that "language scholars of [CDA] find it easier to deconstruct than to construct" (516). Luke (2002) echoes this sentiment when he states that CDA must "move beyond a focus on ideology critique and to document 'other' forms of text and discourse–subaltern, diasporic, emancipatory, local, minority, call them what we may–that may mark the productive use of power in the face of economic and cultural globalization" (98). CDA should thus not only be able to identify hegemonic discourse, but also counter-hegemonic discourse that gives rise to new, revolutionary and/or transgressive meanings. This counter-hegemonic discourse, Luke notes, can be found in texts that he feels have been understudied in CDA analyses, such as texts produced by sociohistorically-disempowered individuals and groups, active attempts by individuals to re-interpret dominant texts to serve their own interests, and instances of resistance and objection to dominant discourses, especially within face-to-face and interpersonal environments.

Martin (2004) offers a potential method for CDA to more systematically examine how discourses can be both resisting and totalizing. He differentiates between two ideologies of CDA, which he calls *CDA realis* and *CDA irrealis*. CDA realis, he argues, falls along more traditional lines of critical discourse analysis that "is concerned with exposing language and attendant semiosis in the service of power" (180). By bringing to light the ways in which ideologies are created and sustained by discourse, a CDA realis framework actively (and, according to Martin, rightly) brings politics into the purview of linguistic theory. But, as Martin argues, a focus on
the totalizing nature of power can unintentionally obscure how individuals are acutely aware of these ideologies, and how this awareness can become a basis for community-building, mobilization, and eventual societal transformation. This is CDA irrealis: "oriented not so much to deconstruction as to constructive social action" (182). He demonstrates this 'constructive' CDA through a discussion of the Australian government's attempts at reconciliation with its historically-victimized indigenous population. The Australian government has produced materials that both textually (through interviews and narratives) and visually (through photographs) give voice to the experiences of indigenous Australian children (especially their experiences being removed from their families and educated in 'white' schools) and their vocal opposition to governmental policies. Through this, Martin argues, non-indigenous Australians are invited to feel empathy for indigenous Australians and engage in public criticism to those policies—all of which, ultimately, foster feelings of solidarity and resistance among all Australians.

In order for a Critical Discourse Analysis-inspired analysis to be effective, then, it must integrate into its methodology a way to identify these competing ideologies, and explore how one particular 'reading' of a text (or section of text) becomes more salient than others in the minds of speakers/readers. Goffman's (1974) conception of frame analysis become especially valuable in this regard. According to Goffman, "when the individual in our Western society recognizes a particular event, he tends, whatever else he does, to simply in this response (and in effect employ) one or more frameworks or schemata of interpretation" (21). An individual's encounter with a social event (or, in this case, a text) involves assessing its semiotic qualities and placing that information with what Goffman calls information states, "the knowledge an individual has of why events have happened as they have, what the current forces are, what the
properties and intents of the relative persons are, and what the outcome is likely to be." (134) Many of these information states involve accessing previous events and finding similarities between those events and the current one: a person who is about to watch a play, for example, identifies the current situation as a 'play' based on particular semiotic qualities (finding a seat within the audience, positioning oneself to view a stage, understanding that the characters on stage are playing characters, and not their 'real' selves), and adjusts his behavior and expectations to fit with those of the category 'watching a play.'

However, as Goffman notes, there are times when these frameworks (which he calls primary) suddenly shift, providing new information and requiring individuals to shift their fields of focus. Often, these shifts are signaled by what he calls keys, "the set of conventions by which a given activity, one already meaningful in terms of some primary framework, is transformed into something patterned on this activity but seen by the participants to be something quite else" (44). Keys transform an activity, and noticing when a key shift has taken place leads to a new understanding of that activity. These new understandings can layer on top of one another (what Goffman calls laminations), creating composites of different frames that affect the reading of a performance. A performer on stage who collapses in the middle of a line represents a key shift in that the audience is unsure of whether or not the collapse is part of the play, and requires additional information to make sense of the activity as part of the continuation of the play (if other performers stay in-character, for example) or if they play has become something else, such as a medical emergency (if other performers begin referring to the collapsed actor by their 'real' name). When one of these activities follows the collapse, a lamination occurs, resulting in the audience understanding the event in a new light, either as part of the performance or as an appeal to help.
Understanding when an activity is re-keyed thus requires two processes: participants must understand what their roles are within a given activity, and know when a sudden event requires a re-keying. This act of re-framing "guide[s] our expectations of what is to occur in the future of a given interaction, and they retrospectively shape our understanding of what has occurred in the past" (Sclafani 2015, 372). In her analysis of how candidates in the 2011-2012 U.S. Republican primary debates introduce themselves, Sclafani noted that many of the candidates explicitly mentioned their families in their introductions: they were just as likely to index themselves as spouses, parents, grandparents, and children (in some cases, to military personnel) as they were to mention their previous positions in government. By doing so, Sclafani argues, candidates provided opportunities for their audiences to re-frame them as family-oriented and, on a larger level, align them with mainstream American conservative discourses that locate the family as a center of morality. This 'reframing' represented a strategy that positioned candidates as highly qualified to assume the presidency of the United States: by mapping their positions as 'successful' family members onto conservative discourses, they were simultaneously able to assert their positions as leaders.

Goffman's conception of frames finds a correlate in van Dijk's (2009) concept of context models, which he argues are necessary to understand in any given analysis of a situation. van Dijk argues that "it is not the social situation that influences (or is influenced by) discourse, but the way the participants define such a situation" (x, italics in original). Context, according to van Dijk, is created by participants as they analyze their current situation, and is often built from scripts (previously-existing representations of events that are used to guide interpretations of current ones). Participants enter a situation knowing their own goals and having ideas about the goals of others, and have an idea of what knowledge is already shared and what is new. By
setting up these context models in their heads, participants can anticipate potential responses to
discursive situations they find themselves in, and build their context models accordingly.

Van Dijk's conception of context models is helpful to CDA studies because it allows for
the possibility of individuals coming into situations with multiple context models. Depending on
the unfolding of the communicative situation, participants choose which cognitive models best
fit their situations, but these models do not necessarily have to be identical among all
participants. Certain aspects of the situation can hold more salience in one participant's mind
than in others, which can lead to differences in interpretation (and sometimes conflict between
participants). These multiple models can not only exist between participants, but also within the
heads of each individual participants. Thus, an individual can encounter two identical situations
and, depending on the context model present within themselves, come away with different
interpretations of the same event. If an audience member who has seen a play about a medical
emergency expects a performer to collapse on stage, their behavior would be markedly different
(they would most likely stay in their seats) than someone who has not seen the play, and may
then get out of their seat and offer help, treating the 'fake' emergency as a real one.

Both Goffman's model of frames and van Dijk's context model ultimately allows for the
possibility of speakers to be able to identify which components of a communicative situation
they feel are important to an understanding of a situation, and which can be backgrounded. This
identification is dependent on the attitudes, beliefs, and understandings of (in)appropriate
behavior they bring to the situation--in other words, their ideologies. People thus come into
different situations with different ideologies, but it is also likely that an individual can bring
multiple ideologies into a single situation, and choose which ideology best fits it. If, as many
proponents of CDA argue, texts are made up of multiple, competing ideologies, identifying
which ideologies might be at-play in a given communicative situation, and how participants use
language to highlight one ideology over another (and thus one reading of a text over another),
becomes important in understanding how that language use contributes to a sense of self.

Finally, Luke's (2002) critique of CDA highlights many critics' dissatisfaction with the
choice of texts traditionally used in analysis. Both Bucholtz (2001) and Blommaert (2001) have
criticized CDA's overreliance on 'public' documents (especially those created by government-
sponsored institutions) at the expense of 'private' discourse that is further removed from the
governmental sphere. Blommaert (2001) also claims that CDA's over-reliance on certain types of
documents over others may present ideological biases in and of themselves: the absence of
documents on/about/by certain groups may in and of itself be an effect of ideologies of power,
and the (unintentional or deliberate) silencing of marginalized groups from the historical record.
Individuals who, for example, speak in a nonstandard dialect of a language often have their
'mistakes' (which are often culturally- rather than linguistically-determined) edited out in
processes of transcription and publication, potentially effacing the value those linguistic
variables might have. CDA must therefore be willing to engage with 'private' as well as 'public'
documents that are likely to preserve those linguistic variables.

Critics of CDA also take issue with the framework through which it views the production
and consumption of texts: as they argue, more traditional CDA frameworks assume a clear
distinction between those who produce texts (often institutions or individuals who hold some sort
of institutional power) and those who consume texts, who are assumed to not hold the same
social power. For CDA theorists working under this framework, power is assumed to flow
unidirectionally, from the producers of the text (who hold more power) to consumers (who hold
less); thus, producers of texts hold an especially important position in crafting identities and upholding ideologies that benefit them.

Other researchers (e.g., Törnberg and Törnberg 2016, KhrosaviNik 2017, Bouvier and Machin 2018) have noted the failure of this aspect of CDA to demonstrate how ideologies and power relations are upheld and/or challenged in texts that are created by multiple individuals, where the distinction between producer and consumer is less clear-cut. Social media communication, for example, differs from traditional texts in that those who create social-media texts "(a.) work together in producing and compiling content; (b.) perform interpersonal communication and mass communication simultaneously or separately [...] and (c.) have access to see and respond to institutionally (e.g., newspaper articles) and user-generated context/texts" (KhrosaviNik 2017, 582, italics in original). In social media texts, users are both producers and consumers: they may read an article, or comments on an article (in other words, consume), and can also comment on the article itself, for others to read (in which case they are producers). In addition, the instantaneous nature of social media texts often removes intermediaries present in more traditional patterns of text creation, such as editors, and allows for numerous individuals to comment simultaneously on a single article or comment. As Bouvier and Machin (2018) note, "whereas former 'elite' texts appeared to provide clearer routs to tracing dominant ideologies, social media is different, mixing voices and genres of communication with shifting combinations of interaction within and across platforms, which often feed into more traditional media forms" (179). This 'mixing' of voices and genres, in effect, blurs the distinction between producer and consumer and can obscure the ways in which dominant ideologies are enforced throughout a text.
However, this is not to say that dominant ideologies do not play a part in the construction of social-media texts: although social-media texts (such as the one under consideration in this analysis, OnYourKnees) are often contributed to by multiple users, underlying ideologies can still be present within those texts that can inform how posters speak about themselves and others. Although more individuals can become 'producers' of texts, they may still structure discourses around (and, ultimately, uphold) dominant ideologies. Bouvier and Machin (2018) note that "just because there may be room for different kinds of communities of opinion, it does not go to say that major forms of social constructions of identities and casualties in society have lost force" (184). Patterns of social media that recommend stories of 'interest' for users, according to Bouvier and Machin, might commoditize those stories as items to be consumed, fundamentally strengthening ideologies that privilege the importance of consumption within a capitalist society.

In order to study how these dominant ideologies become apparent in social media texts, KhrosavNik (2017) argues that analyses of these texts should maintain both a vertical and horizontal component. Horizontal components "deal[] with the intertextuality among textual practices on (potentially) multi-sites and interconnectedness of Social Media users through observation and by linking the available textual platforms and practices horizontally across the sites, platforms, and genres" (585). In other words, this horizontal component deals with how social media users interact with each other across platforms, and how such features as audience, the types of genres (such as newspaper articles or 'casual' media posts) users interact with, and other semiotic information (such as layouts of sites and availability of images) are deployed across platforms. A vertical component, on the other hand, "links both the micro-features of textual analysis and horizontal content to socio-political context of users in society, i.e. links to the societal discourses-in-place" (585). Vertical components thus are sites of ideology: how
users utilize ideologies to interact with each other, and how those ideologies gain salience through both textual and larger, macro-social patterns of communication. In another approach, (Törnberg and Törnberg 2016) use a topic-modeling framework to identify relations between anti-feminist and Islamophobic discourse among Swedish social-media users, identifying both key topics and the strength of interrelations between them. Through studying these interrelationships, they note, CDA analysts can "pay attention not only to top-down relations of dominance, but also acknowledge that power and dominance are not only imposed from the elite using mass media as channels through which they exercise their discursive power" (403).

This dissertation recognizes the above criticisms, and they will be integrated into the CDA analysis that follows. Through arguing that the identity work done on OnYourKnees integrates distinct ideologies that conceptualize power differently (specifically ideologies of hegemonic masculinity and bondage/discipline/sadism/masochism [BDSM]), this dissertation will avoid solely looking at power from a 'top-down' approach, and instead understand power as a complex social phenomenon that can both be given to an individual based on their social position, and as a resource that can be taken up by some at particular points within a discourse, then released for others to use. By focusing on a 'private' text that is co-constructed by members of a group that has traditionally been thought of as 'disempowered' (gay men), this dissertation will provide an example of an 'unfiltered, unedited text that has not been created solely for one group to be consumed by another, but that has been co-operatively created by numerous individuals. By engaging in both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the text of OnYourKnees, this dissertation hopes to integrate a fine-grained linguistic analysis into a broader discussion of how ideologies shape, and are shaped by, the discussions that occur on the messageboard.
However, some criticisms may not be avoidable. This dissertation does not assume an outwardly 'activist' stance, in that I am not claiming to 'give a voice' to those whose voices may be marginalized within the larger society. However, I cannot also claim that my choice of topic is not 'neutral.' Indeed, what (partially) motivates my choice is a lifelong interest in BDSM activity, and a growing realization of the paucity of discussions of language use among BDSM communities within sociolinguistics, and the underrepresentation of such voices in academia in general. In addition, the criticism that CDA has over-relied on political and mass-media texts might serve to minimize the contributions that critical schools of analysis has had on linguistic thought that falls outside of politics and media. As just one example of many, many researchers have spent much time and effort discussing the ways in which ideologies of gender and sexuality have affected the ways that people speak, and how speakers have developed novel ways to resist the effects of totalizing ideologies that assume a strict binary sexual and gendered system.

Ultimately, this dissertation will argue that messageboard participants on OnYourKnees, in the discussion and co-construction of their identities and desires, contend with numerous ideologies that intersect in complex and contradictory ways. On the one hand, the behaviors that participants engage in are consistent with ideologies of hegemonic masculinity that locate social power in the successful enactment of a particular form of masculinity. All participants on this messageboard enact a panoply of behaviors, attitudes, and desires that index their identities as distinctly masculine, and which privilege a particular form of masculinity over all others. In addition, by virtue of their desires, some men (coaches) are granted domination over others (jocks), and many self-identified jocks place themselves in both opposition and submission to coaches. Participants on OnYourKnees thus engage in and maintain a binary system that places coaches on an empowered end of a continuum, and jocks on the disempowered end.
On the other hand, however, the discourses that are created and maintained on OnYourKnees simultaneously challenge and subvert those ideologies of hegemonic masculinity, by privileging an enactment of desire that all participants *willingly* engage in, and which they see as ideal. Through engaging in an activity (erotic hypnosis) that has historically been conceived of as anathema to traditional ideals of 'proper' sexual behavior, participants on the messageboard simultaneously provide sites of resistance to those traditional ideals. By showing their eagerness to engage in and contribute to a complex system of domination and subordination, they simultaneously highlight the performative nature of traditionally masculinist ideologies and the power relations between men that are so-called 'inherent' in such systems. On OnYourKnees, it will be argued, the very notion of 'power' itself is destabilized, becoming not (just) a quality that one has based on his relationship to others, but a resource that is available by all to express their desires and identities.

Studying the discourses created on OnYourKnees through a Critical Discourse Analysis framework will help bring these complex subject positions to light. Understanding how participants imagine jock and coach identities, and their own identities in relation to these categories, can illuminate how larger-scale ideologies of hegemonic masculinity and BDSM activity are reflected through the co-construction of the world by messageboard participants. Studying the deployment of the genre of the hypnotic trance will demonstrate how posters interact with it, both through trances themselves and through discussions surrounding trances, to construct and maintain their identities, while simultaneously challenging traditional sociological notions of power. Analyzing how self-identified jocks and coaches utilize particular linguistic tools, such as process types and distinct orthographic styles, will show how ideologies of power and sexuality are interwoven on the textual level.
Chapter 2: Data and methods

Data for this analysis was initially gathered in the spring of 2014 for a research project that analyzed differences in language use among self-identified jocks and coaches on a messageboard website (OnYourKnees) hosted on an online platform. OnYourKnees first came into existence in March of 2007, with a single post titled "Welcome jock...", in which a poster asked readers who were interested in engaging in online erotic activity to contact him via email. By December 2007, 326 posts appeared on the board; from 2008 to 2014, an additional 2,413 posts appeared on the messageboard, averaging 345 posts per year (or 28 posts per month). During this time frame, the messageboard sustained slow but regular activity; however, by 2015, posting activity on OnYourKnees slowed down considerably. In 2015, only 73 new posts appeared on the messageboard, and in 2018 the messageboard showed only five new posts. In total, as of December 2018, a total of 2,853 posts appeared on the messageboard. With the slowdown of activity, it seems unlikely that messageboard activity will resume on OnYourKnees, although the board is still online as of March 2019.

When an individual first visits the homepage of the messageboard, they are able to view all posts contributed by its members. In order to be able to post on the messageboard, however, they must contact one of the moderators of the messageboard to be granted permission to post. By 2014 the board claimed 2,542 members: by September 2018, this number reached 2,605 members.

---
2 It must be said here that I never applied for membership to OnYourKnees and thus never posted on the messageboard. All data within the corpus was thus taken from naturally-occurring conversations among members, with no intervention from me.
3 Being a member, however, does not entail having posted on the messageboard: this number should not be taken as an accurate reflection of the number of active members who have contributed to its life through the posting of at least one message.
For the initial analysis (see Chambers 2017), 488 posts, comprising 37 threads, were selected from the messageboard for a quantitative analysis of differences in frequencies of orthographic features among self-identified jocks and coaches. For the purposes of this analysis, the word 'thread' refers to a series of posts that are contributed by messageboard users in response to an initial post. These threads contained posts from 148 usernames: for the purposes of this analysis, the term 'username' refers to a handle that accompanies each participant's post (and that is visible for each post), which serves to let other participants know the author of the post. Initially, these posts were chosen because they represented some of the longest and most robust conversations of the entire messageboard, and highlighted communication between posters that (it was hoped) brought out orthographic differences into sharp relief.

For this analysis, 320 discussion threads were gathered, spanning a ten-year period ranging from March 2007 to December 2016. Each thread under analysis contained at least two posts, in order to gain a fuller picture of how individuals co-constructed identities through response to each others' posts. Single-thread posts that were not responded to were thus excluded from the analysis. A total of 2,054 posts (or approximately 71 percent of all posts) were ultimately analyzed (total number of words N = 86,881), posted by 467 total unique usernames. Username representations ranged from a single post within the corpus (for 226 usernames, or 48 percent of all unique usernames) to 84 posts (attributed to one username). Within the corpus, 32 usernames (or 6.8%) are responsible for 698 posts (or 34.0%), suggesting a small-but-stable group of individuals who have contributed to more than one-third of the entire corpus of the messageboard. The average amount of words per post in the corpus is 42.2 words, while the average word count per username is 186 words.
Data was first collected by saving each thread to files in HTML format, then converting each HTML file to a Word document: each file thus contained a single thread. Extraneous information was removed from each Word document, retaining only usernames, dates in which posts were posted, and the text of each post. Because this study looks, in part, at orthographic differences, special care was taken not to alter or 'clean up' the texts of the posts themselves in any manner. However, in order to ensure the anonymity of the posters on OnYourKnees, personal and geographic information (including email addresses, names of websites, and names of cities and states) were removed from each post, and usernames were re-coded into two-letter initials.

Posts were initially read to determine what types of topics were discussed on the messageboard, and how posters discuss these topics; these threads were then grouped into broad categories that reflected 'main themes' focused on by messageboard participants. As posts were continuously re-read, more specific topics and identity categories began to emerge, and threads were re-categorized accordingly to capture these nuances. As these identity categories emerged, posters were grouped into categories based on how they aligned with, or in some cases disaligned with, different aspects of those identity categories. Just like the categories themselves, posters were continuously re-shuffled into more and more distinct categories as their posts were re-read. The observations made from this process informs the qualitative analysis of this dissertation.

For the quantitative analysis of this dissertation, this paper expands on Chambers' (2017) observation that self-identified jocks and coaches display distinctly different orthographic styles that, in part, contribute to larger conceptions of jock and coach identity on OnYourKnees. Once the data had been formatted into Word documents, it was imported into a coding program (QDA
Miner) that allowed for data to be easily coded and then quantified. Entire posts were coded by username and whether the poster self-identified as a jock or a coach. Self-identified jocks, for the purpose of this analysis, are those posters on OnYourKnees who use the word *jock* to either refer to themselves in the present tense (i.e., *I am a jock* or *as a jock...*), or to refer to an identity they wish to attain. Self-identified coaches are those posters who use the word *coach* to refer to themselves.\(^5\) If a poster didn't use the words *coach* or *jock* to describe themselves or an identity they wished to attain, they were separated out into a third category, those who self-identified as neither. Not all self-identified jocks or coaches make their identification known in every single one of their posts: if a poster self-identified within one post, all of his other posts were coded as belonging to a self-identified jock/coach. In addition, each post was carefully read and re-read, and orthographic features were coded based on the following criteria:

- whether individual words conformed or did not conform to Standard American English (SAE) spelling;
- whether words at the beginning of sentences, or 'proper nouns,' conformed or did not conform to SAE capitalization rules; and
- whether first-person subject *I* was present or absent in each instance where they would be expected.

Once posts were initially coded, they were put aside and then reviewed at a later date to ensure that all examples of the orthographic features in question were properly coded. When all data was sufficiently coded, *chi-square* tests were run on the resulting data to determine statistical significance.

\(^5\) It must be said here that, unlike those of many self-identified jocks who discuss what types of jocks they would like to be, there are *no* attested discussions on OnYourKnees of self-identified coaches who do not currently identify as coaches, but who would like to be.
A note must be said about the use of the terms jock and coach throughout this analysis. In this research, great care was taken to follow Eckert and McConnell-Ginet’s (1995) admonition against “delimiting communities of practice in advance. Rather, [researchers] look at people and the practices mediating their relations to one another in order to understand better the raw materials which they constitute their own and others’ identities and relations” (504). In this analysis, a distinction is made between three different types of posters: those who self-identify as jocks, those who self-identify as coaches, and those who, in their posts, identify as neither coaches nor jocks. The terms jock and coach were not chosen by me as a method of neatly separating participants into easily-identifiable categories: rather, jock and coach are terms that posters use to describe both themselves and each other, and represent a conglomeration of beliefs, behaviors, and practices that are held sacred to many members of OnYourKnees.

Using the above criteria for determining self-identification of jocks and coaches, out of the 467 total usernames present in the corpus, 156 posters (33%) self-identify as jocks, 23 (5%) self-identify as coaches, and 288 (62%) identify as neither. These figures demonstrate that there seems to be much more representation of self-identified jocks on the messageboard than self-identified coaches, although the vast majority of posters do not make their orientation as either known.

Table 2-1 below represents the total number of posts among each of these three groups, as well as average posts per speaker and average word count per post:
Table 2-1: Average number of posts and words per post among three groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total # of posts (% of all posts)</th>
<th>Total # of words (% of all words)</th>
<th>Average no. of posts per speaker</th>
<th>Average word count per post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-identified jocks (N=156)</td>
<td>681 (33%)</td>
<td>35,610 (41%)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>52.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identified coaches (N=23)</td>
<td>152 (7%)</td>
<td>13,174 (15%)</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>86.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (N=288)</td>
<td>1221 (60%)</td>
<td>38,097 (44%)</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>31.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>86,881</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 2-1, posts by self-identified jocks make up 33% of all posts on OnYourKnees, while self-identified coaches make up less than 10% of all posts. A similar skewing towards self-identified jocks can be seen in the total number of words written by self-identified jocks: self-identified jocks makes up 41% of all words within the corpus, while self-identified coaches make up only 15%. It is interesting to note, however, that although self-identified coaches seem under-represented in the corpus, they tend to post more often (6.61 average posts per user) than either self-identified jocks or others, and have more words per post (86.67) than either two groups.

What ultimately emerges from this analysis was a complex web of identity construction, in which posters attempted to assert their identities in sophisticated and nuanced ways. As larger identity categories (particularly those of the jock and the coach, as discussed below) were discovered, posters often aligned with certain aspects of those identities, but distanced themselves from others. Some aspects of jock and coach identity were fundamental to nearly all
posters' self-identification, but others became points of contention. To identify as a jock or a coach on OnYourKnees is not a simple matter of choosing one identity over another, but rather participating in and contributing to a larger discussion of what those identities mean, and what one is actually 'doing' when he refers to himself as a jock or a coach.

Similarly, the discussion below will attempt to highlight the fact that jocks and coaches, in discussing their identities and desires, do not simply contribute to discussions of those larger identity categories with which they align. As a jock discusses his identity, he often simultaneously co-constructs a coach identity, and *vice versa*. In addition, many posters often construct multiple identities for themselves, differentiating who they currently are from who they may have been in the past, and who they wish to become in the future. Thus, as will be demonstrated below, jocks and coaches both speak for their self and their selves, creating an array of identities that incorporate their pasts, their presents, and their futures.
Chapter 3: Jocks, coaches, and the construction of identity

(1) Man, All this talk about Dumb Jocks makes me want to be one! The thought of a hunky dude that has trouble putting words together - a guy that has been so mind zonked that his eyes roll back, his mouth hangs open and he starts to drool... gives me a stiffy. :) That's right big guy. Time to bend over and take it hard! (MA, 103:7)

(2) I know you want to submit, you need to, its a part of who you are. I will take that part of you, and force it to grow, to grow in service of me. So I ask you all, who can, who will, serve me in person. (SC, 128:1)

(1) and (2) above are examples of posts on OnYourKnees that discuss two major identities at-play within the messageboard: the jock and the coach. In (1), the poster (MA) claims that previous posts on a particular thread interest him in becoming what he calls a dumb jock: as MA explains, a 'dumb jock' is indexed through his general appearance (which he describes as being hunky), a difficulty in speech production (a dumb jock has trouble putting words together), particular facial expressions (who has been so mind zonked that his eyes roll back, his mouth hangs out and he starts to drool), and a willingness to engage in receptive anal sex (time to bed over and take it hard). This composite of a particular type of identity provides MA with a sense of sexual arousal (indexed by the phrase gives me a stiffy), suggesting this is an identity that MA strongly desires. SC, in (2), provides an identity that strongly contrasts with MA's in (1). In (2), SC explicitly states that he wants individuals to submit [...] in service of me. He assumes (rightly, as subsequent posts demonstrate) there are posters on the messageboard who want to submit because its [sic] a part of who [they] are, and he wishes to force that feeling of submission to grow.7 Although SC does not explicitly use the word coach to describe

---

6 Information in parentheses following each excerpted post represents the following: pseudo-username of poster, thread number within corpus : post number within thread.

7 In the interests of preserving both the form and intent of each poster's words, posts that are referred to in the text of the dissertation are kept intact, including any spelling and grammatical innovations demonstrated in the post.
himself, the composite he creates aligns with the general conceptions of coach identity on OnYourKnees.

On the surface, MA and SC present two contrasting, yet complimentary, identities: one that wants to ultimately be dominated (MA), and one that wishes to dominate (SC). But looking at (1) and (2) in more detail suggest that these contours of domination and submission do not fall merely along the content of these posts. In (1), for example, MA's thoughts *give [him] a stiffy*: by placing himself as the recipient of the verb *give*, MA is constructing himself as someone whose sexual thoughts have control over him, and he is ultimately 'submitting' himself to these thoughts. This is further intensified by his next statement, where he imagines himself being the willing active recipient of anal sex. SC in (2), on the other hand, firmly establishes himself as an agent who *knows* that posters *want to submit*, and who *will take that part of who you are [...] and force it to grow*. SC places himself in an agentive position in (2), using the verbs *know* and *force* to suggest that he has the authority to get other posters to submit to him. In addition, his use of the phrases *you need to* and *its a part of who you are* helps to construct his audience (those who submit to him) as men whose desires to submit are fundamentally ingrained in them.

Both MA and SC thus contribute towards the construction of larger-scale jock and coach identities on OnYourKnees, where posters co-construct a world in which they share their desires of becoming jocks and coaches, and construct these identities along contours of domination and submission. But these identities are not solely manufactured from within the messageboard community: rather, what it means to be a jock or a coach on OnYourKnees, and what it means to share one's desires with others, is heavily influenced by larger social ideologies that present contrasting views of American male sexuality and (particularly gay male) masculinity.
This chapter, and the following one, will thus look at (using Fairclough's [1992] terminology) one lamination of the *macro* level of social practice among posters on OnYourKnees: an Americanized hegemonic masculinity. This chapter will argue that jock and coach identities on OnYourKnees are, in large part, influenced by an Americanized hegemonic masculinity. Using Bucholtz and Hall's (2004) conception of adequation and distinction as a framework, this chapter will argue that jock and coach identities encapsulate a series of ideologies, behaviors, and desires that distinguish them from each other, and which are used by many jocks and coaches to anchor their identities. These tenets of identity not only privilege a particular form of American masculinity that encourages posters to focus on an interest in sports, body-consciousness, and a marked disinterest in pursuits that are seen as intellectual or academic, but they also privilege the creation and maintenance of a binary-oppositional system that places some male-identified individuals (labeled by the community as *coaches*) in positions of domination to others, who are subordinated (labeled as *jocks*). Both jocks and coaches participate in practices and behaviors that are consistent with hegemonic masculinity, ultimately serving to privilege one type of masculinity over all others. However, the binary opposition that develops between jocks and coaches is fundamental in orienting posters to each other, and manifests itself through the discussion of various behaviors and desires seen as the domain of coaches and jocks respectively.

This is not to say that only self-identified jocks talk about 'jock' things, or that posters who identify as neither do not participate in the construction of jock and coach identities. Rather, the vast majority of posters, regardless of orientation, contribute to the creation and maintenance of these two identities. It is also important to note that jock and coach identities do not manifest merely in *what* is talked about, but also in *how* individuals relate themselves to these larger-scale hegemonic masculinity ideologies. As Wodak & Fairclough (2010) note, texts "are contingent upon and shaped by structures and practices and their semiotic moments, languages and 'orders of discourse,' but they are also"
deployments of social agency and the strategies of different agents and groups of agents which are
directed at shaping (reproducing or transforming) structures and practices and may, contingently, have
such effects" (22). How jocks and coaches position themselves vis-a-vis ideologies of hegemonic
masculinity, and especially along contours of domination and submission, appears not only in content
but in form: jocks and coaches, this chapter will argue, utilize distinct textual strategies that form an
integral part of how they are viewed on OnYourKnees. In particular, three strategies will be discussed,
which will be called *strategies of subordination, strategies of domination, and strategies of
naturalization*. Strategies of subordination refer to the textual methods through which jocks are
constructed as subordinated to coaches, while strategies of domination refer to those textual methods
index coaches as dominant to jocks. Strategies of naturalization refer to the methods through which
domination and submission are naturalized and seen as integral to the fundamental make-up of one's
identity. These three strategies work together to index jocks and coaches as submissive and dominant
respectively, and to help build a world in which jocks and coaches are seen as natural identities, a
fundamental part of 'who' they are.

Adequation and distinction:

Adequation and distinction, as one of Bucholtz and Hall's (2004) three tactics of
intersubjectivity that they theorize are fundamental to identity formation, concern the ways in which
community members "heighten similarity in one group, whilst emphasizing difference between two (or
more) groups" (Clark 2016, 22). As mentioned in Chapter 2, adequation and distinction are
simultaneous and complementary processes: when an individual declares themselves as a member of a
group ('us'), they also concurrently declare themselves *not* as members of another group ('them'). As
they describe their Self, they must necessarily describe a (real or imagined) Other against which to contrast their identities. But this Self, and consequently this Other, is embedded within social systems that carry with them multiple (and sometimes conflicting) ideologies that place individuals in sometimes-contradictory positions. Understanding how identity is created through adequation and distinction, then, requires a nuanced understanding of how larger-scale ideologies are present within a society, and how individuals contend with these ideologies in creating conceptions of Self and Other.

Clark (2016) and Said-Sirhan (2014) demonstrate the complexities of adequation and distinction in their studies of how certain groups of individuals negotiate their contradictory positions. For Clark, in her study of self-conceptualizations of flight attendants in incident reports, attendants must contend with their positions as both members of a flight crew tasked with the responsibility of air safety, and their place within a hierarchy in which they (and their experiences and expertise) are often subordinated to pilots. Flight attendants are, on one level, just as responsible for the safety of passengers as their pilots, which places them on an 'equal footing' with pilots in this regard. However, the hierarchical structure of airline command places them as lower in status to pilots, with the consequence that their observations and input are often ignored by those higher-up. In transcripts of aviation incidents, flight attendants thus position themselves as members of simultaneous teams: a team (including pilots) who work together to ensure safety during an incident, and a team of attendants (excluding pilots) whose input and observations are unacknowledged and unappreciated. Said-Sirhan's study of Malay-speaking women in Singapore similarly positions them in contradictory positions. As Malay speakers with a presumed limited proficiency in English, these women are on the periphery of a Singaporean politico-economic meritocracy system, where proficiency in English is held as a necessary qualification for economic achievement. Those who do not speak English are often seen as both economically-disadvantaged and unmotivated and unwilling to learn English to advance themselves.
However, as Said-Sirhan argues, many Malay women do possess English proficiency, and use their English skills to differentiate themselves from an (imagined) Singaporean Malay community seen as lacking in English, and therefore unmotivated. Although women in Said-Sirhan's study do demonstrate proficiency in English, their non-fluent skills are often derided by members of the larger Singaporean community, and when speaking to fluent English speakers are seen as uneducated. Thus, many Malay-speaking women find themselves in a double-bind: their English skills are heartily achieved, but seen as inadequate to be 'proper' Singapore citizens.

Both Clark and Said-Sirhan demonstrate the ways in which adequation and distinction exists on multiple levels: globally, institutionally, and inter-personally. On each of these levels, individuals align (i.e., adequate) themselves with others (other flight attendants, other Malay English learners), while simultaneously positioning (i.e., distinguishing) themselves against an Other (pilots, fluent Singaporean English speakers). These positionings place individuals at a particular point within a nexus of power, often fighting for greater recognition, and also contribute to the creation and maintenance of larger-scale cultural models, "theories about cause and effect in the world (and the cosmos) that are more or less shared among and rooted in the practices and beliefs of specific social groups" (Gaudio & Bialostok 2005, 54). These cultural models, in turn, feed into how individuals adequate and distinguish themselves from the world around them.

However, these positionings, on all levels, are in continuous states of change: as Clark (2016) states, "neither similarity nor difference are objective, permanent states of being; instead, they can be viewed as achievements motivated by social, political, or institutional desires" (22). Contours of similarity and difference are always changing, and individuals align or disalign with others based on what is most advantageous to them at the moment. Thus, flight attendants, who in one instance may distinguish themselves from pilots when fighting for greater input into flight safety recommendations,
may adequate themselves with them in situations where passenger safety is at risk, demonstrating their commitment to maintaining that safety. Similarly, Malay English learners in Singapore may align with other Malay speakers in discussing prejudice experienced against them, yet also distinguish themselves from (real or imagined) stereotypes of Malays as lazy and unmotivated to gain economic and institutional capital. Often times, these contours of adequation and distinction occur simultaneously, placing individuals in precarious positions when discussing how they view themselves and others.

Many times, then, contours of adequation and distinction are reflected through multiple prisms, occurring on local, regional, and global levels. Often times, global conceptions of adequation and distinction manifest locally along similar lines, but these conceptions can also be transformed from the global to more local levels, a process that Wodak and Fairclough (2010) have termed *glocalization*. For the men who participate on OnYourKnees, jock and coach identities fall along larger-scale ideologies that are consistent with those of hegemonic masculinity through adhering to values, beliefs, and behaviors that are seen as stereotypically 'masculine' within American culture. However, on a local level, this masculinity is also re-filtered and re-coded through the development and maintenance of a binary system that upholds some forms of masculinity as more 'dominant', and therefore more sexually desirable, than others. These 'dominant' forms of masculinity are primarily represented by coaches, but this is not to say that jocks find desire solely in being subordinate to coaches. Rather, jocks also find pleasure in 'realizing' an idealized jock identity. The contours of those identities, and what it means to be a 'jock' and a 'coach' on OnYourKnees, will be discussed shortly. First, however, it is important to discuss the larger cultural ideology of hegemonic masculinity, and its conflict with (gay) male identities in order to understand their relevance to posters on OnYourKnees.
Queer Linguistics and Hegemonic Masculinity:

Early studies of language and gender within sociolinguistics (e.g., Fishman 1978; West & Zimmerman 1975) took as their starting point the idea that the labels *man* and *woman* represented distinct social categories that existed in opposition to one another, whose language styles could thus be contrasted with one another, and that members of a particular group could (relatively) easily fall into. Often taking a variationist sociolinguistic perspective in their research, these studies assumed men and women as *a priori* different from each other, and hypothesized that members of those categories demonstrated different levels of usage of one identified variable or another. These studies did not assume that men and women 'spoke' differently because of any inherent biological differences between them; rather, they assumed that the labels *man* and *woman* carried with them power differentials that placed men in positions of dominance to women, with differences in the frequency of linguistic variables reflecting this imbalance. These studies were influential in identifying various ways in which men often demonstrated power over women linguistically, through such discursive acts as disproportionate interruptions of women by men in mixed-sex groups, and lack of uptake by men when women introduce new topics into a conversation (e.g., West & Zimmerman 1975) Women in these studies, conversely, tended to demonstrate a disempowered status through such conversational tactics as hedging and end-of-utterance pitch raising.

These early studies thus related language use to gender and social status: the status *man*, within a larger cultural arena, was seen as occupying a higher social position than *woman* based on their gender, and this manifested in differing ways of speaking. Although much valuable research emerged from thinking about gender in this way, this paradigm still took for granted the idea that *man* and
woman were distinct categories that individuals neatly fit into, and that were relatively stable in the course of one's life. In the early 1980s, however, a new understanding emerged that claimed the categories man and woman were not essentialist absolutes, but socially-constructed categories that people placed themselves into (or, conversely, people were placed into) based on perceived biological criteria. As Motschenbacher (2010) has noted, the origins of this 'queer' linguistics lie in ideas borrowed from queer theory, which arose within the U.S. gay rights movements of the 1970s and 1980s. While previous political gay rights movements congealed around the notion of a stable 'gay' or 'lesbian' identity as a base to organize around, beginning in the 1970s many activists began to question the validity of such an identity. These activists began to realize that coalescing around the labels gay and lesbian assumed a membership based solely in terms of sexual orientation: this strategy, they noted, risked minimizing and erasing (e.g. Bucholtz and Hall 2004) the unique experiences and challenges that so-called 'gay' and 'lesbian' individuals encountered in their day-to-day lives. The effects of other social categories, such as race, class, and age – some of which had more profound effects on individuals who fell under the rubric 'gay' or 'lesbian' than their sexuality – were in danger of being effaced if individuals rallied around an identity that privileged sexual orientation over all others. In addition, membership into the categories gay and lesbian were, in practice, not as all-encompassing as originally believed: the experiences of transgendered and sexuality-fluid individuals, especially, were consistently seen as being minimized because they were not seen as fully adhering to the categories gay and lesbian.

As Queer Theory worked to destabilize the categories that constructed sexuality, it also incorporated strands of feminist thought that highlighted the disjuncture between sex and gender. Taking Butler's (2006) assertion that gender is "a repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance, of a natural
sort of being” (45), Queer theorists claimed that all forms of sexuality were not biological fact, but an act of cultural performance – this included a heterosexuality that was seen as 'natural', 'normal', and biologically-ingrained. Ideologies of sexuality that claimed that heterosexuality was 'natural' and 'rational' (and therefore 'normal') had their power because they were consistently and continuously repeated throughout history, supported by such larger-scale institutions as the medical and psychological professions. This repetition obscured the source of this 'normality' as a social construction, and gave heterosexuality only the appearance of being a natural and biological-based 'fact.' Through this framework, all sexual identities (and, by extension, all gender identities) are merely performative.

Queer theorists, then, continue to have as their mission the uncovering of "the discursive materialisation of all sexual identities, paying attention to the fact that heteronormativity as the dominant discourse of sexuality does not just hurt members of sexual minorities, but also those that self-identify as heterosexual" (Motschenbacher 2010, 16). Understanding gender and sexuality as socially-constructed categories also allowed for the exploration of how binary-gendered (i.e., male/female, man/woman) systems came to be seen as normalized within the Western world, and how/where the existence of these systems marginalize those who do not conform to either side of the binary. This shift in perspective was accompanied by a similar shift where "a paradigm organized around the concept of binary gender difference has been superseded, for the most part, by one that is concerned with the diversity of gender identities and gendered practices" (Cameron 2005, 482). Man and woman, to many queer activists, were not just neutral categories that were inherent properties of individuals. Rather, they represented two sides of a strict binary that forces all individuals to not only conform to one side or another on the sole basis of anatomy, but also to enter into the power relations those labels carried with them. Membership into one or the other of these categories was strictly based
on biology: males have penises, females have vaginas, and individuals who met the appropriate physiological criteria were identified as either men or women. Superimposed on to this strict sexual binary system was an equally strict gender system that assigned males the category 'man' and females the category 'woman.' Historically, queer theorists argued, sex and gender were seen as part and parcel of the same system: males were men, females were women, and individuals who did not 'know their place' with the system were ostracized and pathologized as 'deviant' (cf. Foucault 1978 [1990]). Not only were the categories man/woman and male/female criticized in and of themselves, they were also problematized because of what they represented: a binary system that did not take into account the multiple ways in which individuals enact gender. These strict labels not only erased the experiences of those who did not conform to such labels (a position championed by the burgeoning trans activist movement of the 1990s), but assumed that sex, and the masculine/feminine binary simultaneously imposed on them, were immutable, natural qualities.

These understandings led queer theorists to claim that the labels 'gay' and 'lesbian, much like the terms 'male/female' and 'man/woman,' also enforced a binary on individuals that was not complete and all-encompassing. As Cameron (2005) notes, within queer theory "the sex/gender distinction is questioned on the grounds that sex itself is not 'natural' but constructed: so-called 'biological' facts are always filtered through social preconceptions about gender" (484). The terms 'gay' and 'lesbian,' queer theorists argued, assumed gendered and sexual absolutes: 'gay' included all (biologically male) men who felt sexual attraction (exclusively) to other men, and 'lesbian' assumed a category of (biologically) female women who felt sexual attraction (exclusively) to other women. Membership within these categories was often policed just as strongly as that of the term 'heterosexual': individuals who did not exclusively identify as men or women, or who may show attraction to both sexes (or neither sex), were
marginalized from the terms meant to empower them. As a result, binarization of sexual identity was often preserved, forcing individuals to fit in one category or the other.

Queer theory, then, has its main focus "the deconstruction or blurring of two powerful binarisms stabilizing each other: female vs. male and heterosexual vs. homosexual" (Motschenbacher 2010, 6). As Milani (2014) further explains:

a queer stance tries to draw attention not only to how biological sex (the dichotomy between males and females on the basis of organs of reproduction) is mapped onto gender (the opposition between men and women, masculinity and femininity) and how these dyads are in turn the foundation on which heterosexuality rests […] it also seeks to highlight how some of the ties sex, gender, and sexuality are socially (re)produced as ‘normal’ and ‘desirable’ (typically, the attraction between two allegedly opposite and complementary sexes/genders that underpins heterosexuality) while others are ‘deviant’ and ‘unwanted’ (usually, same-sex desire). (207)

As Milani explains above, Queer theory assumes that as sex and gender were forcibly mapped onto individuals, so too was an ideology that constructed heterosexuality as normative: males desired (or should desire) females (and vice versa), and men desired women (and vice versa). This heterosexuality was historically viewed as natural and ordinary: individuals who deviated from this were viewed as unnatural and obscene threats to the established social order. Within the early gay rights movement, attempts were made to mitigate the threats that non-heterosexuality presented to this social order by ‘normativizing’ same-sex attraction: by aligning homosexuals with the same (non-threatening) values that heterosexual relationships, and the individuals involved in them, claimed to represent, it was hoped that same-sex relationships would be seen as unthreatening to traditional social orders. The more homosexual values and beliefs reflected traditional heterosexual ones, the reasoning went, the more likely it would be that homosexuality would be more accepted within Western societies. Using Bucholtz and Hall's terms, these self-identified homosexuals adequated themselves with
heterosexuals by minimizing sexual difference and presenting themselves as adherents to 'proper' social norms and values.

However, as Milani (2014) has claimed, this strategy often served to disempower many self-identified 'queer' individuals who did not align themselves with these larger Western values, and who understood heterosexuality as carrying with it not only sexual ideologies, but also class-, race-, and behavior-based ideologies (i.e., heterosexuality as middle-class, monogamous, and White). As he notes, “certain forms of same-sex desire [have] themselves become normalized and legitimized over time (for example, monogamous, committed homosexual relationships) whilst others are (re)cast into the domain of abjection […] (for example,) S/M and uncommitted, multi-partnered relationships” (207). Thus, many queer-identified individuals not only railed against gender and sexual categories that were seen as oppressive, but the 'hidden' ideologies of race, class, and sexual behavior that those gender and sexual categories both encompassed and obscured.

Given the critical nature of Queer theory towards the nature of sexuality and gender, it seemed only natural that many scholars began to look at how ideologies of normative and deviant sexualities and genders are reflected within language use. As such, Queer Linguistics work to understand how some sexualities, be they heterosexual or homosexual, become normalized, while others become constructed as deviant, through language. Contrasting itself with other sub-disciplines of sociolinguistics that takes a priori binary sex and gender categories for granted, and uses them as a basis for extrapolating trends from data, Queer linguists attempt to understand how the the deeply-embedded binarisms that shape an individual’s sexual and gendered life (man/woman, male/female, heterosexual/homosexual) are not only enacted and reproduced through linguistic practice, but are also challenged and resisted by speakers. In Queer Linguistics, the very notion of these binaristic either/or categories, becomes problematic: binarisms, Queer linguists note, must be “problematized as a primary
symbol of the marginalization and stigmatization of non-normative subjects and practices” (Davis et al., 2014, 1). The categories man/woman, male/female, etc. are hegemonic, ideological categories in which individuals are placed either one category or the other, and are (partially) used to structure what is appropriate behavior for members of these categories. Inevitably, parsing out of individuals into these strict ‘either/or’ categories renders invisible the experiences and identities of those who do not feel that those categories entail who one ‘is’ accurately. Within Queer Linguistics “all identity categories are [thus] problematic because they normatively regulate and exclude those who do not fully meet their normative requirements. This is true for the categories ‘woman’ and ‘man,’ but just as well for ‘lesbian’ and ‘gay,’ which are not treated as internally homogeneous in Queer Linguistics” (Motschenbacher 2010, 10). By placing the labels ‘gay’ and ‘straight’ onto individuals, these labels risk the simplification of otherwise complex and rich sexual lives.

The effects of such a stringent binary structure are often felt in daily life, and sometimes in the most mundane of circumstances. Individuals who identify outside of gender binaries must contend with its existence, sometimes challenging its legitimacy and other times re-framing the binary to suit their identity needs. Valentine (2003), in his study of talk among an ‘alternative lifestyles’ meet-up group, analyzes what seems to be a breakdown in communication between two speakers, one (Angel) of whom identifies as transgender. Angel, throughout the course of the meeting, identified themselves as having a fluid sexuality and gender presentation, a concept that other participants at the meeting had trouble understanding. This lack of understanding, Valentine claimed, stemmed from different and conflicting understandings of sexuality and gender claimed by Angel and other participants. As an individual who at different points within the meeting identified as a gay man, a straight woman, and a sexually-fluid transgender person, Angel challenged the viewpoints of the other participants, who viewed gender and sexuality as discrete, separate, and categorizable facets of a person’s identity—and
this challenge led to misunderstandings about other aspects of Angel's life, such as viewpoints about sex work (which Angel engaged in).

At times, gender-binary systems can be deeply rooted within the structure of language itself, especially among languages with rich gender systems that divide the world into what have traditionally been called ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ genders. Problematizing this notion of linguistic-gender-as-social-gender, Motschenbacher (2010) studied the prevalence and distribution of female generics in languages with grammatical gender systems. Female generics are those nouns which are grammatically marked for ‘feminine’ gender, but can be used as a general term for mixed-group or gender-unknown groups (in contrast, the use of the term man to describe humans in general, such as in the phrase man walks on the moon, would be considered a male generic). Motschenbacher claims that the concept of ‘gender’, as a way of categorizing nouns into different classes, only took on a ‘gendered’ (i.e., masculine/feminine/neuter) aspect in many languages later on in their histories. He reflected this in his observation that, although many languages do use female-gendered nouns as generics, they are more likely than not to be restricted to historically female domains (within certain professions such as nursing), to confer lower prestige than their male-gendered equivalents and/or be derogatory. Motschenbacher draws the conclusion that “it is only following the association of the masculine grammatical gender with the male sex and of the feminine gender with the female sex that social power structures influence language structure” (121).

In a similar vein, Bershtling (2014) studied the ways in which trans and genderqueer Hebrew speakers negotiate their gender presentation around a highly gender-inflected language. Hebrew possesses a wide variety of required gender markers that obliges the speaker to mark their own gender as either masculine or feminine, with no other possible markers (i.e., neuter) available. At first glance, this strict categorization of masculine and feminine may make it difficult for individuals who fall
outside this strict gender binary to express themselves linguistically. However, Bershtling discovered numerous mechanisms used by genderqueer Hebrew speakers to negotiate around this constraint, including the use of inverse gender forms, blending masculine and feminine forms within the same utterance, and avoiding verb constructions that require the speaker to mark their gender. Thus, as Bershtling notes, “even from the social margins and from a position of relative powerlessness, a counterdiscourse can emerge, exposing the arbitrariness of language, rebelling against its rules and proposing alternative possibilities for action” (58).

This is not to say, however, that the categories ‘gay’ and ‘straight,’ since they have no existence outside of their social construction, should be discarded. On the contrary, as Davis et al. note, “the relevance of [such] binary distinctions to speakers’ organizations of the world around them should not be underestimated; as long as binaries have a role in the talk and other places of those we study, they must remain a component of our explanations” (2). Binarisms (man/woman, gay/straight, male/female) still have much explanatory power insofar as heteronormativity, and the categories that are constructed ‘against’ this heteronormativity, are vital in structuring social lives. Indeed, the labels ‘gay’ and ‘straight,’ ‘heterosexual’ and ‘homosexual’, and 'man' and 'woman' are often contended with, and in many cases actively incorporated into an individual’s understanding of their sexuality. Lozano-Verduzco's (2015, 2016) studies of gay men in Mexico, for instance, highlight the tensions that many gay men feel in not only reconciling their desires for other men among their families, but also in making sense of their desires against a culturally-prevalent machismo ideology that claims only one way to ‘be a man’.

Indeed, for many gay men, their sexuality is often seen (sometimes by themselves, other times by others) as anathema to what it means to be a 'man' in a particular given society. Gay men often have to contend with larger-scape ideologies of what has been called hegemonic masculinity, best
conceptualized as “the pattern of practice (i.e., things done, not just a set of role expectations or an identity) that allow[s] men’s dominance over women to continue” (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005, 832). Hegemonic masculinity refers to a specific, highly-regulated collections of behaviors, attitudes, and presentations that are directly tied to particular gender ideologies that idealize social and cultural superiority of masculinity over femininity, and whose successful enactments privilege one group of individuals (men) over others (women). Those who successfully 'enact' hegemonic masculinity gain access to numerous forms of social capital (economic, political, etc.) that are denied other individuals who are unable to successfully enact those tenets access to that capital.

Hegemonic masculinity takes for granted the idea that the world can be neatly divided up into a strict binary system where, based on the success or failure of meeting the qualifications of being a 'man,' some people have access to power and others do not. This access to power is contingent upon a system that assumes two distinct culturally-determined genders, masculinity and femininity, that are mapped onto biological distinctions that divide men from women on the basis of anatomy.

‘Masculinity’ is conceptualized as the domain of (some) males who meet the requisite criteria: this ‘criteria’ demands adherence to particular behaviors and values, but often also encompasses class-, race-, and desire-based ideologies that determine social power. Those who are not seen as possessing these ideals are Othered to those who are seen by others as doing so. Hegemonic masculinity can thus be considered a reified social system that “embodie[s] the currently most honored way of being a man [and] require[s] all other men to position themselves in relation to it, and it ideologically legitimate[s] the global subordination of women to men” (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, 832). It is a pervasive ideology that, like all ideologies, “preserve[s], legitimate[s] and naturalize[s] the interests of the powerful–marginalizing and subordinating the claims of other groups” (Wetherell & Edley 1999, 336).
Hegemonic masculinity, therefore, is complicit in the construction of a strict binary that sees those who successfully enact it in a dominant position to those who do/can not. As McInnes, Bradley, & Prestage (2009) have noted, masculinity “is an effect of semiotic patterning: it is produced as part of the relational construction of the dynamic opposition of genders (masculinity and femininity as relationally co-productive terms in a binary) that structures our social and sexual worlds” (643). Masculinity, especially hegemonic masculinity, has no existence without its counterpart, femininity: masculine traits that grant access to social power do not gain their power (solely) from their positioning as masculine, but (also) because they are contrasted to a subordinated femininity. Masculinity is thus “an effect of discursive production [that] permeat[es] and shap[es] all level of the experience of our sexed and gendered selves—our bodies, psyches, desires, social roles, dispositions to social action and interaction, rituals and norms” (McInness et al. 2009, 644).

It is important to note that hegemonic masculinity is not assumed to be the domain of all men. It is not a fixed attribute that every man necessarily possesses: only some men can (or have the opportunity to) lay claim to its benefits, while others who may seemingly be entitled to its benefits on the basis of biological sex are unable to reap its benefits, since they may not occupy the additional class/race/other positions inherent within hegemonic masculinity. Further, the sex/gender/class/race positions that make up hegemonic masculinity are often idealized to be part of a historical continuum of behavior that has previously existed and will (ideally) continue to do so, thus removing blame from any particular individual or group of individuals and rendering the enactment of hegemonic masculinity invisible from scrutiny. Hegemonic masculinity is thus unmarked, and as such often goes unremarked, as do the sex/gender/class/racial characteristics that are seen as integral to an ideally hegemonic male. As Bérubé (2001) as claimed with regard to the unmarked status of Whiteness in public conceptions of homosexuality, “Well, there it is. That is how it goes, how it stays white. ‘Without saying.’” (252).
Although many researchers have acknowledged the existence of a ‘singular,’ hegemonic way of being a man, there continues to be debate as to what hegemonic masculinity might look like in practice. Wetherell and Edley (1999) claim that “hegemonic masculinity is not a personality type or an actual male character. Rather, it is an ideal or set of prescriptive social norms, symbolically represented, but a crucial part of the texture of many routine mundane social and disciplinary activities […] it tends] to be correlated with what might be called macho masculinity and exemplified by characters in popular films such as *Rambo, Rocky* and *The Terminator*” (336-7). Although the movies mentioned above, and the actors starring in those movies (Sylvester Stallone and Arnold Schwarzenegger) may seem dated today, it is difficult to deny the fact that these movies remain archetypical of a singular masculine presence who is muscular and dominant, often silent, and uses violence as a means to achieve a goal. This narrow view of masculinity continues to be circulated primarily through mass media today (see, for example, *The Fast and the Furious* film franchise). However, Wetherell and Edley argue that the proliferation of this singular masculine ideal obscures the multiplicity of ways that men secure dominance over both women and other men. Instead, they advocate for a framework that understands how multiple, and sometimes competing, masculinities emerge in practice that may, at first glance, appear to contradict each other, but may on a deeper level still serve to subjugate the feminine. They note that different types of ways of ‘being a man’ that emerge in their interviews (the heroic man who perseveres against all odds, the ‘ordinary man’ who stresses individualism and rationality, the ‘rebellious’ man who actively engages in such non-masculine traits as knitting and cooking) represent archetypes are still firmly rooted in historical discourses that have allowed men greater amounts of freedom from social conventions, a position often denied women.

However, despite the existence of multiple masculinities, there seems to be a general conception that the ‘ideal’ man, at least in the contemporary Western world, assumes a particular set of
qualities, including “being white, heterosexual, aggressive, dominant, competitive, muscular, [and] class privileged” (Yeung, Stombler, & Wharton 2006, 6). This ideal embodiment of hegemonic masculinity in the contemporary Western world tends to be a White, heterosexual cis-gendered, working-class male: this ideal is seen as the archetype against which all other individuals are judged negatively. Those who do not possess the qualities needed to enact this particular form of hegemonic masculinity (women, gay men, transgendered individuals, non-White males, men with non-muscular bodies) are thus subordinated, even if they meet other qualities consistent with a social conception of hegemonic masculinity. Lavelle (2010) observes the tensions between hegemonic masculinity and race in her analysis of how NBA television commentators discussed Black players, and how ideas of race and sports intersect to contribute to an idealized version of Black masculinity. Because commentators, she argues, are mediators between audiences and the game, often providing information that is not readily accessible to players, they are responsible for disseminating a particular viewpoint of players to audiences. She demonstrates that on-court performances are often used to frame the non-basketball-related activities of Black NBA players, suggesting a close interlink, in the minds of commentators (and transmitted to the audience), between on-court ‘value’ to teammates and off-court ‘value’ to society. In addition, the economic potential of Black players is often highlighted, especially in terms of how they contributed to a win/loss, or within the context of team trades, while discussions of White players were more economically-neutral. This framing of Black NBA players, Lavelle argues, provides a particular conceptualization of the bodies of Black NBA players as having economic value (solely) based on their athletic prowess, and reinforces historical ideologies that relate Black value to the value of their bodies, and to athletic achievement.

Despite the variability that can occur among communities in what form hegemonic masculinity might take, many ‘global’ forms of it incorporate the idea that gay men are automatically excluded
from benefiting from it, by virtue of their status as men who are attracted to other men. In earlier writings, Connell (1992) acknowledged this when he argued that “to many people, homosexuality is a negation of masculinity, and homosexual men must be effeminate” (736). This observation notes a conflation of sex and gender, where heterosexuality and masculinity are seen as co-occurring, while homosexuality and effeminacy are constructed as its binary opposite: just as masculinity and femininity are seen as two sides of a single gender coin, so are heterosexuality and homosexuality. Hegemonic masculinity is therefore built on the idea that truly ‘masculine’ men are those who are heterosexual—and those who are not attracted to women are therefore relegated to the realm of the feminine. Indeed, as Eguchi (2009) notes, the very existence of gay men present a threat to hegemonic masculinity because they “are not considered masculine enough because they break the boundary of heteronormativity—heterosexuality as normal” (194).

This often leads to many gay men finding themselves in a double-bind: as men who desire other men, they are ‘Othered’ from traditional notions of masculinity, but yet many also feel pressure to distance themselves from behavior that marks them as effeminate to maintain their status as ‘men’. For some theorists (e.g. Fejes 2002), this double-bind presents new opportunities for re-contextualizing gay male identities, decoupling homosexual desire from its binary heterosexual counterpart and providing avenues for discussions of desire that are not dependent on contrast with traditional notions of heterosexual masculinity. Other researchers, however, note that, despite their ‘Othered’ status, gay men often do reap the benefits of hegemonic masculinity based on their biological sex, and participate (either willingly or not) in the subjugation of femininity to masculinity. Demetriou (2001), for example, argues that Connell’s conception of an overarching hegemonic masculinity that subordinates other types of masculinities does not take into account the fact that qualities of these ‘subordinate’ masculinities can sometimes be incorporated into a superordinate masculinity that ultimately
subjugates the feminine. He notes that “the configuration of practice that guarantees the reproduction of patriarchy […] is in fact a hybrid masculine bloc that is made up of both straight and gay, both black and white elements and practices” (348). This practice, he goes on to say, “incorporate[s] the elements produced by these ‘marginal’ and ‘subordinate’ masculinities that [are] functional to the reproduction of patriarchy” (349). The incorporation of these ‘marginal’ elements serves a two-fold purpose: it allows for individuals marked by a marginalized masculinity to (at least partially) claim a position within a larger hegemonic masculine structure through complicity, while still maintaining a feminized Other that is subordinated to masculinity. The creation and maintenance of this masculine ‘bloc’ thus allows even those who do not fully subscribe to tenets of hegemonic masculinity to reap its benefits, thus erasing differences among men, while still maintaining a binary system that subordinates a feminized Other. Advertising practices, for example, that market cosmetics to men do so by reconfiguring discourses of self-care and appearance (traditionally thought of as being part of a women- and gay-male-centered domain) into discourses of capitalism and power that ultimately serve to reinforce the economic power of men (Harrison 2008).

For many gay men, ideals of hegemonic masculinity also frame sexual preference and practice. Leap (2014), for example, observed the practice of erasing differences among men in order to preserve a singular archetype of masculinity that is eroticized and seen as desirable. In his analysis of online discussions of non-traditional gay male pornography produced by major studios, he noted that reviewers often minimized or erased traditionally non-masculine traits of performers (Black men, men with full-body tattoos, transmale actors with vaginas) while highlighting other, more ‘masculine’ aspects (Black men as penetrators, transmale actors as muscular), typically under the label of being ‘hot’. By doing so, Leap argues, reviewers are often able to preserve gay pornography as a “site of...
opportunity for hypermasculine camaraderie” (145), even in the face of such seemingly major transgressions.

Similarly, McInnes et al. (2009) studied how a group of gay-identified men discuss experiences with group sex and found that, in in-depth discussions, many participants identified as both insertive and receptive partners within group-sex situations, suggesting “a shift away from the tight alignments within the heterosexual matrix between masculine = active/femininity = passive” (642). This might suggest a destabilization of sexual ideologies among gay men that idealize insertive partners as masculine, dominant ‘tops’ and receptive partners as submissive, feminized ‘bottoms.’ However, they also note that their interviewees “rework and re-instantiate the binary masculine/feminine and other binaries in order to represent their motivations for and preferences when involved in group sex in ways that align them with more normative forms of masculinity” (642). These ‘re-instantiations,’ McInness et al. found, included the use of agentive grammatical structures that “valued ways of doing masculinity as active and agentive, as aligned with the natural and primitive, wild and outrageous” (651). Although their sexual activity may say otherwise, these men still found value in aligning with traditional notions of masculinity that privileged well-endowed, muscular men, and the ‘dominant’ sexual behavior they are idealized to engage in, as objects of desire.

The identifying and compartmentalizing of ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ traits thus often presents challenges to gay men, who are sometimes willing to participate in the subjugation of the ‘feminine’ by actively attaching themselves to stereotypically masculine values, sometimes even fracturing their communities of practice as a result. In studies of attitudes toward effeminacy on the gay-male-oriented website StraightActing.com (Clarkson 2006; Eguchi 2009), it has been argued that many posters on the site ‘celebrated’ a local form of masculinity based on the “cultural archetype of [the] primitive, uneducated, and crude depiction of working-class men” (Clarkson 2006, 199). Although, as Clarkson
notes, working-class men are not often seen as bearers of a hegemonic masculinity, this ‘working-class male’ archetype is recontextualized and reconfigured as a highly-valued and -admired trait: this archetype is given even more social power when it is contrasted with an archetype of the ‘effeminate’ gay male who is loud, obnoxious, delicate, and over-obsessed with personal appearance – qualities antithetical to the working-class male, who enjoys a beer with his friends and engaging in (or watching on television) dangerous contact sports.

In later iterations, theories of hegemonic masculinity have allowed for the possibility of local masculinities to emerge and interact with global conceptions of what it means to be a man. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) argue for an understanding of hegemonic masculinity that is enacted at three levels: the local, regional, and global. Local masculinities, which privilege certain ways of being a man over others, emerge within individual communities of practice, and interact with larger-scale conceptions of masculinity at the regional and global level, sometimes in contradictory and conflicting ways. Through this tiered mechanism, hegemonic masculinity is no longer “a fixed entity embedded in the body of personality traits of individuals […] but rather] configurations of practice that are accomplished in social action and, therefore, can differ according to the gender relations in a particular social setting” (836).

Looking at how local masculinities develop and evolve within local communities, then, allows for the possibility of understanding how individuals reconcile, reconfigure, and adapt larger conceptions of hegemonic masculinity, at both regional and global levels. Yeung et al. (2006), in their study of attitudes and beliefs of members of a gay male fraternity, note that fraternity members both challenge and conform to larger notions of hegemonic masculinity. Understanding the college fraternity structure as “part of a larger gender system, one that is defined by power and conflict between two sets of socially-constructed binaries: men/women and masculinity/femininity” (6), they
note that gay male fraternity members challenge existing gender structures, primarily through practices of dressing up in drag and fostering nonsexual and emotional intimacy among its members. On the local level, then, gay fraternities challenge the larger status of fraternities as spaces where masculine behavior is sought as the ideal, and feminine behavior is used as a means of humiliation or punishment. However, although heterosexual men were allowed to (and in some cases did) join the fraternity, members were not willing to allow women into the fraternity, limiting access to the fraternity (and the social benefits accorded members of the fraternity) to men: members also demonstrated attitudes about women (both heterosexual and lesbian) that “present[ed] women as essentially different from men, reject[ed] masculinity in women, and valoriz[ed] men over women” (23). Thus, although challenging gender norms through their practices of drag and emotional intimacy on a local level, members also perpetuated the global idea of the fraternity as a ‘men-only’ space whose benefits were limited to men.

Barrett (2017) also notes an example of gay men attaching to traditionally 'male' values in his discussion of bear culture. Barrett notes that self-identified 'bears' (a term used within gay male communities to refer to a typically older, hairier, and burlier man) present an interesting mix of stereotypically 'masculine' and 'feminine' activities: they "typically participate in activities associated with working-class masculinity, such as wearing sports or camping gear, [but] they are just as likely to participate in activities that are stereotypically associated with rural working-class femininity like sharing recipes at potluck dinners or demonstrating their crocheting at bear craft fairs. Thus bear identity involves the performative assertion of class and regional identities as much as it involves gendered identities" (85). This conglomeration of class, regional, and gendered identities, Barrett argues, results in a presentation of masculinity that borrows much from more global conceptions of 'stereotypical' male identity that, in turn, borrows much from working-class identity, but simultaneously
re-works these borrowings into a localized masculinity that incorporates traditionally-feminine ideologies.

This chapter argues that posters on OnYourKnees co-construct localized versions of masculinity that relate to, yet are somewhat distinct from, the ‘global’ conceptions of masculinity discussed above. On a global level, many posters on OnYourKnees align their identities with a particular type of (Americanized) hegemonic masculinity that values stereotypically-masculine activities, including an intense focus on sports and body-consciousness, and a marked disinterest in scholarly/academic pursuits. On a local level, however, posters simultaneously participate in the co-construction of a binary system that places coaches on the dominant end of a pole, and jocks on the submissive end. Through linguistic strategies of dominance, coaches envision themselves, and are seen by jocks, as idealizing a privileged type of masculinity that places them as dominant, willing to control others, and as intelligent. Jocks, on the other hand, view themselves (and are seen by coaches) as submissive and willing to be controlled, and often index these through linguistic strategies of submission. In addition, jocks privilege particular behaviors, such as physical fitness and the cultivation of a particular public presentation, that align with larger conceptions of hegemonic masculinity while also developing a local conception of masculinity that has meaning and salience, and that provides a vehicle through which to frame erotic desire. Furthermore, through strategies of naturalization, these desires are often framed as not just wanted, but ingrained into the very fabric of what it means to be a jock.

The Jock: contours of identity
As mentioned in the Introduction, the main audience for OnYourKnees is "men that enjoy hypnosis to get lean, fit, muscular, or huge; hypno for bodybuilding and muscle worship; and hypnotism for related fantasies (such as serving a coach, dumbing down, or being a jock slave)." This 'mission statement' appears on the main page of the messageboard website, where it is prominently visible to all readers. Simply from analyzing the mission statement, a few important points can be raised. First, the messageboard explicitly states that it is aimed (primarily) at men; by mentioning men in particular, the messageboard seems to exclude women as a primary audience. But OnYourKnees is not meant for all men; it is meant primarily for men who "enjoy hypnosis to get lean, fit, muscular, or huge." The particular status of hypnosis will be more fully discussed in Chapter 4: it suffices to say for now that hypnosis is seen by many participants on OnYourKnees as a culturally-salient manifestation of contours of dominance and submission. Hypnosis, on OnYourKnees, is meant to be used as a tool for men to develop their muscles, and gain a body that is seen as desirable (as evidenced by the clause hypno for bodybuilding and muscle worship). The messageboard is also meant to discuss fantasies related to hypnotism, including serving a coach, dumbing down, or being a jock slave. 'Dumbing down', as will be discussed below (and further in Chapter 3), refers to the act of presenting oneself as unintelligent and/or uninterested in academic or scholarly pursuits; this behavior, as well as that of serving a coach and being a jock slave, also represent contours along which dominance and submission lie on OnYourKnees.

The 'mission statement' of OnYourKnees thus presents both a cultural model and an ideal type of messageboard user: a cultural model in which gay men should find the fulfillment of their desires in engaging in power relations, and an ideal user who is interested in developing a muscular body (primarily, though not exclusively, through hypnosis), and who are interested in being submissive to an imagined Coach Other. This identity archetype seems to congeal around one of the most oft-used and
significant words appearing throughout the corpus: *jock*. The lemma JOCK appears 722 times within the corpus, and can appear in numerous forms: it can appear in a singular or plural nominal form, posters can use the word *jock* within their usernames, and posters can use it as a self-referent, identifying themselves and other posters as *jocks*. One can also become *jocked* (meaning that they take on characteristics of a stereotypical jock, including watching sports and wearing sports-related clothing), and one can devote much energy developing and enhancing their own *jockitude* (the attitude of 'being' a jock). One can speak about *jock* behavior, attitudes, and clothing; of course, as many posters believe, one cannot be a jock without wearing a *jockstrap*, and finding themselves in a condition of wearing a jockstrap (sometimes even without their realizing it) means that they have become *jockstrapped*.

The term *jock* has much currency on OnYourKnees, as it evokes a particular constellation of activities, behavior, and appearances that both reaches out to larger social ideologies of being a 'jock,' and messageboard-specific ideologies that expand on and, in some cases, distances itself from those larger-scale ideologies. On a larger scale, the term *jock* (within the contexts of the U.S.) carries with it a stereotype that Miller (2009) describes as "participation in a high-profile, high status sport marked by pervasive, hegemonically masculine imagery—under which a dangerously risk-oriented jock identity may develop" (70). Qualities of a stereotypical ‘jock’ identity often include the desire to show physical dominance over others: Miller thus relates the term *jock* to hegemonic masculinity, arguing that the term indexes an individual who, on some level, subscribes to (or is perceived to subscribe to) similar ideologies. This sentiment is echoed by Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1995), who note that “practices aimed at developing and displaying confidence and superior physical strength and skill play a central role in constituting a hegemonic masculinity in the United States […] the body aimed at is muscular and tough, able successfully to withstand physical attacks and to defend others against them, able to
win in attacks with others” (484). For Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, the ideal body inherent in hegemonic masculinity is one that is strong and tough, but one that is also designed for physical labor and defense. The ideally hegemonically-masculine male makes a living from the labor of his body, translating physical capital into economic, and thus social, capital.

However, although the term *jock* has global significance, its meanings and cultural inscriptions can be re-examined and re-framed on local levels, sometimes in negative ways. Miller, for example, notes that the term *jock* indexes participation in certain sports (such as football, basketball, and wrestling) over others (such as golf and swimming): this implies that not all athletes may subscribe to the ideologies inherent in the word *jock*. She also observes that individuals who participate in athletics (the focus of her study) are often aware of the ideologies that the term *jock* carries with it, and may often see it as a stigmatizing identity to be avoided: in her study of student-athletes’ self-assessments, she notes a hesitation in her subjects assigning themselves the label *jock*, preferring the more neutral term *athlete*.

In sociolinguistics, the term *jock* has gained special significance thanks to Eckert's (1989) influential study of jocks and burnouts at Belten High, which demonstrates how the term *jock* can be re-configured and re-conceptualized on a local level, gaining additional significant that has immediate effects on the day-to-day lives of those who contend with such an identity. At Belten High, the identity *jock* was often contrasted with that of a *burnout*: jocks generally saw the school as an important institution that structured aspirational goals and prepared them for entry into professional middle-class life, while burnouts negatively viewed the school as a detrimental institution that impinged on their values and vocational aspirations. Many of the self-acknowledged burnouts in Eckert’s study oriented towards mechanical and vocational trades, an occupational aspiration that they felt the school as an institution at best tolerated and at worst discouraged. Eckert demonstrates how the two identities are
constituted as binary categories that are opposed to one another, and that are used by high schoolers at Belten High to construct their identities and position themselves vis-a-vis their school and their life trajectories. Interestingly, however, the use of the term jock at Belten High seems to contrast with the ideology of jocks as engaging in physical labor (and therefore using their bodies as a means of economic capital): many self-ascribed jocks at Belten High also identified as school-oriented and aspiring to go to college. Thus, the term jock is re-coded within the Belten High population as a marker of higher-class status, while the term burnout is reserved for those who do not have college aspirations and are more likely than not to make a living through physical labor. Nevertheless, jock and burnout became labels for identifying how students viewed the role of the school within their own lives, and within the lives of others.

The term jock, as Pronger (1990) argues, also has cultural significance among many gay men. Noting that "the athletic world of power, speed, and pain is an expression of the masculine ideals of our culture" (3), Pronger claims that "as an expression and exercise of masculine power, athletics is stylized aggression, with the more masculine sports being the most aggressively violent ones" (131). Athletics, Pronger notes, has historically held a special place within gay male homoeroticism, in that it represents an obvious subversion of traditional (heterosexual) masculinity–one that places the locus of desire for a masculine body onto a 'feminine' (i.e. female) form. He notes that this concept of paradoxical masculinity "takes the traditional signs of patriarchal masculinity and filters them through an ironic gay lens. Signs such as muscles, which in heterosexual culture highlight masculine gender by pointing out the power men have over other men and the power they have to resist other men, through gay irony emerge as enticements to homoerotic desire–a desire that is anathema to orthodox masculinity" (144-5). The desire for a traditional 'jock body,' therefore, represents a fundamental upending of norms of desire that are rooted in heterosexuality.
It should be observed, however, that many researchers have noted the tensions inherent in trying to achieve such a body for gay men. Much research (Sánchez et al. 2009; Kane 2010; Lanzieri and Hildebrandt 2011) suggests that the proliferation of an ‘idealized’ muscular gay male body among both gay men and the general consciousness is not only influenced by conceptions of masculinity that privilege such a body, but also can cause depression and the engaging in unsafe behaviors for many gay men who link this ideal body to sexual desire (although it must be stated that not all gay male subcultures accept this as the body ideal, such as ‘bear’ subculture, e.g. Barrett 2017). Baker (2005) also notes the tense relationship between an idealized muscular body and conceptions of masculinity when he claims that

the power from muscular bodies is [...] often symbolic or restricted to a particular community of practice. Large or toned muscles offer one form of power then, which for gay men is likely to make them more successful in the sexual marketplace and instill a sense of confidence. Because such muscles are rarely needed to carry out manual labor, instead they become presentational, a form of cultural rather than physical capital, the result of gym membership, protein supplements or steroids, personal trainers and the free time required to carry out a regular exercise routine. Muscularity is therefore increasingly a signifier of middle-class, rather than working-class identity – although the fact that the body is achieved in an air-conditioned gym rather than a building site means that such authenticity is [often] out of reach (226).

For hegemonic masculinity, a ‘muscular, tough’ body becomes a status symbol, primarily because it indexes physical dominance, the ability to successfully fight with others, and the potential for economic capital through physical labor. Baker argues that, for many gay men, a gym-built body takes on a different ideology. Gym-toned bodies become desirable among gay men because they are an index of both sexual desire (or, to use Hakim's [2010] term, 'erotic capital') and economic potential. Achieving a gym-toned body is desirable for what it is: a body that was invested in through time at a gym. Such time and effort, Baker notes, can only be available when there is free time to do so; i.e., time that is not
spent at a place of employment. The muscular body that is a locus of desire, then, also becomes a(n indirect) symbol of economic security.

But how are these tensions enacted on OnYourKnees? How do jocks utilize these tensions to adequate themselves as a unified group, while simultaneously distinguishing themselves from imagined Others who may not subscribe to such tenets? Perhaps the best way to begin considering how these jock identities are constructed on OnYourKnees, and how those constructions relate to larger conceptions of hegemonic masculinity, is by describing two posts that are meant to exemplify the ideal jock:

(3) To workout a whole lot...
   To make working out very high in his personal priorities...
   To feel a burning desire and need to work out and eating right to make his the body as lean and muscular as possible....
   To put achieving this lean and muscular body ahead of almost every thing else in his life...
   To never skip a work out...
   To push himself to his limits with every rep, of every set, of every exercise, in every workout...
   To be confident in his body and all of his abilities...
   To be comfortable in and enjoy the lean, muscular, masculine, attractive body he has and is building. (ND, 324:2)

(4) It feels good to relax as you think of the ideal jock. Strong, muscular, confident as he trains. Training with his team. Training for his coach. Getting stronger. Reflexes improving. Able to react without thinking. Instinct and training guide him. Listening to coach, being with the other jocks. It is important to obey coach. Finding it so easy to obey coach now and always. (RO, 28:1)

In both (3) and (4), the posters are explaining qualities that they believe an 'ideal' jock should possess. In (3), the poster (ND) claims that an ideal jock should constantly be working out, and should make working out very high in his personal priorities. Making working out a 'high priority' means that he should feel a burning desire and need to work out, and putting this desire ahead of almost everything else in his life. An ideal jock should also be confident in and comfortable in his body, since
it is *lean, muscular, masculine*, [and] *attractive*. Similarly, in (4) RO relates the term *ideal jock* as meaning someone who is *strong, muscular, and confident as he trains*. The ideal jock is always training, both *for his team* and for *his coach*. To be in a state of constant training means that he is *getting stronger*, with his *reflexes improving*, and he is able to *react without thinking*, with *instinct and training guiding him*. Thus, for both ND and RO, an 'ideal' jock should not only be continually focused on achieving a muscular body, but to turn this desire into one that is naturalized and instinctual.

This idealization of the ‘jock’ body, then, reflects both global and local conceptions of masculinity. On one hand, the desire to achieve a strong body is consistent with ideologies of hegemonic masculinity that privilege such a body. However, in (3) and (4), the jock body simultaneously becomes a site of the enactment of a localized masculinity that privileges single-mindedness and focus on achieving that ideal. This is reiterated in RO’s further claim in (4) that an ideal jock should be *able to react without thinking*, with *instinct and training guiding him*. This suggests that the desire for jocks to work out should be a ‘naturalized’ one that is fundamental to the identity of a jock. The phrase *without thinking* and the word *instinct* imply that a jock should know the he should constantly be working out, almost on an unconscious level: in other words, an ideal jock should knowingly and willingly submit to an unconsciously-ingrained desire to want to achieve a gym-toned body. A jock's desire to work out should, thus, be naturalized within him–and this 'naturalization', RO makes clear, is a fundamental tenet of what it means to be a jock.

But this 'instinct' goes beyond merely achieving an idealized muscular, jock body. As RO notes in (4), 'ideal' jocks should not only be constantly working out, they must be in constant *training for his coach*. Here, RO alludes to the idea that body condition is not only a means unto itself, or a means to enable a jock identity – it is also a way to show submission to an imagined coach Other. In (4), then, RO is not only constructing an idealized jock identity that all jocks should aspire (and therefore
adequate themselves) to, but simultaneously constructing an idealized (and distinct) coach identity to which jocks should train for. RO continues this idea when he concludes his post with the affirmation that 'ideal' jocks should obey coach [...] finding it so easy to obey coach now and always. 'Ideal' jocks, according to RO, should always be listening to an (imagined, in this case) coach: the 'coach' is thus constructed as a figure of authority that jocks not only should, but should feel a desire to, listen to. Jocks should easily submit to the will of coaches: indeed, that should be their ultimate desire.

RO's post in (4) utilizes strategies of naturalization, submission, and dominance in the construction of an ideal jock. Because jocks should instinctually desire to achieve a gym-toned body, their desire becomes constructed as something that is naturalized within them. Jocks, moreover, should not only achieve this body for themselves; rather, they should also do so for the pleasure of a coach. By constructing jocks as engaging in activities for a coach, RO is contributing to a strategy of both submission (in that jocks should submit to coaches) and domination (in that coaches should be the recipient of a jock's actions): whether it be to an imagined coach Other or to their desires to achieve a gym-toned boy, jocks should always be submissive. On the surface, this contradicts a fundamental tenet of hegemonic masculinity: by constructing themselves as subordinate to other, more powerful men, jocks seemingly resist an ideology that places their otherwise-masculinist behavior in position of dominance to others. But as jocks construct themselves as subordinated to coaches, they simultaneously, and somewhat paradoxically, sustain hegemonic masculine ideologies in other ways. First, as congruent with ideologies of hegemonic masculinity, they place some men, via a constructed masculine superiority, in positions of dominance over other men. In RO's post, the collocations of the terms coach and obey suggest such a power differential, in that coaches are often thought of, within the larger cultural model presented on OnYourKnees, as individuals who guide athletes in training and reaching fitness goals. By constructing jocks as submissive, RO's post in (4) simultaneously constructs
coaches as dominant to jocks, and jock behavior (in large part) should be directed at fulfilling this 
constructed desire of coaches. RO thus contributes to the development of a binary opposition in which 
a particular group of males (coaches) are constructed as having power over other, subordinate males 
(jocks) – which is a fundamental tenet of hegemonic masculinity.

For some jocks, the gym itself plays an important role in the construction of a jock identity:

(5) For you dudes thats musscle jocks or want to be musscle jocks the best way to be one is to just 
push past any excuse to not to go to the gym and just do it. Maybe think of it like eating or 
sleeping its just something you got to do everyday. Plus when you start doing it everyday its 
like a habit and feels more natural and then when a day comes along and you can't do it you feel 
wird and then you work out even harder the next time you go. For me if I miss a day I punish 
myown self by raising my wts. on the free wts. just to make up for the day I missed. (DL, 5:1)

In (5), DL is addressing his advice to dudes thats musscle jocks or want to be musscle jocks, and 
claims that the best way to be one is to just push past any excuse to not go to the gym and just do it. 
For DL, exercise and lifting weights is not enough: these activities must be done in the gym. By 
equating gym usage with such biologically-necessary activities as eating or sleeping, DL also 
contributes to a larger-scale discourse of naturalization that instinctualizes going to the gym and 
working out as a fundamental activity of jocks: something that jocks got to do everyday.

Within the same thread, the close linkage between jocks and the gym is seen in another poster's 
(HS) response to DL:

(6) Also keep yourown shirt off as much as you can. Show off your work in the gym and when you 
gotta wear a shirt get you a t-shirt and cut off the sleefs and the sides as much as you can to 
show off your work. A good cut off shirt should show off your lats your wide back and part of 
your chest to the nip line. (HS, 5:2)
For HS, it is not only important for jocks to have a well-developed body: it must also be prominently displayed, through the wearing of particular types of clothing. The idea that jocks should be dressed in a certain way (what is often referred to on this messageboard as gear) is brought up many posters. In (6), for HS, jocks should be wearing shirts with their sleeves and sides missing, so that jocks can show off your work in the gym. Often times, such athletic-style clothing is designed to maximize ease of movement for physical activity; however, in (6) such clothing seems to serve an additional function: to show off one's muscular 'jock' physique.

Other posters exploit the link between certain types of clothing and a jock identity:

(7) I spent alot of money on clothes, sweat pants, jock straps, athletic t shirts, baseball caps. Things that I never wore before are now very appealing to me and I think that's the way that it should be. (JL, 249:1)

(8) I already am preferring jock wear! I just put in an order for a bunch of Nike gear... (LO, 249:3)

In (7) and (8), JL and LO profess a preference for certain types of clothing over others, including (in the case of JL) items such as sweat pants, jockstraps, athletic t-shirts, and baseball caps, and (in LO's case) the wearing of certain brands (Nike) that culturally index an athletic-oriented identity. JL, in (7), takes this idea one step further when he claims that these clothes (which he never wore before) are now very appealing to me and I think that's the way it should be. Here, by claiming that wearing such clothing is the way it should be for him, JL also contributes to a discourse of naturalization by adding to a cultural model that 'instinctualizes' such jock behavior.

Clothing thus plays numerous roles in the construction of a jock-oriented identity: it provides not only an index of gym membership and adherence to fitness and body-consciousness, but also of
larger cultural values that privilege an athletic-oriented identity over others. In many cases, the wearing of particular types of clothing becomes a locus of desire in and of itself. This can perhaps be seen most clearly in discussions revolving around jockstraps, an article of clothing that Pronger (1990) has claimed to have a particular significance in the construction of homoerotic desire: "by featuring the phallus it elevates masculinity, but its concomitant delineation of the buttocks draws us simultaneously to the violation of masculinity." (158) The lemma JOCKSTRAP, and uses of the lemma JOCK that specifically refer to a jocks strap, occurs 59 times within the corpus: for many posters, the wearing of a jockstrap is not only a fundamental marker of a jock identity, but carries with it a deeper significance that transcends merely 'looking' like a jock. Often times, jockstraps are linked with the ideology that jocks should be highly-sexual beings who are eager and willing to engage in receptive sexual activity, many times to please a coach. Indeed, many self-identified jocks are aware that they should constantly be sexualized, as seen in (9) below:

(9) my coach makes me wear a jock all the time - even when I go to bed. He told me that dumb jocks think with there nuts when they think so to have jock on reminds you all the time that your a jock. (HS, 113:1)

In (9), HS (who, in a previous post, self-identifies as a jock) notes that his coach requires him to wear a jockstrap at all times, even for sleeping. He notes that his coach told him that jocks think with there nuts, suggesting that jocks should constantly be thinking about sex: wearing a jockstrap, to HS, becomes a physical reminder of his idealized mental state.

For many jocks, as (10) and (11) below exemplify, even the act of working out is intimately related to sexual activity:
(10) When a jock gets to horney it is time to work out!! (HS, 118:5)

(11) Just go SLOW, SLOWER, and "FEEL" it, as the muscles obey your mind, like you obey your Coach.

Good, strong muscles, focused and controlled.

Let your dick get rok hard in your jock. The awesome pleasure from the intense control pumping thru you. (RA, 118:3)

In (10), HS (who was previously quoted in (9)) notes that *when a jock gets to horney it is time to work out!!*, suggesting that sexuality and the desire to work out should be closely intertwined in the 'ideal' jock. RA, in (11), further develops this idea by first claiming that jocks, when they engage in physical workouts, should *just go SLOW, SLOWER, and "FEEL" it, as the muscles obey your mind, like you obey your Coach*. Here, RA draws an explicit symbolic link between working out and obeying a coach: as working out requires intense focus and muscle coordination, RA argues that the body should obey the mind, just as a jock should obey a coach. Here, discourses of subordination and domination intertwine to create an ideal of a jock who is working out to not only please himself (sexually), but also his coach (sexually). RA also claims that such an activity should result in feelings of sexual excitement, as jocks should *let your dick get rok hard in your jock*, resulting in *awesome pleasure from the intense control pumping thru you*. As working out should allow a jock to feel sexual excitement, so should the feeling of being subordinate to a coach.

NK, in (12), elaborates on this theme even further:

(12) For motivation why not picture yourself as the super lean thickly muscled totally ripped muscle boy that putting your all in to your workouts is going to make you.... and how great you will feel as the muscle stud you are becoming, strong, confident, powerful, able to accomplish any goal you set your mind to reach... And what it will be like when you jack off in your studly new body... (NK, 150:2)
For NK, jocks should always keep in mind an 'ideal' of being a super lean thickly muscled totally ripped muscle boy as a (reachable) goal of working out. Jocks should derive pleasure from becoming strong, confident, powerful, and able to accomplish any goal you set your mind to reach. However, NK also relates the pleasure of having a physically-fit body to sexual pleasure, when he states that similar feelings will be obtained when you jack off in your studly new body. Here, as in other posts, the relationships among a jock identity, physical fitness, and sexual feelings are intimately intertwined.

In some cases, posters reach out to larger cultural stereotypes through invoking pop-culture figures that embody, either physically or in attitude, a quintessential 'jock identity':

(13) Hey! - sub 40 gay guy in [geographic area redacted] lookin to be [...] made Keanu-esque valley boi, like in Bill & Ted flicks. Used to have long hair and look the part, workin to get back in shape and gonna grow the mane back out. (AS, 139:1)

(14) I'm looking for like a college frat jock. Speaks like a bro, cocky, likes to work out, show off, have confidence. Always horny [...] Think like Stiffler from American Pie, or Slater from Saved by the Bell. (LF, 285:1)

Personal-ad style posts like (13) and (14), in which jocks-to-be express an interest in either finding a coach or finding particular hypnotic trances that suit their needs, provide an important insight into the development and maintenance of jock and coach identities. Indeed, one of the most effective methods for co-constructing jock/coach parameters on OnYourKnees seems to be through the ‘advertising’ of oneself through personal ad-style posts. It was mentioned earlier that single-post threads were excluded from this analysis: many of these threads took the form of personal ad-style
posts that identified a poster’s desire to meet other men. However, in the corpus there exist numerous examples of posts of this style within multi-post threads, and they contribute to the co-construction of jock and coach identity. Coupland (1996) argues that dating advertisements, as a distinct genre with its own conventions and goals, are “a limiting case for the discursive construction of self-identities[…] requiring highly direct self- and other-representation within a sparse textual framework” (188).

Personal ads have as their goal the ‘selling’ of oneself to a potential (buying) audience, in order to elicit a response: they thus share many attributes with advertisements for goods and services. However, although Coupland recognizes the strict limitations placed on such a genre, she also demonstrates how individuals are able to skillfully manipulate the conventions of the genre, humanizing both the subject of the ad and the target. She concludes that dating advertisements have the power to both “challenge and subvert the discourses of the marketplace and, on the other hand to endorse and use marketized practices” (205).

Many studies have noted the importance of personal ads in the construction of particular forms of sexuality. Reynolds (2015), in a study of personal ads of men who have sex with men (MSMs) on Craigslist, found that many posters were complicit in the creation of “an authentic masculinity that invites sexual contact without threatening social constructions of heterosexuality among posters” (220). This ‘authentic masculinity’ included the explicit de-coupling of sexual acts with romanticism, an emphasis on anonymity, and markers of ‘traditional’ male-bonding activities (including a shared interest in women, watching straight pornography, and bonding over sports and bar culture). Groom and Pennebaker (2005), in a multivariate analysis comparing language use among heterosexual- and homosexual-oriented personal ads, found slight grammatical differences in constructions of personal ads: heterosexual-oriented ads showed a greater use of first- and third-person pronouns, suggesting that heterosexual ads were more focused on difference, while homosexual-oriented ads were more focused
on matching based on similarity. However, they also found a lack of crossover interaction between heterosexual men and lesbian personal ads, on one hand, and heterosexual women on the other, suggesting the lack of correlation between attraction to a particular sex and the deployment of linguistic variables.

Personal-ad style posts play an important role in solidifying jock and coach identities on OnYourKnees, reifying key qualities that are seen as intrinsic to both. In (14), AS claims himself to be a sub 40 gay guy who wishes to look like a Keanu-esque valley boi, like in Bill & Ted flicks. Here, AS refers to the actor Keanu Reeves, specifically his role in the 1989 film *Bill & Ted's Excellent Adventure*, in which he played a stereotypical California surfer-boy with (presumably) below-average intelligence. Similarly, in (15), LF is looking for advice on how to become his ideal of a jock. For LF, jock identity is constructed partially through manner of speech (*speaks like a bro*), general attitude towards life (*cocky...show off, have confidence*), and sexual eagerness (*always horny*). He 'anchors' this identity by referring to the pop-culture characters Stifler (from the *American Pie* series of movies) and A.C. Slater (from the 1990s teenage sitcom *Saved by the Bell*). Both Stifler and Slater, to LF, are a cultural manifestation of attitudes and behaviors congruent with a jock identity: confident (to the point of arrogance), physically fit, interested in sports, and not particularly academically-inclined (see Image 3-1, below). It is also important to note that the pop-culture figures evoked above are high-school students, linking a jock identity to one that is youthful.
In many cases, especially when concerning posts looking for coaches, posters who wish to enact a jock identity do not do so by merely describing their desires, but by simultaneously co-constructing an idealized coach Other that complements a jock identity. Jocks do not merely engage in physical fitness and body-conscious activities for their own personal pleasure: this 'personal' satisfaction is intermixed with the desire to please a coach. Jocks are not 'merely' sexualized: they sexualize themselves, in part, to 'please' this imagined coach Other. Thus, for many posters, as they share their desires in wanting to achieve a jock identity (and, thus, constructing themselves as active, agentive subjects), they are also complicit in constructing the object of that desire: as an ideology of the ideal 'jock' develops, so does an ideology of the ideal 'coach.'

But it is important to note that jock identities are not only constructed against this imagined coach Other. In some cases, posters present a 'current' self-presentation that, they feel, does not align with a jock identity, and they wish to change themselves to more fully align with it. Current selves are constructed as undesirable, as can be demonstrated in (15) and (16) below:

(15) I'm a college student with a history of introversion and a desire to change. I'd like to find a hypnotist to work with online who can help me acquire a jock mindset. I need motivation, so I
want to become obsessed with building muscle and seeking out sex. I'm okay with a little
dumbing down, but mostly I want to learn how to think with my dick, all the time.

Anyone out there with a willingness to help out over the internet? (AK, 101:1)

(16) I am new to this group and am looking for a Hypnotist who will help me to become a jock.
Since a couple of years I am more or less regularly visiting a gym, but only with little success.
Until now I am not much into watching sports and am more intellectual interested like reading,
art-house films and so on.

Maybe someone is interested in changing someone like me into a real jock with main interests
ins training and sports, being less intellectual and more into fun. I would appreciate the
slightest results in change of my personality and appearance. (DO, 83:1)

In (15), AK presents himself as a college student with a history of introversion and a desire to
to change. He would like to acquire a jock mindset, which to him incorporates building muscle and
seeking out sex, to the point where he want[s] to learn how to think with [his] dick, all the time. By
describing himself as an introverted college student, and then claiming that he has a desire to change
his current self into one that more aligns with a jock identity, AK seems to implicitly de-value both his
status as a college student and his lack of public gregariousness: 'proper' jocks should be outgoing and
not particularly interested in academic achievement. In (16), DO is also looking for help in becoming a
jock; although he claims he more or less regularly visit[s] a gym, he still identifies himself as pursuing
intellectual interests, such as reading and art-house films. DO claims that he wants to become what he
calls a real jock whose interests lie in training and sports, being less intellectual and more into fun.
Similarly to AK in (15), his identified 'intellectual' pursuits are not congruent with a real jock identity:
in fact, they are presented as a detriment, something that a 'real' jock would never consider engaging in.
For AK and DO, intelligence has little place in an 'ideal' jock ideology.
Body-consciousness and submission to coaches are not the only markers of a jock identity on OnYourKnees. By and large, the vast majority of posters on OnYourKnees who align with a jock identity also express a desire to be hypnotized, in part to realize their fantasy of becoming a ‘jock.’ In fact, one of the key activities of posters on OnYourKnees is the dissemination and discussion of what are most often called 'trances'. Trances, as they are practiced on this messageboard, are best defined as primarily audiovisual material (though textual examples are also attested) that are intended to be listened to, primarily by jocks, as a tool for helping them realize their ‘goal’ of becoming a jock. Specific trances can take on numerous forms, but the general components of a trance include audio material (sometimes a man’s voice, sometimes soft slow-tempo instrumental music, or a combination of the two) that can vary in length from a few minutes to over an hour. On occasion, trances can also incorporate visual material, often consisting of images of younger, muscular men (sometimes in bondage-like situations), usually in sports-related clothing, that are stored as .jpeg files and are viewed through a computer program which flashes the images onto a computer screen (sometimes as fast as 30 images per second). These images are often watched in tandem with listening to an audio trance, though they can be viewed separately; individuals can also substitute images of their own choosing into the program.

When a trance is created, it is often disseminated to the messageboard community. Often, these trances are made available for free; other times, they are hosted on a pay website, and individuals are asked to purchase them from their creators (some of whom are also posters on OnYourKnees). Trance are stored in various audio formats (such as .wav and .mp3), and creators who make their trances available for free often upload them to time-sensitive file-sharing websites (such as RapidShare), whose links are posted onto the messageboard. The dissemination of trances is often an anticipated and much-discussed event, with posters often commenting on the efficacy of the trance and how it is
helping them realize their goal of being a jock. Trances can be created to realize a variety of effects, and often times a poster will list the titles of some of the trances they create, such as in (17) below:

(17) Desire for Muscle
    Enjoy Working Out
    Fitness Training I
    Muscle Lust Motivator
    Workout for Coach
    Desire to be Healthy
    Eat Right for Coach
    Desire to Serve
    Enjoy My Hypnotic Conditioning
    Gear Mindset
    Good Boys Obey
    Online Submissive
    Slave Trigger
    Serious for Coach (GD, 284:1)

In (17), GD lists a series of trances that are available on another website. The names of these trances are very telling, in that they summarize a list of qualities messageboard posters deem important to a jock identity: some (such as *Enjoy Working Out* and *Fitness Training I*) allude to the importance of physical fitness, while others (such as *Good Boys Obey* and *Serious for Coach*) stress the importance of submission to a coach. Still others contain the word 'desire,' demonstrating the strong linking between such activities as building muscle, improving health, and 'serving' a coach to fulfill desire.

The structure of trances on OnYourKnees, and specific discussions revolving around the activity of hypnosis, will be examined more fully in Chapter 5. It suffices to say for now, however, that trances as a rule are intended to get the listener to reach a state of relaxation while thinking about positive qualities of being a jock. Many posters discuss how listening to a particular trance file is pleasurable to them, and has intended effects. JL, for example, posts the following:
Some of the suggestions are starting to stick. Thinking about sports more and cars. (JL, 28:2)

It is interesting to note that in (18), JL does not self-identify as a jock (and does not use the word *jock*), but his content indicates that he is nonetheless aligning with a jock identity. JL first claims that *some of the suggestions are starting to stick*; the word *suggestions* are indicative of hypnotic trance. He also claims that, due to listening to the trance, he is *thinking about sports more and cars*. By explicitly stating that he is thinking about these two objects, he seems to imply that all jocks should have both sports and cars on his mind, while simultaneously claiming that those two objects were *not* on his mind before listening to the trance. By claiming that a particular trance is effective, JL contributes to the creation of a unified jock identity that privileges thinking about sports and cars as idealized, valuable behavior, and that (re-)asserts the value of trances to attain a jock identity.

Using the idea of being 'tranced' as a vehicle to uphold a jock identity can also be seen in (19) below:

I got the dumb jock hypnosis and been using it pretty solid for couples of days. Best fukin 20 bucks i ever spent. Having truoble thinking straight especialy the morning after listening, unless I'm thinking about my job or hitting the gym. Cant fukin wait to renew my membership and get started again (HD, 290:5)

In (19), HD claims that he has been listening to a particular trance file (what he calls *the dumb jock hypnosis*) for a few days, and asserts that it was the *best fukin 20 bucks i ever spent*. In this phrase, the use of the word *fu[c]kin* is reminiscent of Kiesling's (1998) study of the rate of realization of the (ING) morpheme in the speech of fraternity men. He noted that, in contrast to most other instances of words containing (ING), the token *fuckin* was almost categorically realized with alveolar /n/ among all
speakers. He claims that this word is associated with "vernacular, working class, and physical power" (88). HD's use of the word in (19) contributes to this meaning. In addition, HD's commitment to the efficacy of hypnosis is evident in the fact that he paid twenty dollars for a particular file. He asserts the trance's efficacy by claiming that he is having trouble thinking straight especially the morning after listening, unless I'm thinking about my job or hitting the gym. For HD, the trance's efficacy is demonstrated by his claim that he can only think 'clearly' when he is going to the gym, or about his employment (he does not state what he does for a living), or going to the gym. For HD, his purchase was clearly money well-spent.

Many posters, when discussing their desires to become a jock, additionally actively incorporate an aspect of what most posters refer to as 'dumbness' in descriptions of their desires. Dumbness, as it is conceptualized on OnYourKnees, can best be defined as either an unwillingness or inability to engage in academic pursuits. The link between athletic pursuit and lack of intelligence (especially among high-school and college students) is strong within (American) society, and the prototypical 'dumb jock' has become a source of humor in much American mainstream media ("Dumb Jock," n.d.) Sailes (1993) has noted that the origins of this stereotype, although obscured, may come from ancient Greece, where philosophers often chided athletes for focusing on their physical development at the detriment of their mental. Sailes has also located the stereotype in the stigmatization of (primarily Black) athletes who, in media representations, are often seen as athletically-gifted and the source of college revenue, but not intellectually gifted and therefore ‘unworthy’ of attending college (though this stereotype has been shown in numerous studies to not bear out: e.g., Sailes 1993; Pressley & Whitley 1996; Miller 2009). Despite evidence to the contrary, however, this stereotype is still persistent in contemporary representations of student-athletes, and many are forced to negotiate the tension between
being athletically and academically successful, even going so far as to eschew the self-identifier *jock* for the more neutral *athlete* (Miller 2009).

Despite the fact that much literature claims otherwise, a strong cultural notion still persists that jocks are, by their very nature, unintelligent. This stereotype is reflected through the prism on OnYourKnees, and many posters actively build the idea of being ‘dumb’ into conceptions of what it means to be a jock. The lemma DUMB appears 433 times within the corpus, and like lemma JOCK it can be found in a variety of syntactic positions: jocks can be *dumb*, jocks can participate in a process of *dumbing down* (meaning they are currently engaging in activities to lessen their intelligence, and *dumb* can appear in both file and user names.

Posters on OnYourKnees engage with the concept of dumbness in numerous ways. Posters, for example, often intertwine dumbness with gym activity and a desire not to 'think', as can be seen in (20-22):

(20) i would love to be a really really big dumb happy obedient jock boy im hard to go under but please i like to become more jock and really really dumb plus i go to the gym already about 5 days a week for about 1 hour and 15 mins (DH, 303:8)

(21) Hey all. im looking for a man who can brainwash me and transform me into a total dumbass jock. Im a college student now. would love to only be able to think about working out, sports, etc. my grandes fall until i flunk out... turn my mind and me into a typical jock, manerisms, personality, habits, likes dislikes, the way i talk etc. a total moron. can someone help turn me into the simple minded dude i should be? (BG, 232:1)

(22) Is there anything more I can do to truly live this life as dumb jock I already have all the mp3. I do want a simple life to fit my simple mind it a great life if u want it and I do. My bros say I need to stop thinking that I need more of . (KK, 328:4)

In examples (20-22) above, posters explicitly incorporate the word *dumb* into their ideal self-presentations. For DH (20), his ideal is to become a *really really big dumb happy obedient jock boy*, incorporating dumbness into others aspects of a jock identity that are prevalent on OnYourKnees. In
(21), BG would like to become a total dumbass jock and a total moron who only thinks about working out, sports, etc; he describes himself as a college students who would like his grades to fall until i flunk out. For BG, the attainment of a successful jock identity can only be achieved if there is a corresponding drop in his grades, strengthening a link between jock identity and lack of education.

KK, in (22), wishes to truly live this life as a dumb jock, claiming that it a great life and my bros say I need to stop thinking that I need more of. For the posters above, dumbness is casted as a fundamental attribute of a jock identity.

Additionally, for many posters, becoming a dumb jock is closely linked with erotic pleasure

(23-27):

(23) It turns me on, don't know why but being a dumb jock turns me on so much. (AL, 24:19)

(24) I want to be turned into a brainless, sex-crazed jock. Anyone care to help me with this? (CD, 188:1)

(25) Drools... ya, that's what i meant, simple, that's what i wanna be, simple and lovable. im so horny now... i just wanna hug everybody and go hump the couch or coach or something. :P (LV, 156:8)

(26) I am looking to become a totally trained submissive gay dumb jock slave who only thinks of-- as one erotic story put it -- "the next game, the next practice, the next workout, the next fuck" -- my sucking cock and being fucked, that is -- " the next drink" (OS, 304:4)

(27) Looking to become a stupid, oafish jock with nothing but working out and sex on my mind. (CD, 130:1)

For the posters in (23-27), dumbness is not only a desirable trait in and of itself, but also becomes a means with which to experience erotic pleasure. For AL (23), the thought of being a dumb jock turns me on so much; CD, in (24), wishes to be turned into a brainless, sex-crazed jock. OS, in (26), wishes to think only of, as he quotes from an erotic story, the next game, the next practice, the
next workout, the next fuck. All of the posters above place dumbness high on the list of desirable traits an ideal jock should have.

In fact, for many posters, intelligence is explicitly framed as an undesirable quality that should be avoided by jocks:

(28) I'm currently a genius [sorry], so I worry a lot ... too much ... being smart just means I can find more ways for things to go wrong [usually in the middle of the night when I can't do anything about them] and if I have less brainpower to use, maybe I'd worry less ... and be more content. (OB, 129:8)

(29) Am I dumbed down yet? Unfortunately, no. I cannot wait for that to happen, because I am too smart and thinking is highly over rated. (JL, 249:1)

(30) I have been a brainiac all my life. IT sucks (FC, 24:20)

In (28-30), posters present a current self that self-proclaims to be intelligent, but this intelligence is viewed negatively. In (28), OB (after apologizing to the messageboard community for calling himself a genius) links intelligence to such negative attributes as excessive worry and powerlessness; he believes that if he were unable to think as much as he claims he does, he would be happier with himself. JL, in (29), uses the word too to qualify the adjective smart, suggesting that having an excessive amount of intelligence is a negative trait. For JL, being dumb is not a quality he has achieved yet, but is something he is looking forward to happening. FC, in (30), perhaps puts it the most bluntly, when he claims that being intelligent simply sucks. In all three of these posts, intelligence is framed negatively as a quality unbecoming of a 'proper' jock, while the complementary notion of dumbness is held up as an ideal that prevents worry and unnecessary complications.

In a separate post, FC (the same poster as in (30), when asking for advice on finding a potential hypnotist to work with, gives additional insight into why being a brainiac 'sucks':

116
(31) I have been super preppy all my life. I want to work on bulking up my upper body and legs. I want to lose interest in everything except sports, working out, my body, by jock buds and sex (some partying thrown in to boot). I want to have about a 75 IQ—be a really friendly, open guy—the sort willing to give a buddy the sweaty shirt off his back. I want to get a manual labor job—I worked construction every summer from the time I was 16 right through grad school. I want to barely be able to read and write and become unable to do more than simple math. Hope it's possible. (FC, 109:11)

In (31), FC describes his biographical history as being super preppy all my life, and he wishes to lose interest in activities that should not interest a jock: all he would like to focus on is sports, working out, my body, by jock buds and sex. He also claims a desire to want to possess low literacy and mathematical skills, and a wish to work in manual labor. His mentioning of attending graduate school is very telling here, because it indexes his current, 'super-preppy' self as a person who has sought out post-secondary education as opposed to a physically-demanding job (although he does claim that he worked construction every summer from the time I was 16 right through grad school, suggesting that he 'kept up' employment in the physical labor sector). He also describes his ideal self as wanting to be a really friendly, open guy, characteristics that (it is assumed) his 'preppy' self does not currently have (and may not be able to develop if he continues to identify as 'super preppy').

Ultimately, FC draws a very sharp distinction between two extremes: a current-self, highly-educated man who is cast in highly negative terms, and an ideal manual laborer with an IQ of 75 who is seen as a desired ideal.

It is interesting to note how conceptions of jock identity and ‘dumbness’ intertwine with class ideologies on OnYourKnees, reaffirming tenets of hegemonic masculinity that privileges employment based on physical activity over those that require mental acuity. In many conceptions of hegemonic masculinity, those males who are seen as dominant to other males are often conceptualized as
occupying distinct class positions, often intertwined with ideologies of the body and physical appearance. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1995), for example, relate the accomplishment of a ‘muscular, tough’ body to an association between hegemonic masculinity and working-class identity, where “working-class men are often taken as exemplary [models of hegemonic masculinity…] jobs that institutionalize force, strength and even violence—such as building trades, police and prison work, military combat—are low on the class hierarchy but high on the scale of hegemonic masculinity” (484). Ideologies of hegemonic masculinity thus idealize a particular type of body that is suited for working-class jobs and that rely on physical strength as a means of economic capital.

Other researchers have noted the tensions inherent in the relationship between gay men, class position, and sexual desire. Heywood (1997), in his analysis of erotic narratives in Straight to Hell magazine, notes that many of the stories he studied highlighted characters who demonstrate a “willingness to engage in homosexual acts without displaying or adopting signs of a homosexual identity. Yet the majority of the writers are clearly still signifying a distinct category of man. Thus, as the category of ‘straighness’ dissolves, the notion of masculinity is explored and affirmed” (196). This ‘straightness,’ he argues, is inherent in narratives that often focus on working-class environments, and working-class men as objects of desire. In these stories, Heywood argues, a working-class environment is linked to a heterosexual masculinity, which is then re-configured into a idealized, desirable male. Barrett (2017) notes strong links between ‘bear’ culture (a subculture of gay men that idealize heavy-set men) and working-class cultures and identities. For these men, Barrett argues, their “working-class orientation is often seen as a conscious effort to performatively assert a masculine identity and to draw on ideologies linking sexuality and class” (105). Within bear subculture, heavyset bodies are idealized because they conform to ideologies that link a heavy-set body with ‘practical’ strength, gained through physical labor and casual athletics.
It is interesting to note that posters relate their desire to be a jock to particular types of employment that privilege a gym-toned body. Some posters, such as HS, incorporate discussions of his employment at a construction site into his posts:

(32) Mostly I think it's more that they want to talk and not do. Guys talking about stuff is more a waste of time anyways. Like who cares!? what they think about stuff. Like at work there's guys here that all go in a room with the fourmen and they decide what us other guys got to do. So then they come out and say I need you guys to do this or do that. So we do the work and they talk about it. Same goes for other stuff so either you do stuff or you don't. (HS, 2:4)

(33) Yeah my fourman don't do nothing accept making sure he keeps us busy. Last year he had to help out on some decks we was doing but that's about it. (HS, 2:5)

In both (32) and (33) above, HS discusses his difficulties at his place of employment, and hints at challenges he has with his foreman (here spelled fourman), a supervisor of a construction crew. In (32), he relates the behavior of the foreman as a supervisor to his own position as a construction worker, which he idealizes as one in which he is responsible for the majority of the work, while the foreman (with other men, ostensibly other supervisors) go in a room and decide what us other guys got to do. His statement that we do the work and they talk about it places HS in a position where he is the main actor in accomplishing jobs, where supervisors do no labor. In a subsequent post (33) he reiterates this feeling, claiming that his foreman don’t do nothing accept making sure he keeps us busy.

HS’s identity work in (32) and (33) is twofold. Through discussing his position as a day laborer at a construction site who performs much manual labor, HS reinforces ideologies that place prime importance on jocks’ physical strength as an indicator of economic power. In addition, by placing himself (and other construction workers) in the position of manual labor, while imagining his foreman as a supervisor who does little actual physical labor, he reinforces larger cultural conceptions of physical labor as ‘real’ work, and supervisory work as invalid to a hegemonic masculine identity.
Ideologies of class, dumbness, and employment also also present in the following exchange below, where a poster (BG) worries that his IQ score is getting lower:

(34) hey guys. a year ago my tested iq was 124... ive been listening to files about being a dumb jock and being dumber... have been noticing that while writing papers for school it hasnt been a easy to compose them. just for fun i tested iq and it was 108. maybe i was just having an off day...? i dunno what to think.. lol (BG, 24:1)

In (34), BG notes that he had his IQ tested a year ago with a registered value of 124: however, after listening to trances (here called files) about becoming a dumb jock, he noticed that he began to have trouble writing papers for school. Here, he is indexing himself as a (probably college) student, one who ostensibly has not had trouble writing papers in the past. Just for fun, he claims, he retested his IQ, which he now claims is significantly lower than what it was. By framing his message in terms of IQ, he is indexing larger cultural dialogues that reference IQ tests as a marker of intelligence: his ‘lower’ test score seems to indicate that the files he listened to are having some effect on him. He offers the question maybe i was just having an off day to the messageboard community and gets the response below:

(35) Hmm. Take the test again tomorrow, and then again the day after. If all three scores are widely different, it's probably an off day.

If they're all pretty low...

...well. You weren't using those brain cells anyway. Welcome to life as a dumb jock, I suggest you get to working out and prepare for your new job at Chippendales. (DE, 24:2)

DE offers the advice of taking the test twice again, and comparing the scores. Although he acquiesces that BG’s low score might simply be attributed to an off day, his statement if they’re all
pretty low...well suggests that he is not anticipating that outcome. He then states *welcome to life as a dumb jock*, suggesting that BG has entered some sort of ‘point of no return,’ where he is no longer as intelligent as he used to be, and will most likely be unable to regain that intelligence. He then advises BG to *get to working out and prepare for your new job at Chippendales*, a popular male strip show revue. For DE, BG’s ‘old’ life as an academic is no longer an option for him: because he has now aligned with conceptions of being a ‘dumb jock’, DE is offering him employment advice that privileges the economic potential of his body (especially in an erotic environment) over the economic potential of his mind. This is a thought that other posters uptake and express their alignment with, as in (36) below:

(36) Chippendales sounds really fun! (TR, 24:4)

Ideologies of class thus play an important role in the construction of a dumb jock identity. Hegemonic masculinity privileges a particular kind of male with a particular kind of body, which translates into a valued form of capital. A man’s physical strength is seen as a vital aspect of his being, one that eschews gym training while generating economic capital, and while also devaluing ‘intellectual’ activity as un-masculine and disempowered. Jock identity incorporates these ideologies into what it means to be a ‘jock,’ but does so in unique ways. Although jocks privilege the training and achieving of a gym-toned body, they also see their bodies as a source of economic capital at the expense of their intellectual capacity. Whether it be through HS’s mild annoyance with his *fourman*, or DE’s advice that BG become a male exotic dancer, their individual manifestations of jock identity privilege the capital of their body over the potential capital of their mind.

The above discussion of selected posts on OnYourKnees demonstrates that, for many posters, there exists an 'idealized' jock identity that many subscribe to, and that many eagerly wish to attain.
The qualities that make up an ideal jock can be broadly identified as having five main components: an emphasis on physical fitness and body-consciousness, a desire to be submissive (often times to an idealized coach Other), being in a state of constant sexual arousal, a desire and/or affinity to be hypnotized, and a desire to be 'dumb'. However, despite these broad outlines, not all posters who wish to become jocks align with all of these qualities, and in some cases, what is seen as highly desirable to one jock-to-be becomes a topic of contention among other posters. This can be seen, for example, in discussions revolving around whether or not an ideal jock should be arrogant. Recall in (14) (discussed above) that LF, in evoking the characters Stiffler and A.C. Slater, described being 'cocky' as one of his desired outcomes of asserting a jock identity. Another poster, LM, shares a similar desire:

(37) Does anyone out there know of any ways to hypnotize or brainwash a guy like me to make getting into shape a priority in his life? I don't have a ton of confidence, so if anyone knows a way to make me a bit more cocky along the way that'd be awesome. I want to be a ripped cocky jock so that my master can absolutely break down and take control of me... (LM, 247:1)

In (37), LM is seeking someone to hypnotize him in order to make getting into shape a priority in his life. He admits a lack of confidence, and wishes to additionally become a bit more cocky: in fact, he wishes to be cocky enough so that my master can absolutely break down and take control of me.

Interestingly, for LF, being 'cocky' carries with it both positive and negative connotations: cockiness is not merely a (positive) manifestation of one's confidence, but is also a potentially negative characteristic that would require severe discipline from his master.

The above discussion suggests three important ideals that exist when jocks on OnYourKnees discuss a jock-oriented identity. First, in large part, there exists on OnYourKnees a relatively stable ideology of jock behavior, appearance, and desire that many posters strongly adhere to. From the above examples, a picture of the 'ideal' jock can begin to emerge: a poster who spends much of his time...
engaging in physical activity and who derives sexual pleasure from it, who has an affinity for sports and sport-related clothing, who desires to be 'hypnotized' and submissive to a coach, and who wishes to be 'dumb'. Many of these tenets adhere to larger cultural idealizations of what it means to be a 'man' in contemporary society, and much of the desire of being and becoming a jock is reflected in adhering to particular tenets of hegemonic masculinity. However, as these posters conform to some ideologies of hegemonic masculinity, they also upend it: one of the fundamental tenets of a jock identity, as described above, is to submit (primarily sexually) to a coach Other. Some forms of masculinity (i.e., being sexually dominant) are upheld by jocks and jocks-to-be as strictly off-limits to them, the purview of an imagined Other who occupies the topmost rung of hegemonic masculinity.

Second, for many posters, an ideal jock identity is not constructed in isolation, but is simultaneously constructed with an idealized coach: one who is dominant and the recipient of a jock's sexualized behavior. In addition, for some posters this 'ideal' jock identity is constructed against a current self-representation, where they feel as if they are not quite jocks yet, but identify the aspects of their lives that they feel can be improved by becoming jocks. These broad outlines of jock identity inform what it means to identify as a jock on OnYourKnees, and many posters strictly adhere to them.

Finally, many posters, when speaking about an idealized jock identity, do so through utilizing particular strategies that frame jock identity in specific ways. In many cases, jocks should subordinate themselves: whether it be through submission to a coach Other, their desires to become a jock, or participating in particular jock-oriented activities (such as working out or wearing particular types of clothing), 'idealized' jocks should view these desires as something that they eagerly and willfully submit to. By framing themselves as subordinate to these desires, they often simultaneously construct the objects of the desires as powerful beings and urges that need to be submitted to. These desires, furthermore, are constructed as natural and inevitable consequences of wanting to become a jock.
Discourses of submission, dominance, and naturalization thus play an important role in the shaping of jock identity on OnYourKnees.

Coaches and OnYourKnees: The representation of dominant identities by dominant posters

Up until this point, identity construction has been viewed primarily from the jock's point of view. The vast majority of posters on OnYourKnees align with a jock identity, and the multiple points of view on what constitutes a jock identity are thoroughly and vibrantly discussed on the messageboard. In addition, many jocks, while describing their own desires and interests, co-construct an imagined 'coach' identity that both dominates and supports a jock identity. But how do coaches view themselves on OnYourKnees? How do coaches contribute to the maintenance and discussion of coach and jock identities on the messageboard?

Part of the challenge of discussing how coaches self-identify on OnYourKnees is the relative paucity of self-identified coaches who exist on the messageboard: as mentioned in Chapter 2, only 23 out of 467 total posters make their coach orientation known. Similarly, the lemma COACH appears only 331 times within the corpus, with fewer than half of the occurrences of the lemma JOCK. In addition (as will be discussed below), the lemma COACH seems to be more restricted in its distribution than the lemma JOCK: it can be used as a noun (to refer to either a particular poster or an imagined Other) or as a verb, but it is almost completely unattested in the corpus an adjective: there is no reference to coach behavior, coach identity, or a coach mentality. There is also no corresponding term to jocked or jockification (meaning, there is no discussion about being a coach or the act of becoming one). Coach ideologies are therefore not nearly as represented on the messageboard as jock ideologies are, and discussions of what it means to be an 'ideal' coach are almost non-existent: unlike discussions
of identity undertaken by jocks, who are more likely to discuss aspects of their identity with each other on the messageboard, within the corpus there are no attested discussions among coaches about salient qualities of coach identity. Part of this might be explainable by the idea that, on this board, coaches comprise an unmarked category (Bucholtz and Hall 2004) that other categories (in this case, jocks) are differentiated against. Coaches may not feel the need to assert their identity because, as those who occupy the dominant rung of hegemonic masculinity, there is no need to. Perhaps as a result of their unmarked status, many discussions of coach identity do not share correlates with discussions of jock identity. As an example, within the corpus there is no discussion of ‘idealized’ coach bodies, in the way that jock bodies are idealized to be physically fit and muscular. Also, there are no attested posts within the corpus that describe an individual as wanting to be a coach, but has not yet achieved that goal; thus, unlike posters who contrast a jock identity with a non-jock identity, no coach-to-be contrasts an idealized coach identity with a non-coach identity.

However, this is not to say that coaches do not assert their identity; many coaches, throughout the corpus, bring to light aspects of a coach identity that complement jocks' characterizations of them. As an example, HT (a self-identified coach who is excerpted in (21) below), posts of his desire to find willing subjects to hypnotize:

(38) I'm looking for new submissive jock studs to xpand my hypno stable. contact me privately if youre interested in becoming buff, ripped , and mindless... (HT, 16:3)

Much as jocks use conventions from personal-style ads to exhibit both their 'current' identity and idealized jock and coach identities, coaches also use personal-style ads to express their desires and, in the process, construct both coach and jock identities. In (38), HT expresses his wish to look for new
submissive jock studs to xpand my hypno stable. The use of the word *(e)xpand*, in this context, suggests that HT already has a group of submissive men that he hypnotizes; he therefore indexes that he already has experience with hypnosis. He then asks interested individuals to contact him if they are interested in becoming buff, ripped, and mindless, implying that those qualities are not only those that he himself is interested in, but are those that all jocks (or, at least, those jocks that wish to be submissive to coaches) should have.

Many coaches participate in the sexualization of jocks by acknowledging and supporting the idea that jocks are fundamentally sexualized beings, as (39) below demonstrates:

(39) Would love to take up our program again. Email me back - it'll be hot. You know your dick stiffed up every time I gave you instructions. (JB, 235:1)

In (39), JB is speaking to a self-identified jock with whom he had previously engaged in an online relationship, which involved previous hypnotic sessions. After claiming that he would love to take up our program again, JB suggests that the act of his respondent emailing him would be hot, signifying that it would give sexual pleasure to both him and his respondent. He follows up on this statement by claiming that your dick stiffed up every time I gave you instructions. Here, JB suggests that the act of giving 'instruction' was historically, and will continue to be, sexually stimulating to the respondent; JB also constructs himself (and his act of giving instructions) as the agent of an activity that gave sexual pleasure to the recipient. By placing himself in such an agentive position, JB thus contributes to the construction of an identity (and a strategy) in which a dominant individual is responsible for giving sexual pleasure to his submissive.

The idea that coaches provide (or, in some cases, disallow) sexual release to jocks is mirrored in (40):
(40) You could use orgasms as a punishment and reward. If he can do the required workout set by you, then he can orgasm. If not, then you deny him the right to orgasm. (JO, 250:1)

JO, in (40), is giving advice to a self-identified coach who is looking for advice on how to engage with a submissive jock with whom he is in contact. JO offers the suggestion that the poster can assert himself over his submissive through using *orgasms as a punishment and reward*. JO suggests that the poster set up a demanding workout routine for his submissive: if the poster's 'jock' can *do the required workout set*, he can be permitted to orgasm, and if he fails in completing his workout, the poster can *deny him the right to orgasm*. (40) is particularly interesting because it implicitly contributes to the link that many jocks also make between workout activity and sexual arousal, while simultaneously confirming ideologies that allow dominants to express their power over jocks through the allowance or denial of orgasm. Jocks are allowed to become aroused through their workout activities, but the coach is the one who allows jocks to reach climax.

Coach identities, then, are often constructed along sexual dominant/submissive lines, where coaches are both the 'givers' of sexual pleasure and the 'allowers' of sexual release, and coaches themselves often participate in the building of these ideologies. Although there are no attested posts within the corpus of self-identified coaches discussing 'idealized' coach bodies, dominant-identified individuals often present self-descriptions in common ways that differentiate them from jocks in important aspects. (41) and (42) below, for example, help to construct an ideology of potential coaches as older than jocks:

(41) I would be honored to aid you in your desire to become a jock slave. I've been a hypnotist since [1983] and I enjoying helping men achieve their goals. (DH, 169:4)
Previously in the chapter, it was mentioned that posters who wish to become jocks often present as younger, alluding to college life and younger pop-culture stereotypes to create a link between jock identity and youth. Coaches, on the other hand, seem to present as older, sometimes indexing this identity subtle ways. In (41), for example, DH claims that he has been a hypnotist since 1983, which (assuming he was at least 18 years of age when he began his career), would identify him solidly as a middle-aged man. In (42), in contrast to DH’s less obvious statement of his age, BM states his age much more bluntly, first by expressly disavowing any self-conception of ’youth’ (I’m not blond or 20, or even close to it), and then by expressing his age directly, as 55. Both DH and BM thus contribute to an ideology of coaches as older than jocks.

Coaches who wish to find submissive individuals often detail what is expected of jocks with a high degree of specificity. In (43), below, a self-identified coach is looking for a jock to train:

(42) I’m not blond or 20, or even close to it [...] I’m 55, and I often say so in my postings. (BM, 149:6)

(43) I’m an in-shape, hung, middle-aged, masculine, demanding coach who will require the highest standards of fitness, hygiene, and sexual obedience from the jocks under my supervision. My boys will have to work out regularly, keep themselves groomed and dressed to my precise specifications, and understand that their sexual activities are also subject to my instructions (chastity will be required until a trainee has earned the privilege of orgasm, and then only by the means I permit). (JH, 30:1)

In (43), JH begins by describing himself as an in-shape, hung, middle-aged, masculine, demanding coach: these adjectives imply that he is muscular, has a large penis, is older, and presents as masculine. Interestingly, (43) represents the only instance in the entire corpus where a self-identified coach discusses his physical appearance. JH is thus relating qualities of being a coach to ideologies of
dominant masculinity, including being older and having a large penis. He demands the highest standards of fitness, hygiene, and sexual obedience from the jocks under my supervision, which includes his boys following strict grooming and sexual regimes. The use of the term boys is significant here, in that it has both younger and submissive connotations: JH seems to be implicitly contrasting his older, demanding self with a younger, submissive Other. JH thus participates in the construction of a coach identity that idealizes and older, muscular male as dominant over younger, submissive males.

Although the voices of dominant-identified individuals are not as prevalent on OnYourKnees as those of jocks, the voices that make themselves heard continue to contribute to a binary differentiation of coaches as dominant, older and worthy of respect, on the one hand, and jocks as submissive, younger, and respectful to coaches, on the other. In addition, coaches contribute to an ideology that places them in a dominant position to jocks, figures to be respected and worshipped. Despite the relative paucity of coaches on OnYourKnees, their voices are still heard and important in the construction and maintenance of both jock and coach identities on the messageboard.

A quantitative analysis of lemmas JOCK and COACH on OnYourKnees:

Up until now, this chapter has utilized a qualitative approach to understanding contours of jock and coach identity on OnYourKnees through how posters construct these identities in relation to larger-scale ideologies of hegemonic masculinity, specifically through discourses of subordination, domination, and naturalization. However, Chapter 1 pointed out that one of the criticisms of Critical Discourse Analysis has been an over-reliance on qualitative methods, often at the expense of quantitative methods that can extrapolate larger-scale trends from the data. It is possible to perform a quantitative analysis of how self-identified jocks, self-identified coaches, and those posters who
identify as neither engage with the lemmas JOCK and COACH: analyzing how these lemmas are used may provide additional insight into how these terms are incorporated into larger-scale identities.

Van Leeuwen (2008) offers a framework for analyzing how participants of social actors are represented in discourse. He argues against the use of 'traditional' linguistic categories (such as noun and verb), instead arguing for a method that recognizes that "meanings belong to culture rather than to language and cannot be tied to any specific semiotic" (24). He provides a typology of various ways in which social actors can be represented in discourse: one important way is through what Van Leeuwen calls functionalization and identification. Functionalization occurs "when social actors are referred to in terms of an activity, in terms of something they do, for instance, an occupation or role" (42). Within a text, functionalization often manifests in descriptions of participants in terms of occupation (such as the driver or the professor) or positions within socially-recognized roles (such as the bride or the groom). These terms become relevant in placing actors within activities that are seen as temporal, and relate a participant to the action being discussed. Identification, on the other hand, can be seen when "social actors are defined, not in terms of what they do, but in terms of what they, more or less permanently, or unavoidably, are" (42). Identification can occur when referring to someone by their name, by kinship relations (Serena's uncle), or through socially-recognized categories that are often seen as immutable (such as age, class, or race). Identifications are less dependent on the activities social actors participate in, rather relating participants to identities that are not easily changeable.

Functionalization and identification capture how certain qualities can be seen as either 'external' or 'internal' to a person. They contribute to processes of adequation and distinction by providing parameters through which individuals can be seen as belonging to one group over another, and through which facets of one's identity can be construed as a fundamental quality of that individual that may then be used as a basis for social classification and power relations. But these categories, and the
classifications and relations resulting from them, can shift in values among populations and throughout history. As an example, van Leeuwen cites Foucault's (1979) analysis of homosexuality in the 19th century, where conceptions of individuals (primarily men, it must be admitted) who had sex with members of the same sex shifted from a functional construct (where they were criminalized based on the act itself) to an identificational one (where their 'desire' for same-sex relations were now seen as a fundamental pathology in need of psychological intervention). For Felton Rosulek (2009) in her study of how defendants and victims are discursively constructed by lawyers, prosecutors were more likely to use functionalizational terms to discuss defendants (the defendant, the person in question), while defense attorneys were more likely to identify a defendant by their name. These differing methods of referring to defendants, she notes, help to construct particular ideologies of them, both within the larger legal system and to juries determining their fate: functionalizing defendants highlight their position within a legal system (and thus might serve to 'dehumanize' them), while identifying them both minimizes their position within the legal system and presents them as more 'human'.

Functionalization and identification can thus become powerful methods through which individuals adequate and distinguish both themselves and Others. Using particular words to identify themselves (and Others) as participants in a particular process (i.e., a temporal identity) versus identifying themselves as 'who they are' (i.e., a permanent identity) can also contribute to underlying strategies of dominance, submission, and naturalization present on OnYourKnees. As van Leeuwen (2008) notes, in terms of grammaticalization "identifications can be, and frequently are, classifiers in nominal groups, functionalizations only rarely" (43). Identifications can thus modify nouns, while functionalizing categories can only do so in very limited circumstances. By analyzing where the lemmas JOCK and COACH appear throughout the corpus among self-identified jocks, self-identified coaches, and posters who identify as neither, and by analyzing if and how they are used as classifiers
(adjectives) or nominals by each of these groups, might provide a quantificational way of determining how all posters incorporate the lemma JOCK and COACH into discourses of domination, subjugation, and naturalization.

Table 3-1 below lists the uses of the lemmas JOCK and COACH among all posters, sorted by self-identification as a jock, coach, or other:

Table 3-1: list of uses of lemma JOCK and COACH among all posters on OnYourKnees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>noun (% of total usage)</th>
<th>adjective (% of total usage)</th>
<th>other (% of total usage)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-identified jocks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jock</td>
<td>256 (55%)</td>
<td>106 (23%)</td>
<td>105 (22%)</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coach</td>
<td>112 (62%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>68 (38%)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-identified coaches</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jock</td>
<td>49 (55%)</td>
<td>30 (34%)</td>
<td>10 (11%)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coach</td>
<td>17 (39%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>26 (59%)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jock</td>
<td>62 (37%)</td>
<td>59 (36%)</td>
<td>45 (27%)</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coach</td>
<td>28 (42%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>39 (58%)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the distribution of the lemmas JOCK and COACH among three grammatical categories: noun, adjective, and other. 'Other' uses of the lemmas JOCK and COACH include uses as an honorific (if either term is used as a form of address, most often without a preceding article), URL (if the lemma is within a file name or web address), username (if the lemma is found within a particular username), adjective (if the lemma is used to modify another noun), and when the lemma JOCK is used to refer exclusively to a jockstrap. Of particular importance to the discussion at-hand are the columns
labeled *noun* and *adjective*, where JOCK or COACH is found within the corpus in its nominal form or as a modifier to a noun. The table shows that, among all three groups the lemma JOCK is used more often than the lemma COACH. Most likely, this is an artifact of the fact that the largest group represented in the corpus is self-identified jocks: therefore, jocks are more likely than coaches (and those who identify as neither) to be the subject of conversation. All groups show robust usage of the lemma JOCK as both a noun and a verb, with all groups showing a slight preference for usage of JOCK in nominal form. Using van Leeuwen's (2008) terminology, JOCK can thus be used in both a functionalizational and identificational form.

But it is interesting to note that usage of the lemma COACH differs significantly from JOCK in that COACH is almost categorically excluded from usage as an adjective, with only one instance recorded within the entire corpus (from a self-identified coach, in the phrase *a knowledgeable coach type*). The fact that COACH is not found in a modifier position among *any* poster on OnYourKnees suggests that, for all posters, *coach* is seen exclusively as a functionalizational term–being a coach is not seen as a fundamental part of who one 'is,' but rather denotes how coaches are seen vis-a-vis a jock identity. For JOCK, however, the term can be both functionalizational and identificational, in that it can be both a classifier to a noun and a nominal itself, suggesting that being a jock *can be* part of one's fundamental identity.

It is possible, however, to take functionalization and identification a step further and analyze what modifiers self-identified jocks, coaches, and others use with nominal JOCK and COACH. Doing so might give a clearer picture of how self-identified jocks, coaches, and others incorporate objects, values, and ideals into a jock identity, and may point out differences in how jocks, coaches, and others view what are important aspects of jock identity.
Table 3-2 lists the most common modifiers that occur with nominal JOCK among self-identified jocks, self-identified coaches, and all other posters on OnYourKnees:

Table 3-2: most common modifiers with nominal jock among all groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-identified jocks (% of total occurrences)</th>
<th>Self-identified coaches (% of total occurrences)</th>
<th>Others (% of total occurrences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>dumb(er) / dumbass</strong></td>
<td>NO MODIFIER</td>
<td>NO MODIFIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 (30%)</td>
<td>21 (43%)</td>
<td>33 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No MODIFIER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 (24%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muscle(head)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>muscle/muscly 3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>other wannabe 3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cowboy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (3%)</td>
<td>all others (with 1 occurrence) 13 (27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>young all others (with 1 occurrence) 2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all others (with fewer than 3 occurrences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 (27%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>49 TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the lemma JOCK appears as a noun 259 times among self-identified jocks, a total of 70 distinct adjectives occur within the corpus that modify JOCK, spread out among 323 tokens. Out of the 259 noun occurrences of JOCK among self-identified jocks, only 77 (29%) appear without a modifier. This means that 182 instances of the lemma noun JOCK appear with at least one adjective preceding it, and in many cases numerous adjectives preceding it. For self-identified coaches,
however, out of 49 occurrences of the nominal JOCK, 21 (43%) occur with no adjective, while for all
other posters, 33 (53%) of all occurrences of nominal JOCK occur without an adjective. This seems to
suggest that self-identified jocks and coaches differ in their conception of a jock identity. For self-
identified jocks, the nominal JOCK, in and of itself, is not often sufficient for describing a jock
identity: jocks tend to use modifiers to add specificity to what types of jocks they would like to be, and
who they would like to emulate. All other posters, however, do not participate in the specification of
nominal JOCK to the extent that self-identified jocks do, suggesting that they are more likely to
'totalize' a jock identity, potentially erasing (cf. Bucholtz and Hall 2004) differences among jocks that
self-identified jocks feel are salient to their identity.

The most common adjective preceding JOCK among self-identified jocks, by far, is the
modifier dumb. Dumb modifies nominal JOCK 96 times within the corpus of self-identified jock
speech, accounting for 37% of all occurrences with JOCK (and 52% of all occurrences when a modifier
is present). As can be seen in Table 3, nominal JOCK is more likely to occur with the modifier dumb
than with no modifier. This suggests that, for many self-identified jocks on OnYourKnees, dumbness
is a key quality of being a jock. Good, the second-most common modifier among self-identified jocks,
co-occurs with nominal JOCK 18 times in the corpus. The adjectival phrase good jock suggests both
quality (in that certain behaviors and attitudes are more desirable in a jock) and obedience (in that
many self-identified jocks wish to behave in ways that bring pleasure to coaches), and contributes to
discourses of jock submission and coach dominance. Two other adjectives that frequently co-occur
with nominal JOCK, muscle(head) and big (with 18 and 11 occurrences, respectively) suggest that
another key aspect of jock identity is gaining muscle. It is interesting to note that self-identified
coaches, as well as posters who identify as neither, pattern with self-identified jocks in that, when they
do pair nominal JOCK with an adjective, they are most likely to do so with dumb and muscle (and its
variants *muscly* and *muscle-craving*). This suggests that, on some level, both coaches and posters who identify neither as jock nor coach associate qualities of dumbness and muscular development with jocks.

The analysis of adjectives occurring with nominal JOCK suggests that, on one level, all posters on OnYourKnees view jock identity along similar lines. For all three groups, JOCK is most likely to collocate with adjectives that highlight a lack of intelligence and a muscular body. This contributes to a messageboard-wide ideology of jocks as lacking intelligence and primarily focused on body-consciousness. On the other hand, the fact that nominal JOCK is more likely to co-occur with adjectives among self-identified jocks than with other posters suggests important differences in how the three groups view a jock identity. Unlike for self-identified coaches and those who identify as neither jock nor coach, the nominal JOCK, for self-identified jocks, is not a totalizing identity: in other words, it does not quite function as an ideal identification in van Leeuwen's terms. Many self-identified jocks feel the need to specify what type of jock they wish to be through adjectival modification in a way that coaches and others on OnYourKnees do not view them.

It is also possible to perform the same type of analysis with the nominal COACH. As Table 3-3 demonstrates, the nominal COACH appears 112 times among self-identified jocks, 17 times among self-identified coaches, and 28 times among all other posters. Table 3-3 below lists the most common adjectives occurring with nominal COACH within the corpus, and their frequency of occurrences:
Table 3-3: most common modifiers with nominal COACH among all three groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-identified jocks (% of total occurrences)</th>
<th>Self-identified coaches (% of total occurrences)</th>
<th>Others (% of total occurrences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all others (with 1 occurrence)</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>all others (with 1 occurrence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hot</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong(-minded)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all others (with 1 occurrence)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-3 shows a usage of adjectives with nominal COACH among the three groups that differs significantly from their usage of adjectives with nominal JOCK: among all three groups, nominal COACH is most likely to be found without an adjective. Adjectives that tend to be used with COACH, moreover, are more likely to refer to coaches in a temporal sense (my last coach, my first coach, etc.; in addition, both instances of old appearing with COACH refer to a previous coach, not an elder coach), without attaching values to a particular coach identity. The few adjectives that occur more than once with nominal COACH (all among jocks) include good, hot, and strong(-minded), suggesting an alignment with site-wide ideologies that understand coach identity as both derivers of sexual pleasure and 'strong' in terms of mental/emotional capacity.
Thus, among the three main groups of posters on OnYourKnees, jock and coach identities represent relatively stable identity-categories that carry with them similar ideologies, beliefs, and values. For many posters, collocations of lemma JOCK with the adjectives *dumb* and *muscle* suggest that all three groups share similar conceptions of jocks as uninterested in intelligence and wanting to build muscle. Similarly, an almost complete lack of adjectival COACH among all three groups suggests that a coach identity is seen as 'complete' and 'totalizing,' representing a set of qualities that do not need to be modified. However, important differences also do emerge through this quantitative analysis. As self-identified coaches (and those who identify as neither) are less likely to modify nominal JOCK, self-identified jocks are much more likely to modify it. For self-identified jocks, being a 'jock' is *not* necessarily a totalizing identity: it is an identity that can take on additional nuances that conform to individual ways of 'being' a jock. For coaches and others, however, this seems not to be the case: jocks are jocks, and differences that jocks may think are salient to their own conceptions of identity may often not be as salient to other posters on OnYourKnees, furthering a power differential that views jocks as disempowered and subordinate to coaches.

One further point must be said: the results above, and the general over-representation of self-identified jocks on OnYourKnees, suggests that the messageboard is primarily designed for self-identified jocks to discuss their identities and desires, and that many posters (including self-identified coaches themselves) are either reluctant or uninterested in discussing behaviors and idealized identities of coaches. This skewing towards the discussion of jock identities may, on one level, simply be due to the over-representation of jocks on OnYourKnees: if so many more jocks post on the messageboard than coaches, it would make sense that discussions would revolve much more around jock identity than coach identity. It is possible that, if more self-identified coaches were represented on OnYourKnees, there would be more discussion of different types of coach identities. However, for may posters (even
for those self-identified coaches who do post) on OnYourKnees, there does not seem to be a need to distinguish different types of coaches from each other. For posters, the term coach, as a marker of identification, contains within it a relatively stable set of identity features that are consistent from speaker to speaker. Coaches are seen as the dominant group that, even among self-identified coaches, do not need to be categorized in the way that jocks do. Thus, the paucity of discussion of coach identities may simply be because they do not need to be discussed.

Conclusion:

The above discussion demonstrates the multiplicity of identities that can be hidden in the seemingly strict terms jock and coach, as deployed on OnYourKnees. In large part, the terms jock and coach represent a broad ideology of identities that complement each other: as jocks are submissive, coaches are dominant. As jocks are sexualized, coaches become the object of desire. As coaches are older, jocks are younger. These terms thus contribute to an ideology of desire that upholds, in many ways, larger-scale cultural ideologies of what it means to be a 'man.' A preoccupation with sports, a desire to continuously improve one's body, an attitude that suggests a resistance to scholarly activity, and a subscription to particular masculinist archetypes permeate jock and coach identity throughout this board. In addition, an ideology that privileges coach identity as being 'dominant' over a jock identity is congruent with a hegemonic masculinist ideology that privileges one way of being masculine (idealized in a coach identity) over all others.

However, as the above discussion also highlights, the term jock can become imbued with a multiplicity of interpretations, which are discussed, negotiated, and ultimately upheld on this board. Although jocks, by-and-large, see themselves as submissive to coaches, other aspects of jock identity
are discussed and available for members of OnYourKnees to uptake or reject, based on their individual
desires. Jocks can choose to be dumb, or they can choose not to be. Jocks can choose to be cocky, or
they can choose to be nice. Jocks can be sporty, preppy, or military-oriented, with particular ideologies
based on these sub-identities emerging and being uptaken by individual members of the messageboard.
To be a jock on OnYourKnees, then, is not a singular identity, but one that reflects an individual's
desires and wants.

But the sexual behavior of posters on OnYourKnees, and the jock and coach identities arising
from these behaviors, is not solely informed by ideologies of hegemonic masculinity. Many posters
understand their sexual behaviors to align with another important ideology: that of BDSM
(bondage/discipline/sadism/masochism). BDSM, as an ideological viewpoint, is vastly different from
hegemonic masculinity, yet posters align with behaviors and beliefs that are congruent with a BDSM
ideology that respects limits, explores limits of sexuality (especially the pain/pleasure threshold), and
focuses extensively on the importance of consent as integral to sexual experience. As posters align
with tenets of hegemonic masculinity, they simultaneously (and somewhat paradoxically) align
themselves with these BDSM tenets, providing an intricate interweaving of two seemingly
contradictory ideologies. The ways in which posters of OnYourKnees engage with BDSM ideology
will be explored in the next chapter.
Chapter 4: BDSM and the deconstruction of sexuality

(1) I dont know [one hypnotist] personally and cant say whether what I've heard is true, but I think the reason his files dont work so well is because generally people dont trust him, so the subconscious mind throws up barriers and rejects the suggestions. The rumors are that he puts subliminals in every one of his files to covertly enslave you, turn you into a pain pig or do something humiliating again, I cant say this is true or not, but the rumor is out there and it will subconsciously affect how you listen to the files, no matter how good the tist is, if you dont trust him, it wont work. (HT, 195:4)

Chapter 3 demonstrated the importance of ideologies of hegemonic masculinity to the identity construction of posters on OnYourKnees. Through an analysis of the content of posts, a messageboard-specific hegemonic masculinity emerged that created a binary opposition between two main groups of posters (jocks and coaches), and placed coaches in a dominant position to subordinated jocks. In addition, many facets of jock and coach identities were seen as congruent with larger-scale ideologies of Western hegemonic masculinity, including an emphasis on sports, the desire for a muscular body, and creation of a binary power system that places some males in positions of power over others.

But looking at the linguistic practices of participants on OnYourKnees solely through the frame of hegemonic masculinity obscures the ways in which messageboard members understand their erotic practices as part of a larger BDSM ideology. Consider (1), above, posted by HD during a discussion of a particular poster's trances. In a previous message, another poster noted that although he normally enjoyed listening to trances produced by messageboard members, trances that were created by one poster in particular did not produce the same results. HT in response, in (1), argues that the reason might be that generally people dont trust [the creator of the trance], so the subconscious mind throws up barriers and rejects the suggestions. In this statement, HT indirectly claims that other
messageboard users have identified the creator of the aforementioned trance as untrustworthy: he gives evidence to his claim by acknowledging rumors about the poster that claim he puts subliminals in every one of his files to co covertly enslave you, turn you into a pain pig or do something humiliating. Here, HT is invoking the importance of trust in posters who create trances. Posters who create trances with the intention of hypnotizing others have the responsibility to not put in material (what HT calls subliminals) that might cause the listener to engage in activities he might not otherwise consent to. For HT, these activities include the infliction of pain (turn you into a pain pig) and engaging in potentially humiliating or embarrassing activities. By also claiming that the trances are not having their desired effect because of the (alleged) reputation of their creator, HT is drawing a link between the efficacy of a trance and the intentions of its creator.

Ultimately, as HT ends his post in (1), trust becomes intricately intertwined with the creation and consumption of trances: if you dont trust him, it wont work. The importance of trust is a key theme that runs throughout many posts in OnYourKnees, and it is difficult to place this importance in discourses of hegemonic masculinity that valorize one form of masculinity above others. However, as this chapter will argue, HT's post, and other discussions like it, helps to align the behavior of the messageboard and its participants with ideologies congruent with BDSM (bondage/discipline/sadism/masochism) sexual practice. This chapter will argue that, just as many posters align with larger-scale tenets of hegemonic masculinity that place jocks in a subordinate position to coaches, posters simultaneously align with an ideology, informed by larger-scale tenets of BDSM practice, that privilege trust and consent among all participants in erotic activity, regardless of whether they are submissive or dominant. In order for hypnosis to be effective, in order for posters to be able to share their sexual beliefs and desires in a comfortable setting, and in order for jock and coach identities to fully flourish, a sense of trust must be cultivated among all members of OnYourKnees that
honors both identities equally, including the opinions and conflicts that may arise among posters. An ideology that tolerates nothing less than full consent for all activity among participants on OnYourKnees allows posters to explore their beliefs and desires without feeling as if they are taking advantage of others: another important point that aligns this activity with a larger BDSM-influenced ideology.

A BDSM-influenced ideological frame also manifests in other ways on OnYourKnees. The linkage between hypnosis and erotic activity destabilizes larger notions of culturally- ‘accepted’ sexual practices that view such activity as abnormal and pathological. In addition, although most posters align with a relatively stable set of qualities inherent in jock and coach identities, other facets of those identities are hotly-contested among posters. The discussions that arise around these identities, including which aspects are more flexible than others, can also shed important light on how posters construct themselves, not only as jocks and coaches, but as members of a larger BDSM community with all of its normative rules, behavior, and etiquette. These discussions, it will be argued, are able to primarily exist because of the sense of trust and consent.

The discussions that arise from participants' discussions of their activities, through a BDSM framework, also sheds important light on the ways in which power is dispersed throughout the community of OnYourKnees. Chapter 2 argued that one of the most salient criticisms of Critical Discourse Analysis is its understanding of power as primarily a top-down phenomenon: individuals who are seen in positions of power enact it upon those who are seen as less so. Chapter 2 demonstrated this top-down approach when discussing the importance of power relations among jock and coaches, as seen through a prism of hegemonic masculinity. Within a BDSM framework, participants still engage in top-down power relations that give some people (in this case, those who identify and are identified as dominants) power over others (identified as submissives). This will be illustrated by the ways in
which honorifics are used by self-identified jocks and coaches on the messageboard. However, as this chapter will argue, discussions of what is appropriate behavior on OnYourKnees (and, consequently, who is an appropriate poster) suggest that, on another level, a certain level of power belongs to all members of OnYourKnees: power that allows users to discuss and determine who is an 'acceptable' user of the messageboard, and who violates boundaries that can result in sanctions by the community. Through discussing who is trustworthy and who is not, and what kinds of behaviors are more acceptable than others, all posters can contribute to a messageboard-specific ideology that identifies those who are legitimate posters on OnYourKnees, and who are not. Analyzing these discussions, and how violators are framed by messageboard posters, provides a viewpoint that gives power to all members of the community.

This chapter will begin with a discussion of BDSM ideologies, and how they differentiate themselves from both a 'normative' sexuality and ideologies of hegemonic masculinity. Then, this chapter will demonstrate links between messageboard behavior and BDSM ideology in three key areas. First, posters 'borrow' larger-scale cultural ideologies of BDSM and incorporate them into their understandings of both their identity and the activities of the messageboard: this includes the emergent use of the honorific coach among posters, primarily self-identified jocks. Second, this chapter further explore the meaning of dumbness on OnYourKnees, and how some posters are able to disalign from ideologies that link a jock identity to dumbness. Finally, two threads will be discussed in-detail that demonstrate the prime importance posters place on consent, and the ways in which posters construct particular users as both illegitimate (Bucholtz and Hall 2004) and inauthentic (Van Leeuwen 2001) users of OnYourKnees.

BDSM:
Any researcher who studies literature on BDSM activity will immediately be confronted with the panoply of terms that are used to describe both BDSM activity and its participants. The acronym BDSM, as an example, often serves as “a catch-all for the range of practices associated with B/D [bondage/discipline], S/M [sadism/masochism], D/s [Dominant/submissive], and other ‘fetish’-related practices among (particularly) the heterosexual/mixed community. The term is widely inclusive, and suggests a ‘membership’ amongst peoples […] whose tastes may vary widely but who draw from a common menu of activities” (Herman 2007, 90, footnote 1). This definition suggests the importance of each of these activities to any conception of BDSM-themed activity. The words bondage and discipline, for example, imply two key activities of BDSM, the act of immobilizing a person (such as binding their wrists together) and ‘disciplining’ them, either verbally or physically. 'Discipline' often, but not always, involves some infliction of pain, which can be achieved through such activities as spanking, whipping, or clamping (where weights are placed onto sensitive areas of the body, such as nipples or genitals). The terms sadism and masochism, for their parts, have their origins in the literary works of the authors Marquis de Sade and Leopold von Sacher-Masoch respectively, whose writings explored the intimate interplay between sexuality and submission. Weiss (2006) has noted that the acronym SM predates that of BDSM, and many practitioners of sadism and masochism have incorporated bondage and discipline practices into their larger understandings of BDSM as a common set of activities. Although researchers may make individual distinctions among these various, this dissertation will use the term BDSM as a catch-all for the set of activities described under the sub-categories BD, SM, and others.

Although Newmahr (2010b) argues that “an adequate description of SM is elusive and complex” (318), many BDSM researchers have tried to isolate particular behaviors and ideals that
constitute BDSM activity. In earlier work, Weinberg, Williams, & Moser (1984) defined sadomasochism as “the deliberate use of physical and/or psychological ‘pain’ to produce sexual arousal” (379), making the conception of giving or receiving pain the major focus of SM activity. They identified five features that they saw as integral to BDSM activity: dominance and submission, role-playing, consensuality, sexual content, and mutual understanding that the activities engaged in were part of the BDSM experience. Taylor & Ussher (2001) argue that BDSM behavior is best characterized by “a contrived, often symbolic, unequable distribution of power involving the giving and/or receiving of physical and/or psychological stimulation. It often involves acts which would generally be considered as ‘painful’ and/or humiliating or subjugating, but which are consensual and for the purposes of sexual arousal, and are understood by the participant to be S/M” (301).

Newmahr (2010b) argues that the term BDSM “refers to activities that involve the mutually consensual and conscious use, among two or more people, of pain, power, perceptions about power, or any combination thereof, for sensory or erotic pleasure, in the context of a public community.” (315), and also argues “all SM play involves either servitude, pain, controlled sensation, dominance, submission, or the illusion of dominance and/or submission” (Newmahr 2006, 44).

Although slightly different in the exact activities that are included under the rubric of BDSM, all of the above definitions nevertheless identify three components as integral to any BDSM experience: an unequable-yet-variable distribution of power that results in the exploration and destabilization of traditional dominant/submissive roles; the negotiation of consent and mutual cooperation in what is considered acceptable BDSM activity; and the infliction of some kind of ‘pain’ (whether psychological or physical) that enacts a change upon participants, that is seen as pleasurable to both the giver and receiver, and that is understood to be part of the BDSM experience. It is interesting to note that although some studies (e.g., Taylor and Ussher 2001) argue that BDSM activity
cannot be understood as such without an explicit sexual/erotic aspect, others (Herman 2007; Newmahr 2010) claim that sexual arousal is not a fundamental component to BDSM activity. Thus, BDSM activity is not necessarily, though often, linked with the sexual.

Under this rubric, BDSM activity can take on many forms, and many subcultures with both heterosexual and queer communities have developed that focus on particular aspects of BDSM practice (such as leather subcultures among gay men [Mains 1984; Barrett 2017])\(^8\). As Newmahr (2011) has noted in her ethnography of a heterosexual BDSM subculture, BDSM experiences are often an intimate mix of both private and public activity: although individual experiences between participants (or ‘scenes’) can happen in private or alone, many times they take place in semi-public arenas, such as clubs, where individuals can observe practitioners. As Newmahr observed, these arenas often hosted demonstrations of such activities as whipping, spanking, clamping, and hot-wax dripping (where wax from a candle is dripped directly onto the skin), performed by individuals who were experienced in both giving and receiving such behavior. These activities, performed in a semi-public space, did not lead to a sexual encounter: in the community Newmahr observed, directly-sexual activity within these spaces was directly frowned upon.

BDSM activity thus does not necessarily lead to sexual activity, and constitutes other practices that are not directly sexual in nature. BDSM practitioners, for example, also often participate in ‘munches,’ non-sexual causal meet-up groups where individuals meet other practitioners, and where ‘new’ or interested individuals are first introduced to others. Newmahr (2011) also notes that many practitioners also foster ties among other local, regional, and national BDSM groups that provide
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\(^8\) 'Leather' subculture, a subculture of larger BDSM communities, revolves around the wearing of leather for erotic pleasure.
demonstrations of various activities (such as various ways to tie knots) and safety trainings (for example, how to recognize potential health compromises in submissives during a scene).

Key among any BDSM-identified activity interaction is the deliberate negotiation of power differentials among participants: who is the 'giver' of a particular activity, who is the receiver, and what activities are allowed between participants. As discussed above, Newmahr's (2006, 2010b, 2010a) discussions of how power differentials are enacted within a scene challenges traditional sociological conceptions of power as inherent within a particular person or position they occupy within a social sphere, and instead re-casts is as a resource that belongs to no one, but that can be taken by a particular individual within a given time and can then flow to another through the mediating influence of consent. Thinking about power as a resource that can be actively taken and given to others may initially present a challenge to more 'traditional' CDA analyses that conceptualize power as an unchanging quality inherent within a particular individual (or sociocultural position), but this also opens up the idea that, among some groups and within some orders of discourse, these more traditional conceptions of power may not apply. This can be seen, for example, in the uses of the terms 'top' and 'bottom' to describe an individual's position within a particular BDSM scene. As Hoppe (2011) has observed, the terms 'top' and 'bottom' are used by many gay men to describe their sexual activities, in either doing the penetrating ('top') or being the one penetrated ('bottom'). Although many gay men in Hoppe's study described themselves as both engaging in and receiving penetration in their sexual lives, many men nonetheless described themselves as 'exclusively' tops or bottoms, effectively erasing any sexual activity that was not congruent with such labels. These labels, moreover, extended beyond the purely sexual realm, shaping their adherents' self-conceptualizations and conceptualizations of others. Thus, the term 'top' often becomes associated with a muscular male with a larger penis, and 'bottoms' as less
muscular and less hung—associations that carried over into non-sexual realms that conferred onto 'tops' qualities of being aggressive and dominant in their non-sexual lives as well.

The terms 'top' and 'bottom', however, take on slightly different meanings when applied to BDSM-identified activity. Although some individuals may exclusively identify as dominant (or ‘top’), and others exclusively as submissive (or ‘bottom’), many BDSM practitioners understand ‘top’ and ‘bottom’ not necessarily as fixed identities, but as locations within a particular scene at a particular time: one person’s top is likely to be another person’s bottom, and bottom and top roles can switch among participants even within a single scene. This seems to contrast with these more ‘traditional’ notions of sexuality that identify ‘top’ and ‘bottom’ roles as neatly mapped onto dominant/submissive and insertive/receptive sexual roles, and that assume the consistent behavior of individuals from one (non-)sexual environment to another. Among BDSM practitioners, these labels have power only inasmuch as they describe BDSM activity being engaged in within a particular moment, and have much less saliency outside of a particular scene.

The negotiation of power differentials within a scene also speaks to a related, yet separate, key aspect of BDSM activity: the negotiation of consent. Before any scene, partners negotiate what are acceptable behaviors and actions, and what are not. This pre-scene negotiation is seen as sacrosanct to many BDSM practitioners: individuals who partake in BDSM activity with others without their consent are often viewed with suspicion and ostracized from BDSM spaces (Herman 2007; Taylor and Ussher 2001).

It is important to note that BDSM subcultures, and the very practice of BDSM itself, have both been placed, and placed itself against, a larger cultural conception of ‘appropriate’ sexuality that views

---

9 Although, as Newmahr (2010b) notes, individuals who consistently prefer and perform 'top' and 'bottom' roles in their BDSM activity may be identified as such in non-sexual arenas, for example in munches.
BDSM activity as deviant and pathological. As Taylor (1997) notes, the terms ‘sadism’ and
‘masochism’ (whose terms come from the literary works of the Marquis de Sade and Leopold von
Sacher-Masoch, respectively) were first popularized in medical discourse in the late 19th century by the
Austro-German psychiatrist Richard von Kraft-Ebing, in his 1886 *Psychopathia Sexualis*. Kraft-Ebing
understood sadism and masochism as the enactment of power over others for sexual pleasure: this early
formulation of BDSM behaviors has been criticized for understanding BDSM behavior as a pathology
that is symptomatic of over-sexualized males and psychically ‘weak’ women (109). Other researchers,
such as Freud, became aware of (albeit limited) variability within BDSM-identified sexual practices
(indeed, Freud is credited with combining the two terms into the single ‘sadomasochism’), but still
pathologized the behavior as a ‘flaw’ in an individual that represented an inner conflict that needed to
be resolved.

As of 2013, the American Psychiatric Association still lists sadism and masochism as disorders
in the DSM-V. This pathologization of BDSM activity has contributed to it being viewed as an object
of study that is totalized and placed in opposition to ‘normal’, mainstream understandings of sexuality,
an opposition historically supported by the psychiatric profession. As Taylor and Ussher (2001) have
noted, theorists working with BDSM-identified populations “have generally sought to isolate SM as a
quantifiable and objectively measurable behaviour, consistent and explicit in its presentation and rooted
in the individual’s psychological makeup” (294). Locating BDSM activity as a quantifiable ‘behavior’
that is psychologically-based, they argue, continues to strengthen psychiatric ideologies that
pathologize BDSM as a disorder that is in need of immediate and extensive repair, while (implicitly or
not) normalizing mainstream understandings of sexuality. Herman (2007) has also noted that
participation in BDSM cultures have often been framed, not as aspects of participants’ identity, but
rather as a ‘lifestyle choice’, which leaves it “more open to persecution—social, legal, and psychiatric”
BDSM activity has also been marginalized within political and cultural spheres, although to different extents. Herman (2007) finds links between the ‘deviance’ of BDSM activity to citizenship, where they claim that “BDSM players are periodically demonized as ‘bad citizens,’ thereby showing up what is considered normal and desirable behavior […] sexual dissidents enjoy neither true publicity nor privacy and are thus denied full sexual citizenship” (93). BDSM activity, and the individuals who participate in it, are often marginalized from public spaces in ways that other ‘sexualized’ individuals are not; for example, as Herman notes, many otherwise-public meeting spots may not allow BDSM participants to hold munches. BDSM participants are therefore denied a form of sexual citizenship, in that their activities are much more stringently controlled than other sexually-charged ones. The tension between BDSM communities and notions of citizenship have also been noted by Barrett (2017), who observed that many participants in International Mr. Leather competitions simultaneously negotiate a ‘deviant’ sexual identity and a ‘mainstream’ citizenship that emphasizes community ties (observed through mentioning of volunteer work within on-stage speeches), the importance of family (through discussions of being devoted fathers and uncles), and even allegiance to mainstream American values (through recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance), which makes their ‘deviant’ sexual identity less so.

Within the cultural sphere, BDSM activities have often been conflated in larger cultural consciousnesses with the notion of ‘kinky’ sex, although what the term ‘kinky’ refers to is often vague and under-defined (e.g., Herman 2007). Newmahr (2010a) observes that outside of BDSM communities, BDSM is “often framed as ‘role play’” (393). Weiss (2006), in her study of attitudes
towards the notion of BDSM activity among non-BDSM participants, argued that representations in mass media tend to frame the activity in one of two related ways, what she calls ‘acceptance via normalizing’ and ‘understanding via pathologizing.’ In the first case, “SM is acceptable only when it falls under the rubric of normative American sexuality [...] while in the latter] SM is understandable only when it is the symptom of a deviant type of person with a sick, damaged core” (105). In the acceptance-via-normalizing frame, BDSM activity is acceptable only when practiced by individuals who otherwise conform to heteronormative values: spanking a significant other is OK only if done by a presumed-married man and woman, in their own home, and only if it leads to greater ‘strengthening’ of their (heteronormative) marriage. In the understanding-via-pathologization framework SM activity is a sign of a damaged, ‘sick’ identity, which serves to differentiate individuals with ‘normal’ sexualities and individuals who deviate in some way (i.e., ‘perverts’). BDSM activity thus represents, to many ‘mainstream’ viewers, an alternative sexuality that is “not just scary, dangerous, and exciting, but also funny, romantic, and safe enough to appear on The Learning Channel” (Weiss 2006, 109). Thus, BDSM activity seems to occupy a contradictory place within (American) society: at once dangerous and mundane, forbidden and accepted, deviant and ‘fun’. Erotic hypnosis is not immune to this as well: stereotypical portrayals of hypnotists as seeking to control others must contend with ‘alternative’ portrayals that view it as enhancing orgasm for both men and women (Gilbert-Lurie 2015; Moylan 2012).

But it is also important to note that BDSM practitioners can sometimes also contribute to an understanding of BDSM as diametrically opposite to a heteronormative sexuality. Many practitioners, for example, often contrast their activity to what they see as vanilla sex and sexualities. Vanilla has been defined as “conventional lovemaking without any S/M component” (Herman 2007, 91), and “conventional non-SM sexual relations, [...] which are often viewed] as conformist, uninteresting,
unadventurous, and unerotic” (Taylor and Ussher 2001, 303). ‘Conventional,’ in this sense, reflects a constructed understanding of ‘traditional’ sexual identities that are heterosexual, where the male is sexually dominant and the female is submissive. Weiss (2006, quoting Gayle Rubin) argues that privilege is bestowed on sexuality that is heterosexual, marital, monogamous, reproductive, coupled, vanilla, without ‘manufactured objects,’ relational, homogenerational, and at home […] sexuality that falls within these boundaries is considered good, normal, and natural […] while sexuality that is homosexual, unmarried, promiscuous, nonprocreative, commercial, alone or in groups, casual, cross-generational, in public, or with objects [is] stigmatized, pathologized, policed, and oppressed. (114)

BDSM activity, and many of those who practice it, thus contrast themselves to a ‘vanilla’ sexuality that is rooted in traditional notions of gender and sexuality. ‘Vanilla’ sex is viewed as upholding ‘normative’ sexual and gender norms that locate ‘proper’ sexual behavior within a heterosexual couple who is monogamous, and who is seen as upholding values of monogamy, sex-as-reproductive, and within the confines of a traditional marriage. Ideals of hegemonic masculinity also factor into this conception, since it assumes a dominant male (husband) who asserts his power, in this case sexual, over a submissive female (wife). Many BDSM practitioners, by contrast, construct their erotic activity as “deliberately, consciously antithetical to a sexual hegemonic, namely patriarchal, heterosexuality” (Taylor and Ussher 2001, 302). In their analysis of BDSM practitioners’ discussions about their sexual activity, Taylor and Ussher note that many participants utilize a discursive framework that demonstrates an awareness of their behaviors as somehow threatening to heterosexual, patriarchal systems that locate sexual power and dominance within men or masculine-identified individuals. For many of Taylor and Ussher’s interviewees, in contrast, BDSM activity was largely framed “as a parody of abusive, divisive sexual relations, turning ‘normal’ sex on its head, ridiculing it,
undermining it, exploiting it and exposing it, with the ultimate intention of destroying it” (303). BDSM is for many just as important a political act as it is an erotic one.

It is important to note that not all BDSM practitioners explicitly frame their experiences as deliberately antithetical to heteronormativity: Herman (2007) suggests that “it might be argued that BDSM does little to undermine essentialist identities, yet it might be equally argued that its disinterest in them is its own form of anti-essentialism” (98-9). Although BDSM activity has often been positioned, by its very nature, as antithetical to more ‘normative’ views of sexuality, Herman suggests that not all practitioners politicize their beliefs and behaviors, simply viewing their activity as individual preferences that have little influence or relevancy on other aspects of their lives. Nevertheless, whether it be through self-reporting, the pathologization by others, or the prism of cultural understandings, BDSM activities, and those who practice it, stand outside normative, mainstream values that are traditionally associated with sexuality and gender. Its focus on the blurring and experimentation of power differentials and pain/pleasure thresholds stands against larger cultural ideologies of sexual behavior that idealize heterosexual, coupled behavior – and that hegemonic masculinity is largely complicit in.

The practice of erotic hypnosis, especially as how it manifests on OnYourKnees, shares many corollaries with other forms of BDSM activity, and as such can be consider part of the larger panoply of BDSM practice. Many individuals on the messageboard use tropes of hypnosis as tools that help listeners (almost exclusively self-identified jocks) achieve their goals of being the type of jock they want to be. As such, they also engage in the ‘playing of power’ that is a hallmark of BDSM activity, manifesting various levels of submission that are reflected in the ways they engage with each other and with coaches. Listening to hypnotic trances effects a change upon the submissive, which can be considered a form of psychological ‘pain’ (if the definition of ‘pain’ is expanded to include some
alteration of behavior). In addition, many messageboard participants, jocks and coaches alike, engage in discussions of trances and ‘acceptable’ types of hypnosis that incorporate discussions of consent. Thus, although messageboard participants on OnYourKnees engage in behaviors that may be consistent with hegemonic masculinity, they do so while also engaging in BDSM behaviors that allow for the exploration of sexual identities that blur the distinction between jock and coach, and between dominant and submissive.

OnYourKnees and links with BDSM activity:

Although OnYourKnees, as stated on its home page, is primarily geared towards "men that enjoy hypnosis to get lean, fit, [and] muscular," many posters align themselves with larger conceptions of BDSM identity by drawing links between the specific activities they discuss on OnYourKnees and a larger BDSM culture. At this point, it is important to note that although many posters on OnYourKnees self-identify as jocks and coaches, many other posters who do not align with either of these identities nonetheless identify along dominant/submissive lines, either by claiming they wish to be dominated by others, or by attempting to find individuals to dominate. One poster, for instance, stated the following:

(2) I love being being transformed into a leather jock by [another poster] (CH, 302:1)

In (2), CH claims that he loves being transformed into a leather jock slave by another poster on the messageboard. The use of the term leather, which occurs 19 times within the corpus, suggests affinities with what has often been called the 'leather' subculture in BDSM, which privileges the
wearing of leather for erotic arousal (e.g., Mains 1984; Barrett 2017). By using the word leather as part of the self-ascriptive leather jock, CH indexes his identity to a larger BDSM culture. Interestingly, CH simultaneously uses the word jock to describe himself, suggesting further strong linkages between the micro community of OnYourKnees and the larger macro BDSM community.

Other linkages between OnYourKnees and larger BDSM communities can be seen in (3) below:

(3) ALL masters, slaves, doms, submissives, tists, subjects, jocks, pups, and just the curious are welcome here, as long as they follow the rules (no spam, be respectful, etc). I'm not into pain myself, but I too love the concept of control via hypnosis. (MM, 205:21)

In (3), MM (who is also one of the moderators of the messageboard) claims that ALL masters, slaves, doms, submissives, tists, subjects, jocks, pups, and just the curious are welcome to participate in the OnYourKnees community. For MM, the online community is presented as welcoming to individuals who wish to explore all sorts of power differentials, not just those falling along jock/contour identities. In addition, the specific mentioning of the above groups suggests that they have 'equal' footing on the messageboard: because they are all welcome, their viewpoints and contributions should (ideally) be equally considered and respected.

Other posters draw links between the particular activities they engage in on OnYourKnees, and larger BDSM ideologies. One poster, GD, likens the act of wearing a jockstrap to being 'collared; by a master:

10 Within the context of both OnYourKnees and the larger BDSM community, these terms have slightly different connotations from one another. While 'dom' (short for dominant) and 'submissive' refer to individuals who are seen to give and receive BDSM activities within an individual scene, the terms 'master' and 'slave' connote a relationship between a dominant and a submissive that extends beyond an individual scene (for example, two coupled individuals in a long-term relationship). 'Tists', a term frequently occurring on OnYourKnees, is short for hypnotists, while 'subjects' refer to individuals who listen and appear to be affected by hypnotic trances. 'Pup' refers to an individual who enjoys role-playing as a dog, and also infers a submissive role in BDSM activities.

11 The act of 'collaring' refers to the wearing of a particular piece of clothing by a submissive (such as a leather collar or a chain around the neck) to indicate their submissive status. In many cases, these 'collars' are worn in public and are
I've read a lot about a slave being trained and finally submitting to a Master. Normally it involves the Master claiming the slave by placing a collar permanently around his neck. However, that seems inappropriate for this group. Instead of getting collared, I think that a jock-slave should get strapped. Most of you here can probably imagine it. A few months after your training begins, you get a powerful urge to go to a sporting goods store. You wander around aimlessly, searching for something but unable to figure out what it is. Finally you pass the jock strap section, and you realize that's what you were looking for. You carefully examine each of them, noting the different colors, sizes, and styles. Finally you see one that's absolutely perfect, and proudly proceed to the register to purchase it. Your heart pounds wildly the whole ride home, as you imagine putting it on. After what seems like an eternity, you get home, close the door behind you, and change into your new jockstrap right there in the entrance because you can't wait the few seconds it would take to get to your bedroom. The feel of it is intoxicating and almost electric. Wearing the jock fills you with pride, strength, and most of all obedience to your Master. Somehow, you know that it's a permanent part of you now. There's no lock or key, but you know you can't remove it without your Master's position. You have officially been strapped. (GD, 193:1)

In (4), GD begins his post by alluding to larger BDSM ideologies, namely the idea of a slave being trained and finally submitting to a Master. Among some practitioners (e.g., Harrington and Williams 2012), this corresponds to a 'master' placing a collar around his 'slave's' neck, which is often seen among BDSM communities as a marker of submission and intimate relations. However, GD then claims that wearing a 'collar' seems inappropriate for this group, and suggests that among jocks, collars should be replaced by jockstraps. It is interesting here that, by identifying collars as inappropriate symbols for the type of dominant/submissive relationships explored on the messageboard, GD is separating (albeit in a small way) the behavior on OnYourKnees from a larger BDSM subculture. GD then explains, in intense detail, the process of purchasing a jockstrap, which he claims would be initiated by a powerful urge to go to a sporting goods store. Throughout this narrative, the unnamed shopper is searching for something but unable to figure out what it is, implying that jocks should

meant to be a highly-visible demonstration of ones' sexual/erotic status. In some cases, dominants and submissives in long-term relationships may engage in ceremonies akin to weddings where, instead of rings being exchange, a dominant fastens a collar around their submissives' neck, demonstrating both relationship status and 'ownership' by another.
instinctively gravitate towards jockstraps without necessarily realizing what they are doing (another example of a discourse of naturalization at work). This process is filled with excitement and anticipation, as once a jockstrap is found, the unnamed shopper *proudly proceed(s) to the register to purchase it*, and once the shopper returns home, he immediately puts on the jockstrap because he *can't wait the few seconds it would take to get to your bedroom* (tellingly, the process is described as *intoxicating and almost electric*). Wearing the jockstrap, GD further explains, should fill the wearer *with pride, strength, and most of all obedience to your Master* (bold is mine)–and the jockstrap is now *a permanent part of* the wearer. In fact, as GD ends his post, he claims that the wearer should not remove the jockstrap with his master's permission, resulting in a situation where the wearer has *officially been strapped*. For GD, the jockstrap symbolizes an intimate union between a jock and his coach (or, in this case, a 'master' – it is telling that GD does not use the word 'coach' in his post), where the jockstrap is essentially acting as a proxy to an (unencountered) coach. For GD, therefore, discourses of naturalization, submission, and dominance revolve around the perceived 'need' for jocks to wear jockstraps.

In addition to links between messageboard activity and BDSM communities, many posters draw links textually, through the use of honorifics. Honorific usage, as a way of showing social deference and respect (or sometimes, lack of respect) through language, often involves the exploitation of pronouns, and can stress closeness or distance between other members of a community (e.g., Brown and Gilman 1960), or between community members and 'higher' powers such as deities (as can be seen in the use of *thou/thee* among 17th-century Quakers; see Bauman 1970). Van Leeuwen (2008) incorporates honorific usage into his analysis of the representation of social actors by including it under the rubric of nomination and classification. Van Leeuwen notes that "social actors can be represented either in terms of their unique identity, by being *nominated*, or in terms of identities and functions they
share with others (\textit{categorization})" (40, italics in original). Honorific usage is related to the process of nomination, in that it differentiates social actors into unique identities based on socially-salient achievements (such as \textit{Dr.} or \textit{Prof.}): honorific usage is thus often tied to respect and recognition of social power. However, in some cases honorific usage can play into power relations in surprising ways. Hasrati and Mohammadzadeh (2012), in their study of notes written by Iranian students to professors appealing for higher grades, note the usage of honorifics to address professors within the notes serve two purposes: they not only highlight the asymmetrical power relations between professors and students, but they also serve to put students in a highly-deferential position to professors. This positioning, Hasrati and Mohammadzadeh argue, is part of a larger strategy of manipulation on the part of students to receive higher grades: by deploying honorifics to show their subordination to professors, students demonstrate their attempts to appeal to professors' potential egos and convince them to 'reward' their display of subordination with higher grades.

Within BDSM communities, honorifics are also important in delimiting roles between dominant and submissive players. Makai (2013) notes that honorifics are part of protocol, which he defines as "the customs, courtesies and practices of a group which have become semi-formalized over time, and are generally expected to be observed by members of the group" (471): these 'semi-formalized' protocols include the usage of \textit{Master}, \textit{Mistress}, \textit{Sir}, and \textit{Ma'am} to refer to a dominant individual within a scene. Dwyer (2007), in her study of the use of vocatives within 39 erotic BDSM stories, differentiates between honorifics (which she defines as "generally impersonal and could be used toward anyone of a higher status" (29)) and objectifiers (defined as "terms which directly relate the addressee to an object that can be 'owned'" (32)). Dwyer found that submissive-identified characters are most likely to use honorifics (such as \textit{master} and \textit{sir}) to refer to dominant-identified characters, while dominants were most likely to use objectifiers (such as \textit{slave} or \textit{pig}) to refer to those who are
submissive: these different ways of referring to each other reflect and reinforce particular contours of power relations between dominants and submissives.12

The strategic use of honorifics, then, can position a text (partially) along BDSM contours. On OnYourKnees, three distinct honorifics seem to emerge: *sir*, *master*, and *coach*. *Sir* and *master* align power relations between dominant- and submissive-identified individuals more closely with BDSM ideologies, while *coach* seems to emerge as a messageboard-specific honorific that aligns with BDSM ideologies more diffusely. Examples of all three can be seen in (5-7) below:

(5) Hi there Sir, how r ye?? would love to see/hear u on cam! [SS, 126:1]
(6) Please take the control of me Master [MS, 28:15]
(7) Coach Sir,

    I hope you feel better soon, sir! Your health is very important, health and comfort sir! If I were around, I'd be sure to take good care of you, and rub ya down and get you soup or whatever you need, coach! [RY, 29:8]

In both (5) and (6), two self-identified jocks (SS and MS) are responding to a post by a self-identified coach. SS uses *sir* in (5) to refer to the coach, while MS in (6) asks that the coach *take the control of me Master*. (7) presents an interesting example where two honorifics are combined. In (7), RY is sending wishes for another poster to feel better, claiming that if he were present, he would give the poster a massage and *get you soup or whatever you need* (implying that he will cater to all of his needs). RY uses *coach* twice, both times as an honorific, and *sir* three times as an honorific (and,

---

12 Dwyer, however, notes the difficulty of differentiating between honorifics and objectifiers, stating that "different members of the BDSM community may classify some terms differently, with significant overlap between titles, objectifiers, profanities, and diminutives" (32).
interestingly, combining them in the phrase coach sir). RY’s creative use of both coach and sir as honorifics allows him to further index his deference.

Taking Dwyer's (2007) definition of an honorific usage as one that occurs in a clause without an article (a, the) or pronominal (my, your), regardless of whether the terms was used as a direct address or a third-person reference, all usages of the honorifics sir, master, and coach were extracted from the corpus and sorted according to whether they were used by a self-identified jock, self-identified coach, or a poster who identified as neither (as seen in Table 4-1 below):

Table 4-1: use of honorifics sir, master and coach among three groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total occurrences</th>
<th>sir</th>
<th>Total uses as honorific</th>
<th>Total occurrences</th>
<th>master</th>
<th>Total uses as honorific</th>
<th>Total occurrences</th>
<th>coach</th>
<th>Total uses as honorific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOCKS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45 (97%)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15 (33%)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>54 (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACHES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5 (24%)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20 (45%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39 (100%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37 (37%)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of the terms sir, master, and coach in Table 4-1 illustrates that self-identified jocks, self-identified coaches, and those who identify as neither all utilize these terms as honorifics, although at different rates. Although self-identified jocks use the term coach more often than sir or master (with 180 total tokens), it is only used as an honorific in 54 instances (30%). Although sir and master occur with equal frequency among self-identified jocks (with 46 tokens apiece), sir is overwhelmingly more likely to be used as an honorific than master. Among tokens of master among self-identified jocks that are not honorifics, 16 occur with an article (a/an/the), while only 9 co-occur with a possessive pronoun (most often my, with their, his and its also attested). This imbalance seems
to suggest that *sir* is highly unlikely to be used as anything other than an honorific (thereby indexing the referent of *sir* as someone worthy of honor or respect), while *master* can be used both honorifically and as a general referent for dominant-identified individuals.

Unlike among self-identified jocks, *sir* is almost unattested among self-identified coaches (with only two occurrences in the entire corpus, both of them within the same post quoting a previous user), while *master* occurs as an honorific five times (out of 21 total occurrences). In all instances where *master* is used by self-identified coaches, it is referring to another coach on the messageboard. This seems to suggest that self-identified coaches are more likely to use *master* among themselves as markers of respect for each other, rather than *sir*, which is reserved for jocks who wish to show deference to coaches. Perhaps surprisingly, *coach* occurs 20 times as an honorific among self-identified coaches, but in all but one instance, the honorific is self-referential, as exemplified in (8) below:

(8) nice post, boy..... where are you? Have pics for *coach*? [DD, 325:2, bold is mine]

In (8), DD is responding to a poster who is looking for a coach, and is asking him his location and any photos he may have. He asks *Have pics for coach?*, where *coach* is referring to DD. This type of self-referential use of *coach* suggests that coaches use the term to refer to themselves, furthering the use of the honorific to structure power relations between dominant coaches and submissive jocks. The use of the word *boy* to refer to the poster looking for a coach is very interesting: excluding cases where it is incorporated into a username, the lemma *boy* occurs 67 times within the corpus. Dwyer (2007) notes that one of the categories of terms used by dominants and submissives to relate to one another in BDSM erotic incorporates such age-graded terms as *boy*, *girl*, and *child*, suggesting that *boy* is used, to some extent, within BDSM cultures as a form of address. DD's use of the word *boy* in (8) thus
establishes a link between the immediate messageboard community and a larger BDSM community. On OnYourKnees, the term _boy_ can be used by self-identified submissives (i.e., its usage is not restricted to jocks) to describe themselves, and self-identified dominants (who do not necessarily have to identify as coaches) utilize it to address those who are seen as submissive. By using both _boy_ and _coach_ in his post, DD seems to index numerous facets of his identity: a dominant speaking to a submissive, and a coach speaking to a jock.

Finally, among posters who identify as neither jocks nor coaches, recall that many of these posters may identify as dominant or submissive, just not as jocks or coaches _per se_. Among absolute types, _master_ (100 tokens) tends to occur more commonly than either _coach_ (67 tokens) or _sir_ (39 tokens), but when used as an honorific _sir_ and _master_ occur with similar frequency (39 and 37 tokens, respectively), patterning with self-identifying jocks in this regard. _Coach_, as an honorific, occurs 22 times within the corpus, which suggests that posters who identify as neither show respect to other coaches by using the term as such.

Table 4-1 thus demonstrates that the use of _sir, master, and coach_ as honorifics can be used by all three groups to refer to dominant individuals. Although differences do exist among the three groups (jocks are most likely to use _coach_ and _sir_, while those who identify as neither show a slight preference for _sir_ and _master_), the data demonstrates that all three groups do, on some level, participate in the usage of honorifics to delineate power relations among dominants and submissives. Self-identified jocks use all three as markers of their submission, while self-identified coaches primarily use _coach_ as a self-referential honorific. Those who identify as neither show a more robust usage of all three, implying that they also participate in the usage of those terms to further dominant/submissive lines of power.
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This is not to say, however, that all posters use *sir*, *master*, and *coach* interchangeably: in some instances, conflict may develop around which honorific is appropriate to use in a particular context. One discussion thread in particular highlights how these three honorifics may develop subtle shades of meaning that not all posters may understand. In this thread, a poster (who identifies neither as a coach nor a jock) begins with the following:

(9) Approach for instruction [MS, 205:1]

By simply stating *approach for instruction*, MS is asking submissive-identified individuals to show deference to him. Another poster responds with the following:

(10) SIR hi SIR [BS, 205:2]

By using the honorific *sir*, BS (who, in another post, identifies as a jock) indexes both recognition of the dominance of MS, and his own submission. However, another poster (DR) takes issue with the fact that BS uses the honorific *sir* to refer to MS:

(11) thats Master NEVER sir [DR, 205:3]

In (11), DR criticizes BS's use of the honorific *sir*, instead claiming that the appropriate honorific should be *master*. Here, DR implicitly draws a distinction between the usage of *master* and *sir*, although he does not initially make clear what the distinction is. Another poster (HT), in turn, interprets DR's message as incorrect itself, and posts the following:

(12) actually the boy was correct, leather protocol dictates the boy call you "Sir" untill you claim him for ownership. he may call you "Master" if its your title [HT, 205:4]
In (12), HT (who is a prolific poster on OnYourKnees and who does not identify as a jock or coach) claims that the boy was correct in using *sir* to address a dominant, because *leather protocol* dictates the boy call you 'Sir' until you claim him for ownership. By alluding to 'leather protocol', HT reaches out to larger BDSM cultural practices that address the distinction between *sir* and *master*. For HT, the more impersonal *sir* is to be used by a submissive until a more intimate relationship is established, in which case *master* would be appropriate. His reference to leather protocol also indexes HT as an individual who is familiar with these larger BDSM cultural practices, and who seemingly has some authority in observing the difference between the two terms.

Other posters support HT’s position, and DR responds with the following (after providing apologies to the messageboard):

(13) I prefer to be referred to as Master, that may be as much a cultural thing as well as a definition of my role. To me, there are many men in life you will call *sir*, father, teacher, boss etc. I see there is a distinct difference between myself and those male roles. Does a Master assume the attributes of such roles? Of course he should, it is not about abuse as much as taking a sub from where they are and helping them reach their potential. But I see to refer to me as *sir* or Sir is to downgrade me into a similar position. [DR, 205:14]

For DR, the use of the word *sir* is akin to other such honorifics as *father, teacher, boss* etc, and he differentiates his role from those by noting that he sees a distinct difference between myself and those male roles, although he does not specify what those roles are. The implication, however, is that DR, in his role as a master, sees his responsibility as taking a sub from where they are and helping them reach their potential (although, again, he does not state what that potential is). A master, according to DR’s implication, has a much more intimate relationship with his sub than what a father, teacher, or boss would have with their subordinates, where *sir* would be much more likely to be uttered
as a more impersonal honorific. *Master*, for DR, does identity work in a way that *sir* does not: it indexes this intimate relationship in a very particular way.

What is also interesting about this thread is the way in which DR's post in (11) is seen as threatening and potentially abusive. DR notes this in his response in (13) when he claims that his insistence on being called *master is not about abuse*. Later in his post, he addresses the claim that his post was seen as possibly abusive:

(14) As far as telling a new sub how he should behave, I wonder if there is not any "teaching" how is a sub to know how to behave in any sense. maybe we should just invite them to leather clubs and scare the living shit out of them? I am not saying every experience will be good but neither is every experience bad and it is both the good and the bad experiences that as in all of life that we all learn from.

Personally I have met more than a few subs that have faced serious abuse. Drugged, raped, force fisted and hospitalized. For my part I have helped them to see that not all M/s relationships are like that and I have helped more than a few to believe that through patience and sensitive treatment. [DR, 205:14]

In (14), DR acknowledges the idea that he (and, by extension, all dominant-identified individuals) has a responsibility to treat submissive-identified individuals respectfully and not act in a way that can be seen as potentially abusive. Although he mitigates his personal feelings of responsibility somewhat (by claiming that *it is both the good and the bad experiences that as in all of life that we all learn from*), he also understands that many submissive-identified individuals have faced serious abuse from others who identify as being dominant, including being *drug, raped, force fisted* [referring to the act of having a fist forcibly inserted into one's anus] *and hospitalized*. He notes that he has helped many submissives to realize that not all dominant/submissive relationships are abusive, constructing himself (and, again, by extension all dominant individuals) as someone who has a responsibility to treat submissives with *patience and sensitive treatment*. Here, DR draws a distinction
between the above activities and what he does, understanding his role to be someone who treats submissives with dignity and care.

DR, in his response, thus addresses numerous issues about dominant/submissive relationships that extend beyond merely using one honorific over another. Specifically, he invokes ideologies of trust and consent into his role as a dominant, and the role of dominants in general. A 'good' dominant does not abuse, drug, rape, or otherwise cause harm to his subjects. Rather, a 'good' dominant respects the limits of his submissive, works with the submissive to reach his goals, and helps him to discover what a 'healthy' dominant/submissive relationship should entail. DR understands that stereotypical portrayals of BDSM relationships are not about the inflicting and receipt of damaging pain, but rather a transcendence of personal boundaries that upholds the dignity and health of both dominant and submissive. Although DR does not use the word outright, he implies that consent is a key aspect of any BDSM relationship, and contributes to the villianization of those who force themselves upon others: those who drug and rape their submissives are not 'truly' BDSM practitioners.

(14) demonstrates the ways in which discourses of consent run through many threads on OnYourKnees. Messageboard posters are often aware of the complex issues that run through their use of erotic hypnosis as a vehicle through which to realize their desires, and many often participate in discussions that focus on issues of trust and consent among voluntary participants. Some behaviors are seen as congruent with these larger-scale ideologies of trust, while other behaviors (and, subsequently, the posters who participate in these behaviors) are seen as at-odds with honoring and respecting the limits of consent of all participants. The next section of this chapter will argue that, when discussing ideologies of consent and trust in relation to erotic hypnosis, participants construct some behaviors as acceptable, and others as unacceptable. Using Bucholtz and Hall's (2004) conception of authenticiation...
and illegitimation can help to understand how these issues are discussed and who, subsequent, are authentic and illegitimate practitioners of erotic hypnosis and users of OnYourKnee.

Tactics of intersubjectivity on OnYourKnees:

Bucholtz and Hall (2004), as part of their framework of tactics of intersubjectivity, include what they call *authorization* and *illegitimation* as key components in the construction of identity. They note that these terms "involve the attempt to legitimate an identity through an institutional or other authority, or conversely the effort to withhold or withdraw such structural power" (386). Sauntson (2016) further defines authorization as "language use [that] denotes a state in which a subject is perceived to be afforded some degree of institutional recognition and power [which] is used to legitimate certain social identities" (21), and defines illegitimation as "language use[that] denotes a state in which a subject is perceived as being structurally marginalized, and power is used to revoke or withhold validation of certain identities" (21). Authorization and illegitimation often relates language use to larger social institutions that influence who is an 'appropriate' user of markers of identity (including linguistic varieties and styles), and who is seen as not. These social institutions can be state-sanctioned (such as in the case of granting one variety of language 'official' status over others), or can be more diffused throughout a population (as is the case with linguistic markers that index race or class). If a user is 'authorized' to use a particular variety of language, they are often subsequently granted access to institutional power that is denied those whose language use is not deemed to be authentic.

What is deemed 'authorized' and 'illegitimate' language use has had an enormous impact on sociolinguistics, and is also bound up with another pair of Bucholtz and Hall's (2004) tactics of
intersubjectivity: authentication and denaturalization. As they note, these tactics "respectively concern the construction of a credible or genuine identity [authentication] and the production of an identity that is literally incredible or non-genuine" (385). As Bucholtz (2003) notes, "authenticity underwrites nearly every aspect of sociolinguistics, from our identification of socially meaningful linguistic phenomena, to the definition of the social groups we study, to the methods we use to collect our data, to the theories we draw on in our analysis" (398). Historically, as Bucholtz argues, many sociolinguistics have constructed particular versions of linguistic authenticity that privilege certain types of information, and consequently certain types of speakers, as more authentic than others. Many language documentarians, for instances, have focused on certain types of speakers (male, older, rural-oriented, and relatively isolated) in data collection, constructing them as ideal keepers of a linguistic variety that is seen as more 'pure' than others. As these 'ideal' linguistic subjects are seen as more authentic speakers, they gain authentication within the linguistic community and are thus seen as ideal sources of data: as Bucholtz claims, this privileging of some speakers over others has (intentionally or not) led to the erasure of knowledge of linguistic varieties of other groups (such as women, bilingual speakers, and urban-oriented individuals), who are subsequently constructed as less authentic speakers of their language(s), and therefore denaturalized.

However, this is not to say that ideologies of authenticity are conferred from outside: rather, much research (e.g., Scannell 2001; van Leeuwen 2001) suggests that what determines an 'authentic' individual can emerge from within individual communities, is highly community-dependent, and can vary within the same community from one historical era to another. As van Leeuwen notes, the notion of what it means to be an ‘authentic’ individual is socioculturally produced, and specific to particular communities at particular points in time. He notes that “authenticity cannot be seen as an objective feature of talk, or of any other form of sociocultural production, despite all the scientific and scholarly
procedures and methods that have been developed for establishing it” (396). What is authentic, and who is authentic, is locally produced and contextually-dependent.

Authentication is thus "not there to be discovered, not even to be cleverly coaxed into range of our recording equipment: rather, it is conferred – by language users and their audiences, and by us, the sociolinguists who study them" (Bucholtz 2003, 408). Authentication and denaturalization are therefore related to authorization and illegitimation in that, once a person's identity is perceived to be authentic by a particular institution (such as the state or education), they have access to certain avenues of power that denaturalized identities do not; these denaturalized identities can therefore be seen as illegitimate, and those who possess denaturalized identities can be denied access to social institutions.

By examining the contours through which authentication (and denaturalization) are constructed within a particular community, and how those contours structure language use and access to social resources, researchers can more fully understand how some community members are granted that access through the acceptable use of language and social norms (i.e., authorized), and how others are denied that power (or denaturalized). Some researchers have used theories of authenticity/denaturalization and authorization/illegitimation to understand how community members see themselves as 'authentic' or not, and how language practices might shape their conceptions of who is considered authorized within their community: who has access to avenues to discuss their 'real' selves. In her discussions of lesbian/gay/bisexual (LGB) students' experiences in school, Sauntson (2016) notes that tactics of authentication/denaturalization and authorization/illegitimation were often used to construct LGB students' identities as denaturalized and illegitimate, while authenticating (and therefore authorizing) the existence of homophobic language and bullying. In interviews with LGB youth, she found that many students constructed their school experiences as unwelcoming of their LGB identities (i.e., their 'real' sexual selves) through normalizing opposite-sex relationships (i.e.,
authorizing them) and a lack of discussion of same-sex attraction (illegitimating them). In the interviews, this was linguistically realized through a variety of tactics, including the use of modal verbs (such as would have) to suggest unrealized opportunities to discuss LGB identities with others, leading to feelings of alienation and loneliness in those who identified as LGB. Similarly, homophobic language and bullying was often constructed as being authorized by schools: in one example, a student noted that he was bullied and the school didn't do anything about it, constructing the school as an active agent that authorized bullying but illegitimated any attempts on their part to mitigate it.

Both Bucholtz and Hall and Sauntson relate authorization/denaturalization and authorization/illegitimation to larger-scale institutions that have enormous social, economic, and political power. But these tactics can exist on a smaller scale, within individual communities of practice. Who gets to claim certain identities over others, and who has access to resources based on those claims, can just as much be a result of inter-community relations as it is through relationships with larger-scale institutions. Within BDSM communities, for example, the 'search' for authenticity has been argued to play an important role in why individuals participate in BDSM activities, how they view their participation, and who can thus claim a 'legitimate' BDSM identity. Newmahr (2010a) argues that “at its core, the link between SM participants is a quest for a sense of authenticity in experiences of power imbalance” (395). Authenticity in BDSM play, according to Newmahr, can be located in participants’ feelings and experiences of relative powerfulness or powerlessness, during and as a consequence of their SM scenes. This authenticity is beyond that of which one might experience when playing a role […] SM participants who, when they play, feel as if they are playing a role (as an actor might) do not achieve the authenticity of players who say they feel afraid, helpless, evil, or invincible during their play […] the authenticity in SM likes in the extent to which SM participants are able to convince themselves, and each other, of the realness of the experience.” (396, italics in original)
In the above excerpt, Newmahr draws a distinction between an inauthentic experience of participating in a scene (which she likens to ‘role-playing’) and more ‘authentic’ BDSM experiences, where feelings of pain, helplessness, or invincibility are not merely enacted, but more fully and legitimately felt by participants during a particular scene. Authenticity, then, emerges when participants temporarily suspend their knowledge that their environment is heavily-controlled, and that they have an integral part in creating and maintaining that control.

For many posters on OnYourKnees, being an authenticated participant in its activities means learning and understanding contours of jock and coach identities, and successfully enacting (or at the very least respecting) those tenets through discussions and their language use. But being an authenticated participant also means understanding what contours of identity can be flexibly tailored to suit one's individual desires, and which aspects of identity are seen as transgressing a boundary of some kind. Although jock and coach identities, as discussed in Chapter 3, can be recognized by adherence to a relatively stable set of ideologies, beliefs, and values, not all self-identified jocks and coaches have to strictly adhere to these sets at all times. As the below discussion will demonstrate, self-identified jocks and coaches demonstrate great variability in what they consider appropriate behaviors and qualities of jocks. This can especially be seen in discussions of cockiness and dumbness, two qualities that are seen as integral to some posters' conceptions of an idealized jock identity, but not others. Discussions that arise around cockiness and dumbness, as will be demonstrated below, show that some contours of identity are not seen as necessary to enact an 'authentic' identity.

However, as orientations towards cockiness and dumbness are seen as variable and individually-dependent, others are seen as sacrosanct to the community as a whole. Simply put, some
behaviors, and posters who enact those behaviors, are not seen as congruent with the messageboard as a whole: when one of these breaches is recognized, it often results in their denaturalization, most frequently in sanctions on the poster (including being banned by moderators and shunned by other posters). Much of what is seen as inviolable behavior on OnYourKnees revolves around ideologies of consent, which help to further link the messageboard-specific behavior of participants on OnYourKnees to larger-scale ideologies of BDSM, and which help to separate the authentic and the authorized from the denaturalized and the illegitimate.

Consent:

The requesting and granting/receipt of consent is considered one of the most fundamental aspects of BDSM activity. Without consent from all parties involved, activities are no longer considered as part of the BDSM experience, and practitioners are often denied the ability to lay claim to a BDSM identity. Weinberg et al. (1984) identify consent as one of their five primarily constituents of BDSM activity, and which they define as "a voluntary agreement to enter into dominant/submissive 'play' and to honor certain 'limits'" (381). For Weinberg et al., consent within a BDSM framework involves the agreement, between all parties involved, that there are certain activities which are considered acceptable to engage in, and certain activities which are not (and which are often, but not always, negotiated before any scene begins). Transgressing the 'limits' of what has been deemed acceptable, to many BDSM practitioners, is akin to sexual violence: as Moser & Madeson (1996) note, "just as the difference between intercourse and rape is consent, so the distinction between SM and true violence is also consent" (31). To be put into a position where one is unable to consent, or one is
engaging in activity they did not consent to, is often compared to rape, and can result in sanctions, such as being shunned by other members of BDSM communities and being banned from participating in events (cf. Newmahr 2011).

However, although many BDSM practitioners place an exceptionally high value on consent, what constitutes consent is not always clear. Even the utterance *no*, which is often assumed to be a clear indication of an unwarranted and unwelcome activity, can be open to different interpretations depending on when and where it is said: as a speech act, its interpretation thus depends on the domain in which it is uttered, and its performative effect may consequently differ. As Kulick (2003) has noted, the word *no* is often understood in some arenas (such as in a courtroom or otherwise in a legal realm) as a clear index that nonconsensual activity is going on. This interpretation is highly-dependent on the understanding of both the circumstances of the utterance and its evaluation: when a victim of a crime utters *no*, it is thus understood that the victim is experiencing a nonconsensual, and thus becomes a legally-defined victim of a crime. In other arenas, however, *no* does not have the same performative effect. Among participants in a BDSM scene, the utterance *no* may be interpreted not as a warning to stop activity, but as an invitation to further exploration of one's sexual desires.\(^{13}\) Depending on the contexts in which it is uttered and interpreted, *no* can thus have vastly different performative effects.

Other researchers have noted problematic issues that arise from discussions of consent. Barker (2013), in her study of how consent is negotiated by the characters in the book *Fifty Shades of Grey*, explains that the idea of consent is often understood in the singular: there is only one type of consent,

\(^{13}\) It is important here to discuss the concept of the safeword, which is a lexical item that is uttered by a submissive partner during a BDSM scene to indicate to the dominant partner that they do not feel comfortable with the current activity, and is often meant as a command to immediately stop. Often times, the safeword chosen is a lexically-unusual item (such as *banana*), which would be unlikely to be otherwise uttered during a scene. Safewords, like other parts of a scene, are negotiated beforehand. It should also be said that not all BDSM activity involves penetrative sex, or sexual activity of any kind, further divorcing the erotic aspect of BDSM from the (purely) sexual.
and once this singular 'consent' is agreed upon, there is no need to further re-negotiate. As Barker claims, this can often lead to mismatches of consent between participants in BDSM activity, where one person (who thinks they have received ‘consent’ to perform a particular sexual activity) performs an act upon another (who did not explicitly give consent to that particular activity) that is seen as violating the person acted upon. This has led some BDSM practitioners to enact a “yes means yes” stance that opposes a more traditional “no means no” approach: instead of disallowing certain activities (which individuals may perceive to mean that all other activities are allowed), practitioners should make clear exactly what is acceptable and what is not, and only allow activity that has been expressly allowed (and thus removing activity that has not been explicitly consented to).

In a similar vein, de la Ossa (2016), in her study of United Kingdom-based corpora of sexual violence literature aimed at gay/bisexual/trans male victims, identifies three distinct discourses that permeate such material: positive consent, 'talk-listen-think' discourses, and moral-aesthetic discourses. Within institutional (i.e., academic/legal) discourse, as she notes, victims of sexual assault often "render[] victims' attempts to communicate non-consent as 'inaction' [....] if they do not 'just say no' directly" (367), shifting the responsibility of non-consensual sex to the victim's absence of a clear 'no'. Positive-consent discourses frames "the giving of sexual consent as necessarily an affirmative saying yes, distinct from a lack of resistance" (369), with the implication that sexual consent is only given with a verbal 'yes,' and not before. This contrasts with 'talk-listen-think' discourses, in which boundaries of sexual acceptability are expected to be discussed and negotiated beforehand; however, these discourses, as de la Ossa notes, implies that men are unwilling to have these discussions beforehand, implicitly framing them as potential sexual predators who are fundamentally "driven by sexual desire" (374), and who will engage in (nonconsensual, it is assumed) sex if boundaries are not explicitly discussed beforehand. As a third discoursal frame, moral-aesthetic discourse suggests that boundaries of non-
consent (and discussions of those boundaries) are a community responsibility, constructing an individual act of non-consent as damaging to the community as a whole while mitigating individual responsibility. These conflicting discourses, de la Ossa argues, uneasily vacillate between portraying (gay/bi/trans) men as free agents who have the right and responsibility to consent, and conforming to larger stereotypes that frame these same men as fundamentally sexually-driven and potentially predatory creatures.

BDSM practitioners must also contend with popular conceptions of consent in BDSM activities, which Newmahr (2010a) argues fundamentally misunderstand its importance among BDSM communities. Although BDSM has often been viewed as a type of roleplay, it is often envisioned in the popular consciousness as an arena in which ‘anything goes’: because individuals who participate in 'BDSM' are automatically framed as deviant, they must also automatically be seen as consenting to any activity that deviates from 'normal' and acceptable sexual behaviors. Within this popular conception, BDSM becomes “first and foremost, a game of ‘make believe.’ Second, it does not really hurt” (394). These misconceptions mitigate and hide what might otherwise be violent behavior under the guise of consent: in BDSM, ‘anything goes,’ and it is impossible to injure someone too much or act in a nonconsentual way, because ‘anything goes.’

However, on OnYourKnees and in BDSM cultures, 'anything goes' is not part of the ethos of acceptable behavior. On the contrary, posters show a great deal of consistency in understanding what aspects of identity can vary from poster to poster (and are therefore up for discussion), and what aspects can not (and are therefore liable to result in sanctions). As will be discussed below, some aspects of jock identity (such as cockiness and dumbness) are seen as important to some posters' conception of an idealized jock identity, but not so much by others. Discussions stemming from ideologies of cockiness and dumbness demonstrate that a jock identity is not a singular concept:
messageboard posters show great flexibility in allowing individuals who wish to align with a jock identity to tailor it to specific needs. Thus, for many posters, many different types of jock identity become authorized, and posters who do not align with conceptions of cockiness and dumbness can nonetheless be considered authentic jocks. On the other hand, some behaviors, and some posters, are simply not tolerated on the messageboard, and are constructed as both denaturalized and illegitimate users of OnYourKnees. A discussion of two threads will highlight the ways in which posters who transgress boundaries are constructed as inauthentic, and therefore illegitimate, messageboard participants.

Cockiness and Dumbness: The Negotiation of Jock Identity

Chapter 3 argued that many posters on OnYourKnees incorporate conceptions of dumbness into their idealized self-presentations. For many posters, a disinterest in/ inability to engage in scholarly pursuits is seen as a fundamental facet of jock identity, and they often ask for help and advice in realizing their 'dumbness'. Recall that in chapter 3, the modifier *dumb* is more likely to appear with nominal JOCK than any other, including the bare nominal JOCK. This suggested that many self-identified jocks incorporate conceptions of dumbness into jock identity. To these posters, on a fundamental level, jocks should be uninterested in academic pursuits; for some posters, this is taken to an extreme of being unable to read or do anything but the simplest math. But not all self-identified jocks feel that dumbness is important: in fact, some posters actively wish *not* to be dumb, and many posters disalign with it. For these posters, dumbness is *not* seen as integral to jock identity; in fact, for many it is seen as *in itself* a negative quality that should not be considered part of an 'ideal' jock's identity. In one post, for example, a poster (AW) takes offense to the term *dumb jock*:
(15) I dislike the term Big Dumb Jock, IMHO it is a slur against all the athletes that are not particularly big and most of whom to be competent in their sport cant in any meaningful way be dumb. (AW, 109:22)

In (15), AW likens the term *Big Dumb Jock* to a slur, claiming that athletes do, in fact, have to be intelligent in order to be *competent in their sport*. Calling jocks 'dumb', as AW sees the term being used and enacted on the messageboard, negates the specialized training and focus that athletes must engage in to be successful in their sport—including, it seems to be implied, jocks on the messageboard who must have specialized knowledge of exercise and nutrition in order to be successful themselves.

Another poster, in (16), also believes that intelligence is a beneficial quality to jocks:

(16) That's why I tend to suggest that jock training be supplemented with BOOSTING intelligence, not eliminating it. Smart jocks have more to offer, and are better at finding a new tist if and when they lose the one they've got. (AL, 156:2)

In (16), AL (who is a self-identified coach and who participates regularly on the messageboard) believes that hypnotists have a responsibility to support the intelligence of posters who want to become jocks, since (as he claims) *smart jocks have more to offer*, and can have more luck finding a new hypnotist if they need or want to. This not only seems to suggest that jocks (as men who want to be hypnotized) should have enough intelligence to be able to locate a new hypnotist if their current one is unsatisfactory, but also implies that intelligence is a quality that hypnotists themselves desire in subjects. However, it is interesting to note that in (16), AW mitigates his belief by prefacing it with the phrase *that's why I tend to suggest*. By using this phrase to introduce his belief, AW is tacitly accepting that his opinion is merely that—an opinion that posters are free to share or disregard.

Another poster (HT) takes up AL's idea and adds to the discussion with the below:
I couldn't agree more. smart jocks are hot, and ask any "tist" its easier to hypnotize a smart person. If I might suggest having your hypnotist "install" a "dial" or "switch" in your psyche which can temporarily control your IQ. (HT, 156:9) 

For HT in (17), *smart jocks are hot*—jocks who are intelligent are also sexually desirable—and they are more desirable subjects to hypnotists because *it's easier to hypnotize a smart person.* If jocks wish to become dumb, HT suggests, hypnotists may be able to create a condition in which the 'dumbing down' of a jock is only temporary, and can be reversed when the condition of being dumb is no longer desirable.

Other posters challenge the idea that jocks should be dumb by drawing a distinction between 'dumbness' on the one hand, and what they call 'simplicity' on the other. In one post, for example, CM discusses his difficulties in interacting with individuals who are interested in having ‘deep,’ intellectual conversations:

Have any of you found it difficult to deal with people who were used to having conversations with you that required a lot of thought? I've found that thinking less than I used to makes me happy. But I think it's taken some people by surprise. They seem to think that analysis and deep thoughts are good things. I don't think it leads me to much anymore except stress and indecision.

Basically, too many people are thinking too much, and it's getting them nowhere. If they would just go lift some weights or play some sports, I bet they'd feel a lot better about their lives. Agree? (CM, 2:1)

In (18), CM asks the community if they *found it difficult to deal with people who were used to having conversations with you that required a lot of thought.* Here, he is expressing his unhappiness with people who are interested in having certain types of conversations with him – conversations that,
previously, he may not have had difficulty engaging in. He then claims that thinking less than I used to makes me happy, linking ‘thinking less’ to happiness, and contrasting himself to people who are more interested in analysis, a trait that he feels leads to stress and indecision. It is interesting to note that in this conversation, CM is referencing a ‘previous’ version of himself (who, at some point, was interested in such conversations) to his ‘current’ self, who is no longer willing to engage in such fruitless endeavors. Although he is not making his jock orientation explicit here, he is heavily implying that he has taken on some qualities of being a dumb jock, which have led him to a life free of ‘stress’ and ‘indecision.’ He also claims that too many people are thinking too much, and it's getting them nowhere, instead advising them to just go lift some weights or play some sports so they could feel a lot better about their lives. CM is linking thinking to much (and, by extension, intelligence) with a lack of happiness; if individuals would simply lift weights and play sports (interestingly, two fundamental tenets of jock identity), they may be much happier. CM, then, is indirectly linking a jock identity, and the ‘dumbness’ seemingly inherent within it, to a happier existence.

WD, below, responds to CM’s post with the following:

(19) The fact of the matter is, we have brains and they like being stimulated in some way. Who's to say which way is best? It's actually best to have a fit body and a sharp mind. I don't mean rocket scientist stuff, but being able to pick up on things IF you absolutely have to. Simple is going with the flow and just doing what you like best. Dumbness is being mentally lazy and stifling.  
(WD, 2:2)

In (19), WD claims that we have brains and they like being stimulated in some way, although he qualifies this claim by asserting that there is no ‘one’ way to stimulate a brain. He then claims that it’s actually best to have a fit body and a sharp mind. At first, this seems to contradict a fundamental tenet of jock identity: having a ‘sharp mind’ implies that jocks should be aware of what is going on around
them, which seems to be anathema to an ideology that jocks should be singularly focused on submission and body-consciousness. However, he also subsequently qualifies this claim in his statement *I don’t mean rocket scientist stuff, but being able to pick up on things IF you absolutely have to.* Under this conception of proper jock mentality, jocks do not have to be particularly intelligent (as the phrase *rocket scientist* refers to), but should be able to understand basic concepts and have an awareness of the world around them—but only if circumstances necessitate that awareness.

WD ends his post with what, to him, seems to be an important distinction: one between ‘simplicity’ and ‘dumbness.’ Simplicity, he argues, is *going with the flow and just doing what you like best.* Here, WD seems to imply that jocks should be ‘simple,’ in that they should not necessarily concern themselves with activities other than what they like doing best (which, although he does not explicitly state this, seems to be focusing on body-consciousness). Importantly, however, WD contrasts this with ‘dumbness,’ which he frames in negative terms: *dumbness is being mentally lazy and stifling.* For WD, ‘dumbness’ is couched in negative terms. Jocks should not be ‘mentally lazy,’ in that they should not do anything that requires mental attention. It is interesting to think of this statement in light of the idea that physical fitness, as related through the lens of body-consciousness and gym activity, does require specialized knowledge of nutrition, workout routines, and muscle groups that not everyone may have the capacity to understand. It is possible that in his distinction between ‘dumbness’ and ‘simplicity,’ WD is implicitly drawing this distinction: jocks should have knowledge about working out and achieving a gym-toned physique, and not be ‘mentally lazy’ in understanding how to achieve that body.

WD’s distinction, then, seems to favor a conception of ‘simplicity’ over that of ‘dumbness’: to not be lazy, to go with the flow, and to do what one likes best, but to not avoid educational pursuits *per se.* This is echoed in another poster:
I prefer the idea of my jock boys being "simple" as opposed to being dumb. The time between action and reaction is short with a minimum amount of thought. That way the boys can be "loveable lunkheads". (DH, 156:7)

For DH, in (20), the condition of being 'simple' is preferable to being 'dumb' because, in 'simple' jocks, the time between action and reaction is short with a minimum amount of thought. Jocks do not necessarily have to think at all points in time, but their lack of thinking should be limited to action-reaction responses, which results in a condition he calls loveable lunkheads.

The above discussion thus demonstrates that although many posters align with ideologies of dumbness and incorporate them into their personal identities, other posters feel that dumbness is not a goal that jocks should aspire to. Whether it be retaining some sort of intelligence, or distinguishing between dumbness and simplicity, certain posters allow for the possibility of dumbness as not being an integral part of jock identity. On a smaller scale, this can be seen with similar discussions of another attitude that is often stereotypically linked with jocks: cockiness. Within the larger (U.S.) sociocultural sphere, those who engage in athletics or body-conscious activities are simultaneously indexed as having arrogance, a feeling of self-superiority, and mistreatment of others who they perceive to be socially or physically inferior. Some posters on OnYourKnees are aware of these stereotypes and attempt to de-link them from messageboard-specific concepts of jock identity, as illustrated in (21) below:

I know some people have a view that the jock personality can mean being a jerk that picks on geeks etc, but I've known lots of jocks, many of whom are great guys and some even have geeks as friends. (MM, 109:9)
In (21), MM acknowledges a larger cultural association between jock identity and arrogance by alluding to popular conceptions of jocks as jerks that pick on geeks. Here, MM acknowledges larger social ideologies where jocks exhibit a set of personality traits (including an emphasis on popularity, sports, and physical strength to the detriment of interest in school) that are pitted in opposition to 'geeks' (often viewed in the general cultural consciousness as intelligent, school-oriented, unpopular, and less physical), and where jocks are socially expected to show their dominance on geeks. However, MM quickly disaligns from this opposition by claiming that that many jocks he knows are great guys, some of whom are even friends with 'geeks'. In contrast to larger cultural depictions that construct jocks and 'geeks' as antagonistic toward each other and on opposite ends of a sociocultural spectrum, MM claims a 'reality' of jock identity that is more grounded in respect for others, an appreciation for all, and a lack of arrogance.

This theme is further developed by RA in one of his posts, detailing what he termed his 'Dumb Jock 100.' As an exercise in building camaraderie among posters on OnYourKnees who wish to attain a jock identity, RA began posting a series of daily affirmations and activities for other self-identified jocks to engage in, with the hope that they would report back on and share their experiences with each other on the messageboard: activities included performing physical exercises, speaking with other men at the gym about their workout activities, and following specific diet plans. The ultimate goal, as RA stated, was to 'turn' someone who followed his activities into a 'dumb jock' after 100 days.14 One such challenge that RA offered was (22), below:

---

14 Unfortunately, RA only posted six of these 'exercises' before disappearing from the messageboard, a fact that was of great disappointment to posters who anticipated his next challenges.
A lot of you guys think being big n dumb will give you the right to be cocky fukrs. But if you're here, you know a big body and SIMPLE mind are meant to obey, obey a strong coach, obey the team, obey a strict routine.

[...] DUMB is kool, but OBEDIENT is hot. Today, and from now on, you will say "Thank You, Sir!" or "Thank You, Ma'am!" to people that maybe you think are beneath your station in life. The old dude at the convenience store, the crazy lady with all the cats, the mailman, the drycleaners, anyone that is a workin stiff. You will be genuine and respectful to all the hard-working folks out there that make our lives better. GOOD MANNERS for DUMB JOCKS!

Each time you give a genuine "Thank You, Sir!" you will feel a buzz in your SIMPLE brains. You will KNOW, deep inside, that you are a GOOD BOY. Your Coach will want to see that have taken obedience well, and if you throw a boner when you feel that power of obedience, well, all the fuken better. (RA, 108:1)

As RA begins his post, he claims that many posters have the belief that developing a well-muscled physique gives them the right to be cocky fukrs. Interestingly, he does not explicitly define what it means to be 'cocky,' but he contrasts it with a mindset in which jocks should obey, whether it be to a coach, a team, or a (physical fitness) routine. Being 'cocky,' then, seems to imply a general disregard for authority and a sense that one is better than others, beliefs and behaviors he believes are incongruent with a jock identity. He furthers this line of thought by recommending that other posters demonstrate what he calls good manners: engaging in public demonstrations of politeness, exemplified by saying 'thank you Sir/Ma'am' to people that maybe you think are beneath your station in life. By engaging in such rituals of politeness, RA claims, posters will feel a buzz in your SIMPLE brains, suggesting that these acts will give them inner pleasure. However, he also claims that being polite will also please a jock's coach, who will most likely interpret acts of politeness as a sign of obedience. For RA, being 'polite' is not (merely) an act that gives pleasure to jocks and those around them: it is simultaneously re-contextualized as a symbolic act of obedience that gives pleasure to a (real or imagined) coach. Cockiness, for RA, is an undesirable attribute of jock identity because it mitigates a larger sense of obedience to others, which he feels is more important to a jock identity. (22)
demonstrates that cockiness, which includes arrogance and a lack of authority and is often culturally linked to a typical 'jock' identity, can be re-coded as an undesirable quality in potential jocks because it undermines what is seen as a primary marker of jock identity, that of obedience to others.

The above discussion demonstrates that, although many posters align with messageboard-specific conceptions of jock identity that share correlates with larger cultural ideologies of what it means to be a jock, some aspects of these cultural ideologies can be contested and, in some cases, outright rejected. Although the conception of dumbness is framed positively by many posters, others reject the thought of being 'dumb,' and would rather either be or have a 'smarter' jock. Similarly, not all jocks-to-be value cockiness as a positive trait: some believe that being 'nice' and polite is an admirable trait that indexes obedience to a coach. These discussions, and the avid participation revolving around them, suggest that jocks are not limited to a single conception of an 'ideal' jock identity, and are constrained neither by larger cultural ideologies, or by messageboard-specific conceptions that are otherwise shared by posters. Multiple jock identities are allowed to be authenticated and authorized on OnYourKnees: jocks, for the most part, are essentially free to be whatever jock they desire to be, and to absorb or reject whatever sub-ideologies they choose.

Pushing the limits of consent – authorization and illegitimation on OnYourKnees:

Although, as the above discussion demonstrated, posters are free to incorporate or disalign from particular aspects of jock identity, other aspects of identity remain inviolable to members of OnYourKnees. By participating in a practice that incorporates hypnosis as a fundamental activity, many posters must contend with larger cultural ideologies of hypnosis that construct hypnotizers as evil and willing to take advantage of others, and subjects as victims who fall under the sway of hypnotists
and are unable to control their actions. These ideologies run counter to studies that suggest that individuals under the influence of hypnosis, at least when used in a clinical setting, are not likely to engage in actions they would otherwise undertake in a 'waking' state (e.g., Crabtree 2012; Fromm & Nash 1997). As Fromm and Nash (1997) state, “hypnotic subjects are not passive automatons, mechanically responding to the immutable imperatives of an altered state of consciousness or the explicit demands embodied in the hypnotist’s suggestions [...] rather,] hypnotic subjects are cognitively active problem solvers” (61). Subjects undergoing hypnosis thus have a great deal of control over their surroundings and actions.

Even among BDSM communities, the use of hypnosis in scenes is often met with caution. For example, in 2017 users of FetLife (a social networking website for BDSM practitioners) reported that many groups, including most erotic hypnosis groups, had been deleted without prior member notification. After the deletion, FetLife released a statement claiming that online merchant companies threatened to remove their advertising from the website (meaning a major loss of revenue for FetLife) if groups supporting "illegal or immoral" acts were present on the website. FetLife interpreted this statement as including activities in which non-consent could potentially exist, including erotic hypnosis: as the website stated, such activities "can also be considered nonconsensual in a legal context, and we have to take into account the opinions of the authorities and merchant accounts as well to not only survive but thrive as a community" (Barnett 2017). By framing erotic hypnosis as an activity that may result in nonconsensual activity, and by relating that nonconsensual activity to legal and economic realms that sanction its practitioners, FetLife contributes to an understanding of hypnosis as dangerous and of questionable legality, even among BDSM practitioners.

Posters on OnYourKnees, often times, are largely aware of the dangerous connotations of erotic hypnosis, and participate in discussions that construct some forms of hypnosis as safe, while others as
less so. These 'less safe' forms of hypnosis, as posters describe, in some cases involve breaches of trust, while in other cases highlight the sharing of information that can be seen as potentially harmful. Nonetheless, some posters challenge larger-scale cultural depictions of hypnosis by constructing hypnosis as beneficial and 'safe', as (23) and (24) below demonstrate:

(23) I'm nowhere close to where I want to be, but I am a hell of alot closer. I know that hypnosis cannot make you do things you normally wouldn't do (i.e. become a jock if you hate jocks) so I know that deep down, I really wanted to be a jock and the hypnosis help. (JL, 249:1)

(24) I see progress and I'm not seeing negative effects, all since I only will act on what I'd be okay with. :)(LO, 249:3)

In (23) and (24), both JL and JO understand that hypnosis cannot make you do things you normally wouldn't do, and under hypnosis they only will act on what I'd be okay with. Both posters also understand the benefits of hypnosis: JL, in (23), states that I am a hell of alot closer to enacting his vision of a jock identity, while LO in (24) claims that I see progress and I'm not seeing negative effects. By constructing themselves as individuals who have already undergone hypnosis, JL and JO present an alternative view to the practice as safe and beneficial to realizing their identities.

Posters on OnYourKnees also negotiate around these larger-scale biases against hypnosis by differentiating between some forms of hypnosis (and its practitioners), which are seen as more acceptable, and other forms which are seen as less so. These forms of hypnosis are often illegitimated by those describing it, as illustrated by (25) below:

(25) Hypnosis subjects are also reminded to be cautious when dealing with hypnotists, especially those that may be looking for cash slaves etc., unless of course that is what you are looking for but even then be careful who you trust. (MM, 217:1)
In (25), MM (who is a moderator of the messageboard) instructs those who are interested in being hypnotized to *be cautious when dealing with hypnotists*, especially those who participate in what he terms 'cash slavery': a particular form of erotic hypnosis that involves the hypnotizer ordering the subject to 'reward' them with money while the subject is in a hypnotic state. By highlighting this form of hypnosis as one that requires a great deal of caution, MM constructs it as a form of hypnosis that can potentially be economically destructive to subjects. However, he also qualifies his statement by saying *unless of course that is what you are looking for*, suggesting that cash slavery is acceptable as long as the parties involve know the risks—leading MM to end his post with *be careful of who you trust*.15

MM thus constructs cash slavery as a particularly risky form of erotic hypnosis that must be engaged in with extreme caution and a great deal of care. Some posters on OnYourKnees also note the potential dangers of of some forms of erotic hypnosis, and especially some hypnotists who practice these more extreme forms. Being asked to give certain types of information during a trance, for example, is seen by some posters as crossing a threshold that they are not comfortable with: these posters are often mentioned and warned against, as (26) below demonstrates:

(26) Please be careful with this person. He asks for personal information that could be used for identity theft or other fraud. In this video he asks you for your date of birth. If you continue on, he'll ask for your place of birth, home address, and even clothing sizes. (DI, 27:3)

In (26), DI is warning the messageboard community to *please be careful* with one particular poster who requests personal information, including date of birth, place of birth, home address, and clothing sizes. The use of the phrase *please be careful* is telling here, for it frames the poster being spoken about as a potentially denaturalized and problematic hypnotist, who might use personal

---

15 This qualified allowance of cash slavery, however, was only temporary: in another post, MM states that he had banned request for cash slaves outright from the messageboard.
information to commit identity theft. For DI, the construction of such information as 'sensitive', and
the subsequent construction of the poster-in-question as someone who may potentially commit criminal
acts with that information, violates an (unspoken, seemingly) understanding that such information
should be kept private—a violation that DI feels justified in warning the community against.

Interestingly, another poster (HE) also contributes to the discussion of the poster-in-question:

(27) I had an experience with him - I ran into his videos on youtube. They're very enjoyable. I used
the "gym time hypnosis". He contacted me shortly thereafter and had me start watching another
video...

[...] Since then, I've noticed that I sent him $29.88 on paypal, although I don't remember doing
that. I stopped watching his videos when he asked me to send him pics of my significant other.
(HE, 27:9)

In (27), HE describes his initial experiences with the poster-in-question as *very enjoyable*, and
the poster reached out to HE, asking him to watch more of his videos. After watching these videos,
however, HE claims that he had sent the poster money, an act he states he doesn't recall. HE then
claims that he stopped watching the videos (and presumably cut off all contact with the poster-in-
question) when the poster asked for information about his significant other. For HE, this poster is also
threatening to the messageboard, not simply because of his request for personal information, but
because that information can potentially harm someone else (in this case, the significant other). The
poster-in-question thus continues to be denaturalized as a 'proper' practitioner of erotic hypnosis.

Posts (25-27) demonstrate that some types of erotic hypnotic activity, especially those in which
sensitive information is asked for, are seen as more threatening than others because they can potentially
compromise the safety of the subject. Those who practice these threatening forms of hypnosis should
be approached with caution. The concerns arising from these posters' activities become especially
relevant when placing the \textit{micro} activity of OnYourKnees within a larger context of BDSM ideologies that respect boundaries and demand trust and full consent from all parties involved. For these posters, personal information is not coerced, it is volunteered: any poster that does not understand what types of information is more sensitive than others is seen as ultimately threatening, not only to the cohesion of the community as a whole, but to the larger values that OnYourKnees adheres to—and they are seen as denaturalized practitioners as a result.

It is not only certain types of hypnosis that are seen as more 'dangerous' than others: certain hypnotists are often constructed as untrustworthy, certain subjects are constructed as 'flaky', and these posters are also often considered denaturalized participants of OnYourKnees. However, in one thread, denaturalization becomes the basis for illegitimating posters, revoking anonymity from them. In this thread, HT posts the following:

(28) there seems to be a lot of phonies here [...] I'm going to start publishing a list on every site with the names of the site members who flake out on their tists. and I invite the other tists to add to it. if they cant commit then tists should know about it and not waste their time with them. (HT, 214:9)

In (28), HT claims that \textit{there seems to be a lot of phonies} on the messageboard; he more clearly defines a 'phony' as \textit{site members who flake out on their tists}. 'Phonies,' to HT, are those messageboard members who request to be hypnotized, establish contact with another messageboard member, and then cut off that contact. For HT, those (denaturalized) users should be publicly identified as illegitimate practitioners. What is interesting about HT's post is that he constructs illegitimate members of the messageboard as those subjects who are unwilling or unable to 'follow through' with their requests to be hypnotized, placing the onus of illegitimacy (in part) on those who wish to be submissive.
ND, in (29) below, responds to HT's idea, but introduces a noticeable shift in who should be considered illegitimate users of the messageboard:

(29) Hmmm, That is probably a good idea, but only if there is a matching list of "tists" that fail to respect the wishes, limits and boundaries they agree to when recruiting a guy to train as a Jock...Wanting to become a Jock Muscle Boy does not imply the willingness to become some ones cock slave. (ND, 214:10)

ND shows support for HT's idea in (29), but also claims that a list of 'flaky' poster-subjects would be effective if it only includes 'tists' that fail to respect the wishes, limits, and boundaries they agree to when recruiting a guy to train as a Jock. Here, ND expands the concept of an denaturalized (and therefore illegitimate user) to those hypnotists (i.e., those who create trances) who include suggestions in their trances that run counter to what many subjects might be looking for. He further draws a distinction between the desire to become a Jock Muscle Boy and becoming some one's cock slave. For ND, the two are not mutually inclusive: many posters may wish to become a jock without unwilling or unconsentingly wishing to engage in sexual activity. One is acceptable, the other is not.

In another post within the thread, ND also contributes the following:

(30) I can understand the view that, if you assist in helping some one better himself you deserve some compensation but sex and bondage are not realistic things to demand. (ND, 214:13)

In (30), ND claims that he understands the idea that hypnotists, on some level, may feel that they deserve some compensation for their services, but he rejects as inappropriate that the compensation should consist of sex and bondage. For ND, an ideal hypnotist is someone who helps a subject better himself: ND thus constructs the hypnotist's role as helping someone (presumably a jock-
to-be) reach his goals, not as someone who demands *sex and bondage* as compensation. CD, in (31), further supports ND's idea:

(31) Took the words right off of my keyboard, the number of times I've spoken to tists, who just say anything to get you to go under and then try and slip a few suggestions in that weren't agreed to before...yeah, if that's not an abuse of trust I don't know what is. (CD, 214:15)

In (31), CD acknowledges (from personal experiences, as evidenced by the phrase *the number of times I've spoken to tists*) that many hypnotists will *say anything to get you to go under and then try and slip a few suggestions in that weren't agreed to before*. Here, CD understands the importance of negotiating limits before becoming hypnotized, and places the responsibility of adhering to those limits onto the hypnotist. Those who do not respect those limits, according to CD, perform an *abuse of trust*—with the understanding that they are not legitimate practitioners of hypnosis.

Although ND and CD understand the importance of hypnotists respecting and understanding limits with their subjects, other posters place the responsibility of setting limits not on the hypnotist, but on the subject, as MM demonstrates in (32):

(32) Subs need to be very clear on what they are looking for or not - there's been many times when a sub is asked what is off limits and they say anything goes... but then truly do not mean this. Subs should think carefully about what their limits are, and clearly express these to the tist. And likewise, the tists then need to respect these limits, and be very clear about what they are planning to work on. (MM, 214:16)

In (32), MM explicitly states that *subs need to be very clear on what they are looking for or not*. Although MM does further claim that hypnotists should respect those established boundaries, he also makes clear that the individual looking to be hypnotized shares responsibility in delimiting and negotiating what they feel comfortable with, and what they do not. MM seems to imply that, on a
fundamental level, the sub has a responsibility to not only clearly express their limits to the tist, but to also be clear, within their own minds, what their own limits are. For MM, then, a 'legitimate' practitioner of erotic hypnosis goes beyond merely expressing their wishes and limitations: they have undergone much self-work to understand what those limits are.

The above discussion demonstrates that, for many posters on OnYourKnees, contours of authentication and denaturalization are firmly entrenched within ideologies of trust and consent. Authenticated practitioners are those who negotiate consent with each other, who do not engage in 'dangerous activities' that may cause harm to others (such as cash slavery or requesting personal information), and who make their limits known. Denaturalized practitioners, on the other hand, are those who do engage in activities that can potentially breach a subject's willingness to consent to activity. For posters on OnYourKnees, it is both parties' responsibility to ensure that all of these specifications are met. Any poster (be they dominant or submissive) who does not follow these tenets is viewed with suspicion, met with derision, and ultimately illegitimated as valid practitioners of erotic hypnosis.

But what happens when a poster directly violates one of these tenets? How are posts potentially identified as involving non-consent, and how are posters dealt with directly by others? Two cases will be discussed below in which a post on OnYourKnees is identified as breaching an issue of consent, and how other posters construct both the post and the person who created the post as both a denaturalized and illegitimate user of OnYourKnees. In one thread, the question of whether or not a poster is willingly consenting to a trance is initially brought up. A poster begins a thread with the following:

(33) Teamviewer id *** *** *** password: ******* spiral ready to be used at willingly (HB, 21:1)¹⁶

¹⁶ The actual ID and password have been removed and replaced with asterisks - EC
The poster in (33), HB, begins his post by giving an ID and password to a program (Teamviewer) that allows individuals to remotely access another user’s computer, including any files stored within. By providing an ID and a password, HB seems to be asking others to access his computer remotely, though he does not provide a reason as to why he wishes others to do so. Although he uses the word *willingly*, which seems to suggest that he is engaging in this behavior with consent, he also uses the word *spiral* (a tool that is often used within visual trances that is meant to help listeners increase focus, and often consists of a black-and-white spiral that slowly rotates; see image in Introduction for an example) to suggest he may be in a hypnotic trance himself. By claiming he is *ready to be used*, he is claiming himself to be under a hypnotic trance.

This behavior presents a difficult situation to other posters, who are unsure as to whether HB’s request is legitimate or not. Posters realize that a boundary has been transgressed: although HB claims to be ‘willingly’ releasing his ID and password, effectively giving control over his computer to others, he is not directing this request to anyone in particular, and seems to have given intensely personal, and potentially damaging, information to the entire community. Some posters thus interpret this request of information as a potential breach of consent, and try to determine whether or not HB’s request is consensual. The next poster responds to HB’s request:

(34) Can someone tell me if this is spam or legit or what? (LF, 21:3)

By asking if HB’s request is *spam* (referring to unsolicited advertisements, often not directed to a particular individual and often seen as distracting to messageboard users; see Stivale 2004), LF is bringing forth the issue of whether or not HB’s request is ‘real’. It is important to note that LF is not
speaking directly to HB: rather, LF is directing his query to the entire community. By addressing the community instead of engaging with HB directly and by comparing HB’s request to unwanted intrusions that may threaten the experience and safety of the community and its members, LF is implicitly suggesting that HB’s behavior is both very unusual and potentially out-of-bounds with what is acceptable behavior within the community. If HB’s request is legitimate, it may suggest that he is engaging in unsafe behavior against his will: if HB’s request is spam, it may represent an unwanted intrusion of information that may threaten the cohesion of the community.

JO, a poster, then responds:

(35) Next time this is posted, if I'm at the computer I'll see if its real...

Although, I don't understand what he wants or expects. Teamviewer is meant for file sharing/remote desktop connection... if he has a spiral going and is in trance, I dint know if he wants someone to poke around in his PC, or if he's expecting someone to give him commands...

if he just wants commands, a skype chat would suffice! (JO: 21,4)

JO, above, claims that he will see if its real, referring to HB’s request. By using the word real to describe HB’s request, JO is questioning whether HB is wanting to engage in a hypnotic session, or if he is merely attempting to disrupt the behavior on the messageboard. JO then further questions the implicit logic behind the request by explaining what Teamviewer is (ostensibly to those who are unfamiliar with the program), and suggesting that if he is tranced, his request is still unclear. Does HB want someone to access his computer, or does he want someone to give commands to him in a highly unusual way? If the latter, as JO argues, there are already sufficient, community-approved ways to do so (such as Skype, a visual messaging service). But the phrase if he just want commands, a skype chat would suffice! seems to be doing additional work as well. JO does not seem particularly concerned
about HB's well-being, or whether or not he is hypnotized with his own consent. Rather, through this phrase, JO speaks about HB's activities with derision, giving the sense that he is annoyed by his lack of specificity. By questioning HB’s request in such a way, JO is ultimately casting doubt on HB as an authentic poster, questioning his legitimacy within the community.

A third poster, BT, then claims to have attempted to make contact with HB through a private message, and contribute to the thread with the following post:

(36) He says he wants to be controlled and to obey, but a simple request that I make of providing a self pic, seems to be too complicated, doesn't sound like a very good obedient sub to me..aka a time waster! (BT, 21:5)

In (36), BT claims (implicitly through his private messaging of HB) that HB’s request is seemingly legitimate: he wants, according to BT, to be controlled and to obey. But, when BT asked for a photo of HB (for BT, a simple request), HB was unable (or unwilling) to fulfill the request. BT interprets HB’s inability to follow through with the request as symptomatic of a larger inability to behave like a very good obedient sub: implicitly, according to BT, self-identified submissive individuals should especially be willing and ready to submit a photo of themselves at the requests of others. He even goes so far as to refer to HB as a time waster, suggesting that he is disrupting messageboard activity with unwanted intrusion. Because HB was unable to engage in what, to other members of the community, seems like a simple request (especially one that submissive individuals should ideally follow through with), his status as a self-described submissive is questioned, and ultimately invalidated. HB is no longer seen as an authenticated poster, and is thus no longer viewed as a legitimate one. It is telling that HB does not post on the messageboard after this incident.
The discussion of posts (34)-(36) demonstrates the tensions inherent in identifying posters on OnYourKnees as both authenticated practitioners of hypnosis and authorized users of the messageboard. When presented with a poster who gives seemingly personal and potentially damaging information, the entire community is put on-guard: a poster has done something that has stepped outside the boundaries of acceptable behavior within the community, and his status as an authenticated participant is questioned. By asking whether or not HB’s post is ‘spam’, and by directing this inquiry to the entire messageboard, HB’s status as a person behind the computer, as opposed to an automatic computer program, is brought into focus, potentially illegitimating him as a 'proper' member of OnYourKnees. Although it is later determined that he may be a person, HB’s inability to engage in basic community practices puts the question of whether or not he is willingly consenting aside, and instead he is claimed to be a ‘time waster,’ a person who is unable or unwilling to participate appropriately within the community. Thus, the question of HB's status from whether or not HB is a consenting user, to whether or not HB is an authentic user. Ultimately, he is determined not to be by the other members of the community.

The final thread under consideration in this section also concerns issues of consent and legitimacy, this time concerning age guidelines. In the United States, 18 U.S. Code § 1470 prohibits the transfer of obscene materials to individuals under 16 years of age. Because of the sexually-explicit content of the messageboard, and because the age of consent in some states is 18, users are legally required to be 18 years of age or older in order to access it. In order to view the website, users must click on a pop-up window that confirms that they are 18 years of age or older. If they click ‘yes,’ they are granted access to the messageboard: if this window is not clicked upon, the site is re-directed to a general search website. When users click on the window, then, they are acknowledging that they are 18 years of age or older, and legally responsible for the material they are about to view. Although it is
possible (and likely) that users who are under 18 years of age lie about their age to gain access to the messageboard, there seems to be a tacit understanding among all users of the messageboard that all participants are at least 18 years of age. If it is discovered that a user is under the age of 18 (and therefore not legally able to consent), action must be taken by moderators of the messageboard, usually a suspension of the user’s account. If action is not taken, and moderators are aware that users under the age of 18 are accessing the messageboard, the entire site, and therefore the entire community, may be shut down by the host of the messageboard website. Therefore, it is in the best interests of all messageboard posters to ensure that no one under the age of 18 is able to access the messageboard.

One poster begins a thread with the following:

(37) If anyone wants to be a slave and ha huge muscles tell me! (KS, 22:1)

At first glance, this poster (KS) is initiating a thread on a commonly-discussed topic, the discussion of sexual submissive desires. KS’s request of tell me! suggests that he is expecting a response, and a conversation to ensue. Because this is KS’s first post on the messageboard, it is unclear as to where he fits on the jock/coach continuum: it is not clear whether he is looking to share experiences with other jocks, coaches, or the community at-large.

However, at least to some posters, KS's request is seen as authentic. This can be seen by another poster's response to the above:

(38) I don't have the huge muscles...yet. Getting there though (RO, 22:2)
RO’s response to KS demonstrates that his initial inquiry is worthy of response and, therefore, part of the appropriate behavior that is expected of posters on OnYourKnees. RO thus authenticates KS's post, and subsequent identity as an authentic poster: other posters also authenticate him by responding to his request. However, KS's status is soon challenged by a moderator of the board (SA):

(39) Mainly writing because it has come to my attention that [KS] is at most 14 years old. While it doesn't bother me if a younger guy sneaks through *****’s 17 age protocols, it does bother me that he'd pass himself off as able to have a muscle slave and give out his number (besides the lying, it also poses legal danger for someone so young to ask over 18 to send pics). He has been removed from the group, and e-mailed as to why.

I hate to deny someone with desire for muscle access, but I just can't stand by for that kind of misrepresentation and urge anyone to report any bad or suspicious experiences. I can't always do anything if it's one's word versus another's word, but in this case I have confirmed “[KS]” is 13 or 14 and misrepresenting himself with his posts here. Apologies to anyone affected. (SA, 22:5)

SA’s interjection in (39) is important here in many respects. First, it is important to note that SA is a moderator of this messageboard, and therefore has a particular responsibility to ensure the maintenance of the board and the safety of his members. By noting that he is deleting spam as it comes through, he is not only reinforcing his role as moderator, but also framing his further comments, suggesting that what he has to say next is related to his moderator duties.

SA then claims that he is writing because he discovered (although he does not specify how) that KS is under 18 years old, and is therefore not legally authorized to be a messageboard participant. In fact, as SA claims, KS is well below the legal age limit, and has subsequently been banned from posting to the group. SA, however, frames his reasoning for banning KS in a very particular way. SA is not necessarily concerned that someone under the federal age of

17 Name of website that hosts OnYourKnees removed. - EC
consent is a user of the messageboard: he later states that he hate[s] to deny someone with desire for muscle access, and he may also tacitly be acknowledging that some users may fall under the same category. He is bothered, however, that SA is trying to pass himself off as able to have a muscle slave; i.e., presenting as someone who, despite his age, is able to have someone under his control. KS has also seemed to ask other users (all of whom, ostensibly, are over 18) for pics, which can put those who sent the pics in danger of violating federal obscenity laws, and ultimately compromise the safety of those users.

In his post, then, SA carefully negotiates the problematic nature of dealing with a poster who is legally unable to consent. Although KS’s age is an integral part of why he was banned, it was not his age per se that had him removed from the group: it was his misrepresentation as a fully-consenting user, and his thoughtless endangerment of others’ safety by asking other users to send him pics of themselves. Part of the responsibility of being a poster on OnYourKnees (and, by extension, a BDSM practitioner) is ensuring the safety of all users: indeed, SA reiterates this responsibility when he urges other posters to report any bad or suspicious experiences, although he does not go into detail about what those experiences might include. Because KS risked the safety of other posters, he essentially infringed on their right to consent, a situation that posters should never find themselves in. Thus, in a way, the tables are turned on KS: an individual who does not have the legal right to consent is banned from a messageboard because he denies others the right to consent.

KS’s status as illegitimate user of the messageboard is further supported by another poster, LF; however, LF’s reasons for illegitimating KS are presented in a different light:
Thanks for catching that. I was kind of suspicious of him cause he had been wanting to be a muscle slave a few days ago... and now wants to have one? didn't quite make sense to me. Luckily I never replied or anything. (LF, 22:7)

For LF in (40), KS’s status as a denaturalized user stemmed from the fact that he had posted contradictory information: a few days prior, KS had posted about wanting to be a muscle slave, and now seems to be presenting as an individual who desires to have one, a situation that *didn’t quite make sense* to LF. Although it is not impossible to believe that some posters on OnYourKnees are able to successfully switch between jock and coach identities, LF seems to think that it can only be done so gradually. A poster who claims to want to be a muscle slave (i.e., take a submissive role) and then, only a few days later, claim to want to have one (i.e., take a dominant role) is not seen as a poster who has a stable identity, and is therefore quickly viewed with suspicion by LF. For LF, then, KS is denaturalized because he is seen to shift between dominant and submissive identities at inappropriate times: KS’s age status is now only seen as additional support for his denatured status.

The two threads discussed above thus demonstrate that posters, even when they initially present behavior consistent with being a 'proper' practitioner of erotic hypnosis, can still be shunned by the messageboard community for engaging in behavior that is interpreted as violating community norms. This process is influenced by the various ways in which posters are understood to adhere to norms that determine who is an authenticated poster on the messageboard, and who is denaturalized. For HB, his inability to respond to a request for photos of himself gives other posters the opportunity to position him as someone who is not really 'serious' about engaging in erotic hypnosis, even though he initially presents as someone who is in a hypnotic state. Likewise, KS's violation of OnYourKnees' age guidelines illegitimates him as an authentic user of the messageboard, but this illegitimation is further highlighted by another user pointing out his previous post history, where he claims to be both a dominant- and a submissive-identified individual. Through the discussions arising around these
problematic posters, ideologies of who constitutes an authenticated poster on the messageboard are brought into discussions, and contours of authenticity and denaturalization on OnYourKnees are negotiated and re-affirmed.

These identified violations of community norms also have real effects for HB and KS: not only are they seen as denaturalized posters whose identity is called into question, their authorization in being allowed to post to the messageboard is also challenged. Although HB is not banned from the messageboard outright, his lack of further posts suggest that he may have been aware of his illegitimate status. For KS, his violation resulted in more obvious sanctions: the removal of his ability to post. Their violations are seen as incompatible with the norms and values of the messageboard, but violations are also interpreted as occurring on multiple fronts. HB's transgression is not solely that he is providing personal information without his obvious consent, but he is unwilling to engage with other members of the messageboard, earning him the appellation 'time waster.' HB is thus seen as inauthentic because of his inability to follow through with what other posters expect. Similarly, KS's removal from the messageboard does not necessarily arise from his misrepresentation of his age, but also from an uneasy and unconvincing blending two seemingly separate identities: a dominant-identified and a submissive-identified individual. As a group, posters determine when violations have occurred, and under what conditions these acts are constructed as violations. APosters on OnYourKnees, then, demonstrate great power in determining who are authentic and authorized users of the messageboard, regardless of whether they identify as dominants or submissives.

Conclusion:
Critical Discourse Analysis has often explained the enactment of power through a top-down approach that imbues certain individuals with power, and which gives them the ability to control discourse and to decide who gets to lay claim to certain identities over others. On one level, as was explained in Chapter 3, posters on OnYourKnees work within a framework of hegemonic masculinity that actively places some men (jocks) in subordination to others (coaches), while at the same time maintaining a viewpoint that encourages adherence to stereotypically-masculine views among all participants. Through the creation and maintenance of this binary hierarchy, self-identified jocks both place themselves, and are placed by others, in positions of less power, where they actively and willingly claim to be subordinate to both coaches and their own desires.

But on another level, as this chapter explored, posters on OnYourKnees simultaneously understand their beliefs, behaviors, and ideologies as belonging to a larger community of BDSM practitioners. This association with a larger BDSM identity is achieved, in part, by the robust use of honorifics on OnYourKnees, used by dominant- and submissive-identified individuals to index power differentials (particularly respect and deference). This chapter demonstrated that the honorifics sir and master, just as in larger BDSM communities, are also highly-used by members of OnYourKnees to index dominant and submissive identities, and also illustrated the emergence of coach as a messageboard-specific honorific that achieves similar work. Through the use of these honorifics, participants align themselves with a larger BDSM identity.

However, BDSM practitioners also operate with nuanced understandings of trust, consent, and appropriate practices that guide their behavior, and what is considered acceptable BDSM practice. By placing the onus of trust on all members of the community, all participants possess a certain level of power: the power to determine what is acceptable and appropriate behavior, and the power to claim that deviant activities (and those who participate in them) do not constitute BDSM play. These discourses
of trust and consent, this chapter has argued, runs deep within many posters on OnYourKnees, and they use these ideologies to construct and discuss contours of authentication and denaturization (i.e., who gets to claim a jock identity on OnYourKnees), and who is allowed or denied access to participate in the messageboard community. Posters who do not believe that dumbness or cockiness constitutes part of their jock identity are welcome on the messageboard, suggesting that they have great flexibility in tailoring particular qualities of identity to suit their individual desires. On the other hand, posters who ask for personal information, who engage in nonconsensual activities, or who do not follow community guidelines (such as communicating with others when asked, or who display unstable identities) are named, derided, and even banned from the messageboard. If many posters participate in a power structure that gives coaches power over jocks and dominants over submissives, posters simultaneously participate in the policing of boundaries on OnYourKnees that demonstrates who can post, and who is engaging in unethical and dangerous behavior. On this level, then, power is not something that is given to someone by virtue of their status as a coach or dominant, but by their knowledge of BDSM culture and the ways in which their behavior is seen as part of that continuum. The power to decide what is appropriate, and who is appropriate, is thus shared by messageboard members.

But although posters engage in the practice of erotic hypnosis, it has not yet been discussed how the practice itself contributes to contours of domination and submission on OnYourKnees. This requires an understanding of not only the linguistic structures of hypnotic trances, but a larger understanding of hypnotic trance as a genre. This will be the subject of Chapter 5.
Chapter 5: The genre of the trance

(1) I've found that by constant reinforcement (listening again and again) you will lose any shyness and "fear of the gym" and ask guys at the gym for tips...they are usually eager to help. Keep listening...and find that your desire for being a jock will take over and you will naturally discover through guys you meet and articles you read just what you need to do. (CJ, 299:4)

Chapters 3 and 4 demonstrated that posters on OnYourKnees interact with multiple ideologies that shape how they discuss themselves and others in varied, sometimes contradictory ways. A frame of hegemonic masculinity contributes to the construction of jock and coach identities by setting up a system where some men are (naturally) seen to have control over others, and where jocks value behaviors, ideals, and norms that are consistent with larger-scale representations of traditional masculinity. On a different level, viewing identity through a BDSM frame helps to understand how participants on OnYourKnees understand their beliefs and desires against a backdrop of normative sexual relationships, and how ideologies of trust and consent are seen as crucial to in-group belonging.

However, one aspect of activity on OnYourKnees has been relatively unexplored up to this point: the importance of practices of hypnosis in the lives of its members. The state of being hypnotized, and the genre of the hypnotic trance itself, plays an important role in the realization of jock and (to a lesser extent) coach identities. Many posters on OnYourKnees view engaging in hypnotic trance as a conduit through which a jock identity can be realized, and many self-identified jocks on OnYourKnees view undergoing hypnotic trance as an integral part of 'becoming' a jock. (1), excerpted above, demonstrates this interaction. The poster, CJ, claims that he found that by constant reinforcement (listening again and again) you will lose any shyness and 'fear of the gym'. Although CJ, in his post history, self-identifies as neither a jock nor a coach, he nonetheless asserts that repeated listening to a particular trance file (which he claims is constant reinforcement) will allow listeners to
overcome whatever potential fears of going to the gym they might have. He also claims that, by continuing to listen to the trance, listeners will find that your desire for being a jock will take over. For CJ, the desire to become a jock is often already present within the hearer (a claim further reiterated with the use of the word natural in the phrase you will naturally discover); repeatedly listening to the trance will simply bypass whatever feelings of self-doubt jocks-to-be might have about participating in an activity expected of them. The trance, as CJ constructs it, is merely a vehicle through which jocks-to-be can realize what they 'naturally' are, and will allow them to gain the information they need to do just what you need to do.

The trance, then, becomes an important genre through which ideologies of jock and coach identities are mirrored and explored, and contours of domination and submission maintained. This chapter will explore how posters on OnYourKnees interact with the genre of hypnotic trance, including both how subjects are constructed within trances themselves, and how posters discuss the act of being tranced. The present chapter is structured in three parts. The first part will present an explanation of the importance of genres in Critical Discourse Analysis, and demonstrate the existence of a 'hypnotic trance' genre that is easily-recognizable and allows individuals to frame content in a particular way. This part will also present an overview of the two main schools of thought concerning the structure of hypnotic trances, which are termed direct and indirect methods. The second part will analyze two trances, posted textually on OnYourKnees, to understand how subjects are understood through the trance itself. This part will utilize Halliday's (2004) conceptions of modality and transitivity within Systemic-Functional Linguistics (SFL), and argue that the structure of the two trances presented on the messageboard align with an ideology of 'direct' hypnotic trance, which serves to construct listeners as passive agents with little control over the hypnotic process. The final part will analyze discussions revolving around the act of hypnotic trance, and show that many posters demonstrate a rather
sophisticated understanding of how trances work, viewing the act of being tranced as simultaneously
disempowering (in that they serve to place listeners under a direct control over another) and
empowering (in that they allow posters to realize an ideal identity). Ultimately, this chapter will show
that the practice of hypnotic trance on OnYourKnees both maintains asymmetrical power relations
between jocks and coaches, and provides a vehicle through which listeners feel confident and capable
in discovering their 'true' selves.

Genres, modality, and transitivity within CDA and Systemic-Functional Linguistics:

Genre plays an important role in Critical Discourse Analysis, in that the recognition of a
particular piece of discourse as belonging to a distinct genre provides a framework through which that
discourse is understood by readers. Fairclough (1992) has defined a genre as “a relatively stable set of
conventions that is associated with, and partly enacts, a socially ratified type of activity, such as
informal chat, buying goods in a shop, a job interview, a television documentary, a poem, or a scientific
article. A genre implies not only a particular text type, but also particular processes of producing,
distributing, and consuming texts” (126). Particular social activities, according to this definition, are
often accompanied by specific discursive patterns (primarily semantic and syntactic) that become
closely associated with those activities. An interaction involving 'buying goods in a shop,' for example,
may often begin with a shop employee asking a customer May I help you?, and can then continue with
either a request for help (Yes, can you tell me if you have this item in stock?) or a denial for help (No
thanks, I'm just browsing). Within this type of interaction, a limited set of discursive types are
anticipated, and conversation is often expected to flow in predictable ways (it would be atypical, for
example, for a customer to respond to *May I help you?* with *I like to eat bananas*). This 'predictability' of discursive types allows for a genre to be recognized as such by particular communities of practice.

Genres, however, are not limited to particular interactions: because they are easily-recognizable, they have the potential to be transferred across domains. Similar to how an individual is able to recognize expressions of desire based on particular linguistic forms and attitudes towards others that are (re-)circulated throughout a community and identified as such (e.g., Cameron and Kulick 2003), the recognition of a particular genre-type helps to guide a reader towards a particular understanding of a text (including the relevant social spheres that give the genre its meaning), and positions the reader into a particular viewpoint through which to understand the text. Understanding a text as a poem, for example, requires a reader to recognize certain linguistic forms as belonging to that genre, including particular rhyming schemes and the use of creative and metaphorical language. Once a poem is understood to be a 'poem,' then the reader can position themselves with respect to the text to understand its message in a particular way, perhaps by seeing a familiar phenomenon through an unfamiliar lens. Similarly, identifying a stretch of text as a newspaper article requires a reader to recognize it as such, for example by the presence of a headline or the use of value-neutral language that reflects community-held notions of unbiased styles of discourse. The reader is then meant to understand the text as an ‘accurate’ and factual reflection of an event, despite the possible existence of less-obvious uses of language which push the reader towards one understanding over others (cf. van Dijk 2008).

For Critical Discourse Analysts, genres play an important role not only in how a text is read, but also in how participants within that text should be understood. Genres, through a Critical Discourse Analysis framework, both create subjects through the deployment of particular discourse-types and contribute to the maintenance of systems of dominance, submission, and resistance throughout a community. Genres not only mediate the “structured sequence of activities of which it is composed
[...but also] the participants involved in the activity – the set of subject positions which are socially constituted and recognized in connection with the activity type” (Fairclough 1992, 126). In the example of the exchange between a shop employee and a customer, the utterance *May I help you?* not only identifies the activity in question (buying goods in a shop), but also locates the shop employee in a position of subordination to the customer. Because a high value is placed on those with economic power within capitalist systems, those who are in a position to demonstrate that power are viewed in high regard (as can be seen in the aphorism *the customer is always right*). By uttering *May I help you*, especially with the marked polite form *may* as opposed to the more casual *can*, shop employees show deference to customers, which recognizes customers' purchasing power and contribution to a capitalist system.

Genres, then, have both a structural and deployment component that can interact with each other to produce subjects and power relations between them. Van Leeuwen (1993) acknowledges this when he notes that any analysis of how genres are deployed throughout a text should study both its generic structure and its field structure. A text's generic structure can be recognized by a (relatively) predictable order of speech acts that is more-or-less identifiable as belonging to a particular mode of communication (such as a newspaper article or an advice column), and that can be transferred among domains of communicative activity. Field structure, on the other hand, is "the representation of a discourse, of a knowledge of some field or fields, which pertains to and is activated in a specific social context" (203-204). Looking at a genre through its field structure allows for it to become socially-imbued with values, viewpoints, and specific knowledges that allow the reader(s) to interpret the information being presented within the genre in a particular way. Information presented in a 'newspaper article' style, for example, follows a set of conventions (its generic structure) that include headlines that summarize the story, a first paragraph that summarizes the story, and additional
subsequent paragraphs that provide further information about people and events mentioned in the first paragraph (often accompanied, for example, by quotes from participants in the story). Through the lens of field analysis, presenting information in this socially-recognized way gives readers the impression that the story being told is thorough and factual, regardless of source.

In order to understand how particular genres situate readers into recognizing themselves within the text, many Critical Discourse analysts have borrowed from MAK Halliday’s (2004) systemic-functional school of linguistics (SFL). This school “is a grammar of meaning in that it views language as a system of meanings realized through the functions of the rich resource of grammatical options that language users choose” (Li 2011, 203). Although, as mentioned in Chapter 2, Critical Discourse Analysis has historically been seen as multimodal and welcoming of different approaches, many analysts have appealed to Halliday's SLF in order to provide a "detailed and rigorous analysis of text [that] helps to preserve the interpretation from ideological bias" (Alameda-Hernández 2008, 162).

For SFL theorists, language use is predicated on the understanding that users have a variety of choices they can make in 'making sense' of the world around them. Those choices that speakers make allow them to "utilize language together to achieve everyday social life and how social worlds are, in exchange, established in and through language” (Kazemian and Hashemi 2014, 1179). Speakers are thus not constrained by grammatical considerations: they have a vast array of linguistic structures that allow them to make sense of the world around them, and speakers are active agents in choosing which structures best convey their experiences.

Halliday suggests that language helps its users to make sense of the world through three distinct, yet related, axes which he calls metafunctions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. The ideational metafunction of language concerns “the ‘content’ of a discourse: what kinds of activities are undertaken, and how participants in these activities are described, how they are classified and what
they are composed of” (Huang and Wang 2014, 57). The interpersonal function of language deals with how individuals position themselves vis-a-vis each other and the world around them. Ideational functions are most often represented on a clausal level, which represents “an interactive event involving speaker, or writer, and audience” (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 106). Ideational functions have two main components: mood (how the speaker positions themselves and others within a given clausal structure) and modality (a speaker’s/writer’s degree of certainty about a propositional truth expressed within a given clausal structure). The textual function concerns the organization of a message or text, and is often discussed through the concepts of theme (what comes first within a clause) and rheme (what comes after). Each of these three metafunctions interact with each other to produce a particular reading of a text that orients subjects and participants in particular matrices, and allows a text to be ‘read’ in particular ways over others.

Two ways in which Critical Discourse Analysis has utilized Halliday’s SFL is through understanding how modality and transitivity play roles in the construction of subjects, which reflects how subjects are viewed as having various amounts of agency over the situations they find themselves in. The first, modality, concerns how subjects are presented as evaluating the certainty of their propositional statements through deployments of specific grammatical structures. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) define modality as “the speaker’s judgment, or request of the judgment of the listener, on the status of what is being said” (143). In systemic-functional grammatical analyses, modality is treated as part of the ideational metafunction of language, and constructs subjects in part through their certainty that a given proposition is true.

Traditionally, two different types of modality have been recognized within the literature, differentiating between the speaker’s amount of certainty that an event is going to happen (referred to as epistemic modality) and the obligation that a speaker feels toward making true a certain proposition
(deontic modality). Understanding how these different types of modality are deployed within a particular text can help construct the reader’s view of the amounts of agency the subjects present in the text have in believing a certain proposition to be true, and how readers might view the subjects’ commitment to the truth of propositions. Often times, this is refracted into beliefs of how subjects present their knowledge about a certain proposition. Qiuping (2012), for example, claims that epistemic modalities serve a constructive function, in which “different epistemic modal expressions may be used to construct different types of writer identities (negotiative vs. authoritative writers), writer-reader relations (equal vs. hierarchical; bidirectional vs. unidirectional) and discourse communities (democratic vs. hegemonic ones)” (353). Qiuping notes that non-native English speakers tend to overuse strong epistemic modal expressions (such as should and must) in academic writing, as opposed to ‘weaker’ modal expressions (such as can and may) that are more prevalent in native English speakers’ academic writing. These 'weak' epistemic modals, Qiuping notes, have the effect of speakers trying to “lower their privileged positions, putting themselves on an equal footing with the audience […] they treat their audience as their equals and as full members of a democratic society who have their own independent way of thinking” (359-360). The overuse of strong modal expressions, Qiuping argues, may (unknowingly) lead to readers viewing writers as assertive and authoritative, as opposed to egalitarian; this can potentially cause readers to think they are being spoken ‘down’ to, which may have unintended negative effects in how their writing is viewed.

Understanding how modality is deployed in English texts, many researchers note (e.g., (Sulkunen and Törrönen 1997; Nartey and Yankson 2014), is often difficult because English possesses multiple grammatical mechanisms for deploying modality; as Nartey and Yankson (2014) note, “modality is a stubbornly contentious concept that eludes precision” (22). One grammatical construction that English does possess is the use of modal auxiliary verbs, which “may be involved in
the expression of time, necessity, possibility, permission and obligation as well as such grammatical phenomena as negation, affirmation and questioning” (Nartey and Yankson 2014, 22). Nartey and Yankson identify ten such auxiliary verbs: could, can, need to, must, shall, should, may, would, will, and might. Each of these verbs can be placed on a continuum that expresses the amount of certainty a subject might have towards believing a proposition to be true, ranging from near-certainty (in the case of must) to less so (in the case of can or could, e.g. Kazemian and Hashemi 2014). However, Nartey and Yankson claim that it is not easy to assign a strict level of probability to each of these verbs, since they can often provide multiple views of expressing modality that overlap with and often contradict each other (for example, the propositional value of the word can in the sentence he can go to the store tomorrow can express either permission to go to the store or a physical ability to do so); thus, it is important to examine the context in which a modal auxiliary verb is deployed to determine its propositional contribution in that specific instance. Nevertheless, as they note, taken as a whole modal auxiliary verbs can be used to determine subjects’ positions with regard to certain propositions. In their study of a 2012 manifesto attributed to the Ghanaian New Political Party (NPP), they note that auxiliary verbs are “strategically deployed and fastidiously instantiated to positively project the NPP before the electorate, while at the same time highlight the supposed inefficiencies and incompetence of the incumbent government and governing party” (29).

The deployment of auxiliary modal verbs within a specific text can help understand how individuals depicted within the text express varying amounts of agency regarding their certainty towards a proposition. Particular genres, presumably, can utilize aspects of modality to align with particular ideologies and/or audiences, expressing a stance towards an object or group that then leads the hearer to view those propositions in the same way. But modality is not the only way in which subjects within a text can be demonstrated to have agency: the types of actions, feelings, and behaviors
they participate in, and the ways in which those actions and feelings have control over subjects, can also be achieved through what Halliday and Matthiessen call transitivity. Transitivity, as they note, "construes the world of experience into a manageable set of process types [...which] provides its own model or schema for construing a particular domain of experience as a figure of a particular kind" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 170). As part of the ideational function of language, transitivity represents experiences of subjects to others and the world around them, and looking at how transitivity processes are deployed within a text "makes it possible to relate the structural organisations at the clausal level with the ideologies embedded within the texts analyzed" (Alameda-Hernández 2008, 163). Analyzing patterns of transitivity can show how subjects, emerging through a discourse, engage with each other and with the outside world, and demonstrate attitudes, beliefs, and ideologies that exist within subjects.

For SFL theorists, processes of transitivity lie in the clause, which construes "a quantum of change as a figure or configuration of a process, participants involved in it an any attendant circumstances" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 169). Verbs that occur within these clauses, which are called processes in SFL, can belong to one of six categories, with three making up the majority of processes within most texts. Material processes are those which represent actions caused by an agent and effecting some sort of change in the recipient of those actions. Mental processes "are concerned with our experience of the world of our own consciousness" (197): thoughts and feelings that reflect subjects' inner states. Relational processes compare one subject (or one aspect of a subject) to something else; in English, they are most often reflected by the use of the verbs be and have. In addition to these three 'major' processes, there exist three others that also work to locate subjects within a particular social nexus. Behavioral processes represent outward manifestations of inner states, that can often be observed by others, such as smile and laugh. Verbal processes involve acts of saying and
other forms of communication, including *say, quote, and reply*. Existential processes indicate the mere existence of an entity or subject: in English, this is often realized by the existential constructions *there is* or *it is*.

Analyzing how subjects are depicted in texts through transitivity processes can demonstrate “how language users construe versions of reality in discourse […] thereby ensuring information is arranged in a way that can indicate their ideological positioning” (Bentley and Hildago-Tenorio 2015, 18). Transitivity focuses on how individuals are constructed within texts as experiencing a phenomenon or enacting agency, and also concerns the types of effects that agents are seen as causing in others. Different subjects can use different process types to position themselves, which can then allow them to be perceived by readers and listeners as empowered or disempowered.

Transitivity analyses have been used by many Critical Discourse Analysts to show how subjects are constructed by others in a variety of discursive realms, including national identity (e.g., Alameda-Hernández 2008), within media representations of crime (Machin and Mayr 2013), newspaper reportings of aviation incidents (Li 2011), 'official' publications from heads of state, such as speeches (Ghachem 2014; Chen 2018), and newspaper letters to advice columnists (Melrose 2005). Bentley and Hildago-Tenorio (2015), to take just one example, use of transitivity to analyze how homosexuality is portrayed in English-language Irish newspapers. Through a systematic study of the types of processes used to describe both queer individuals and homosexuality in Ireland, they note that when queer individuals are put in positions of agency within a sentence, they are often seen as enacting some kind of negative change within society: this creates a reading of texts that support a conservative ideology where “silence, discrimination, persecution, exclusion, violence, rights violations, disease and death are patently manifested in the representation of gays […] homosexuals are demonised, victimised” (24).
Huang and Wang (2014) also utilize the notion of transitivity to discuss reports of disputes between China and Japan concerning the Diayou Islands as reported in two major newspapers, the *China Daily* and the *Washington Post*. They found that Chinese entities (citizens, travel agencies, and China as a nation) were often represented as belligerent actors who enacted a change, often towards Japanese groups and businesses, that was seen as undesirable and combative. This stance, they argue, was further reinforced in the ways that Chinese and Japanese agents were quoted within the newspapers: quotes by Chinese participants in the dispute were often accompanied by strong verbal processes such as *urged* and *warned*, while quotes by Japanese participants were more often than not accompanied by more neutral words such as *wrote* and *reported*. These textual strategies helped to shape an ideology that portrayed China as the unambiguous aggressors in the dispute, and Japan as the victims.

A systemic-functional linguistic framework, then, can allow for an understanding of how ideologies can (partially) be encoded within particular grammatical constructions, that can then lead readers to understand texts, and the subjects presented within those texts, through particular ideological lenses. As will be discussed below, modality and transitivity play an important role within clinical hypnosis, where two distinct schools of thought have historically emerged regarding the linguistic structures of hypnotic trances, often called 'direct' and 'indirect' frameworks. A ‘direct’ hypnotic framework stresses a power asymmetry between hypnotist and subject, and ultimately constructs the subject as having limited power in directing their trance. ‘Indirect’ hypnotic frameworks, in contrast, stress the cooperative and egalitarian construction between hypnotist and subject in the creation of a hypnotic trance, and gives the subject a greater degree of agency in affecting the efficacy of the trance. Both styles of hypnosis utilize distinct linguistic structures that allow for them to be recognized as a distinct genre; however, a key difference between direct and indirect models of hypnosis can be found
in the deployment of modality. Indirect trances tend to incorporate weaker modal grammatical structures that encourage the subject’s exploration and agency, while direct trances tend to utilize stronger (if any) modal structures that lead to a textual reading limiting subject agency. Structures of modality that are present (or absent) in trances posted on OnYourKnees support a ‘direct’ induction technique that, on a larger community level, serve to strengthen contours of submission and dominance among jocks and coaches.

Hypnosis as a genre:

The practice of hypnosis has a long history that can be said to begin with the work of German physician Franz Mesmer in the 18th century, who believed that all objects shared a fundamental force that can be manipulated to achieve healing properties, both physical and mental. This ‘healing’, he thought, can be realized through the achievement of a profound state of focus between two individuals, through which those fundamental forces could be activated and flow. As Crabtree (2012) notes, this ‘state of focus’ often included the following characteristics: “a sleepwalking kind of consciousness […] a ‘rapport’ or special connection with the magnetizer […] suggestibility with heighened imagination […] amnesia in the waking state for events in the magnetized state […] ability to read the thoughts of the magnetizer […] and a striking change in the personality of the magnetic subject” (298). These ideas were later developed by the Scottish surgeon James Braid, who, in the early 19th century, gave the phenomenon the name ‘hypnotism’ and posited that individuals under severe mental or physical stress left them especially susceptible to the phenomenon.

To some individuals, it is often unclear as to what is exactly being spoken about when formulating ‘hypnosis’ as a definable practice, and many researchers differ as to which activities
should fall under its definition (cf. Zeig and Rennick 1991). Many practitioners of hypnotists have been careful to define their practice in so-called ‘scientific’ terms, drawing a distinction between objective, measurable implications of hypnosis for subjects (in particular the psychologically-beneficial properties of engaging in such a practice), and less-well-defined, ‘metaphysical’ effects of hypnosis, which have historically included such phenomena as astral projection (a separation of mental and physical components of the body, and the ability to mentally ‘travel’ to physically-inaccessible locations) and precognition (an awareness of events before they happen). As Crabtree (2012) also notes, some researchers take a socio-cognitive view of hypnotic practice, claiming that ‘hypnotism’ (inasmuch as the practice can be defined) is the by-product of the hypnotist and subject enacting socially-constructed roles that enact a change in the subject solely because the subject expects themselves to be ‘hypnotized’, when in fact no such state is achieved. In these understandings of hypnosis, as Crabtree argues “in playing the part of the hypnotized person, the subject produces expected hypnotic phenomena […] there is no creation of a ‘state’ of hypnosis, but a subtly choreographed interaction between subject and experimenter that produces the impressive but familiar dramatization that we call hypnosis” (304).

Nevertheless, a definition of contemporary understandings of hypnosis emerges, where it is understood to be “a social interaction in which one person, the subject, responds to suggestions offered by another person, the hypnotist, for experiences involving alterations in perception, memory, and action” (Fromm and Nash 1997, 55). As a psychological/therapeutic tool, hypnosis is often used to allow subjects to enter ‘alternative’ states of mind (often called in the literature ‘altered states of consciousness’) that differ from normal, waking states. Achieving these mental states allows for subjects to make sense of past experiences and desires that so-called ‘normal’ states of thought may obscure. Szendi et al. (2009), for example, have noted that some of the manifestations of this ‘altered
state of consciousness’ include the “attenuation of influence of dysfunctional attitudes, schemas, or control mechanisms; bringing suppressed and repressed material to light; and facilitating cognitive reframing and cognitive affective reorganization” (383). As an illustration, in a study of hypnotized and non-hypnotized Hungarian speakers, Szendi et al. discovered that hypnotized individuals performed significantly better than non-hypnotized individuals in semantic information processing tests, suggesting a link between hypnotic state and ease of processing of semantic information.

Hammond (1990) claims that hypnosis can be used for a wide variety of physical and mental reasons, including pain management and preparation for anesthesia-free surgeries, the alleviation of anxiety and phobias (including, interestingly, dental phobias), ego-strengthening and the building of confidence, sexual dysfunction, relationship management, smoking and other addiction cessation, academic/athletic performance, and obesity and eating disorders.

Fromm and Nash’s definition of hypnosis above stresses one important point that seems to be consistent in all conceptualizations of hypnosis: a strong, trusting relationship between hypnotist and therapist. Most psychologically-recognized forms of hypnosis locate the interaction between the hypnotist and subject as the most important component of a successful session, and it is the cooperation of both that creates a clinically-defined hypnotic trance: as Crabtree (2012) notes, “hypnosis is in its very nature an interpersonal thing” (313). For many researchers, hypnosis in an intensely interpersonal experience that depends on a high degree of comfort and rapport on the part of both hypnotist and subject. In most (but certainly not all) hypnotic sessions, hypnotist and subject are present in the same room, and physical cues (such as gentle touching) are often incorporated into a subject’s induction into a trance state.

But what exactly is a trance state? In order for the subject to achieve a state in which they can experience those ‘alterations’ in perception and memory, a subject must achieve “a state of profound
focus on something accompanied by a diminished awareness of everything else, which evokes appropriate subliminal resources” (Crabtree 2012, 297). Snyder and Shor (1983) define the trance as “the degree to which the usual generalized reality-orientation [of a subject undergoing hypnosis] has faded from the background of awareness so that ongoing experiences occur in relative isolation from the usual interpretive schemata of everyday life” (1). By entering into a state of trance, they argue, individuals can potentially become “more responsively involved in, and open to, at least certain kinds of emotive and aesthetic experiences” (1). A trance, then, can be said to refer to the achievement of a particular mental state that is markedly different than one that is encountered in everyday life, and that allows for individuals to explore alternative ideas and mental frameworks from a different viewpoint.

Aside from researchers who take a sociocognitive model of hypnosis (cf. Lynn and Rhue 1991; Zeig and Rennick 1991), who claim that what is seen as a ‘trance’ relies mainly on subjects’ preconceived notions and views on the efficacy of hypnosis (and who, if they ‘believe’ they are more hypnotizable than other, are more likely to fall into socially-recognized patterns that allow them to achieve a hypnotized state), the eliciting of a trance state within a subject is of utmost importance for a successful hypnotic session.

Trances are typically composed of three parts: an induction, a suggestion, and a termination. Inductions, according to Lynn and Rhue (1991) “orient the subject to reduce vigilance and relax physically and mentally; to focus of attention directly on subjective experience and on the hypnotist’s communications; and to give free reign to fantasy and imagination in line with suggested events” (405-6). In inductions, subjects are generally instructed to train their focus onto the hypnotist’s voice (sometimes aided by focusing on a distant point or imagining a particular scenario) in order to enter a state of ‘profound focus’: often times, the subject will also be asked to perform a series of small tasks (such as raising their arm or imagining an insect crawling on their skin) that assesses their current
mental state. Once a subject is sufficiently inducted, the hypnotist then gives them a suggestion that is meant to produce a psychological response to a stimuli: suggestions are tailored to the particular therapeutic aim of the subject, and can range from directing the subject to feel more confident in themselves (in subjects who wish to improve their self-esteem) to feeling disgusted every time they pick up a cigarette (in cases where subjects wish to stop smoking). After a suggestion is introduced to the subject, the session is then terminated. Termination is often an important aspect of clinical hypnosis: once the subject has done the work they are able to do under hypnosis, therapists ‘revert’ the subject back to a state of normal awareness, often by counting slowly from 10 to 1. As Fromm and Nash state, the termination of a hypnotic suggestion “is an emotionally charged event as evidenced by the widespread, but completely inaccurate belief that patients can ‘get stuck’ in hypnosis. Patients are no more likely to ‘get stuck’ in hypnosis than they are to ‘get stuck’ in a traditional, intensive nonhypnotic therapy session” (119). In part, then, a distinct termination process allows the subject to understand that the hypnotic session is over, and they are no longer hypnotized.

The importance of a termination process, as a way of bringing awareness to the subject that they are no longer hypnotized, also speaks to the importance of subject agency in any hypnosis session. Popular conceptions of hypnosis often frame it as a method of control over a subject, akin to brainwashing, where hypnotized subjects are under the complete control of a hypnotizer and perform whatever tasks the hypnotizer wants, with no input from the subject themselves. This popular conception often conflicts with clinical views of hypnosis, where the subject is imagined to have full agency over their thoughts and actions, and would not (normally) perform any action under hypnosis that they would not do under ‘normal’ circumstances. Indeed, Crabtree (2012) addresses this fear in a very direct way by claiming that “trances do not turn people into automatons. In trances individuals do not lose their ability to make their own judgments” (312). In fact, Fromm and Nash (1997) argue for
the importance of the hypnotist to make clear their role in the process, even imploring them to directly claim “Hypnosis is not something that I do to you, nor is it something that you do by yourself […] hypnosis is something we do together” (72).

Ultimately, the goal of hypnosis seems to be to encourage a subject to experience “a flow of images, feelings, personal associations, and self-evaluations that may be represented verbally and visually, and in tandem with suggestion-related sensations […] concrete and abstract thinking and reality-based and fantasy-based thinking coexist” (Lynn and Rhue 1991, 402). The language used in a hypnotic induction plays an important role in achieving this state. Sundararajan (1993), borrowing Heidegger’s differentiation between ‘authentic’ and ‘inauthentic’ language, argues that “hypnosis entails a particular relationship to language, a relationship which is characterized by a profound respect for the autonomy of language […] as a self-referential system […] by an equally profound respect for silence” (197). According to Sundararajan, Heidegger draws a distinction between ‘everyday,’ inauthentic language, which is used merely to objectively describe the material world of its users, and a more ‘authentic,’ poetic language that is non-representational in nature, and that transcends the boundaries of ‘inauthentic’ language by bringing objects into being for a brief, unique instance. The language used in hypnosis, Sundararajan argues, is akin to Heidegger’s conception of authentic language, in that it creates a self-referential world that is momentarily shared by the hypnotist and the subject: both parties co-create an environment that is created in the moment of hypnosis and which is explored through a system of language that can only be made sense of by those two participants within the moment of its creation. Thus, hypnosis “constitutes a special kind of language, which is distinctly different from the everyday use of language” (189).

To create this world and get a subject into a state of hypnosis, however, requires strategies that differ among hypnotists. Two distinct schools of thought seem to emerge concerning the wording of
inductions that are generally called within the literature ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ wording techniques. Although both methods have champions and detractors and share the aim of leading the subject into a hypnotic state, direct and indirect wording techniques utilize distinctly different linguistic technique to achieve that aim.

Lynn et al. (1993) define ‘direct’ suggestions as an “unambiguous tacit request for a specific response that is couched in authoritative language, yet conveys the expectation that suggested effects will occur involuntarily” (124). Direct suggestions, they claim, primarily make use of language that directly tells the subject what they are experiencing (i.e., you are very much relaxed), and predictive language that “involves telling the subjects what they are going to experience or do (e.g., “Your arm will lift off the chair” (124)). They offer this additional snippet of an example of a direct suggestion:

(2) You are going into a deep trance….a deep deep trance, a hypnotic sleep. A trance in which you will experience all sorts of things I will ask, things I will ask you to do. (Lynn, Neufeld, and Maré 1993, 124)

In (2), the hypnotist is directed to tell the subject that you are going into a deep trance...a deep deep trance. The phrase you are going suggests that the subject does not have any agency in whether or not they are experiencing a trance: they are directly told to do so by an agent (the hypnotist) who has absolute control over them. The repetition of the word deep also suggests that repetition of key phrases plays an important role in direct modes of hypnosis. This trance, (1) argues, will be one in which the subject will experience all sorts of things I will ask, things I will ask you to do: the repeated use of the word will (a strong modal verb) further constructs the subject as one who has little, if any, agency in entering a trance.
Another example of a directly-worded induction comes from the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility, which is generally recognized as a manual that illustrates direct-trance methods:

(3) Put your fingers together. Interlock your fingers together. Interlock your fingers and press your hands tightly together. That’s it. Put your fingers together. Interlock your fingers and press your hands tightly together. Interlock tightly...hands pressed tightly together. Notice how your fingers are becoming tightly interlocked together...so tightly interlocked together that you wonder very much if you could take your fingers and hands apart...your fingers are interlocked, tightly interlocked...and I want you to try to take your hands apart...just try… (Shor and Orne 1962, 8-9, underline in original)

In (3), two distinct linguistic strategies seem to be in play that contribute to the efficacy of a direct induction. First, the subject is repeatedly instructed to *interlock your fingers together* and *press your hands tightly together*. Continuous repetition of key words and phrases is an easily-identifiable quality of direct schools of trance: this may be because repetition provides an anticipated rhythm that allows subjects to more easily fall into a hypnotic state (e.g., Snyder and Shor 1983). Second, there is an almost complete lack of modality present: most sentences in (3) take the form of commands, allowing an individual very little agency in choosing whether or not to follow them. The only modal auxiliary verb present in (3) is in the sentence *you wonder very much if you could take your fingers and hands apart*; although *could* suggests a modicum of choice on the part of the subject, it is subordinated to the larger clause *you wonder very much*, suggesting that the subject will be very much unlikely or unable to.

Direct suggestions, then, take advantage of linguistic structures that limit agency on the part of subject, and place the hypnotist in a dominant position to the (powerless) subject. Direct wording is often associated with earlier schools of hypnosis, and are oft-repeated in general-consciousness.
ideologies of hypnosis “that foster attributions of passivity and automaticity” (Lynn, Neufeld, and Maré 1993, 78). This direct styles of suggestion contrast with an indirect suggestion style which, as Lynn et al. (1993) note “use[s] permissive language as contrasted to the authoritarian, directed language of direct suggestions […] indirect suggestions offer a choice of responses, whereas direct suggestions usually prescribe a specific response” (76). Championed by hypnotherapist Milton Erickson, indirect suggestions highlight the co-construction of a state of trance by hypnotist and subject, and give subjects greater agency in directing their level of trance.

Many researchers who support indirect-suggestion methods advocate for hypnotists to use linguistic strategies that stress exploration and agency on the part of the subject, although what these strategies are may differ among practitioners. Fromm and Nash (1997), for example, state that “it is a good idea for hypnotherapists to refrain from overusing conditional words like maybe, perhaps, can or might […] it is likewise important to avoid questions that convey doubt such as ‘Is your arm light?’ As a rule make questions into gentle requests: ‘allow the arm to become light, and as it becomes light, it will move in a way we both can see” (74-75, italics in original). Although Fromm and Nash advocate against using modal words like can or might, other proponents of indirect suggestion (e.g., Lynn, Neufeld, and Maré 1993) claim that modals should be incorporated within inductions to give the subject agency in the exploration of their trance.

Other linguistic strategies that are often suggested in indirect suggestion include the use of passive voice that obscures the hypnotist’s agency in directing the subject (such as using the phrase the eyelids are getting heavy as opposed to your eyelids are getting heavy), the importance of supportive statements (such as that’s right and yes) to encourage the subject to follow cues, and language that stimulates the evocation of rich imagery, often through metaphor and simile, that can “provide the
substance from which its listener is free to carve whatever understandings he or she finds consciously or unconsciously appropriate” (Gordon 1982, 114).

Ultimately, it is believed by proponents of indirect-induction methods, the use of such linguistic strategies serves to obscure the hierarchical relationship between hypnotist and subject, allowing the subject to feel as if they are helping to co-creating a world that is freely-accessible and -explorable by the subject. These strategies allow for “permissiveness and choice [...that] undercut[s] conscious resistance and defensiveness, increase[s] rapport, and facilitate[s] access to underused or unconscious resources and potentials” (Lynn, Neufeld, and Maré 1993, 128). An example of an indirect suggestion is excerpted in (4) below:

(4) I want you now to just continue as you are, maybe wondering...or perhaps your mind is wandering, I don’t know, and it really doesn’t matter that you do anything at all, and I’m going to tell you a little story soon, a story that may or may not have anything to do with your situation, and of course, you may choose to not even listen, which is just fine. (Gafner and Benson 2000, 112, italics in original)

In (4), the hypnotist directs the subject to just continue as you are (presumably falling into a trance), with the note that the hypnotist will tell you a little story soon. But, as the suggestion directs the hypnotist to say, the subject maybe wondering...or perhaps [their] mind is wandering, I don’t know. The use of the words maybe and perhaps suggests that they hypnotist’s knowledge of the subject’s state of mind is not absolute (further cemented by the following statement I don’t know, which serves to further obscure the controlling effects of the hypnotist); the hypnotist thus acknowledges that they do not have full access to the mental processes of the subject, demonstrating a level of relatively weak control over them. The story the hypnotist is about to tell may or may not have anything to do with your situation; the use of the weak modal may suggests that the story might not be applicable to the subject,
and it is up to the subject to find any worth or value in it. In fact, as the suggestion directs, the subject may choose to not even listen, which is just fine; again, the use of the modal may gives the subject agency in deciding whether or not to listen to the story to begin with.

It is also important to point out that (3) and (4) are examples of inductions, which is only the first step of a hypnotic session. Once a subject is successfully inducted into a trance, either directly or indirectly, the hypnotist then provides suggestions to the subject that will allow them to alter undesirable behavior. Just like inductions, however, suggestions can be direct or indirect, and can also reflect underlying ideologies of the amounts of agency given to subjects by hypnotists. One example of a direct suggestion given for patients who wish to quit smoking is given in (5) below:

(5) ...and as you become and as you remain free from nicotine and free from cigarettes, you will find a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment. You will find that, more and more, you are able to sleep very well, your sense of smell will improve, and your sense of taste will improve. You will not eat excessively and you will find an appropriate amount of food to be satisfying to you. (Elkins and Rajab 2004, 76)

In (5), the subject will find a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment, after realizing that they have become [and] remain free from nicotine and from cigarettes. Moreover, they will find that they will be able to sleep better, improve their sense of smell and taste, and refrain from excessive eating. The only modal auxiliary verb present in (5) is will, which occurs four times within the passage. Using a strong modal suggests that the subject’s reaction to the hypnosis will be inevitable: the subject is constructed as having no choice but to follow the suggestions put forth by the suggestion and, by extension, the hypnotist.

In contrast, an example of an indirect suggestion (also to be used for subjects who wish to quit smoking) is excerpted below:
(6) And you can feel really proud, of your decision to become free, and to remain free. In fact, you may be surprised over the next while, at sudden, fleeting feelings—perhaps familiar, perhaps now—feelings of real pride, and well-being. Pride that you have chosen, to take care of yourself. Pride that you have chosen, to free yourself. Pride that you have chosen to stand by, what you know to be right. And you can even feel pride that you have chosen to let this experience be one, that is calmer, more comfortable, easier, than you may once have expected. You are free now. (Hammond 1990, 410, italics in original)

In (6), the subject can feel really proud of their decision to become free. The use of the word decision suggests that it is the subject’s choice to no longer smoke, and they can (i.e., have the ability to) feel pride in their decision. The subject may be surprised over the next while of the feelings of pride in their decision—the modal may suggests that the subject is allowed to indulge in these (presumably new-found) feelings. It is interesting to note that the phrase pride that you have chosen is repeated for times in (6), highlighting the importance of repetition in hypnosis (and also helping to mark it as a distinct genre), but the last phrase is preceded by the modal can, again indexing an allowance of the subject to indulge in their new feelings. The use of the weaker modals can and may, as opposed to the heavy use of strong-modal will in (5), constructs the subject as having some sort of agency in how they choose to react to the suggestions and, by extension, the hypnotist. They are not bound to the hypnotist’s words, but can choose to follow them at their own benefit.

Some researchers have noted the use of 'hypnotic' language within other genres. Adams (2007) notes similarities between descriptions of hypnotic inductions and those of religious/mystical experiences, in that both rely on linguistic strategies of vagueness that “invite the listener to insert aspects of their own experience” (74). For Adams, these strategies of vagueness include the use of indefinite nouns and qualifiers (such as not all people), nominalization strategies (most often from adjectives to nouns, as in the pair empty/emptiness), and the extended use of metaphorical language.
Adams found that individuals who identified themselves as having a mystical experience were also more likely to enter into a hypnotic state, suggesting a link between the two phenomena that are mediated by vagueness strategies that allow the listener to ‘fill in the blanks’ with their own experiences. In a similar vein, Snyder and Shor (1983) identify similarities between hypnosis and particular forms of literature, in their claim that certain types of poetry has the potential to allow the reader to enter mind-states similar to those found among hypnotized individuals. These ‘trance-inducing’ qualities include a regularity of rhythm and rising-falling tone, vagueness in imagery (so that descriptions have “soft, shadowy outlines” (4)), intentionally vague phrases and complex sentence structures that “cause the listener fatigue and help to break down his critical alertness” (5), and phonological qualities (emphasis on liquid and nasal consonants, particular forms of vowel harmony). Although their descriptions of these qualities can be poetic and lacking in phonological detail (noting, for example, that some poetry is “ornamented with consonantal harmonies of a most pleasing sort” (4), without elaborating on what some of those harmonies might be), it is important to note that they do highlight the importance of regularity (both phonetic and prosodic) and vagueness of imagery in creating a potential trance-like state among readers.

Some BDSM practitioners incorporate many of the above techniques of hypnosis into their own activities, as a vehicle through which they can engage in voluntary power differentials and increase their own sexual pleasure (a practice that is often termed ‘erotic hypnosis’). Many websites that focus on individuals interested in non-normative sexual practices (such as FetLife), until recently, hosted online groups for practitioners of erotic hypnosis.¹⁸ Conferences (such as the New England Erotic Hypnosis (un)Conference) exist that bring together both practitioners and interested individuals to

¹⁸ Although see Chapter 4 for complications to this acceptance.
discuss techniques, methods, and parameters of consent. BDSM practitioners who specialize in erotic hypnosis publish books (very often self-published, e.g., Masters 2008; Wiseman 2015), which provide guidelines for potential practitioners and samples of hypnotic trances. Many of these materials outline the many ways that engaging in erotic hypnosis can be beneficial for increasing sexual pleasure: Masters (2008), for example, identifies hypnosis as a method of indulging in fantasies and role-playing, heightening sexual responsiveness, and increasing variety in sexual activity. In addition, some mass-media news articles (Gilbert-Lurie 2015.; Moylan 2012) have described practices of erotic hypnosis as a way to increase intimacy between partners.

Hypnosis, then, can be said to constitute a genre in two ways. First, it is a pattern of text that is easily-recognizable by a variety of lexical and syntactic features that can be transferred among different domains. Second, the recognition of these features as a hypnotic trance is meant to do something: it elicits a reaction by the reader that represents calmness and meditation (which may give the hypnotic trance the status of a speech act: cf. Austin & Urmson, 2009). Furthermore, two distinct types of hypnotic trance can be recognized (a 'direct' and 'indirect' hypnotic trance), each with its own particular structure and view of the listener as having (or not having, in the case of direct) agency in directing the trance. As will be shown below, posters on OnYourKnees are cognizant of these features, and incorporate them into their own trances. The trances, and the discussions that arise concerning the hypnotic trance, serve to put the listener in a state of subordination to the content of the trance, thereby maintaining contours of dominance and submission among messageboard members.

The trance on OnYourKnees:
As discussed in Chapter 2 and 3, trances play an important role in the lives of users of OnYourKnees. Many, though not all, messageboard users incorporate practices of hypnosis, including the creation and consumption of trances, into their self-conceptions of what it means to be a jock or a coach. On OnYourKnees, trances most often take the form of audio files (either .mp3 or .wav formats) that can be downloaded and consumed by messageboard users. Sometimes these files are accompanied by visual images that depict muscular men in various stages of undress, often wearing sports-related clothing: in this case, they are often combined in a file format that combines audio and visual files and run through a program called Subviewer, that allows the audio portion of a file to play while images are rapidly depicted on a user's computer. Often times, hypnotic trances are posted to the messageboard via links to time-sensitive file-sharing websites (such as RapidShare), where they can be downloaded for a limited time. The vast majority of files are thus made freely available to users on OnYourKnees, though some posters also offer trances that they create for sale through outside websites.

The practice of trances on OnYourKnees flows unidirectionally: although anyone (as will be demonstrated below) can create a trance, the primary audience for trances are jocks-to-be who wish to further their transformation towards a jock identity. There are no attested discussions on OnYourKnees about files that allow listeners to become coaches, suggesting that the consumption of trances is purely for jocks. Unfortunately, due to the time-sensitive nature of the websites on which trances are posted, these files are no longer available for analysis. However, despite the fact that audio trances are no longer available on OnYourKnees, posters often list file names of trances that they make available for other users: these names often provide insight into the function of those trances, as the list of fine names in (7) and (8) below illustrate:
The file names in (7) and (8) are typical of the trances that posters make available to others on OnYourKnees. In (7), the file names suggest that some trances allow listeners to fall into a state of hypnosis (Focus Induction), while others suggest the goal of the file is to allow listeners to align with a jock identity through focusing on body-conscious activities (Perfect Body File, Bodybuilder, Curse Swimmers Body Remix). The file names in (8), similarly, suggest that the trances in those files focus on body-conscious activities (TrainTotalJock, Train Weightlifter, Train Bodybuilder). These file names suggest that files are intended to allow the listener to align with activities that are associated with jocks on the messageboard.

In addition to file names of trances, many posters submit texts of what it is they wish to include in a file they are creating. These texts are often 'rough drafts' of written speech which posters hope to incorporate into an audio trance. These postings provide enormous insight into how posters utilize particular qualities of hypnotic language to position subjects (i.e., intended listeners). In (9), for example, WJ posts the following:
Hey Bros,

I was a bit inspired so I threw together a basic script I want to record at some point. It doesn't have an induction because it's just a suggestion file designed to fit the files structure I explained a short while back.

I tried to use what I've learned to create a short, positive and clear script.

Give it a look and tell me if there's anything I should change/add. I might tweak it a bit myself anyway. REMEMBER that this one is purely about dumbing down so don't suggest anything that should be in a different type of file. (WJ, 36:1)

In (9), WJ is asking for advice on whether or not the text of his script (the textual portion of a hypnotic trance) can be seen as effective, and what improvements might be made. By using words such as script, induction, and suggestion, he frames the text of the trance as part of a larger genre of ‘hypnotic script’ that is meant to be read in a very particular way, and with a particular effect in mind (he notes that his file is purely about dumbing down; he asks posters to refrain from making suggestions that might be appropriate for another type of file). He also notes that the trance he intends to create doesn't have an induction because it's just a suggestion file: by claiming the text he is about to post as an induction and not a suggestion, he demonstrates a relatively sophisticated understanding of schools of hypnosis that differentiate between the two, suggesting that he has some experience and knowledge about making (successful) trances.

He then posts the trance in its entirety ((10), numbers of each line not present in original):

(10) 1 You are dumb
     2 You want to be dumb
     3 You enjoy being dumb
     4 Being dumb is fun
     5 Being dumb is easy
     6 Hard to be smart
Hard to think
But easy to be dumb

Trying to think makes you hard
And that feels good

So good to be free of thought
Of worry
Of pain
Of responsibility
Being dumb is so much easier
Feels so good to be dumb

You want your brain to shrink
A small brain is good
Letting your brain shrink feels good
Easier to have a small brain
Easier not to think

Mind so simple
But fun
Easy
Good

So much easier to have a small brain
A small, dumb, brain
And to feel it shrink
And feel yourself get dumb

You want to listen to this file
As often as you can
Because it makes you feel good
It makes you feel dumb
And that feels good

You want to be dumb
And this file makes you dumb
Being dumb feels good
Listening to this file feels good
In (10), the overall goal of the trance is to make the listener, through the act of consuming the trance, become ‘dumb’, and both enjoy and become sexually-aroused by the experience. Many textual patterns are present in (10) that both locate the text squarely within the genre of ‘hypnotic trance’ (specifically within a direct style that gives little agency to the listener), and construct the listener-subject as a person who should single-mindedly be focused on becoming dumb. It is helpful, first of all, to examine both the frequency and distribution of key words within (10). The trance presented in (10) (total words N = 179) is composed of 52 unique words. Five of those words make up one-third (33.3%) of the total body of the text: to (18 tokens, 10.0% of the total text), dumb (14 tokens, 7.8%), you (11 tokens, 6.1%), good (10 tokens, 5.5%), and be (7 tokens, 3.9%). The large concentration of these words, especially dumb, good, and be, suggests that much of the trance is dedicated to the act of making the listener dumb: this is supported by the multiple collocations of the phrase [lemma BE + DUMB], which occurs a total of 10 times within the corpus.

At the beginning of the trance, the listener is explicitly told that he is dumb, and subsequent lines associate dumbness with positive qualities (being dumb is easy in line 4 and being dumb is fun in line 5) and the act of thinking with negative qualities (hard to be smart in line 6 and hard to think in line 7). The association of dumbness and happiness (and the consequent association with thought and unhappiness) continues in lines 13-18, where the listener is told that it is so good to be free of thought / of worry / of pain / of responsibility, and lines 21-27 (where it is easier to have a small brain and easier not to think). Lines 32 to 36 tell the listener to listen to the file / as often as you can, because it makes you feel good). Finally, lines 37-40 summarize the effects of the trance to the listener, telling the listener that both being dumb and listening to the file feels good.
It is interesting to note that there seems to be a contradiction in CJ’s trance. In line 11, the trance tells the listener that \textit{trying to think makes you hard}. At first glance, this clause might seem to act contrary to the overall goal of the trance: if the goal of being dumb is not to think, why would trying to think make one sexually aroused? This clause makes more sense, however, when contextualized with what comes before in the trance. Lines 3 and 4, as well as lines 5 and 6, tell the listener that \textit{being dumb is fun and being dumb is easy}, and that is \textit{hard to be smart, hard to think, but easy to be dumb}. In line 9, the phrase \textit{hard to think} is repeated, but then followed with \textit{but easy to be hard} (line 10). The repetition of the word \textit{hard} is especially interesting because each instance refers to a different meaning of the word (difficulty in line 9 versus sexually-aroused in 10), suggesting a metaphorical use of the word. The meaning of \textit{hard} as sexually-aroused is carried into line 11 (\textit{trying to think makes you hard}), which is meant to make the listener feel good. In these lines, two important points are worth noting. First, WI makes explicit the link between being dumb and sexual arousal: in addition to not being very intelligent, an ‘ideal’ jock should also continuously sexually aroused. Dumbness and sexual arousal thus feed into each other, just as the word \textit{hard} both begins and ends lines 9 and 10. Second, the meaning of the word \textit{trying} in this case seems to imply that a dumb jock can \textit{try} to think, but the act of trying to think will only remind him of the fact that he is no longer able to think. His act of trying will cause him to be sexually aroused precisely because he will fail to do so.

The trance in (10) thus constructs the listener as a passive agent who is being explicitly told that they are dumb, and that being dumb feels good. Here, dumbness is overwhelmingly shaped as a positive quality, while the act of thinking is associated with negative feelings the listener should avoid. (10) demonstrates an almost complete lack of modal verbs, suggesting that the listener should have no say in whether or not he chooses to be affected by the trance. Interestingly, in only one instance (line 33) is a modal auxiliary present: in line 33, the listener is told that he wants to listen to the trance \textit{as}}
often as he can. The only clause in the trance where the listener you has any sort of agency is in listening to the trance as often as possible; however, as often as you can is subordinated to the previous line (you want to listen to this file), suggesting that even in this circumstance, the listener has little agency in following his desires.

The deployment of particular processes over others also helps construct the listener/subject you as passive and with little agency. As mentioned above, you occurs 11 times within the corpus. By determining how the listener is positioned within the text via the processes you engages in, a clearer understanding can emerge in how the listener is constructed as having, or not having, agency in affecting the outcome of his activities. As Table 5-1 below demonstrates, in seven instances, you occurs in the subject position, while in four instances it appears as the rheme of the clause:

Table 5-1: occurrences of you within (10), and relevant material processes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line number</th>
<th>clause</th>
<th>material process of clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You as subject:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You are dumb</td>
<td>(attributive) relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You want to be dumb</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>You enjoy being dumb</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>You want your brain to shrink</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>You want to listen to this file</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>As often as you can</td>
<td>behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>You want to be dumb</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You as object:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trying to think makes you hard</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Because it makes you feel good</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>It makes you feel dumb</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>And this file makes you dumb</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-1 shows the clauses in which you appears in the trance, divided into instances where you appears as a subject, and you appears in the rheme. In the seven instances where you appears as a subject, five are accompanied are mental processes, which “are concerned with our experience of the world of our own consciousness […]and which] construes a quantum of change in the flow of events taking place in our own consciousness.” (Halliday and Mathiessen 2004, 197). Mental processes concern themselves with inner-world experiences, such as cognition, perception, emotion, and desire. In four of the five instances, the process-verb want follows the subject you, while in the last case (line 3), the process-verb enjoy follows you. The use of the mental processes want and enjoy position the listener you as someone who is inhabiting a rich mental world, and who desires and enjoys listening to the file and the benefits of being dumb.

In only two cases is the subject constructed as doing something other than wanting or enjoying. In line 1 the listener is explicitly told you are dumb. By directing the trance to an unspecified ‘you,’ the listener is allowed to inject his own self into the trance, taking the place of ‘you’. In the trance, the lack of modal auxiliary verbs in the phrase you are dumb suggests that the listener is given no option but to think that he is dumb. The phrase you are dumb also relates to Halliday’s (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) relational process of transitivity, which focuses on how individuals are positioned within a text as being and becoming something. One way of discussing relational processes is by analyzing whether the relational process in question is attributive (i.e., x has y quality) or relational (x is the same as y). The phrase you are dumb suggests that the quality of being dumb is being attributed to the listener by another (the producer of the trance); the lack of modality in the phrase further suggests that the listener has no choice (and, therefore, no power) in identifying as or rejecting the label ‘dumb’. In addition, in lines 32-33 the subject is being told to listen to this file / as often as you can. Can, in this case, is
relating the subject to the process *listen*, a behavioral process. The subject is thus being told to engage in a behavior as often as possible.

In contrast to the subject positions of *you* in Table 5-1, the four instances of object *you* present in (10) identify the subject is being part of a material process, in which a change is being enacted on him: in all four cases the material process is *make*. In line 11, the subject is made to be *hard* through the act of listening to the trance. In the other three instances of *you*-as-object, the actor that is eliciting the change in the subject is the trance itself. Absorbing the trance makes the listener *feel good* (line 34) and [*feel* *dumb*] (lines 35 and 36). The listener is thus put into a position where the act of listening to the trance enacts a change in the subject. The lack of modality in these clauses further supports the idea that the listener has no choice but to allow the trance to enact its effects on him.

Table 5-1 thus demonstrates that when the listener *you* is being explicitly referred to in the text, positionings of the listener *you* manifest themselves in different ways. When the listener is put into a subject position, he is constructed as having a rich inner mental world, supported by the mental relational processes *want* and *enjoy*. The listener wants to be dumb, and enjoys the idea of doing so. In some instances, he is also constructed as already belonging to a set of individuals who are dumb. However, although the listener is put into a subject position, he is constructed as having little agency in 'deciding' whether or not he wants to be dumb: in the one instance where he is constructed as having some kind of agency, whatever agency the subject might have is constrained by his desire to want to listen to the file. Conversely, when the listener *you* appears in a position other than a subject, he is being made to do something, either through his efforts to think or by the trance itself.

In addition, other textual strategies emerge that place the trance in (10) squarely within the realm of the hypnotic-trance genre. Repetition of key phrases, for example, is often an important component of trances. As mentioned above, the phrase [lemma BE + DUMB] occurs 10 times within
the text, and in numerous syntactic positions. It often occurs within the text as an expected or anticipated outcome (such as in line 2, you want to be dumb, or line 18, feels so good to be dumb), and other times as an idealized condition that results in a positive outcome (such as in being dumb is fun in 4, and being dumb is so much easier in 17). The fact that these phrases can appear in multiple syntactic positions, as well as both within and between stanzas, suggests that their repetition plays a key role in maintaining cohesion within the text, continuously reminding the listener of its intended effects.

Repetition can also occur through elision, in that syntactic patterns present in one line can carry over into subsequent lines. The third stanza (lines 13-18), for example, suggest that by being dumb, the listener is free of thought, of worry, of pain, of responsibility (lines 13-16). The repetition of the syntactic structures free of x equates thought with three qualities that are often seen as negative: worry, pain, and responsibility. Being dumb, according to the trance, means to be free of such negative qualities, since being dumb is so much easier (line 17). In fact, the listener is told that you want your brain to shrink (line 19), because a small brain is good (line 20) and it is easier to have a small brain, easier not to think (lines 22-23). In these lines, the word brain is being metaphorically used to refer to both one’s physical brain (which, ideally, is not easily able to shrink) and one’s mental capacity. By being told that you want your brain to shrink, the listener is told to picture his physical brain, and thus his mental capacity, getting smaller—a condition that both feels good and is easier to have.

Finally, the listener is told that you want to listen to this file, as often as you can, because it makes you feel good, it makes you feel dumb, and that feels good (lines 32-36). As in lines 13-16, the repetition of the phrase makes you feel equates the qualities good and dumb, suggesting that the qualities of feeling good and feeling dumb are identically-ideal qualities that the listener should aspire to. The repetition of the phrase feeling good in lines 40 and 41 similarly equate being dumb and listening to the file, further pushing the listener to consume the file as often as he can.
The trance presented in (10) demonstrates qualities within the text that readily identify it as both a hypnotic trance, and specifically as a direct trance that places the listener-subject in a particular relation to it. The regular use of repetition of syntactic phrases, and the usage of particular types of metaphor, present the text as an example of a larger genre of hypnosis that uses similar methods to place suggestions into the listener’s mind. The total lack of modality further places this trance into a ‘direct’ category that minimizes agency on the part of the listener.

Similar patterns can be seen in another trance, posted to the messageboard. Much like (10) above, the poster of the trance (SJ) provides background information as to what he would like his trance to achieve:

(11) I'm trying to write my own script to make me addicted to working out and eating healthy, to achieve a low body fat and a drive to build muscle for the rest of my life. (SJ, 37:1)

In (11), JS claims to be creating his own trance to make me addicted to working out and eating healthy. The use of the phrase make me addicted is particularly telling. Addiction is normally perceived as a negative quality in an individual, and usually signifies that the behavior the person is ‘addicted’ to (such as drugs, alcohol, or overeating) is detrimental to the person’s overall well-being; in addition, the word addicted suggests that the person has little control over their behavior when presented with the substance to which they are addicted. For SJ, however, the word addicted takes on a positive connotation: he would like to become addicted to behaviors that are normally seen as healthy. Here, though, it still retains the connotation of being unable to control one’s behavior. SJ would like to become addicted to working out and eating healthy, and he hopes that the script he wrote help him
have no control over his desires. Thus, SJ hopes his trance will be effective in making him submissive to his desires.

He then posts the text of the trance (12) below:

(12)  1 "You are a bodybuilder.
2     You eat like a bodybuilder.
3     You exercise like a bodybuilder.
4     You enjoy working out.
5     You only eat what helps you to become a better bodybuilder.
6     Working out everyday makes you happy.
7     You will only eat foods that help you build muscle and stay healthy.
8     Eating healthy foods makes you horny.
9     Getting horny makes you hard.
10    Being hard reminds you to eat healthy.
11    You wake up wanting to work out.
12    You go to work wanting to work out.
13    You go to lunch wanting to work out.
14    You leave work wanting to work out.
15    You workout every day after work.
16    You want to work out.
17    Working out makes you happy.
18    You workout safely to exhaustion.
19    You workout safely to muscle fatigue.
20    You workout safely like a bodybuilder.
21    You workout safely with every rep at full intensity.
22    Intensity makes you horny.
23    Getting horny makes you hard.
24    Being hard reminds you to eat healthy.
25    Once you start to work out, you won't be satisfied until you are fatigued.
26    Once you start to work out, you won't stop until your exhausted.
27    Once you start to work out, you work out like a bodybuilder.
28    After every workout you shower.
29    Showering makes you horny.
The trance presented in (12) shares many similarities with the trance in (10), but a close analysis also shows marked differences in how this trance presents its listener-subject. As in (10), the trance is intended to persuade the listener to engage in a particular type of behavior—in this instance, to work out and eat healthy, in order to gain muscle mass and become a bodybuilder. However, this trance is not meant to ‘dumb’ the listener down: the lemma *dumb* does not appear at all in (12). Nevertheless, this trance is intended to elicit within the listener a strong desire to want to work out and achieve the physique of a bodybuilder, especially through eating healthy (although what is considered
‘eating healthy’ is not addressed within the trance. Thus, just as in (10), the subject you in (12) is constructed as an individual who is to be single-mindedly directed towards a particular goal.

It is also interesting to note that in (12), just as in (10), you is one of the most frequently-occurring words in the text. However, unlike (10), you is the single most frequently-occurring word within the text, appearing 56 times (total words = 346), making up 16.1% of the total word count. Like (10), to is also one of the most frequently-occurring words (22 tokens), accounting for 6.4% of the total word count. Makes is the third-most-frequently-occurring word (15 tokens, 4.3%). Other frequent words include out (14 tokens), healthy (12 tokens), horny (12 tokens), hard (12 tokens), work (12 tokens), eat (11 tokens), and bodybuilder (8 tokens). Taken together, these ten words make up 50% of the entire word count of the trance. As in (10), a small amount of key words are continuously repeated throughout the text to demonstrate their importance in achieving the trance's desired effect.

The high frequency of you in the text suggests that the listener is being continuously addressed within the trance: tokens of you occur in every line except once (line 42, packing your clothes is a promise to workout), and can occur more than once in a single line (as in line 5). In 32 instances, you appears as the subject of a clause, while in 24 you appears as an object. Table 5-2 (see Appendix) lists all of the occurrences of you as subject and object, and the relevant process types associated with each token. When compared with Table 5-1, some interesting differences arise. Unlike in (10), where mental process types were the most frequently co-occurring with you as subject, in (10) material processes emerge as the most numerous, with 22 instances. The most frequent material processes accompanying you in these instances are eat (7 instances) and workout (6 instances). Although perhaps unsurprising to find these so frequent in the trance above (whose motive is to elicit a desire to eat healthily and work out within the listener), it does help to construct the subject as singularly-focused in his desire to achieve those aims. Other material process types present in (10) include start (three
tokens), *wake up, go to work, go to lunch, leave work, shower, and go home*. What is interesting about these examples, however, is that they are all accompanied by the phrase [lemma WORK + OUT], suggesting that these activities are only important insofar as they relate to the act of exercise. Thus, the subject is constructed as having two main goals (eating healthy and working out), and all other activity must necessarily revolve around these two goals.

Much like the trance presented in (10), the trance in (12) also contains relational and mental process-types. In all cases of relational process types, the listener you is imagined to belong a set of all things sharing a physical (*you are fatigued*, line 25) or emotional (*you won’t be satisfied*, line 25) characteristic. Especially important, however, is the attributive relational process type present in line 1 in the trance: *you are a bodybuilder*. Much as in (10), the trance begins by identifying the listener as already belonging within the set of the goal, in this case being a bodybuilder. Identifying the listener as his goal in the beginning of a trance, then, seems to be a common feature for some trances. The mental process types in (12) include *enjoy, want, love, like,* and *take pride*: all of these seem to suggest positive feelings associated with activities, helping further to construct the subject you as someone who is desiring his goal of being a bodybuilder, and who will do what is need to be done in order to achieve that goal.

Unlike instances of you as subject, which demonstrate a wider range of process types, you as object seems to be much more constrained in terms of process types in (13). In the 24 instances in (13) where you is presented as a non-subject within a clause, it participates in a material process type in 18 cases, where a change is being enacted upon the listener. As in (10), these types of changes are highly constrained: in 15 instances of you-as-non-subject, you is being made to do something 15 times. Thus, you is often being changed by an agent of some kind: the most frequent agent that makes you change is *getting horny*, which appears six times in the phrase *getting horny makes you hard*. The frequent
repetition of this statement throughout the text further reiterates the important of repetition within hypnotic trances, and helps to locate the text within the larger genre of hypnotic trance. Other actors that enact a change in you include *working out, eating, planning healthy bodybuilding meals, intensity, showering,* and *getting home.* These actions make you *happy* or you *horny.* By frequently using the verb *makes* with non-subject you, and by associating these material processes with happy, horny, and hard, a subject emerges who is experiencing pleasure and sexual arousal through daily activities, all centered around the ideas of working out and eating healthily. In the six remaining cases where the subject you is the object of the clause, you is being reminded of something (verbal process): however, all of these cases are represented by the same phrase *being hard reminds you to eat healthy.* The repetition of this phrase further serves to index (12) as a hypnotic trance.

Just as in the trance presented in (10), the trance in (12) demonstrates an almost complete lack of modal auxiliary verbs. Ultimately, the trance is enacting total control over the subject you by constructing him as an individual who will fully listen to the trance, and experience its effects, without hesitation or choice. However, unlike in (10), where only one modal auxiliary verb is present, some do appear in (12). Will appears three times (in lines 25, 27, and 37), although its status as a strong modal verb still allows for little choice on the part of the listener. The only modal auxiliary verb that demonstrates some degree of agency is present in line 32 (*after working out, you can go home happy*), which, at the very least, may provide some choice for the listener.

Through the specific lexical and syntactic features present within them, the trances presented in (10) and (12) thus locate themselves squarely within the genre of the hypnotic trance. Specifically, both trances represent a direct style of trance that minimizes agency on the part of the listener, and constructs the listener as someone who has little choice but to follow the directions given. These 'directions,' moreover, construct the listener as engaging in activities that are congruent with a jock
identity as idealized on OnYourKnees: a person who is dumb, who enjoys being dumb, and whose energy should be directed solely to the pursuits of achieving an idealized jock body. Although (10) and (12) highlight different aspects of a jock identity, they both use a lack of modality to construct the listener-subject as someone who has little say in questioning the directives of the trance. Trances, in essence, control the listener and put them in a subordinate position, not just to the hypnotist, but to the feelings and desires of becoming a jock and enacting a jock identity. The trance becomes an important vehicle through which this subordination can be realized.

Evaluations of trances:

The above discussion demonstrated that the linguistic structure of trances posted on OnYourKnees conforms, in many ways, to linguistic constructions of trances within clinical hypnosis. In particular, the lack of modal verbs, the positioning of listener you as having very little agency, and the frequent use of repetition aligns with a 'direct' style of hypnosis. This style of hypnosis helps to position its listener as subordinate, having little power to resist the suggestions present in the trance: this subordination, furthermore, contributes to an ideology that sees jocks as subordinate to not only coaches, but to their desires to become jocks. By listening to trances, jocks are able to improve themselves on their journey to realize their desired selves.

When messageboard users post trances on OnYourKnees, they are often discussed: posters evaluate their effectiveness, offer praise for the trances, and suggest improvements. In many cases, posters will relate their experiences listening to a trance, and whether or not it was effective in allowing the listener to enact a jock identity:
In (13), HD discusses his experience with a particular trance, which he had listened to pretty solid for couples of days. For HD, buying the trance was the best fukin 20 bucks i ever spent: he relates that ever since he began listening to the file he has trouble thinking straight especially the morning after listening, unless I'm thinking about my job or hitting the gym. Cant fukin wait to renew my membership and get started again (HD, 290:5)

Testimonials such as these (which are not unlike those found in informercials and other marketing materials that are designed to get consumers to buy a product) not only extol the virtues of a particular trance, but strengthen the important role trances play in the general realization of jock identity.

Discussions revolving around the textual structure of trances also provide insights into what makes a 'good' trance, and what qualities should be avoided. Often, these discussions demonstrate some posters' nuanced understanding of trances, especially as they are practiced within a clinical setting. One poster, for example, (correctly) notes that a hypnotic trance often consists of three distinct parts:

(14) To put together a file, you need an Induction, a Body [or you can string together several file bodies] and a Wake-Up [unless you want to use this as a file for when you sleep, in which case an alarm clock works better]. (OS, 188:2)

In (14), OS demonstrates his knowledge of how trances are used in psychological domains by claiming that they need an Induction, a Body [...] and a Wake-Up. By offering this knowledge to the messageboard, OS aligns his conception of a trance (and, presumably, the practice of trance in general
on OnYourKnees) to larger institutions of psychology, and by extension to a greater degree of legitimacy.

Often, suggestions for improving trances include adding text that may help listeners more easily achieve a jock identity. One poster, OB, offers the following suggestion to WI's trance (posted in (12) above:

(15) You might wanna add a few things like how you'll kno ur dumb like
"you nedd to count on ur fingers to add"
"u nedd to sound out words when u read"
"thaz how u kno ur dum" (OB, 36:3)

In (15), OB notes that the effectiveness of WI's trance (and the pleasure that it can elicit in listeners) can be improved by adding suggestions that integrate public recognition of one’s dumbness, including needing to count on fingers in order to be able to add, and needing to sound out words in order to read them. These suggested improvements seem to imply that although WI’s trance may be effective in causing the listener to become dumb, it does not specify how dumb the listener is meant to become: OB suggests incorporating metrics that listeners can use to test their dumbness. In (15), OB reveals a particular conception of dumbness that includes trouble with basic arithmetic and reading skills (which, as discussed in Chapter 4, some messageboard participants might find problematic and undesirable). For OB, WI’s trance does not go far enough in satisfying his understanding of dumbness, and would like to see more concrete examples present in the text.

Discussions of specific trances can sometimes broaden into larger discussions that attempt to discern what textual qualities hasten effects of trances, and what qualities might be a detriment. OB, for example, also posted his experiences with SJ’s trance in (10), and highlighted a flaw that he saw in the trance that was later omitted:
I'm familiar with the file. I was [SJ’s] beta tester. I pointed out one bad feature in the version he sent me: he had a section in there about "only being able to have sex with your wife" which didn't work for me, as I'm gay and can't get married. I pointed out this flaw and he obviously rewrote it before he recorded it. (OB, 37:4)

In (16), OB notes that by being SJ’s first listener for his trance, he already had familiarity with the file. This suggests that posters may share files with each other privately before posting them to the messageboard. OB found one passage in the original trance problematic: a section that deals with “only being able to have sex with your wife.” OB found this distracting and ineffective, as I’m gay and can’t get married (it is important to note that this post was written before the Supreme Court’s decision to legalize same-sex marriage in the U.S. in 2015). For OB, the inclusion of a passage about having sex with one’s wife conflicted with his then-inability to get married (although, interestingly, not necessarily with the idea of having sex with a woman), which in his mind did not seem to align with the message presented in the rest of the trance. This flaw in the text, he notes, was pointed out and removed before the trance was posted to the messageboard.

Stating his previous familiarity and status as a beta-tester for the trance has an additional consequence for OB: he is now recognized by other posters as someone who has experience with trances, and whose advice about what makes a good trance is especially heeded by others. This recognition becomes evident when a poster takes the opportunity within the thread to ask OB the following:

One thing I wanted to ask. I've heard a lot of people say that you should avoid negatives in hypnosis, is this definitely a good rule to stick by, or is it something that can be ignored? (JW, 37:5)
In (17), JW is asking if negative phrases within a hypnotic trance (such as *don't do X*) are as effective as positive phrases (i.e., *do X*). OB responds to JW with (18):

(18) You definitely want to avoid negatives in hypnosis. It's the old "I bet you can't not think of an orange rhinoceros" trick. To process a negative, the brain has to first picture the idea/object/whatever – just what you want to avoid – and then negate it. With a little ingenuity, you can phrase anything in a positive light and attach positive emotions to it. I find that a more pleasing way to proceed. (OB, 37:9)

In (18), OB claims that creators of trances *definitely want to avoid negatives in hypnosis*. As discussed above, the use of positive phrases in hypnotic trances reflects the view of some hypnotists (such as Fromm and Nash 1997) that phrases which signify some sort of doubt are not conducive to the subject's ability to perform a certain task or achieve a particular mental state. OB states later in his post that *with a little ingenuity, you can phrase anything in a positive light and attach positive emotions to it*, further constructing an effective hypnotic trance as one that allows listeners to picture the idea/object/whatever through the avoidance of negatives.

It is interesting to note that in a previous post, JW himself offers constructive criticism to an audio trance that another poster offered to the messageboard (and in which the file in question is no longer available). Although the trance itself is no longer accessible, JW's comments suggest additional qualities of what makes a successful trance:

(19) I've been following your files for quite a while and I've noticed a definite improvement. Your diction has definitely improved and you seem to slur a lot less, which makes it easier to listen to what you're saying. Your tone also has improved from I remember and you have much better pacing.

A small comment: watch the sudden change in your tone at times. You saying "push" louder actually shocked me out of the trance I was falling into. Also, this may just be me personally, but don't try to make make the trance about you, at least not to quickly. Try to make the
potential subject feel safe and in control, like you're suggesting, not demanding. Let their mind
give into you.

The sudden change to talking at me in bro-speak also threw me a bit. I was definitely enjoying
the file a lot more before that. Try to speak as a suggesting force rather than a fellow bro
demanding things of me. I like some of the concepts, but I think that some would work better as
a fetish audio story rather than a hypnosis file. Some of it could work as a hypno file, but I think
that a different approach would be better. (JW, 25:4)

In (19), JW lets the poster know that he has been following your files for quite a while, and that
he has noticed a definite improvement in the poster's trance. He notes that the poster's diction has
definitely improved, and that he seems to slur a lot less, which adds to the trance's clarity. Although the
audio is unavailable to compare JW's description with, it seems that a slower speech rate, with clearly
enunciated words, allows the listener to comprehend what the speaker is saying much easier. Then, JW
suggests that the poster watch the sudden change in your tone: he notes that saying some words (such
as push) at a louder volume than their surrounding words can shock [a listener] out of the trance. He
further suggests that the poster refrain from making the trance about you, at least not to quickly: he
suggests that minimizing a focus on the speaker will make the potential subject feel safe and in control,
like you're suggesting, not demanding. For JW, it is imperative that the listener feel safety and control,
and that the speaker control the tone of his voice so that the act of becoming tranced is suggested, not
demanded. Using such words as safe, control, and suggesting suggests that JW is aware that the
listener must feel comfortable with the trance in order for it to be most effective. He thus positions the
listener-subject as a person whose safety and feeling of control are of prime importance, and should not
be violated (a sentiment which is reiterated in the phrase let their mind give into you, where let
suggests that the listener is allowing his control to be given over, and can reclaim it at any given time).

JW gives another suggestion to the poster-in-question: he notes that the sudden change to
talking at me in bro-speak also threw me a bit. Because the audio of the trance is unavailable, it is
unclear as to what phonological/prosodic qualities make up this 'bro-speak' (although the next chapter will attempt to point out what some of these qualities might look like). Regardless of what features make up this 'bro-speak', however, JW suggests that the poster try to speak as a suggesting force rather than a fellow bro demanding things of me. JW's comment here is important for two reasons. First, he reiterates the word suggest to further construct the listener as an active participant in the hypnotic process; he contrasts the word suggesting with demanding in the next clause, mirroring his comments made previously in his post. In addition, JW interprets the poster's current voice as a fellow bro demanding things of me. The use of the term fellow bro identifies both JW and the poster of the trance as aligned with a jock identity, and therefore similar to each other: to JW, because of this equal status, a fellow bro should not be in any position to demand something from another 'bro.' A trance that consists of 'bro-speak' has the potential to produce an ineffectual trance, insomuch as the speaker of the trance should not be identifiable as a 'bro' (i.e., a jock). Speaking in a 'bro' register, JW seems to imply, blurs the barrier between dominance and submission, and between jock and coach—a barrier that JW feels should not be breached.

JW's post in (19) suggests that certain vocal qualities are more desirable than others in a trance: trances that use 'bro-speak' may be less desirable than those that do not because they do not align with messageboard-specific ideologies of jocks-as-submissive.

Accent, too, may play a role in creating a successful trance. In (20), EW offers his services for recording trances for the following reason:

(20) Well, I have - I'm told - a suave and smooth English accent, so first of all I'd like to offer my services if anyone needs a VO recorded with those kind of associations, you know, English, intellectual-sounding, genuine melodious and rich voice. (EW, 151:1)
In (20), EW claims that he has *a suave and smooth English accent*, which he associates with *intellectual-sounding, genuine melodious and rich*. EW's claims align with larger ideologies of varieties of English which demonstrate that British English patterns of speech (specifically, Received Pronunciation) are more favorably viewed than those of other varieties of English (Rindal 2010, but see Scott et al. 2007 for an opposing argument). By associating his *suave and smooth* accent with higher intellect and sophistication, and by claiming that his voice would be ideal for trances, EW thus indexes an association between the speaker of the trance–someone who is highly intelligent and cosmopolitan–and the ideal identity of a dominant-identified person on OnYourKnees, thereby maintaining a links between intelligence and domination.

The discussions of trances, as shown in (13-20), demonstrates that posters relate their own personal understandings of what a trance should accomplish, and how a trance should sound, to larger ideologies of hypnotic trance that, in large part, conform to clinical ideologies of hypnosis. Participants discuss the value of 'positive' versus 'negative' language, provide improvements that reflect speaker-specific ideologies of jock identity, and suggest ways of speaking that locate the speaker of the trance as someone who is authoritative.

But the posting and discussion of trances also, in their own way, contribute to ideologies of consent and trust. When a poster makes a file available to the messageboard community, or posts text of a trance they wish to create, it is with the full understanding that individuals are free to–or free to *not*–listen to the trance if they wish. Posters understand that listening to a trance without a hearer's consent is a strong violation, and attempts by posters to trance individuals without their consent often leads to being banned from the messageboard (note that WJ in (9) and JS in (11) make explicit their intention to solicit feedback for their trances before posting them, potentially mitigating the possibility of interpretation that they are trying to hypnotize someone without consent). In many cases, these
'unsolicited' attempts at trance take the form of written posts that do not claim to be trances themselves, but incorporate linguistic strategies of trances that are recognizable by other members of the community. Post (21) below represents such an example:

(21) I am looking for white men to become my sex slave through the process of hypnosis. You will obey and serve me. You have no will power. Your mind belongs to me now. I want only white men. NO minorities should apply. Only weak white men. You will contact me ASAP and you will begin to the process of being hypnotized over and over again. You will obey me and only me. I am your master. You have no master. I am your master. I am your master. I am your master. You will contact me today. You will obey and serv me. You have no will power. You will serve and obey only [DR]. (DR, 215:1)

In (21), the poster (DR) states that he is looking for white men to become my sex slave through the process of hypnosis.19 Although (21) is presented in written form, many textual patterns appear in (21) that locate it squarely within the genre of 'direct' hypnotic trance. The collocation of subject you with the strong modal verb will (which appears seven times) suggests that the listener has little agency in deciding whether or not to follow the commands written by DR. Readers are told that they will obey and serve DR, that they will contact DR as soon as they can, and they will begin [...] the process of being hypnotized. The listener you participates primarily in material processes (obey, serve) that place the listener is a position of deference to the speaker, and in relational processes (have [no]) that suggest the listener does not have the capacity to resist the speaker's suggestions. The speaker I, on the other hand, participates primarily in behavioral processes (am looking, want) that suggest a great deal of agency on his part; in addition, the speaker I participates in a relational process in the phrase I am your master (which repeats four times in the above), suggesting that the listener should equate the speaker

---

19 This post, one of the only that specifically addresses racial characteristics, brings up the problematic notion of unmarked whiteness on OnYourKnees, and will be addressed in the Conclusion.
with *your master*. Repetition of verbs (*obey, serve, contact*) and phrases (*I am your master, you have no master*) also helps to identify DR's text as a hypnotic trance.

Although DR does not identify his post as a trance in (21), it is nonetheless identified as one by other members of the messageboard. The posting of (21) led to a moderator of the messageboard, MM, banning DR from further posting on OnYourKnees. In a subsequent post, MM discovered that DR had posted similar messages in the past using alternative usernames, which were also banned from further posting. In response to one of these other posts, MM explained the following to the messageboard community:

(22) I didn't have a chance to log in yesterday, but today I am and I'd just like to say that group messages trying to hypnotize members will NOT be tolerated. We of course encourage masters/tists and subs to meet and work on a one on one basis. Scripts or Audio Files that clearly state their intended purpose are fine as well - that exact same message could have been posted in a text document with a warning and all would have been good. But group messages that go straight into such a script are NOT accepted. (MM, 126:4)

In (22), MM states that *group messages trying to hypnotize members will NOT be tolerated.* MM requests that scripts and audio files that are posted to the messageboard *clearly state their intended purpose,* and *messages that go straight into such a script are NOT accepted.* For MM, and for other members of the messageboard, reading a script without realizing it to be a script constitutes a severe breach of etiquette. If members should wish to be hypnotized, they can only do so with their full knowledge and consent: any attempts to covertly hypnotize posters are not tolerated and result in sanctions. But what seems to be especially important about (22) is that MM does not specify exactly how DR's posts are recognized as trances. Recognition of a piece of text on OnYourKnees as a hypnotic trance requires that the characteristics of a hypnotic trance be easily-recognizable and
socially-salient. The above discussion demonstrated that trances on OnYourKnees can be identified by a series of linguistic features that both align with larger conceptions of hypnotic trance (especially within clinical psychology) and are specific to the practice of posters. MM's discussion of DR's post demonstrates that these features are not only salient in recognizing an audio file as a trance, but a written text as well. For MM, the written text of a hypnotic trance is just as potentially dangerous as a spoken text—and posters who use trance-like writing in their posts without first notifying the community are seen as transgressing boundaries of consent.

Many posters on OnYourKnees engage with the genre of the hypnotic trance in relatively limited ways, praising them and discussing their content. Other posters, however, use the genre of the trance in a more personal way, expressing their desire to be tranced to realize an idealized identity that is starkly contrasted with a current, less-than-ideal self. (23), below, is typical of such a post:

(23) I have a challenge for the real mind warpers out there can you change a shy introverted socially inept nerd with little confidence in himself as a person and negative self image into a confident, bordering on cocky, open, self-assured, muscular jock athlete. (AW, 218:1)

In (23), AW presents himself as a *challenge for the real mind warpers out there*. The phrase *real mind warpers* suggests that he is speaking primarily to those hypnotists who have both experience and success in creating trances that help jocks realize their identity. He characterizes himself as a *shy introverted socially inept nerd with little confidence [...] and negative self image*, and expresses his desire to change into a *confident, bordering on cocky, open, self-assured, muscular jock athlete*. Here, AW juxtaposes two different identities: a 'current' self that he sees as undesirable (which is shy, socially awkward, and unconfident) and an imagined 'ideal' self that is framed in a much more positive
light. The identity AW currently possesses is unwanted; the identity AW aspires to is an attractive hunky package, and he hopes that hypnosis will help him reach that goal.

In his research on racist discourse, van Dijk (2008) notes that one of the most robust strategies for the maintenance of systems of domination is the construction of discourse that portrays some individuals ('We') in a wholly positive light, and others ('Them') much more negatively. He notes that "in interaction, people try to act, and hence to speak, in such a way that their interlocutors construct an 'impression' of them that is as positive as possible, or at least speakers try to avoid a negative impression" (123). Being 'racist,' van Dijk argues, is often seen as a 'fundamental,' ingrained quality of a person that is not easily resistant to change. When dominant (most often White) members of a society engage in racist discourse, it is often framed in such a way as to portray the speaker as non-racist, often with such qualifiers as "I'm not racist, but...". By hedging their racist remarks in such a way, many individuals who would otherwise be considered racists are able to construct themselves as separate entities from their thoughts, which further allows them to lay claim to the idea that they are 'good' people and proper citizens. The act of hedging such remarks further serves to objectify the targets of those remarks, creating the impression that, as an undifferentiated group, they are 'bad' people. Through this way, those who make racist remarks remain 'good,' and retain the power to construct themselves as such.

AW, in (23), seems to be using a similar strategy by constructing a 'negative' self and a 'positive' self. However, for AW, both the negative and positive selves that he identifies are temporal: he defines his current self as shy, socially-introverted, and 'nerdy,' and he contrast this self with a more positively-framed, future, ideal self: confident, cocky, and self-assured. By contrasting these two selves, AW not only aligns with an idealized jock identity that has much currency on OnYourKnees, but adds to that value because that is who he is not now. His negative self-image, furthermore, can
only be reversed by the real mind warpers out there: the hypnotists who create trances, and whose trances can help AW realize his ideal. For AW, hypnosis is not just a way to realize his ideal self: it is the way in which he can transform himself.

A similar sentiment can be seen in (24) below:

(24) I do have a few things I would like to accomplish with hypnosis. While I am not fat, I could stand to lose some weight, or even become more muscular. Doing this under your suggestions and tutelage would be ideal, I would also like to be able to enjoy myself more when I'm with guys. I get very nervous when I'm being intimate with guys, many times to the point where I can't come, I would love to lower my inhibitions some. (MG, 157:1)

In (24), MG claims that he could stand to lose some weight (although he refrains from calling himself fat), or even become more muscular. Here, MG presents his 'current' self as someone who does not have the idealized muscular jock body. Interestingly, he also notes that he get[s] very nervous when I'm being intimate with guys, to the point where it becomes sexually problematic, suggesting that his very identity as a gay male is somewhat problematic. MG believes that hypnosis will not only allow him to achieve what he believes is an ideal body, but also to enjoy myself more when I'm with guys. For MG, hypnosis is not merely a tool for achieving a jock identity: it is a means through which he can achieve a gay identity that feels comfortable having sexual encounters with other men.

For AG and MG, and for many other posters on OnYourKnees, the hypnotic trance is not merely a vehicle through which contours of jock and coach identity, and contours of domination and submission, can be enacted and maintained. For these posters, the trance becomes an important tool in making what they see as improvements in their lives. The posters above contrast an undesirable 'current' self with an idealized and highly-sought-after 'future' self, and view the trance as a key component of the way to achieve those selves.
Conclusion:

This chapter demonstrated that posters on OnYourKnees engage with the hypnotic trance in numerous ways that reflect its importance in their messageboard activities. As a genre, hypnosis can be identified by numerous lexical and syntactic characteristics that identify it as such, and that can be used by messageboard posters as a manifestation of their desire to enact a jock identity. An analysis of two trances suggested that, when posters incorporate texts of trances into their activities, they use the trances as a way to construct themselves as individuals with little agency, who wish to become single-minded in pursuing activities that will help them achieve an idealized jock identity. Through the strategic use of modality and transitivity, posters position themselves within the trances as subjects who are, essentially, controlled by their desires to become jocks, and to participate in activities that will help them realize their goals. In addition, an analysis of discussions about trances demonstrate that posters often have sophisticated understandings of how to construct trances that align with larger psychological-clinical uses of hypnosis, and posters use this knowledge to view the trance as a vehicle through which they can achieve their idealized identities.

Hypnosis, then, becomes a way through which posters incorporate texts into their self-realizations. However, the use of hypnotic texts is not the only way in which jock and coach identities can be realized, and recognized as such by posters on OnYourKnees. Throughout this analysis, excerpts from the messageboard have been presented in their entirety, as a reader of OnYourKnees would encounter them. Readers of the messageboard might be struck by the fact that some posters demonstrate deviations from standard American English orthographic conventions, including innovative spellings that deviate from standard American English, a consistent lack of subject I,
creative uses of uppercasing and lowercasing. Far from being random, or a mere artefact of variety in orthographic styles, the next chapter will attempt to show that such innovations in orthography play an important role in projecting and enacting jock and coach identities. Indeed, it is not only *what* is said, but *how* it is said.
Chapter 6: Jock and coach orthography on OnYourKnees

(1) I've always been fascinated with "bro speak" and "dude speak". Any advice or files on learning to talk like a bro or dude? (LF, 23:1)

(2) "bro speak/ dude speak" isn't something you learn its something you do bro (BB, 23:2)

(3) Yeah like either your a dude or your not (HS, 23:3)

Throughout this entire analysis, much attention has been paid to how posters on OnYourKnees display a series of ideologies and behaviors that both contradict and complement each other. On one hand, posters on OnYourKnees uphold traditional Western notions of masculinity as something to desire and strive towards. They achieve this by creating a world in which some men are deliberately (and willingly) subjugated by others who are seen as more powerful, while at the same time asserting certain ideologies on being proper jocks and coaches. On the other hand, posters disassemble those notions by aligning with sexual ideologies that value trust and full consent among all participants, and by using lexical items that index them as belonging to a larger BDSM-identified community. These two strands of thought run through all activity on OnYourKnees, creating a unique world in which men can explore their sexual desires without fear or reproach.

Up until now, however, relatively little attention has been paid to how jocks and coaches construct themselves on a textual level: how they take advantage of distinct lexical, syntactic, and orthographic forms to help index their identities as jocks and coaches. This chapter will argue that the distinction between jocks and coaches, just as it manifests in the content of posts, can also be demonstrated in the form of their posts. Jocks and coaches engage in distinct ways of describing
themselves and others that rely on understanding themselves as subjects in different ways: orthographic form, this chapter will argue, is instrumental to further indexing their jock and coach identities.

It must be said that, throughout the entire corpus, there is very little discussion of what a jock or coach should 'sound' like: numerous discussions are dedicated to how idealized jocks should act, but there are very few examples of posters describing how a jock or coach should speak. Examples (1) - (3) above represent the only posts within the corpus that attempt to describe a jock's speech style. In (1), LF asks if there is any advice posters can give, or any files that he can listen to, that will allow him to achieve a distinct style of speech that he terms bro speak and dude speak. The use of the adjectives bro and dude is telling here, in that it acknowledges the possibility of a style of speech that indexes its users as jocks, and can potentially index such qualities as physical power and solidarity among the working class (Kiesling 2004, 1998). Interestingly, this is a question that does not elicit many responses: BB and HS are the only two posters who answer LF, and their posts seem less than helpful. BB claims that bro speak and dude speak are not styles of speech that are learnable, but are rather something you simply do. HS reaffirms BB's comment with his own: it is interesting to note that both HS and BB do acknowledge the existence of bro speak and dude speak, but claim that they are an integral part of one's being. It cannot simply be learned: only 'real' bros and dudes can use that speech.

Thus, bro speak and dude speak remain undefined on OnYourKnees. But looking at the posts in (2) and (3) suggests that the question has more merit than what HS and BB afford it. In (2), BB demonstrates a missing apostrophe in its and a lack of capitalization, while in (3) HS replaces the contraction you're with the homophonous your. Taking these observations into account, this chapter will argue that there does, in fact, emerge distinct styles of orthography among jocks and coaches that depend on the deployment of specific lexical, syntactic, and orthographic styles that help to index a jock or coach identity. This chapter will demonstrate these emergent styles of writing in two ways.
First, using Halliday and Mathiessen's (2004) conception of process types, it will be argued that posters construct themselves and others, through their use of the nominal lemmas JOCK and COACH, in particular ways that reinforce contours of dominance and submission on OnYourKnees. Jocks, through the proliferation of relational process types that equate them with a jock identity, are essentialized: they are primarily seen as 'being' jocks. Coaches, on the other hand, are seen as doers: active agents who demonstrate a great deal of control over their circumstances, especially when it comes to their understanding and treatment of jocks.

Second, this chapter will also build on the work of Chambers (2017), and analyze the use of orthographic conventions among self-identified jocks and coaches. This chapter will argue that particular orthographic qualities emerge among the text of self-identified jocks and coaches that create and sustain links associating jocks with casualness and dumbness, and coaches with formality and intellect. Self-identified jocks, it will be argued, show greater usages of non-standard non-capitalization of sentences, non-capitalization of first-person I, and nonstandard spelling innovations. Self-identified coaches, on the other hand, show greater usages of standard sentence capitalization, and a greater adherence to standard American English spelling conventions. However, although these features seem to be relatively consistent among jocks and coaches, individual posters demonstrate great variability with orthography, and deploy it strategically to achieve particular communicative aims. This will be shown through an analysis of two excerpts of threads, in which speakers (both self-identified jocks) use these orthographic variables to demonstrate a state of being 'tranced,' or affected by hypnotic trances. Ultimately, this chapter will argue for the importance of orthography as a tool through which individuals can perform their identity, and can have implications for a critical discourse analytical framework that emphasizes how self and Other are created and maintained.
As mentioned in Chapters 4 and 5, Halliday and Mathiessen's (2004) Systemic-Functional Grammar has been used by many Critical Discourse Analysts to analyze the micro level of discourse: "how participants produce and interpret texts on the basis of their members' resources" (Fairclough 1992, 85). These 'members' resources' include the methods (lexical, syntactic, and orthographic) through which subjects are created and interpreted within texts. As Halliday and Mathiessen have noted, speakers have a wide variety of linguistic options open to them any time they describe a particular event or specific moment in time. In a situation where John puts a book on the shelf, for example, a speaker can choose to say *John put the book on the shelf* or *the book was put on the shelf by John*. Both sentences describe the same outcome (a book is now on the shelf because of John), but each sentence uses different syntactic methods to describe that outcome. This is achieved primarily through what has traditionally been called 'active' versus 'passive' tense, which highlights one participant (*John* in the first case, *the book* in the second) over the other, and can be exploited to put focus on one participant over another.

Many Critical Discourse Analysts have appealed to Systemic-Functional Grammar in their analyses to relate the particular grammatical and lexical arrangements within present within a text to larger-scale social structures that influence its construction and reading. Unlike Halliday and Mathiessen, who downplay the social ramifications of language use in favor of a framework more firmly anchored in grammar, Critical Discourse Analysts assume that language choice is deliberate, and meant to support or undermine larger social forces that position some individuals as more powerful than others. Thus, language use on the grammatical/lexical level is intimately related to power structures and ideological agendas: as Koller (2009) states, "the linguistic features of text at the micro-
level are influenced by the meso-level of discourse practice, which predicts who has access to what means of producing and distributing texts and who is in a position to receive what kinds of texts” (paragraph 2). Systemic-Functional Grammar has been seen to provide a framework through which linguistic features of texts (the micro level) can be taxonomized, and results can be extrapolated to larger-scale trends of domination and resistance.

Halliday and Mathiessen's concept of transitivity, for example, has been used to analyze how certain social actors are associated with particular verbs that assign them various amounts of agency. Whether it be post-invasion Iraq (Abid & Manan 2016), chemical weapons in Syria (Sharififar & Rahimi 2015), homosexuality within the Irish press (Bartley & Hidalgo-Tenorio 2015), representations of political parties within the Kenyan media (Matu & Lubbe 2007), or the construction of the 'wickedness' of Sadaam Hussein (Hidalgo Tenorio 2011), the choice of which subjects in a text undergo particular activities plays a key role in readers' understanding of subjects.

To demonstrate one example, Ghachem (2014), in an analysis of two newspaper articles written by (then)- president Barack Obama and UK Prime Minister David Cameron, explores the use of the pronoun we to create solidarity not only among the two heads of state, but also with an imagined audience who is set up in opposition to a similarly-imagined 'them' (in this case, those who wish to do harm to the U.S. and the UK). Ghachem analyzes the process types associated with we present in the two speeches, and notes that the majority of instances of we engage in are material processes, constructing we as entities who do things, and to whom things are done. By putting we in material processes, Obama and Cameron are seen as a unified active force that works to enact some sort of change within the world. Correspondingly, Ghachem also notes a comparative lack of mental process

---

20 See Chapter 5 for a further discussion of transitivity.
(such as *we think*) from the two authors, which she argues is intended to "leave[] no room for the readers to disagree with their discourse and to judge what they think of as right or wrong" (556). The exploitation of material processes and lack of mental processes, Ghachem concludes, can be interpreted as part of a larger strategy to unite Obama and Cameron as a single voice of authority, minimizing dissent between them and leaving no room for questioning.

Not all critical discourse analysts, however, fully appeal to Systemic-Functional Linguistics in relating textual structure to social relations. Van Leeuwen (2008), for example, believes SFL to be too strict in relating grammatical forms to particular readings of the world, arguing that "there is no neat fit between sociological and linguistic categories" (24). Instead, he advocates for what he calls a "sociosemantic inventory" of grammatical forms that does not rely on grammatical categories (such as Agent and Patient) *per se*, but rather on sociological categories that dictate the particular actions social actors within a text engage in. Actors in a text, for example, can be genericized (where they are represented as belonging to a particular class, such as *the immigrant* or *ordinary people*) or specified (where they are given a name within a text): although these categories have grammatical manifestations (genericized referents tend to occur as plural nouns without articles, or singular nouns with definite articles, while specified referents are not), they also allow readers to view certain actors in a text as more 'individual' than others and, therefore, possessive of an authority that is denied others.

Taking an approach that incorporates both sociological and linguistic factors into its analysis, he argues, not only moves an analysis from mere description into the realm of explanation, but can also help to make sense of seemingly contradictory data: different texts, intended for different audiences, can utilize grammatical and lexical choices in wildly different ways. Van Leeuwen (2008) notes, for example, the tendency for newspapers aimed at different class markets to genericize and specify people in different ways. Newspapers oriented towards the middle-class tend to specify individuals in
government and academic positions, while genericizing the mass public: newspapers oriented towards more working-class audiences, on the other hand, tend to specify members of the mass public (either through direct quoting or description of daily experiences), while genericizing the government or the computer industry. Van Leeuwen notes that this mirror-patterning reflects a strategy of erasing certain individuals who "are so symbolically removed from the readers' world of immediate experience, treated as distant 'others' rather than as people whom 'we' have to deal with in our everyday lives" (36). The familiar–the trustworthy–are named, while the unfamiliar–those who cannot be as easily trusted–remain nameless, and who is considered trustworthy and who is not can vary from community to community.

The following section will utilize Halliday and Mathiessen's concept of transitivity to examine how posters on OnYourKnees view themselves, others, and the world around them. Understanding that one of the main criticisms of critical discourse analysis has been its biased selection of texts and a tendency to 'cherry-pick' examples out of larger corpora that suit their own viewpoints, this section will follow Sriwimon & Zilli's (2017) framework for adopting a methodology that minimizes bias. First, a majority of the corpus of text on OnYourKnees was analyzed for instances of the nominalized lemmas JOCK and COACH that engage in process types: the decision was made to limit the analysis to these two words both for ease of analysis, and because these two terms are ideologically loaded on OnYourKnees. By analyzing what kinds of processes JOCK and COACH engage in, a larger sense of how posters on OnYourKnees view themselves and others can be ascertained. All instances where verbs were not recoverable from their context, or where JOCK or COACH were not present in a clause, were excluded from the analysis: this left a total of 328 instances of JOCK and 142 instances of COACH to be analyzed. Then, the verb that accompanied JOCK or COACH in its clause was categorized as belonging to one of Halliday and Mathiessen's (2004) six process types. The data was
further subdivided into whether it was uttered by a self-identified jock, self-identified coach, or by a poster who identified as neither, to attempt to ascertain differences in usage of process types among the three groups. Following Sriwimon and Zilli's recommendation that researchers should be "as truthful and transparent as possible in giving sufficient details about the data source" (137), relevant extracts from the corpus that illustrate different process types are excerpted in the discussion below.

Table 6-1 below demonstrates the processes that nominal JOCK engages in throughout the corpus.

Table 6-1: All instances of JOCK and relevant process types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>material</th>
<th>mental</th>
<th>relational</th>
<th>behavioral</th>
<th>verbal</th>
<th>existential</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOCKS</td>
<td>48 (20%)</td>
<td>56 (24%)</td>
<td>100 (42%)</td>
<td>14 (4%)</td>
<td>16 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACHES</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>18 (44%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>17 (34%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>17 (34%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all three groups, the most common processes are material, mental, and relational: this supports Halliday and Matthiessen's (2004) observation that "material, mental and relational are the main types of processes in the English transitivity system" (171). Self-identified jocks most often use nominal JOCK with relational processes (N=100 tokens, 42%), as do coaches (N=18 tokens, 44%). Those who identify as neither self-identified jocks nor coaches, however, engage with nominal JOCK most often in material processes (N=17 tokens, 34%) and relational processes (N=17 tokens, 34%). As Halliday and Matthiessen note, relational processes "relate one fragment of experience to another: this is the same as that, this is a kind of the other" (170). The proliferation of relational processes
associated with nominal JOCK among self-identified jocks and coaches suggests that both groups 'equate' a jock identity with something. Looking at relational processes more closely can give a clearer view as to what jock identities are being compared with, and if there are noticeable differences between jocks and coaches in the usage of these relational processes.

In English, relational processes are most often realized by the verbs *be* and *have*, although other verbs (such as *become*) can also participate in these processes. Halliday and Matthiessen differentiate between two types of relational processes, attributive and identifying. Attributive relational processes are those where "an entity has some class ascribed or attributed to it" (219): these relationships relate an item as belonging to a particular class of objects, and is often syntactically recognized by co-occurrence with an indefinite article (e.g., *Sarah is a teacher*). Attributive relational processes thus relate one object to a larger class of objects. In contrast, in identifying relational processes "some thing has an identity assigned to it" (227). These processes equate one item with another: they often co-occur with definite articles (e.g., *Sarah is the teacher*). Attributive and identifying relational processes thus relate objects to others in slightly different ways: attributive processes assume that there are other objects, besides the one present in the clause, that can fulfill the requirements of being in a particular class (Sarah is not the only teacher in the universe, for example), while identifying processes assume a one-to-one fit between object and category (Sarah is the only person who fulfills the requirement of being the teacher within the circumstances of the clause).

Relational processes find a correlate in van Leeuwen's (2008) distinction between functionalization and identification. Functionalization, he notes, occurs when "social actors are referred to in terms of an activity, in terms of something they do, for instance, an occupation or role" (42). Identification, on the other hand, occurs when "social actors are defined, not in terms of what they do, or but in terms of what they, more or less permanently, are" (42). While functionalization
most closely relates to processes in which actors are *doing* something, identification closely correlates with relational processes, in that speakers equate themselves (or others) with a larger imagined identity. By using relational processes, differences between speakers can be minimized, essentializing (cf. Bucholtz & Hall 2004) speakers and constructing them as part of the same population.

The prolific use of relational processes with JOCK among self-identified jocks thus suggests that jocks themselves are participating in a process where they imagine themselves to be a single, unified group. For self-identified jocks, the verb *be* occurs most often when nominal JOCK participates in relational processes (71 out of 100 tokens, 71%). In 33 of those 71 cases (46%), the speaking is comparing himself to a jock identity, as in (4) and (5) below (relevant processes are in bold):

(4) I guess I *been* a dumb jock along time before I was a dumb laborer lol (HS, 10:10)
(5) being a dumb jock *is* who i am (GT, 108:4)

In (4) and (5), the speakers (HS and GT) are equating themselves with the state of being a dumb jock through using the relational process *be*: in addition, (4) and (5) show the indefinite article *a* preceding *dumb jock*, suggesting an attributive relational process that imagines them as sharing qualities with a larger group of individuals. For all relational processes with nominal JOCK by self-identified jocks (100 total tokens), these attributive relational processes account for 79% (79 tokens): this suggests that when jocks discuss their orientation towards a jock identity, they imagine themselves as aligning with a set of qualities that other jocks share. They thus contribute to an ideology of a singular jock identity as being a goal that can be reached, and that can be shared by others.
Self-identified jocks, however, are not limited in their use of *be* to equate themselves with a larger jock identity: jocks can also discuss *becoming* a jock (18 tokens), or *turning into* a jock (4 tokens), as (6) and (7) below exemplify:

(6) need to bulk up and **become** a complete musclehead jock (JO, 109:32)
(7) **turn** my mind and me **into** a typical jock (BG, 232:1)

In (6) and (7), posters who, in future posts, self-identify as jocks (JO and BG) use the relational processes *become* and *turn into* to express their desires to enact a jock identity. For JO and BG, the pairing of nominal JOCK with the indefinite article *a* suggests that they wish to align with a jock identity is imagined to already exist, and in which they can share.

Table 6-1 above also demonstrates that self-identified coaches are most likely to engage with nominal JOCK in relational processes (18 out of 41 tokens, 44%). As with self-identified jocks, self-identified coaches are most likely to use the verb *be* in these relational processes: unsurprisingly, coaches do not compare themselves to jocks, but compare jocks with qualities that are expected of them, as (8) and (9) demonstrate:

(8) Muscle Jock - obsessed with muscle, goes shirtless a lot and otherwise muscle T's and tanks. (MM, 10:1)
(9) perhaps you could ask him to work with you feeling comfortable **being** both a muscle-craving jock and a gay man. (JO, 103:5)

In (8), MM associates jocks with particular behaviors and appearances, while in (9) JO advises another poster (who has questions about working with a particular hypnotist) on how to speak to his hypnotist. In both examples, coaches use relational processes to equate JOCK (and, subsequently,
those who wish to align with such an identity) with attributes that are seen as desirable for jocks to have.

Although 'others' (those who self-identify as neither jocks nor coaches) tend to associate JOCK with material processes more, they also use JOCK in relational processes rather frequently (17 out of 50 total tokens, 34%). Thus, they also contribute to an ideology that is prevalent on OnYourKnees: that jocks simply are. For many posters on OnYourKnees, regardless of orientation of self-identification, the prevalence of relational processes suggests that jocks are seen, and perhaps more importantly see themselves, as belonging to a larger imagined jock identity.

Although relational processes are the most common among self-identified jocks and coaches (and second-most-common among others), posters on OnYourKnees also associate JOCK with mental processes. Mental processes, according to Halliday and Mathiessen (2004), "are concerned with our experience of the world of our own consciousness" (197). Mental processes do not relate one entity to another, but rather relate the participant performing the process (called a Senser) via their consciousness to another entity (called the Phenomenon). Halliday and Mathiessen differentiate among four different types of verbs that can enter into mental processes: perceptive (verbs involving recognition, including perceive and see), cognitive (verbs involving thinking, including believe and suppose), desiderative (verbs denoting desire, including want and wish), and emotive (verbs associated with emotional states, including like, love, and hate).

As Table 1 shows, among self-identified jocks and coaches, mental processes are the second-most common processes that JOCK engages in. Among self-identified jocks, JOCK is engaged with a mental process in 56 tokens (24% of all occurrences), while among self-identified coaches, JOCK appears with a mental process in 11 of 41 instances (27%). Among all other posters, mental processes are the third-most common, accounting for 11 of 50 total tokens of JOCK (22%).
At first glance, this data might present something of a contradiction: Chapter 2 demonstrated that many posters on OnYourKnees build ideologies of dumbness into conceptions of jock identity, which is often marked by an inability or disinterest in thinking. It would seem counterintuitive, then, for self-identified jocks to engage in mental processes that involve thinking. But analyzing what mental processes most commonly occur with JOCK, which of the four sub-categories they belong to, and whether JOCK is acting as a Senser or a Phenomenon can give a clearer picture into how jocks are constructed as 'thinking' beings.

Among self-identified jocks, desiderative mental processes are most prevalent, accounting for 43 out of 56 total mental process tokens (77%). The most common desiderative processes are want (15 tokens), look for (9 tokens), and love (5 tokens), as (10-12) demonstrate:

(10) I **want** to be a ripped cocky jock so that my master can absolutely break down and take control of me (LA, 247:1)

(11) I'm **looking for** like a college frat jock (LF, 285:1)

(12) Dumb Jocks **love** to "feel" them. (RA, 118:1)

In (10) and (11), both LA and LF use mental processes to construct themselves as individuals who highly desire something. Interestingly, LA and LF are the Sensers of the clauses, while JOCK is the Phenomenon that is being desired or sought. This suggests that many jocks wish to attain a jock identity, or seek out things that will allow them to achieve that identity (in (11), LF is referring to a particular trance that will help him attain an identity of a *college frat jock*). In (12), RA is discussing how jocks love to feel "them" (referring to pushups and crunches): jocks, according to RA, look favorably upon the pain and discomfort associated with exercise.
The high frequency of mental processes suggest that self-identified jocks often construct themselves as desiring something: the object of these desires is most often a coach or file to help them become a jock, or the desire to become a jock itself. On the other hand, cognitive processes account for only 18% of mental processes (with 10 total tokens): jocks can sometimes *know* things (3 tokens) and *think* things (3 tokens), but not nearly with the same frequency as wanting something. Jocks are thus not particularly seen as *thinking* about things that they do not explicitly claim to want. In addition, emotive mental processes, where jocks demonstrate emotion, occur quite infrequently (only 3 out of 56 tokens), and perceptive mental processes are unrepresented among self-identified jocks. Thus, when jocks discuss themselves in terms of mental processes, they exhibit a strong preference to describe their desires as opposed to emotion or cognitive mental faculties.

Although many fewer tokens of mental processes with JOCK are represented among self-identified coaches and others, both groups also overwhelmingly prefer to use desiderative mental processes to describe the 'inner' thoughts of jocks. Self-identified coaches use desiderative processes to construct jocks in 7 out of the 11 tokens (with *look for* and *love* being the most prevalent), while other posters use desiderative processes in 6 out of 11 tokens. This can be seen in (13) and (14) below:

(13) *i am looking for* a young dumb jock or bodybuilder to brainwash and completely control. (JE, 181:1)

(14) jocks are insecure about their bodies and **seek** to company of other jocks for "protection and nurturing" (NK, 33:7)

In (13), JE (a self-identified coach) stresses his interesting in finding a *young dumb jock or bodybuilder* that he can brainwash and control, while in (14), NK (who does not make his self-identification known) is criticizing the text of one particular trance, which he feels inaccurately
portrays jocks as *insecure about their bodies* and feeling the need to associate with other jocks for protection. In both of these cases, JOCK is acting as a Phenomenon, suggesting that is an object of one's desire.

Although not as prevalent as relational and mental processes, it is important to note that JOCK also engages in material processes on OnYourKnees. Halliday and Mathiessen (2004) define material processes as "constru[ing] a quantum of change in the flow of events as taking place through some input of energy" (179). Material clauses are thus those that show one being (called an Actor) as enacting some sort of change or transformation onto another (referred to as the Goal). Material processes are thus verbs of agency, in that they demonstrate the ability of an Actor to effect some sort of change within the world.

Table 6-1 demonstrates that, in general, posters on OnYourKnees do not view JOCK as engaging in material processes. Among self-identified jocks, material processes occur with JOCK in only 48 out of 237 instances (20%), while self-identified coaches associate JOCK with material processes in only 5 out of 41 total instances (12%). Interestingly, posters who identified as neither associate JOCK with material processes in 17 out of 50 total tokens (34%): this represents the most common type of process for others, along with relational processes. This suggests that posters who do not self-identify as a jock or a coach assign somewhat more agency to jocks.

However, engaging in a material process does not automatically assign agency to a participant: it is possible that many of the occurrences of JOCK within material processes are found within Goal positions, suggesting that JOCK is having something effect a change onto them. It is important, then, to not only note what types of material processes posters each of the three groups engage in with nominal JOCK, but whether JOCK is constructed as an Agent or a Goal.
Self-identified jocks, among their 48 instances of material processes with nominal JOCK, construct the jock as being an agent in only 18 instances (37%). Jocks eat certain foods (5 occurrences), scratch themselves (3 tokens), and wear certain types of clothing that indexes a jock identity, such as jockstraps (2 tokens). Jocks can also wrestle, do pushups, hit the gym, and save his jizz. In these instances, self-identified jocks construct JOCK as an Actor only within a limited activity sphere: those activities which promote fitness and body-consciousness, and frame them as sexualized beings. In contrast, JOCK acts as a Goal in 30 out of 48 instances (63%). The most common material processes occurring in these instances involve transformative processes: posters wish to be made into jocks (8 tokens), transform into jocks (4), and turn into jocks (3), and other 'transformative' verbs represented in the corpus include change, mold, and reprogram (1 token each):

(15) Sir can make me a big hot jock. (RA, 103:8)

(16) I'm looking for a man who can brainwash me and transform me into a total dumbass jock (BG, 232:1)

In (15) and (16), self-identified jocks RA and BG use transformative material processes to describe their desires to attain a jock identity. Similar to the earlier-mentioned examples with become, these material processes contribute to an understanding of a jock identity as a state to be achieved.

The few instances of JOCK engaging in material processes among self-identified coaches seems to suggest a slight preference for JOCK as Goal: in three instances, posters can help to create jocks, make jocks, and turn someone into a jock. In only two instances is JOCK an agent: jocks can hide and take someone’s challenge. Instances of material processes with JOCK among other posters also seems to suggest that jocks are seen as passive rather than active actors: in the 17 instances of material verbs
occurring with JOCK, only 5 construe JOCK as an Agent (jocks can *send pics* and *visit others*), while 12 construe JOCK as Goals.

The above discussion points to a broad construal of jocks on OnYourKnees: posters tend to construct jock identity as an imaginary that can not only be attained, but is highly desirable to self-identified jocks. This desires manifests itself through the use of numerous verbal processes: relational processes that equate self-identified jocks with an imagined singular jock identity, the proliferation of desiderative mental processes that construct jock identity as something that is wished to be attained, and an abundance of transformative material processes that express desire to be transformed into being a jock. Two important points stand out in this analysis. First, posters, regardless of orientation, tend to view a jock identity as falling along these contours. Self-identified coaches, self-identified coaches, and those who identify as neither all participate in the selective use of particular process types to construct jock identities in this very particular way. For many posters on OnYourKnees, a jock identity is one that is highly-sought after, and one that is accompanied by a high level of desire.

Second, and perhaps more importantly, self-identified jocks themselves participate highly in this process. Through constructing a jock identity as something that is highly-sought after, and by using a high level of relational processes that already equate them with such an identity, jocks *themselves* participate in a process that ultimately essentializes them as focused on a singular goal.

But how do posters on OnYourKnees engage with the lemma COACH? If coaches are seen as having more power than jocks on the messageboard, then it would be expected that COACH engages in different processes that reflect this power differential. Table 6-2, below, shows the distribution of process types accompanied by COACH among posters on OnYourKnees:
Table 6-2: COACH and relevant processes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>material</th>
<th>mental</th>
<th>relational</th>
<th>behavioral</th>
<th>verbal</th>
<th>existential</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOCKS</td>
<td>31 (28%)</td>
<td>37 (34%)</td>
<td>20 (18%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>17 (16%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACHES</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two important points can be made from the data presented in Table 6-2. First, as in the usage of JOCK, self-identified jocks are overwhelmingly represented in the usage of COACH in their posts, with self-identified coaches and those who self-identify as neither jock nor coach using COACH very infrequently. This may be an artefact of the fact that self-identified jocks are represented much more than self-identified coaches on the messageboard. However, it is also interesting to note that, although 328 instances of JOCK are present in the corpus, only 142 instances of COACH are present: even among self-identified jocks, JOCK (N=237) occurs more than twice as frequently as COACH (N=109). Why might there be such an asymmetry? One possibility might be that, because there are so many self-identified jocks on the messageboard, they are more likely to talk about themselves (and therefore use the word jock) much more frequently. But another possibility emerges as well: self-identified jocks speak about many other aspects of a jock identity besides talking about coaches. Jocks talk about attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that do not necessarily involve experiences with or the search for coaches. Coaches, therefore, only make up some of the topics available to messageboard members on OnYourKnees.

Aside from this asymmetry of use of JOCK and COACH, and although the lemma COACH is not as frequent as JOCK, trends can still be seen within the data in 6-2 that suggest that coaches are
spoken about differently through their engagement in different material processes. While JOCK was most likely to engage with relational processes, COACH is most likely to be used with mental processes among self-identified jocks and coaches: out of 109 total tokens of COACH among self-identified jocks, mental processes occur in 37 instances (34%), while material processes occur in 31 instances (28%), and relational processes in only 20 (18%). Among self-identified coaches, mental and verbal processes are the most frequent (4 tokens each, 31% for each), while material processes occur 3 times (23%). For others, material processes are the most frequent (12 out of 20 total tokens, 60%).

Taken as an absolute, Table 6-2 demonstrates that COACH occupies the realm of thinking and doing in a way that JOCK does not. By analyzing further each of these process types, a clearer picture can emerge of what types of behaviors COACH (and, by extension, coaches) engage in, and how they are viewed by posters. Upon further investigation, some similarities between JOCK and COACH emerge. Among self-identified jocks, the most frequent mental process undergone by COACH is look for (16 tokens), as (17) and (18) demonstrate:

(17) **Looking for** anyone who wants to be a coach to a slave (RC, 16:9)

(18) **Looking for** a coach to help me out, help me stay motivated. (TP, 197:1)

In (17) and (18), two self-identified jocks state that they are looking for a coach: in (14), RC wants someone who will *be a coach to a slave*, while in (15) TP wants a coach to *help [him] stay motivated*. Much as a jock identity is something that many posters aspire to, self-identified jocks locate COACH as a Phenomenon, something to be desired. Other frequent mental processes include *need* (3 tokens) and *want* (3 tokens): in these instances, coaches also act as the Phenomenon, suggesting that they are things that are desired and wanted. However, although self-identified jocks were also
observed to use desiderative processes such as *look for, need, and want* with JOCK, when used with COACH they are engaging with these processes in different ways. Jocks use *look for, need, and want* with JOCK to describe something that they want to *be*, while they use similar verbs with COACH to denote COACH as an agent in realizing their desires to become a jock. This demonstrates that similar lexical and syntactic patterns can thus be deployed for wildly different purposes to meet particular communicative aims.

Self-identified jocks are also likely to engage with COACH in material processes: these account for 31 of 109 total tokes (28%). It might be expected that jocks are more likely to put coaches in an Agent position, but perhaps surprisingly, COACH is an agent in only 12 of these material processes (39%). Coaches can *catch* things, *help* jocks, and *wrestle* with jocks. However, the most common process here is *make*, which occurs 9 times within material positions: coaches can *make* jocks strip down to a jockstrap, *make* a jock dumb, and *make* a jock wear a jockstrap at all times. The use of the In contrast, COACH is a Goal in 19 instances (61%), but a closer examination of these particular processes show that when COACH is a Goal, it is often associated with a process that demonstrates obedience. Jocks *obey* coaches (5 tokens), trances can *reinforce obedience to coaches*, jocks can *turn over command* of their bodies to a coach, and jocks can *worship* a coach, as (19) and (20) below show:

(19)  you know a big body and SIMPLE mind are meant to obey, *obey* a strong coach, obey the team, obey a strict routine. (RA, 108:1)

(20)  you need to *turn over command* of your body to your coach. (HS, 103:9)

Both (19) and (20) suggests that although jocks are less likely to assign agency directly to coaches, they still use material processes to set up coaches as an object of worship and reverence.
Although there are only 13 instances within the entire corpus of self-described coaches using COACH, the few instances that are available show a preference for both mental and verbal processes. However, in all four instances of mental processes with COACH, COACH is a Phenomenon, not a Senser: posters can feel comfortable with coaches, know coaches, and want coaches (the latter appearing twice within the corpus). Coaches do not participate in mental processes where they are the Senser: this suggests that they are unlikely to talk about things that they specifically want or desire, and are rather the source (or vehicle) of others' desire.

As coaches are most likely to engage with COACH in mental processes, they are just as likely to engage in verbal processes. Halliday and Mathiessen (2004) define verbal processes as those which "contribute to the creation of narrative by making it possible to set up dialogic passages" (252). Verbal processes include talk, say, and reply, and often give some sense of authority to the person doing the speaking. Coaches can offer their services to others, slip in suggestions in a trance, and tell the truth; coaches can also be the object of the process contact. Self-identified jocks, on the other hand, are less likely to engage with COACH within a verbal process: verbal process + COACH account for only 17 out of 109 (16%) of their process types. However, jocks are more likely to use verbal processes with COACH than they are with JOCK, which only accounted for 7% of all instances of JOCK among self-identified jocks. The most common verbal processes for COACH among self-identified jocks include say (4 instances), tell (4 instances), and ask (3 instances), as (21-23) demonstrate:

(21) my last coach would ask me what my wts was what I was doing and if I was pushing my own self. (DL, 6:1)

(22) a good coach will say stuff like do a massive arm day today or for a great chest you got to do some back and lat stuff. (HS, 6:3)
My Coach in college told us dumb dudes "I'll provide the gameplan, you boneheads provide the muscle. (RA, 103:10)

In (21-23), each self-identified jock locates the coach as a sense of authority and knowledge, which is accompanied by verbal processes. Coaches are thus constructed as wise and knowledgeable, and whose advice should be heeded.

Finally, among those who do not self-identify as jocks or coaches, material processes are most prevalent (12 tokens, 60%). In only three instances is COACH acting as an Agent, while in 9 instances COACH acts as a Goal. Here, perhaps surprisingly, COACH is not seen as an active participant enacting change in another individual. However, when looking at the particular verbs associated with these mental processes, it becomes apparent that COACH is involved with mental processes that evoke transformation and obedience (patterning with self-identified jocks in this regard), as (24) and (25) demonstrate:

(24) He's got this dumb, vacant look and I keep thinking some coach MUST have molded this boy. (RC, 103:14)

(25) Dumb Football : Makes you a dumb FOOTball Jock and reinforce obedience to coaches (HC, 29:3)

In (24), RC is discussing his observation of a man that he had noticed on his campus, who he believes is under the influence of a coach. In (25), HC is describing the effect of a particular trance (named 'Dumb Football') that not only turns its listener into a jock, but reinforces obedience to a coach. In both instances, the use of the material processes mold and reinforce obedience further contributes to the widespread ideology of coaches as individuals who not only guide individuals on their journey to be jocks, but who are also worthy of respect and worship.
The above discussion demonstrates that many posters, regardless of orientation, are most likely to engage with JOCK in relational processes that relate individual identities to a larger, imagined 'jock' identity. This suggests that jock identity is thought of as a singular achievement, something that one 'is' or that one can aspire to be: this conformity to a larger jock identity tends to essentialize jocks as belonging to a singular collective. Moreover, jocks are less likely to be thought of as agents, but more likely as individuals to which things are done. COACH, on the other hand, is more closely associated with realms of thought and action: coaches do, coaches think, and coaches say. The proliferation of these processes associate COACH, and by extension those who identify (or are identified) as such, with doers.

Two important conclusions can be drawn from the above. First, the association of particular degrees of agency and process-types with jocks and coaches conforms to larger notions of what it means to be a jock or a coach on OnYourKnees: the essentialization of jock identity through relational types and the association of coach identity with verbs of thinking and doing reinforce larger messageboard-wide notions of jocks as relatively powerless and submissive, and coaches as dominant and enacting change. However, it must also be acknowledged that jocks themselves are primarily responsible for these ideological agendas being encoded in the grammar: self-identified jocks are the largest users of the lemmas JOCK and COACH, and their posts are the ones that primarily drive the associations of JOCK and COACH with particular process-types. In a very important way, the above demonstrates that jocks themselves are largely complicit in the creation and propagation of ideologies of dominance and submission—ideologies that manifest not only in content, but in form as well.
Orthography in action:

The above discussion demonstrated that posters on OnYourKnees exploit particular syntactic structures and lexical choices to index their identities. But this paper will demonstrate that, just as posters take advantage of particular syntactic and lexical forms to index their identities, they also demonstrate the use of particular orthographies to do similar work.

In previous work, Chambers (2017) analyzed orthographic variation among a subset of posts on OnYourKnees, and demonstrated that self-identified jocks were more likely than self-identified coaches to show three particular orthographic features in their posts: non-conformity to standard American English spelling, non-conformity to standard American English capitalization rules, and deletion of first-person subject I. Self-identified coaches, on the other hand, were more likely than not to conform to standard written American English spelling and capitalization, and retain first-person I within these posts. Through a series of chi-square analyses comparing these orthographic differences among self-identified jocks and coaches, it was demonstrated that there were differences in orthographic 'codes' that were exploited between jocks and coaches to index their identities as such. These variables, it was ultimately argued, worked together with content to allow individuals on this messageboard to index a jock or coach identity-type, and contribute to the creation of 'ideal' jock and coach identities that then become cultural objects that messageboard members can construct, deconstruct, strive for, and/or delegitimize.

This section will expand on Chambers' 2017 study in numerous ways. First, the data set has been significantly expanded to include the life of the messageboard: as Chambers' initial study focused on only 37 threads, comprising 488 posts spanning a two-year period of OnYourKnees, this section
will expand the analysis to include 2,056 posts, spanning a seven-year period. Second, this section will not only compare the frequency of orthographic variables between self-identified coaches and self-identified jocks, each result will also be compared to the results of those who identify as neither jock nor coach. Testing frequencies against this 'other' group will help to determine if jocks and coaches both utilize similar orthographic tools to index their identities, or if one variable has more salience among one group than another.

Critical discourse analysis, it seems, has yet to fully exploit the value of studying orthographic patterns among producers of text. Because posters on OnYourKnees self-generate the text that is to be consumed by others, studying how posters make use of particular orthographic conventions to index their identities can say much about how ideologies of power can be manifested throughout a text on a level other than what Systemic-Functional Linguistics can offer. If jocks and coaches make use of particular orthographic styles that index their identities as jocks and coaches, then this parameter can represent a contour of identity that functions independently of what process-types jocks and coaches seem to engage in.

Orthography and identity:

Indexical relationships, as originally viewed in sociolinguistics, have historically been linked to ways of (verbal) speaking, concentrating on the distribution of a phonological or morphosyntactic variant within a population and its indexical 'meaning' within a larger historical-cultural frame. Traditionally, studies of language and identity have focused on the spoken word: how individuals use their oral speech to index their identities and those of others, and what phonological/morphological/prosodic qualities make those indices salient. However, in recent years,
especially with the rise of computer-mediated communication (CMC), orthographic style has been focused on as an especially fruitful site of identity. Whether it be through script choice (e.g., Grivelet 2001; Sebba 2003; Wertheim 2012), the choice of spellings that do not conform to a standard written language (e.g. Androutsopoulos, 2000; Darics 2013; Friedline 2008; Iorio 2009; Vigoroux 2011), the use of particular syntactic constructions (such I-subject deletion in English 'diary' registers, e.g. Teddiman & Newman, 2007), and even ‘extralinguistic’ variables such as apostrophe usage (Squires 2012), ASCII characters (Vaisman 2011), and emoticons (Dresner & Herring, 2010), writers, just like speakers, engage in language play that often defies the seemingly codified and inflexible structure a written language presents to its speakers, providing opportunities for its users to manipulate its boundaries, develop variations, and use those variations to index a multiplicity of identities.

As Ochs (1993) has noted, the linking of particular linguistic variables to a particular identity is not always a random process: linguistic variables are often chosen because they have some salience, both to the individual and to the community. In computer-mediated communication, this saliency can manifest in the deliberate removal of some linguistic feature for ease of message production: the absence of the variable can then be linked to casualness. This seems to hold for the written as well as the spoken word, on lexical/phonological levels as well as pragmatically. On a lexical level, van Compernolle & Williams (2010) have argued that accent aigu is more likely to be present in French-language forum discussions than in (real-time) chat environments, suggesting that text present in forums (where individuals have more time to compose their thoughts) may be more conservative in terms of variation than other, more rapid forms of communication. Other times, written forms can mirror spoken forms and take on the indexical associations with those forms. Eisenstein (2015), in analyzing a corpus of Twitter messages, found that //deletion and -g-deletion in -ING forms pattern similarly to spoken speech: word-final -t and -d are more likely to be deleted when the following
(written word) begins with a consonant, while -g dropping is more likely to occur in verbs than in nouns. Spoken phonological variability is thus likely to be captured in written orthographic environments that support informality and intimacy.

Linguistic variation can also occur on a pragmatic level, taking advantage of links between particular forms of speech and larger-scale ideologies of speakers and hearers to add additional meaning to what is written. On a website for dog owners who maintain blogs from their pet's point of view, the use of first-person narration and a specialized 'doggielect' that emphasizes child-like writing (such as syntactically simple sentences and words/phrases that incorporate lexical items concerning dogs, such as pawsome for awesome) becomes recontextualized to present an 'authentic' dog's point of view of the world, reaching into larger-scale social ideologies that equate dogs to children and dog-owners to parents (Leppänen 2016). For Sul & Bailey (2013), the posting of illogical responses to questions on a Zen Buddhist messageboard, which on other messageboards could be seen as an index of disinterest in the topic at-hand, is recontextualized to index a sign of expertise in posters' knowledge of Zen Buddhism, and whose literary tradition stresses the importance of nonlogical koans in understanding the transient nature of the universe. Similarly, for Vigoroux (2011), the deliberate use of non-standard French spellings on marabout (spiritual healer) advertisements help to index marabouts as yet-to-be-fully assimilated into French culture while still 'close' to traditional African cultures, cultivating a sense of authenticity in their healing abilities that can translate into increased economic capital.

The choice of which orthographic markers are available to use in the indexing of identity is thus often linked to extra-linguistic identities and ideologies, which are then adapted for individual use, in individual settings. It is also not often the case that a single linguistic marker can be linked to a particular identity (or facet of identity), while another (distinct) linguistic marker is linked to another
identity. Rather, it seems that linguistic markers work with each other to index a particular set of qualities that, in turn, index an identity (Silverstein 2003; Eckert 2008). Even if only one of these markers are in play in a particular stretch of text, that marker still accesses this set of qualities; conversely, speakers have a choice of markers, each of which can serve to highlight or downplay a particular facet of identity.

Although many researchers understand that orthographic variation plays a role in the construction and maintenance of one's identity, researchers differ as to how this variation should be studied. Many studies of orthographic variation use a quantitative methodology, analyzing large-scale corpora (often times with word counts running into the millions) and finding patterns based on statistical analyses. Some researchers, however, feel that quantitative studies are ill-suited to capture variation in computer-mediated discourse because much meaning can arise from a single instance of orthographic variation that might produce a tangible qualitative shift in understanding speakers, but would be unlikely to be significant in a quantitative analysis. Androutsopoulos (2011), for example, argues that computer-mediated discourse should be seen not primarily as technological containers of speech, but as sites of users' social activities within language […] the classification of language use on dimensions of variation is complimented by an attention to the situated exploitation of linguistic difference, which doesn't shy away from the importance of singular, unrepeated instances of linguistic difference as used in a strategic, yet nonquantifiable way. Likewise, the correlation with predefined social categories is replaced by a focus on identities as discursive constructions that participants claim and negotiate by drawing on a variety of semiotic means […] it suggests that what characterizes language online is neither a specific new pattern of variation between two predetermined poles nor a new language variety, but rather a heightened attention to all aspects of written language as a key mode of signification. (280)
The 'situated exploitation of linguistic difference', according to Androutsopoulos, becomes important to study in and of itself, since it allows for the possibility of exploring not only which particular linguistic variables index difference, but why these variables may be chosen, and how those variables are constructed as 'like' and 'unlike' both in content and in form. Thus, if the choice of what linguistic variants are used to index identities are (in part) motivated by maximizing distance between the two, then it becomes easier to understand why particular variables might have the salience that they do. Thus, it might become easier to understand why the frequency of words that do not conform to standard German spelling Androutsopoulos noted in his analysis of fan-originated German punk music fanzines (2000) might be associated with an anti-dominant cultural stance: 'misspellings' are highly-noticeable to readers, and the binary opposition that misspellings present (for words can either be spelled 'correctly' or 'incorrectly') are an immediate reflection of dominant (German/Western) notions of education, conformity, and 'proper' citizenship that German punk culture rejects. Likewise, it becomes easier to understand why girl-identified Hebrew speakers might incorporate non-Hebrew characters and ASCII art in their typographic blogging practices as a marker of femininity (Vaisman 2011): it sets up a highly-visible binary opposition between Hebrew and non-Hebrew characters that reflects the culturally-constructed binary opposition of masculinity and femininity within Israeli society. It may even be evident as to why 'expertise' on a Zen Buddhist blog is indexed through the use of nonsensical language, or sometimes even non-response to questions (Sul and Bailey 2013): what is a more dissonant response to a question than not answering at all?

However, it must also be said the distinction between jock and coach identities on the one hand, and the deployment of jock and coach orthographies on the other, is not absolute: not all self-identified coaches or jocks deploy distinct orthographies to index their identity, and those who self-identify as neither may show some qualities aligning with jock and coach orthographies. Rather, posters on
OnYourKnees show great acuity in strategically deploying qualities of jock and coach orthographies to index their particular identity at a particular moment in time. This flexibility can potentially challenge heteronormative assumptions of 'static' dominant/submissive behaviors in BDSM cultures by suggesting that orthography can be playful and variable, even within the same speaker. Participants can thus demonstrate, through the selective use of jock and coach orthographies, subtle differentiations in self-conceptions of power that can destabilize not only heteronormative ideas of static dominance and submissiveness, but the very notion of jock and coach identities as stable within the messageboard itself.

Through a detailed analysis of a subset of posts on this messageboard, Chambers (2017) identified three orthographic variables that were hypothesized to play a role in distinguishing jock and coach identities: I-subject deletion (what has also been called in the literature as 'diary drop' (Teddiman and Newman 2007), adherence or non-adherence to standard American English (SAE) capitalization norms, and (non-)adherence to SAE spelling conventions. These linguistic markers are hypothesized to play an especially important role in the construction of identity on AtCoachsFeet because they demonstrate an 'either/or' quality that is highly visible within the text: for example, words can be spelled correctly or incorrectly (but not some hybrid in between), first-person subject I can be present or not present in a single instance (but not both), etc. The categorical quality of these linguistic variables seem to lend themselves particularly well to a jock/coach framework, in which distinction is capitalized by binary extremity. 'Jock' orthography, it was observed in Chambers (2007), was characterized by high levels of I-subject deletion and non-adherence to SAE capitalization and spelling conventions. Coach orthography, in contrast, was characterized by high rates of I-subject retention, and a(n almost) total adherence to SAE capitalization and spelling conventions. Through a series of
chi-square tests, it was demonstrated that these results were significant, suggesting a marked difference in the ways jocks and coaches exploited orthographic tools to index their identities.

But these linguistic variables do not have to be 'in-play' at all times: jocks and coaches do not have to use all four variables simultaneously in order to index their identity. Although some users may (and do) choose to use these tools in all of their posts, others may be more selective, choosing one (or more) particular variable(s) at one particular point in a conversation, and other tools at another. As this analysis will also demonstrate, posters have great flexibility in choosing which orthographic features they feel are more salient at a particular point in conversation to index their identity, which has real effects for how the poster and his audience are meant to ‘read’ the text.

Data collection and discussion:

Each instance of the orthographic variables in question (I-subject retention or deletion, number of words not conforming to standard American English spelling, the strategic use of capitalization or noncapitalization in standard American English environments) was coded, along with whether the speaker identified as a self-identified jock, a self-identified coach, or neither (whose category, for the purpose of this analysis, is called 'Other'). Since each of these variables is categorical (i.e., no poster could be in both the 'self-identified jock' and 'other' category), a chi-square analysis was deemed the most appropriate for comparing rates of presence or absence of each orthographic variable. In addition, because results were compared against the three groups, a series of bivariate chi-squared analyses were performed against each pair (jocks vs. coaches, coaches vs. others, jocks vs. others) to determine $p$-values between the number of linguistic markers present in posts and patterns of self-identification.
Below is a discussion of the four linguistic variables under analysis in this study, including rationale for why that variable is of interest, and results of statistical analyses:

1. **Standard vs. non-standard spelling**: It is hypothesized that spelling differences play a role in indexing jock and coach identities. Differences in spelling among users of messageboards have been tied to conceptions of identity in numerous languages, including (British) English (Sebba 2003), Hebrew (Vaisman 2011), German (Androutsopoulos 2000), and Finnish (Peuronen 2011). Because spelling is a highly-visible parameter within print, it can become a rich multimodal tool that language users can exploit to create identities. Adherence to 'standard' spellings has often been historically tied to linguistic purity, education, and proper citizenship (Anderson 1983; Cameron 1995; Sebba 2007). These deviations from SAE include letter transpositions that are likely to occur in fast, uncorrected typing (*teh* for *the*, *adn* for *and*), homophonous substitutions (*won* for *one*), and misspellings of words with longer characters (such as *caplmaints* for *complaits*). In many cases (though certainly not all), deviations from an established 'standard' language (itself highly sociohistorically defined) “place the discourse in an opposition to standard language and the ideologies associated with it [because] in public awareness, correct orthography is often taken as an indicator of conformity to norms and ideals of a dominant culture” (Androutsopoulos 2000, 515). Non-standard spelling, then, becomes a highly-salient method through which individuals defy norms of a 'dominant' culture, whether it be because they outright reject those norms (Androutsopoulos 2000), strengthen their ties to a faith-based culture that is seen through a larger context as threatening larger cultural patterns (Peuronen 2011), or to highlight the users' 'exoticness' (Vigoroux 2011). Thus, those who use nonstandard spellings are seen to 'reject' standard spelling, and the notions of conformity that are indexically associated with it, though what exactly is being 'non-conformed' to can vary.
For the purposes of this paper, the term 'nonstandard spelling' refers to the spelling of words that do not conform to standard written American English. Words that fall under this category include non-dictionary spellings of words (such as musscle for muscle or fealt for felt), words that may be 'spelled' correctly but are found in unexpected positions within a sentence (for example, in the sentence I went their, their would be coded as an instance of nonstandard spelling because the expected form there is not present), forms that have gained currency as 'shorthand' in computer-mediated communication, but whose usage has been discussed and contested within larger cultural spheres as incompatible with standardized forms (txt for text, u for you, etc.; c.f. Crystal 2008), single-word truncations of more than one word (including such forms as hafta for have to and gonna for going to), and contractions that are missing an apostrophe (such as Im for I'm; cf. (Lyddy et al. 2014).

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, there are very few attested conversations that address how a jocks should 'sound', either orally or in written form. However, throughout the corpus there are hints that suggest some forms of orthographic presentation are preferred or expected among jocks or coaches. In one particular thread, a poster () comments on a poster in a previous thread, who is advertising himself as a coach wishing to find others to submit to him as jocks. Although this particular post (for reasons unknown) is no longer available on OnYourKnees, two posters felt it necessary to comment on orthographic forms that present in his original post:

(26) Might be more convincing if you spelled "commands" correctly on the front page. [KL, 89:1]
(27) Not to mention the word "is"... [JS, 89:2]

In (26) and (27), both KL and JS note that the original poster being spoke about, in his original post, misspelled the words commands and is. In (26), KL prefaces this observation with the clause
might be more convincing: this phrase suggests that the original poster's request for individuals to dominate was not only unsuccessful, but its lack of success can be attributed (in part) to the misspelling of the word commands (a sentiment echoed by JS, who brings attention to the fact that the poster misspelled is). Note that in both (26) and (27), the 'misspelled' words are spelled correctly. These two posts suggest that, on some level, an indexical link is made between proper orthographic spelling and coach identity: the implication is, at least to KL and JS, that 'proper' coaches know how to spell correctly.

It seems that on OnYourKnees, conformity (or lack thereof) to standard written American English is a resource that can be used to construct jock and coach identities. An example can be seen in (26) below, in which a poster (DJ) relates his experiences of listening to a trance once a day, and sharing his experiences with other users by posting daily. By the fourth day of listening to the trance, he writes:

(28)  day 4... def fealt it mor this mornin wen i cam out of transe. i was a lil foggy n sorta slow... it wor off but i hav no dout the werds r sinkin way down into my brane. i woek up sorta twice durin the transe but fell rite back down n dont even remember wat i herd. musta ben a shalo transe today or sumthin... well seemingly [DJ, 1:7]

In (26), DJ is discussing his experiences after being 'tranced' for four days: he claims that he felt somewhat disoriented and 'slow' throughout the entire day, a positive sign that the trance was working. DJ's spelling in this post is replete with non-standard spelling, to the point where what he is saying is not easily comprehensible. Words like fealt (for felt), werds (for words), and transe (for trance) all
demonstrate highly unusual nonstandard spelling that DJ is using as an index of his being 'tranced', which also is linked to being easily controlled.21

Another poster, uptaking DJ's indexical stance, responded with the following:

(29) It's possible [the trance is] affecting you in ways you aren't even noticing. For example, your spelling on the day four post is awful – but it didn't seem like you realized that. Hope you don't need to do too much writing for work or school [MM, 1:8]

By responding to DJ's post, MM in (27) supports (and thus reaffirms) the link between being a jock and being easily susceptible to trances. MM is also drawing a direct link between jockness and spelling (your spelling on the day four post is awful), mediated in this case by the concept of being tranced: jocks have poor spelling, especially when they are tranced, and (should implicitly) enact this through their posts. Although not as explicit, MM (a self-identified coach) also reaffirms orthographic qualities that index the identity of coaches through his own language practices. He shows no instances of nonstandard spelling in his post, and through both providing insight into DJ's writing (pointing out that your spelling on the day four post is awful) and joking with him (hope you don't need to do too much writing for work or school) he is implicit in the construction of how coaches should behave: coaches should support jocks in their quest to become 'dumb' through knowledge and encouragement.

Table 6-3 below shows the \( \chi^2 \) distribution of spelling innovations among self-identified jocks, self-identified coaches, and others (those who identify as neither):

---

21 Consider also the fact that many posters may be typing on mobile devices, many of which have built-in spellcheck devices that autocorrect incorrect spellings – it may be, in those cases, that misspellings have to be extra-deliberate.
Table 6-3: Total words conforming to standard American English spelling vs. words not conforming to standard American English spelling, among all posters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Words not spelled correctly (N = 1535)</th>
<th>Words spelled correctly (N = 85346)</th>
<th>% of total words spelled incorrectly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jocks (N = 35610)</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>34597</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (N = 13174)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13076</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (N = 38097)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>37673</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 (1) = 190.703, \ p > .001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Words not spelled correctly (N = 1535)</th>
<th>Words spelled correctly (N = 85346)</th>
<th>% of total words spelled incorrectly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jocks (N = 35610)</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>34597</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (N = 13174)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13076</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (N = 38097)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>37673</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 (1) = 288.756, \ p > .001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Words not spelled correctly (N = 1535)</th>
<th>Words spelled correctly (N = 85346)</th>
<th>% of total words spelled incorrectly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jocks (N = 35610)</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>34597</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (N = 13174)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13076</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (N = 38097)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>37673</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 (1) = 13.23, \ p > .001$

Table 6-3 demonstrates that there is a robust relationship between nonstandard spelling and self-identification among all three groups. When posting, jocks are seemingly more likely than both coaches and others to use words non-conforming to standard American English, while coaches are more likely than both jocks and others to more closely adhere to standard American English spelling. It must be asked why this is so. It is possible that, because many jocks subscribe to an ideology that they should be 'dumb,' they use spelling innovation as a way of indexing a disinterest in education. However, as has been previously discussed, not all jocks incorporate conceptions of dumbness into their self-identity. But it is also possible that jocks who non-conform to spelling are simultaneously participating in an inversion of a dominant culture where ideologies of masculinity stress the
importance of education and proper citizenship. Hallmarks of jock identity—the desire to be 'dumb,' an eagerness to submit to other men—are seen as incompatible with ideologies of hegemonic masculinity that privilege education as a locus of power. By showing greater rates of misspelling, it seems that jocks also index a rejection of what it means to be a 'proper' man.

Two points must be made here. First, it must be acknowledged that the total number of instances of spelling non-conformity is very low when compared to the total number of words within posts: out of a total corpus of 86,881 total words, only 1,535, or fewer than two percent, demonstrate spelling non-conformity. This suggests that the use of non-conforming spelling is strategic, and may be used sparingly by both jocks and coaches alike. The highly selective use of misspellings may be a reflection of what Sebba (2007) has called the zone of social meaning: according to Sebba, in order for a particular orthographic feature to have meaning, it must be somehow recoverable in order for others to make sense of it. Too many nonstandard spellings would render a text unreadable: jocks who use nonstandard spelling must carefully negotiate a balance between its indexical power and readability. It is also possible that some misspellings are simply an unintentional incorrectly-typed word. However, Table 6-3 shows that there is also an appreciable difference in the rates of usage of spelling non-conformity between jocks, coaches, and others. Thus, spelling non-conformity can be said to contribute to the 'idealized' version of a jock identity, just as much as the content of a jock's posts; similarly, a stricter adherence to spelling conventions can be an orthographic index of a coach's identity.

Second, it is possible that some words, and some categories of words, are more likely to non-conform to standard American English spelling than others, and some types of misspellings are more common than others. It is worth exploring both the most frequently misspelled words on OnYourKnees, and the grammatical categories that possess the most frequently-misspelled words. Table 6-3 shows the breakdown of misspellings by type among jocks, coaches, and others.
Misspellings were categorized into one of the following categories: apostrophe deletion (where an apostrophe would be expected in a contraction, such as cant for can’t); letter deletion (a letter is deleted from the word, such as dum for dumb); final -/g/ deletion (where final /g/ is deleted from a gerund or progressive form, as in runnin for running); letter addition (the appearance of an extra letter within a word, such as letterr for letter); letter substitution (where one letter appears in place of another, such as thooght for thought); letter transposition (where two letters in a word are switched, such as in wrod for word); colloquialism (a spelling that captures a pronunciation of a word, such as gonna for going to); extra space between letters (if a space appears in a word where it is not normally found, as in jock for jock); no extra space between letters (if no space appears to separate two or more words, such as extraspce for extra space); and others (including number-for-letter substitutions and instances where the word is not recoverable from context). The results are summarized in Table 6-4 below:

Table 6-4: breakdown of misspellings by type among jocks, coaches, and others (categories with most mispellings in each group are in **bold**):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misspelling Type</th>
<th>Jocks (% of total)</th>
<th>Coaches (% of total)</th>
<th>Others (% of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>letter deletion (not including final /g/)</td>
<td><strong>339 (33.1%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>31 (31.3%)</strong></td>
<td>98 (22.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apostrophe deletion</td>
<td>169 (16.5%)</td>
<td>19 (19.1%)</td>
<td>88 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter substitution</td>
<td>147 (14.4%)</td>
<td>15 (15.1%)</td>
<td>41 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final-/g/ deletion (in -ING forms)</td>
<td>85 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>4 (0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter addition</td>
<td>68 (6.6%)</td>
<td>3 (3.0%)</td>
<td>39 (8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no extra space between letters</td>
<td>34 (3.3%)</td>
<td>5 (5.1%)</td>
<td>20 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter transposition</td>
<td>21 (2.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>24 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colloquialism</td>
<td>16 (1.2%)</td>
<td>6 (6.1%)</td>
<td>20 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extra space between letters</td>
<td>8 (0.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>7 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 6-4, it can be seen that for self-identified jocks and coaches, misspellings pattern in similar ways: the most common type of spelling error is the deletion of a letter from a word, followed by the deletion of an apostrophe from a contracted word. It is interesting to think of these results in light of Sebba's notion of the 'zone of social meaning': although jocks and coaches are both most likely to misspell words by omitting a letter or apostrophe mark, the *frequency* in which these spelling innovations occur seems to play more of a role in establishing a jock or coach orthography than the *type* of misspelling each group may display. Also of interest is the fact that, although letter deletion is also the second-most-common type of spelling innovation among others, words that do not fit into the established categories (primarily those whose meaning is unrecoverable) is the most common type of spelling innovation displayed by that group. This may suggest that, for those who neither identify as jock nor coach, spelling innovations are unlikely to fall into any established category, perhaps allowing them to be realized as spelling 'mistakes' and not part of an orthographic style *per se*.

However, although Table 6-4 provides the frequency of *types* of spelling innovations, it is worth looking at the most common *tokens* of spelling innovations among posters on OnYourKnees, as Table 6-5 displays:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>others (number substitutions, unrecoverable from context, etc.)</th>
<th>136 (13.3%)</th>
<th>16 (16.2%)</th>
<th>99 (22.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 Some words contained more than one innovation and were counted in multiple categories.
Table 6-5: most common tokens of misspelled words among jocks, coaches, and others:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jocks (no. of tokens)</th>
<th>Coaches (no. of tokens)</th>
<th>Others (no. of tokens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>its (for it's) (36)</td>
<td>u (for you) (14), ur (for your) (14)</td>
<td>u (for you) (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>im (for I'm) (33)</td>
<td>im (for I'm) (5)</td>
<td>dont (for don’t) (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>u (for you) (28)</td>
<td>gonna (for going to) (5)</td>
<td>im (for I'm) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>thats (for that's) (17), your (for you're) (17), to (for to) (17)</td>
<td>its (for it's) (5)</td>
<td>its (for it's) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>wanna (for want to) (16)</td>
<td>pict (for picture) (3)</td>
<td>thats (for that's) (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>fukn (for fucking) (13)</td>
<td>aint (2), em (for them) (2)</td>
<td>ur (for your) (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>an (for and) (12)</td>
<td>cant (for can't) (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>kinda (for kind of) (11), n (for and) (11)</td>
<td>youre (for you're) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ive (for I've) (4), lets (for let's) (4), wanna (for want to) (4), an (for and) (4), hes (for he's) (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 6-5, some of the most frequently misspelled lexical items are shared among the groups. The most common tokens of misspelled words for jocks is *its*, which is the fourth-most-frequently misspelled lexical item for both coaches and others. *Im*, the second-most-frequently misspelled lexical item among self-identified jocks, is also among most frequently misspelled among coaches and others. *U*, for *you*, is the most-frequently-misspelled word among coaches and others, and is also third-most-frequent among jocks.

However, important differences can also be seen in Table 6-5. Misspelling of the lexical item *you're* occurs in Table 6-5 for jocks and others (but not for coaches); however, the most frequent misspelling of *you're* for jocks is *your*, while the most frequent for others is *you're*. Interestingly, two
distinct misspellings of *and* are frequent among self-identified jocks (*an* and *n*), neither of which are frequent for coaches or others. Individual lexical items also occur in each group that are not present in the others. For jocks, one of the most frequent misspellings is the adjective *fukn*, whose spelling reflects a pronunciation that stresses alveolar */n/*, and which has been argued to mark a masculinity indexed by working-class values and physical strength (Kiesling 1998). For coaches, the word *pict* (a misspelling of the word *picture*) occurs 5 times within the corpus, while for others, the second-most-frequent misspelled lexical item is *dont*.

Although different tokens occur with different frequencies among self-identified jocks, coaches, and others, Table 6-5 suggests that for many posters of the messageboard, some words in general are more likely to be misspelled than others, preferably those words whose meanings would still be easily recoverable from context.

Finally, it is worth looking at differences in misspelled words among the three groups in terms of grammatical categories: are there grammatical categories that are more likely to be misspelled than others? Table 6-6 shows the percentage of misspellings among grammatical categories for self-identified jocks, self-identified coaches, and those who identify as neither:

---

**Table 6-6: frequency of misspelled words among grammatical categories (most populous category for each group is in bold):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>JOCKS (N=1013)</th>
<th>COACHES (N=98)</th>
<th>OTHERS (N=424)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>270 (26.7%)</td>
<td>12 (12.2%)</td>
<td>56 (13.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>172 (17.0%)</td>
<td>10 (10.2%)</td>
<td>105 (24.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractions (non-pronominal)</td>
<td>125 (12.3%)</td>
<td>21 (21.4%)</td>
<td>87 (20.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>95 (9.4%)</td>
<td>6 (6.1%)</td>
<td>50 (11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>87 (8.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>23 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interestingly, in Table 6-6 the three groups differ significantly in terms of which grammatical category possesses the most mispellings. For self-identified jocks, verbs constitute the greatest number (N=270 total tokens, 26.7%), while among self-identified coaches misspelled words are most likely to be found in the pronoun category (N=35 tokens, 35.8%). For others, nouns are most likely to be misspelled (N=105, 24.8%). Each group thus shows a slight preference for different grammatical categories they are most likely to misspell words in.

The above discussion thus shows that jocks are more likely than coaches to misspell words, coaches are most likely to adhere to standard American English spelling conventions, and those who identify as neither fall in-between. It is interesting to consider these results in light of Morikawa's (2019) discussion of pro-feminist speech on Twitter. She noted that women who associated tweets with the hashtag #YesAllWomen were less likely to use non-standard abbreviations (such as gonna and wanna) in those tweets, than in other tweets unrelated to the movement, although they were likely to use more profanity. She explains these contradictory results by claiming that the combination...
"suggests an unapologetic brazenness that is legitimized by adherence to prescriptive linguistic standards associated with education, high socioeconomic status, and structural power" (118). In order to appear more legitimate in the eyes of the public, she claims, users participating in the #YesAllWomen movement were less likely to use stigmatized spellings that may be used against them, allowing them to be viewed as uneducated and therefore not powerful. Here, on OnYourKnees, it seems that misspellings achieve a similar effect for jocks: because a jock identity, in large part, rests on their perception by others as being less powerful and (in many cases) uneducated, nonstandard spelling becomes a tool through which that perception of disempowerment is achieved.

However, it is also important to note that jocks and coaches do pattern similarly in that they, if they misspell, they are most likely to do so through letter deletion (primarily in non-ING forms) and apostrophe deletion. Those who identify as neither, although they also delete letters and apostrophes, are also likely to show a variety of spelling innovations. Although certain lexical items are most likely to be misspelled among the three groups, each group does show some preference in which exact lexical items are most likely to be misspelled; in addition, each group seems to differ in terms of which grammatical category is most represented by misspellings. It seems, then, that what contributes to an emergent jock and coach orthography on OnYourKnees is not necessarily the ways in which words are misspelled, or which grammatical categories they belong to, but the frequency in which they do. Regardless of the type of spelling innovation being exhibited, jocks are simply more likely to misspell a variety of words than coaches.

2. I-subject-deletion and retention: Another possible linguistic tool that Chambers (2017) found salient in the orthographic construction of jock and coach identities is the presence or absence of first-person subject I. I-subject deletion has also been called in the literature “diary drop” (Teddiman and
Newman 2007), and is defined as the overt deletion of the subject I in speech and writing: in their corpus, they found that diary drop is more likely to occur in sentence- and clause-initial position, and I is more likely to be deleted than other pronouns. Teddiman and Newman link diary drop to both a 'casual' attitude towards readers that assumes informality and lack of pretense, and an index of one's speech as reflective of personal, introspective thought.

Chambers (2017) found that deletion of subject I is more likely to occur in posts generated by self-identified jocks. Contextually, examples of I-subject deletion can be found in the corpus. One self-identified jock, for example, posted about what qualities he sought in a good coach:

(30) Its kind of easy to kep track of like one part but a good coach kinda catches you where you forgot to do some of the stuff that makes you get gains. Like I'm good at doing routeens in the gym but a good coach will say stuff like do a massive arm day today or for a great chest you got to do some back and lat stuff. Just more reminders stuff relly. But your right the eating and sleeping and even cardio – yech – stuff is part of it. dont want a coach thats more for dumming dudes down. I got that part lol. want one thats more into the other stuff too. [HS, 6:3, bold and italics mine]

In (30), HS discusses the qualities that he looks for in a good coach: a good coach should support a jock in his training and encourage him to continue to build strength and 'do a good workout.' HS demonstrates both I-retention and I-deletion in the above post. His first use of I is retained (Like I'm good at doing routeens), although this use is not subject-initial. He then deletes I when referring to himself (dont want a coach thats more for dumming dudes down), then retains it (I got that part lol), then deletes I again (want one thats more into the other stuff too). This suggests a rather sophisticated use of subject I.

But what aspects of jock identity may be signaled here? It is possible that second-indexical links are being created between I-subject deletion and a jock identity, with the mediating factor being
casualness: jocks are expected to take a more casual attitude towards life than coaches, and will reflect that through their greater rates of I-deletion. Another possibility, underexplored in the linguistic literature, is a link between form and identity in which submission is the mediating force. Some kink/fetish practitioners have recommended that submissive individuals in a kink/fetish relationship avoid using the term I as a reference to oneself, and instead use the third person he/she as a self-referent pronoun as a way of “enhanc[ing] the role of slave into believing that they are nothing more than property and are granted no personal power by removing their identity” (LunaKM 2011). LunaKM draws a link between depersonalization and submissiveness, viewing identity (linguistically marked as the 'privilege' of using I to refer to oneself) as a quality that should be minimized within submissives. As discussed in previous chapters, jocks are more likely than coaches to be seen, and see themselves, as submissive. It is possible that I-subject-deletion can then be used by jocks in a similar manner, to index submission to coaches and (potentially) a deliberate erosion of their own self-identity.

This can also be illustrated in 'personal-ad' style posts on OnYourKnees, in which individuals are looking for jocks or coaches. A sample of posts by individuals who are looking for coaches yields numerous examples of I-subject deletion:

(31) Hi everyone, I'm new here as well. **Looking for anyone who wants to be a coach to a slave and hoping to be turned into a jock.** I already have a trigger, so just email me any commands you want. [RC, 16:9]

(32) **Looking for sites/tist²³ to become a jarhead dumb military jock or drone for their use** [JS, 18:9]

(33) **sub/slave am in search of a tist** to make me into the perfect jock, please let me know if you are or know of a tist that can help me. [P, 33:7]

²³ Slang for hypnotist, a relatively frequent shorthand on AtCoachsFeet.
In (31-33), each post demonstrates at least one example of *I*-subject deletion (and, in the case of [33], co-occurs with the use of *sub/slave* as a self-referent marker). Conversely, Chambers found that self-identified coaches were significantly more likely to fully realize *I*-subject retention in their writing:

(34) **I started an email training program** with a college boy back last spring but things happened and I wasn't able to complete everything the way we would have liked. Now I'm *hoping to start back* with a new trainee(s). I'm an in-shape, hung, middle-aged, masculine, demanding coach who will require the highest standards of fitness, hygiene, and sexual obedience from the jocks under my supervision. [JH, 30:1]

In (34), JH identifies as a coach who is looking for subjects to being a training program. In all cases where subject *I* can be present, it is. Here, just as with jocks, a link seems to be created and strengthened between a coach identity and *I*-subject realization: coaches, in positions of power over jocks, should be more likely to assert their dominance, (in part) realized by full realization of the subject *I*.

Are there appreciable differences in the rates of *I*-subject deletion among self-identified coaches, jocks, and others? In this corpus, all sentences in which *I* is either present or absent were coded as such (in the cases in which *I* was absent, sentences that were determined to be such were coded as 'I not present' if *I* was recoverable based on context, or if first-person inflection of the accompanying verb was present. Cases in which this determination could not be made were excluded from the analysis.) Table 6-7 shows the total number of instances of *I*-retention and deletion in posts in which users also self-identified as either jocks or coaches:
Table 6-7: instances of *I*-subject deletion and retention in all posts of users who self-identify as jocks, coaches, and others:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deletion of first-person <em>I</em> (N = 665)</th>
<th>Retention of first-person <em>I</em> (N = 3099)</th>
<th>% of total deletions of first-person <em>I</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jocks (N = 1962)</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (N = 308)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 (1) = 1.955, \ p = .162$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocks (N = 1962)</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (N = 1494)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 (1) = 3.453, \ p = .063$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (N = 308)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (N = 1494)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 (1) = 0.145, \ p = 0.70$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When expanding the data set to include all posts made by users on OnYourKnees, results are *not* significant at $p = .05$ among any of the three groups. This runs *contra* Chambers' claim that first-person *I* deletion is a salient marker among posters on OnYourKnees to index a jock or coach identity. This discrepancy can best be explained by the fact that more data on the messageboard has been included in the present analysis (which speaks to the importance of a larger data sample). Although *I*-subject deletion, just like non-standard spelling, may be present in the posts of self-identified jocks, statistically it does not seem to play a significant role in the differentiation of jock and coach identities.

3. Conformity and non-conformity to standard American English capitalization rules: Possibly related to, but distinct from, *I*-subject deletion is the use or non-use of capitalization rules that conform to those found in standard American English, including the capitalization of the first letter of a sentence, proper names, and the first-person subject marker *I*. Strict conformity to 'proper'
capitalization rules in computer-mediated conversation has been, in recent years, a particular point of contention among language 'purists' who see non-conformity to capitalization rules in emails and other forms of CMC as unprofessional, ungrammatical, or otherwise deviant (cf. Kawasaki 2012). Cingel and Sundar (2012) have noted that capitalization is often omitted in text messages to produce and send messages faster; nevertheless, they include noncapitalization as one of the 'errors' they study in grammatical patterns of teen and tween messaging use.

Deviation from SAE capitalization conventions, it is hypothesized, can be another linguistic tool that jocks and coaches can exploit to create opposing jock and coach identities: jocks are less likely to conform to standard American English rules of capitalization, while coaches are more likely to. Why might this particular linguistic tool be used as an index? One potential link might be youth, mediated by convenience: as Lyddy et. al (2014) have noted, Irish-English university students show high levels of capitalization non-conformity within their texts, presumably to remove a step from (and thus speed up) communicating on mobile platforms, where speed of response is seen as important. Another link may be mediated by the concept of dumbness: jocks are supposed to be less intelligent than coaches, and are therefore less likely to adhere to capitalization rules because they do not 'know' them. This is illustrated in one poster's discussion of his experiences taking IQ tests both before and after listening to hypnotic trances that motivate him into being a 'dumb jock' (all instances of non-capitalization are in bold):

(35) **hey** guys. **a** year ago my tested iq was 124... **ive** been listening to files about being a dumb jock and being dumber... **have** been noticing that while writing papers for school it hasn't been a easy to compose them. **just** for fun **i** tested iq and it was 108. **maybe i** was just having an off day...? **i** dunno what to think.. lol [BG, 24:1]
In (35), BG is discussing how his IQ (a popular measure of intelligence) has seemingly dropped after listening to hypnotic trances that encourage him to become a dumb jock. Here, however, he is demonstrating a total lack of adherence to capitalization rules: none of his sentences begin with a capitalized letter, and all three instances of I are lowercased. A direct link is being made here between form and content: partially perhaps because of his self-perceived drop in intelligence, BG no longer conforms to standard American English capitalization rules, and his style of writing can potentially become a public recognition of his new-found ‘dumbness’: this stance is realized and taken up by the next poster (all instances of capitalization are in bold):

(36)  **Hmm. Take** the test again tomorrow, and then again the day after. **If** all three scores are widely different, it's probably an off day.

**If** they're all pretty low...

...well. **You** weren't using those brain cells anyway. **Welcome** to life as a dumb jock. **I** suggest you get to working out and prepare for your new job at Chippendales. [DK, 24:2]

In (36), DK is affirming the links between lack of capitalization and dumbness in numerous ways. First, he recommends to BG to take the test again numerous times, and to compare the results. If they are the same (which DK is anticipating), he encourages BG to accept his new 'life' as a dumb jock, and to accept work in an environment where intelligence is not as valued as body-consciousness (Chippendales refers to a popular male dancer/stripper revue). Content-wise, DK is affirming BG's new identity as a dumb jock. However, by doing this, DK is also affirming the use of non-capitalization as a marker of jock identity. This is partially achieved by a (tacit) acknowledgment that BG has now become 'dumb', but it is also accomplished by DK's own style of writing. In DK's post, all instances of
sentence-initial letters are capitalized, as is the first-person subject I and the proper name Chippendales. By fully realizing adherence to standard American English capitalization rules, DK is exploiting the differences in style between a 'dumb jock' and a poster who does not identify as one: individuals who do not identify as jocks (i.e., coaches) know how to capitalize properly, while jocks do not.

It is also possible that other qualities of jocks are being indexed here. Jocks, for example, are probably more likely than coaches to simply type out what they are saying without thinking about it, which indexes their casualness and spontaneity. Adherence to SAE capitalization, on the other hand, may index thoughtfulness and wisdom, which are qualities typically associated with coaches on AtCoachsFeet: coaches take the time to compose their thoughts in a way that jocks do not. Sebba (2007) argues that messageboard environments represent a ‘middle ground’ between what he calls fully-regulated orthographic space (including text prepared for publication) that strictly adheres to standard norms, and unregulated space, where “writers may disregard the conventions […] and which] occupies the margins, orthographically and socially” (44). While a messageboard environment allows for conversation, it is often done asynchronously, as opposed to the real-time environments that face-to-face conversation or text messaging allow. Thus, although participating in a multi-party conversation that allows for limited turn-taking, there is still time and space available for individuals to compose their messages. Those who utilize that time and space, presumably, are more likely than others to consider the form of their posts as well as their content, and are thus more likely to conform to SAE capitalization rules as a reflection of making use of that time and space.

The presence or absence of standard capitalization may also be tied to larger conceptions of subordination and domination. It is possible that lack of capitalization on this messageboard does similar work to identity as discussions about capitalization among dominant and submissive members
in kink/fetish relationships, where submissive individuals may be more likely to use lowercase *i* as an orthographically-salient marker of submission to a dominant *Master* (Simula 2012; LunaKM 2011).

In the OnYourKnees corpus, adherence or non-adherence to standard American English capitalization rules were captured in three coding schema. Instances in which the first letter following a punctuation mark indicating the end of a previous sentence (such as a period, question mark, or exclamation point) were capitalized were coded as different from instances in which the first letter following these marks was not capitalized (instances where it was difficult to determine punctuation patterns were excluded from this analysis). In addition, instances in which *I* was present were coded separately as either conforming to SAE capitalization rules (*I*) or not (*i*). Finally, instances of proper names, including names of individuals and computer programs, were coded as either conforming (proper names were capitalized) or non-conforming (proper names were not capitalized). Table 6-8 below summarizes the results:
Table 6-8: Adherence vs. nonadherence to SAE capitalization (including sentence capitalization, first-person subject *I*, and proper names) among self-identified jocks and coaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adherence to SAE capitalization (N = 8458)</th>
<th>Non-adherence to SAE capitalization (N = 1578)</th>
<th>% of total nonadherence to SAE capitalization rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jocks (N = 4682)</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (N = 917)</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (N = 4437)</td>
<td>3677</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>χ²(1) = 15.0721, p &gt; .001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocks (N = 4682)</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (N = 4437)</td>
<td>3677</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>χ²(1) = 4.8824, p = .0271</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (N = 917)</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (N = 4437)</td>
<td>3677</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>χ²(1) = 25.0936, p &gt; .001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-8 shows the total number of tokens in which SAE capitalization rules are adhered to among the three groups. The bivariate analyses suggest that there is a significant relationship between the use of capitalization among members of the messagboard. Jocks are much more likely to use non-conforming capitalization rules than coaches (15.4% versus 10.5%), while coaches are more likely than others to show a stricter adherence to SAE capitalization rules (10.5% vs. 17.1%). Interestingly, however, although jocks and others show a significant difference in adherence to SAE capitalization rules, the direction is contrary to what might be expected: posters who identify as neither self-identified jocks nor coaches seem to show non-SAE capitalization more than self-identified jocks (17.1% versus 15.4%).
What might explain this surprising result? Chambers (2017) separated out all instances of three types of SAE capitalization rules (sentence-initial capitalization, proper-name capitalization, and first-person *I* capitalization), and found significant differences between jocks and coaches among all three parameters: jocks were more likely than coaches not to adhere to sentence-initial capitalization, proper-name capitalization, and first-person *I* capitalization rules. Table 6-9 below shows the chi-square results for the expanded dataset among the three parameters for jocks and coaches, as well as for those who identify as neither ('others'):

Table 6-9: Comparision of self-identified jock and coach capitalization and non-capitalization tokens, categorized by type (significant results are in **bold**):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sentence-initial capitalization</th>
<th>Proper-name capitalization</th>
<th><em>I</em>-capitalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capitalized (% of total)</td>
<td>Capitalized (% of total)</td>
<td>Capitalized (% of total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocks</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325 (13.6%)</td>
<td>161 (22.1%)</td>
<td>236 (14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 (6.3%)</td>
<td>48 (28.7%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>χ²</em> (1) = 20.245, <em>p &gt; .001</em></td>
<td><em>χ²</em> (1) = 3.265, <em>p = .071</em></td>
<td><em>χ²</em> (1) = 13.194, <em>p &gt; .001</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409 (17.5%)</td>
<td>227 (25.3%)</td>
<td>124 (10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>χ²</em> (1) = 13.369, <em>p &gt; .001</em></td>
<td><em>χ²</em> (1) = 2.161, <em>p = 0.142</em></td>
<td><em>χ²</em> (1) = 13.321, <em>p &gt; .001</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-9 shows some results that differ significantly from Chambers' similar analysis. For all three groups, proper-name capitalization is seen as non-significant: there are no appreciably different
rates in non-capitalization of proper names among jocks, coaches, and others. This suggests that, 
contra Chambers' initial results, differences in rates of proper name capitalization are not a significant 
differentiation between jock and coach orthography. First-person I capitalization, however, does seem 
to be a significant factor: jocks are more likely not to capitalize I than coaches (14.9% versus 6.5%) or 
others (14.9% versus 10.2%). Interestingly, there does not seem to be statistical significance in the 
rates of I-capitalization between coaches and others (6.5% versus 10.2%), suggesting that non-
adherence may be a salient difference in jock orthography on OnYourKnees, but stricter adherence not 
as much for coach orthography.

For sentence-initial capitalization rules, differences among all three groups were significant: 
jocks, coaches, and others show significant differences in rates of sentence-initial capitalization among 
each other. Coaches are more likely than jocks to capitalize the first words of sentences (6.3% versus 
13.6%), and are similarly more likely to do so than others (6.3% versus 17.5%). However, although 
jocks and others show a significant difference in rates of sentence-initial capitalization, the trend is in 
the opposite, less expected way: jocks show greater adherence to sentence-initial capitalization than 
others (13.6% versus 17.5%). Thus, those who do not self-identify as jocks or coaches are the ones 
who capitalize their sentences the least.

This presents an interesting contradiction to the idea that jocks are less likely than other groups 
on OnYourKnees to show conformity to standard American English spelling conventions. Why might 
those who self-identify as neither jocks nor coaches show the greatest non-adherence to sentence-initial 
capitalization, and, perhaps more importantly, why does this difference go unremarked or unnoticed? 
One explanation may lie in the possibility that, on some level, self-identified jocks on OnYourKnees do 
expend some time and energy in composing their thoughts, which is reflected in a relatively more strict 
adherence to SAE sentence-initial capitalization rules. Because so much of the material being
discussed on OnYourKnees is about jock identity (and the behaviors and values that go along with it), jocks are always at the forefront of discussion. Although those who self-identify as neither jocks nor coaches are robust participants in discussions, much discussion does not necessarily revolve around them, or their identities as 'other.' It is possible, then, that on some level the orthographic space revolving around these 'others' is not as regulated as those of jocks and coaches: they can show innovations in their orthography that do not necessarily contribute to their identity because they are not seen as having one.

The above discussion demonstrated that jocks and coaches engage in different orthographic styles that help to index them as their respective identities. Taking Chambers' (2017) analysis as a starting point, the discussion showed that self-identified jocks are more likely than self-identified coaches to engage in spelling non-conformity, first-person I non-capitalization, and sentence-initial non-capitalization. Self-identified coaches, similarly, are more likely to adhere to Standard American English capitalization rules, first-person I capitalization, and sentence-initial capitalization. However, this simple binarization of features obscures the more nuanced ways in which jocks and coaches utilize orthographic features as part of their linguistic repertoire. Although jocks and coaches are most likely to demonstrate spelling innovation as apostrophe deletion, jocks and coaches differ in which grammatical categories they are most likely to misspell words. Those who self-identify as neither jocks nor coaches seem to show interesting innovations of their own, lacking adherence to sentence-initial capitalization rules at greater rates than jocks do. This study seems to suggest, then, that jocks do not simply write 'worse' than coaches do: their orthographic choices are motivated and regular, and perform much identity work on OnYourKnees.
DJ, CM and the tranced jock:

Up until this point in the chapter, orthographic variability among posters was examined quantitatively and categorically, attempting to ascertain differences among self-identified jocks, coaches, and those who identify as neither. It is important to understand that dialogic conversations do not only occur among speakers: often times they also manifest *within* speakers. As Pietikäinen and Dufva (2006) note, although “speakers resort to discourses, and are constrained by them, they also have options in choosing and modifying them. The ways of expressing and constructing one’s identity are thus not exclusively determined by discourses, but are also reflections of the individual and his/her life story, as indicated by the concept of voice” (213).

The below discussion will analyze in-depth two threads from posters who exemplify this 'choosing and modifying' of orthographic features. Each analyzed poster, DJ and CM, take advantage of the above-discussed orthographic features to index not only the identity of a jock, but that of a *tranced* jock: a poster who has listened to a trance and currently finds himself under one. Studying how each poster deploys particular orthographic features can help make sense of how, on a larger level, orthographic variability on OnYourKnees can be used as a tool for indexing particular and nuanced identities.

The first thread under consideration in this analysis is the daily chronicle of one individual poster [DJ] who is chronicling about his experiences listening to a particular trance once a day. Below is the entire text of the thread: the first column lists the number of the post within the thread, the second column lists the poster, the third column lists the line number that will be referenced in the analysis following the text, and the fourth column is the text itself (as presented on the thread, with all spelling innovations intact):
(37) today was day one listenin to the file. im gonna listen to it once a day and see what happens. has anybody else listened to this file? (DJ, 1:1)

DJ has not previously posted in the messageboard: this represents his first (and, as of this writing, only) participation in the OnYourKnees community. As such, where he falls on the jock-coach continuum is unknown to other members of the community at this point. His post in (37) establishes his plans to listen to a trance (what he calls a file) once a day and record his observations and thoughts for other posters). Here, although at this point in the conversation it is not explicit, DJ is clearly aligning with a jock identity: actively desiring to listen to a trance is one of the characteristics associated with being a jock on OnYourKnees.

It is also important to note how DJ constructs himself as an Agent at this point in the conversation. He identifies himself as going to experience a behavioral (listen) and mental (see) process in listening to the file. However, his orthographic style in (37) also demonstrates nonstandard capitalization and nonstandard spelling. He does not capitalize any of his sentences, nor does he capitalize I in im. He also nonstandardly spells two words (listenin and im). Here, both the content of his post and use of nonstandard capitalization and nonstandard spelling work together to establish his alignment with a jock identity.

DJ's second post (38) chronicles his second day listening to the trance:

(38) day 2, Ø²⁴ lisend again this mornin last week i broke my foot so ive ben layed up and out of work and Ø will b for a while... so a lot of how im respondin to this file has to do with facebook n frends by txt etc... today i notised that im bord with allmost every single one of my frends posts esp the wordy ones... all i honestly care about is the sports posts like bleacher report n NHL and th NY rangers stuff... i had a weird urge to post

---

24 Ø refers to an instance of I-subject deletion, where first-person subject I should be expected (but is not). 318
somethin wordy explainin how frustrated i am with bein on bedrest n stuf after readin a frends post about travelin south for a few days but i stopped myself... Ø cant explain why... Ø guessin its the file takin hold! (DJ, 1:2)

In (38), DJ's alignment with a jock identity becomes more apparent in both content and in form. DJ begins to describe his changes in behavior that he attributes to listening to the trance. Content-wise, he notes his lack of concentration in reading his friends' posts on Facebook (especially the wordy ones), and being only interested in sports news. He also observes that he was unable to respond to a friend's post, with the implication that he was unable to do so because he could not compose a wordy post. He attributes this lack of interest to the trance itself, stating guessin its the file takin hold!. Each of these observations seems to index a particular aspect of jock identity: disinterest in reading (his lack of concentration), interest in sports (wanting to read only sports news), and lack of intellect (not responding to a friend's post in a 'wordy' way). An important implication here is that, had he not been listening to the trance, he would normally be interested in and capable of responding to his friends' posts on Facebook, and he would be interested in more than sports news. Implicitly, then, DJ is drawing a distinction between his pre-trance and post-trance behavior, drawing links between being tranced and engaging in behavior, associated with being a jock, that is mediated by the act of listening to the trance.

In this second post, DJ's use of linguistic form is also noticeably different from his first. While in (37) he engaged in behavioral and mental processes, in (39) he seems to favor the use of mental processes in describing the effects the trance has on him. After breaking his foot (material process) and being layed up (behavioral process), he begins to incorporate more mental processes into his post. He noticed that he was bord with most Facebook posts (except those having to do with sports), and although he had a weird urge to post something, he felt frustrated with his limited mobility. It is
interesting to note that the extensive use of mental processes here coincides with his discussion of listening to the trance a second time, most likely because a trance is supposed to induce (in part) a mental change upon the listener. Although he stopped himself (material process) from posting, he can't explain (verbal process) why he did—though he supposes its the file takin hold! With this statement, DJ is acknowledging that the file is inducing changes in how he sees himself and the world around him—the use of the material process takin[g] hold transfers agency from him onto the file itself.

DJ's orthography also undergoes an important change in (38). As in (37), his second post demonstrates multiple instances of lack of adherence to SAE capitalization rules, including frequent lack of capitalization of proper nouns (facebook, bleacher report [a sports news television show]). Interestingly, he does capitalize some proper nouns (NHL) and even demonstrates mixing of capitalized and non-capitalized forms within a single term (NY rangers), suggesting that this non-adherence to capitalization is not absolute. In addition, he shows numerous spelling nonadherences. However, unlike in (36), where he only misspelled two words out of 27 (or 7% of the total post), in (37) he misspells 25 words out of a total of 129, or almost 20% of all of his words within that post, a noticeable increase. It’s important to consider this increase in light of the fact that, in total, self-identified jocks only deviate from standard spelling in 3% of their total words. Even though DJ shows a noticeable increase in nonstandard spelling between his first and second post, both posts show a higher-than-average rate of nonstandard spelling (7% and 20%, respectively). This may be a case where, as a first poster whose jock/coach orientation is unknown to other posters, DJ is orthographically hypercorrecting by making it very clear that he is clearly a jock. Out of the 25 spelling nonadherences DJ demonstrates in lines (3-10), seven are instances of word-final -g missing (ex. respondin in line 4, explainin and readin in line 8). This may suggest an attempt to reflect a particular phonology, where word-final velar /ŋ/ is realized as a full alveolar /n/ within speech. In addition, many of his nonstandard spellings, like b for be and n
for *and*, is reminiscent of text found in mobile text conventions (cf. Crystal 2008): this may be his individual way of indexing a youthful, casual identity.

The noticeable increase in nonstandard spelling forms, and the unique forms the spellings seem to take, seems to be a deliberate strategy by DJ to show his gradual 'giving in' to the trance. By using mental processes to describe his thoughts and feelings as he is listening to the trance, DJ acknowledges the power a trance has in effecting changes in thought and attitude within the listener. By noticeably increasing the proportion of misspelled words in a post where he is trancing himself for a second day, he is demonstrating that he is becoming more and more tranced and (therefore by implication) more and more like an 'ideal' jock who is constantly tranced and unable to conform to standard spelling conventions at all. The dropping of final -g, on the other hand, seems to be DJ's unique take on how to write like a jock: essentially, he is tailoring already-existing and already-salient orthographic forms to suit his particular and personal conception of what a tranced jock should sound like (cf. Morikawa 2019).

It is also important to note that DJ's increased use of spelling innovations does not go unnoticed by other posters. MM, a self-identified coach, responds to DJ with the following:

(39) It's possible it's affecting you in ways you aren't even noticing. For example, your spelling on the day four post is awful - but it didn't seem like you realized that. Ø Hope you don't need to do too much writing for work or school ;) (MM, 1:7)

In (39), MM's post presents an orthographic style that is consistent with standard American English convention: he demonstrates a strict adherence to SAE spelling conventions and capitalization rules, which (as discussed above) is congruent with a coach identity. However, MM also contributes to the link between orthography and identity when he claims that *your spelling on the day four post is awful*. By bringing attention to DJ's 'poor' spelling, MM draws an implicit link between nonstandard
spelling and a jock identity, and ultimately helping to codify and legitimate an appropriate jock orthography for speakers on OnYourKnees.

But one thing to notice about DJ's posts is that he is not only discussing his experience becoming a jock: he is discussing his experiences becoming a jock through the medium of the trance. Thus, DJ's posts may not necessarily reflect an orthographic innovation of a jock identity, but that of a tranced jock. This begs the question: are there differences in the ways in which tranced jocks and non-tranced jocks manipulate orthographic features to assert a particular identity—that of the tranced individual? In order to answer this question, all posts in which self-identified jocks explicitly identified as being in a state of trance (28 posts in total, total number of words N = 1946) were analyzed for each of the orthographic features discussed above, and a chi-square test was run to ascertain any differences in frequency between those posts and all others posts from self-identified jocks who, at the time of their posting, did not self-identify as being in a tranced state. Table 6-10 below summarizes the results:

Table 6-10: orthographic differences between tranced and non-tranced jocks (significant results are in bold):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Posts from tranced jocks (N = 1946)</th>
<th>Posts from non-tranced jocks (N = )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spelling innovations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correct spelling</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorrect spelling</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>32931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*χ² = 922.525, *p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presence of first-person I:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not present</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*χ² = 0.2503, *p = .617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6-10 demonstrates that, along some parameters, self-identified jocks who present as tranced do not engage in different orthographic practices than jocks who do not present as tranced. For first-person-\(I\) retention/deletion and proper name capitalization, tranced jocks pattern with non-tranced jocks \((p = .617\) and \(p = .114\), respectively). This suggests that, when jocks present themselves as tranced on OnYourKnees, their written text conforms with jocks in a non-tranced state along these two parameters.

However, the written text of jocks who present as tranced does differ from that of non-tranced jocks in other significant ways. Tranced jocks are more likely than non-tranced jocks to demonstrate greater spelling innovation \((\chi^2 = 922.525, p > .001)\), a less-strict adherence to capitalization of first-person \(I\) \((\chi^2 = 187.2104, p > .001)\), and a less-strict adherence to sentence-initial capitalization \((\chi^2 = 184.4477, p > .001)\). These three parameters, as discussed above, represent salient differences in the ways in which self-identified jocks and self-identified coaches present themselves orthographically: it seems that the text of tranced jocks represents an exaggeration of orthographic features already present.
in the text of self-identified jocks, and their increased presence within a text can thus index a tranced identity. In a way, this increased presents represents a variation on Barrett's (2017) concept of citationality, in that the indices that are recognized as qualities of a jock orthography are re-cast when deployed in an exaggerated manner to represent a 'tranced' jock.

In (37-38), DJ (as a new poster) recognized the orthographic tools at-play within OnYourKnees that helped to index a jock identity, and demonstrated a skillful manipulation of them that was recognized by other members of OnYourKnees as indicative of a jock identity. Other posters, however, demonstrate that it is possible to transgress boundaries among jock and tranced-jock identities even within the same thread, and thus can identify as both even without explicit self-identification: the careful deployment of salient orthographic features helps, in part, to flit back-and-forth between two identities.

This can be demonstrated in two posts (belonging to the same thread) written by CM, who is responding to a thread that discusses attitudes toward a previously-posted downloadable hypnotic trance:

(40) I'm skeptical that hypnosis can truly make someone less intelligent. I do believe, though, that the power of suggestion can be very strong. By repeatedly telling a guy that he's not smart, and by emphasizing the things about him that don't require much intelligence, you can, in effect, dumb him down appropriately. Real guidance from a real person with an agenda is the key to "success," I believe. (CM, 4:4)

At the point where CM enters the conversation in (40), other posters are sharing their experience with a particular trance. CM, responding to these experiences, expresses his doubt that hypnosis can make someone less intelligent, instead advocating for real guidance from a real person. CM's opinion that hypnosis, as a general practice, may be ineffectual is a rather daring claim to make
on a messageboard on which many posters create, discuss, and share hypnotic trances, and where the consumption of these trances is a primary activity for posters. Although CM does align with the general idea that some jocks can be made to be less intelligent, he disaligns from the more specific idea that hypnosis can make someone less intelligent. Part of the force of this comment comes from its form, and in the way he sets himself up as an authoritative figure. He first uses a relational process (I'm skeptical) to stress his doubts about the efficacy of a trance in 'dumbing' someone down, and uses two instances of the mental process believe to explain his particular point of view. CM also demonstrates no non-standard spelling and no non-standard capitalization, qualities of form associated with coachlect and coach identity.

However, CM posts again after he listens to the trance in question:

(41) Dudes, i take back some of what i said about not believing in hypnotizing. ive listened to the musclehead file yesterday and this morning before going to the gym, and its clearly had an effect on me. i feel more simple-minded already, which is great. i was thinking too much anyway. all that matters is that i get more muscular, look good, and eat well - or at least those are the most important things.

even after listening just once yesterday, i looked next to me on the sofa and there was a book and some magazines that had nothing to do with muscle or nutrition, and suddenly they seemed mostly meaningless. just clutter. i threw them away. (CM, 4:5)

CM's post in (41) demonstrates a marked shift in message and tone. He claims that he listened to the particular file in question, and it has had an effect on him: he feels more simple-minded, and wants to focus only on books that deal with muscle-building and nutrition. He also claims that all that matters is that i get more muscular, look good, and eat well – or at least those are the most important things, qualities associated with a jock identity. In content, ultimately, CM is opposing what he claimed
in (40): hypnosis now works for him, and he seems to be happy to share his change of heart with the rest of the community.

This change in perspective is important for two reasons. First, by claiming that hypnosis ultimately has an effect on him, CM is reaffirming one of the key values of the community: the importance and power of trances in the maintenance of a jock identity. Being affected by trances brings with it a constellation of qualities that are associated with a jock identity, including wanting to work out more, feeling more simple-minded (if not explicitly dumb), and being more body-focused and -conscious. This co-occurrence of jock qualities further cements them as important, if not essential, components to claiming a jock identity, bringing all of these elements together into a cohesive identity-type.

Second, his post highlights the importance of exploitation of process types and orthographic form in the assumption of these identities. While in (40) CM primarily uses mental processes to assert himself as an authority on the efficacy of trances, in (41) he exhibits a wider range of process types to demonstrate his experiences listening to the trance. He uses verbal processes to take back what he previously said, and a behavioral process to show that he listened to the file. He also claims that he feels more simple-minded and now understands that he was thinking too much: mental processes that highlight these changes in his thought and attitude. He also notes that what is important to him now is engaging in material processes: get[ting] more muscular, look[ing] good, and eat[ing] well are all material processes associated with a 'proper' jock identity.

CM's post in (41) also utilizes orthographic features not found in his first post that correspond to his new-found identity as a tranced individual. In contrast to (40), which fully adhered to SAE capitalization rules (with four instances of sentence-initial capitalization and one instance of I-capitalization), CM's post in (41) only adheres to SAE capitalization twice: in the beginning of the post
(Dudes) and in one example of first-person *I*. In all other places where SAE capitalization would be expected, lowercasing is found (in ten total instances, with eight instances of lowercasing of first-person *I*). The preference for lowercase sentence-initial capitalization and lowercase *I* is a marked, noticeable difference from his preceding post.

It seems, then, that CM takes advantage of particular jock orthographic forms to set up a contrast within himself. Pre-‘trance,’ he is skeptical and does not believe hypnosis can work. This statement is correlated with full adherence to SAE spelling and capitalization rules. (41), however, signals a marked difference in his attitude: he now believes that hypnosis works because he feels the effects himself. This statement is also correlated to a particular form: lack of adherence to SAE capitalization rules. The net effect of this change in style seems to be that, as CM is tranced, he is incorporating more jock-like linguistic behavior into his writing: he not only enacting a jock identity, but a *tranced* jock identity.

It is also interesting to note that, although CM shows a marked difference in rates of non-capitalization of initial sentences and first-person *I*, his rates of conformity to spelling are not markedly different. In (40), CM fully conforms to SAE spelling, and in (41) he also largely conforms to SAE spelling. However, in (41), two instances of spelling non-conformity are evident: *ive* and *its*, two examples of apostrophe deletion. CM, in (40), already demonstrates spelling conformity to such contracted forms (in fact, he begins his post with the orthographically-correct *I’m*). The presence of these two instances of apostrophe deletion in (41), and their contrast with *I’m* in (40) may represent a strategic use of contrasting between orthographically-correct and -incorrect forms to index a (tranced) jock identity, and may be reflective of Androutsopoulos's (2011) importance of looking qualitatively at shifts in orthographies, rather than quantitatively. Such a shift may not be noticeable on a larger scale,
but within the confines of his conversation, CM seems to use this shift strategically, to effectively mark the change in his attitude and behavior, and to create his own version of how the trance affects him.

However, although CM uses an increase in lowercasing to index his growing jock identity, the (relative) non-exploitation of non-SAE spelling may also suggest that CM's 'jockness' may only be partial and temporary. Perhaps CM does not want to be viewed as a very dumb jock, at least not for long. As other posters comment on CM's changed mental state, CM responds with (42) below:

(42) One more thing... The only time I took my ear plugs out and talked to somebody during my workout this afternoon was when a guy was asking me how to do a certain exercise. That was very cool. I'd like to get to a point where that's the only thing guys ask me about at the gym, at least when I'm in the middle of working out. In fact, now that I mention it, I think I'm going to do just that. I will mostly ignore guys unless they're asking me a question about exercise -.- Or if they're hot, I'll respond to whatever they say. :P. Ha. (CM, : )

In (42), CM returns to fully adhering to SAE capitalization rules. The switch back to full capitalization conformity seems to also be strategic: this is a way for CM to index that he is no longer tranced, and he can look at his experiences under trance more critically. He now presents similarly to the identity-type he showcased in (40), fully adhering to SAE capitalization and spelling rules – with one exception: the use of lowercase i in his last clause. The appearance of this lowercase form may also be strategic. He mentions that he would like to be able to concentrate on working out at the gym, and only talk to other gym-goers if they need a question answered about exercise – unless they're hot, in which case he'll respond to whatever they say. Perhaps here, the use of lowercase i is a subtle but effective use of non-capitalization to index submission, lack of ability to think, and an ability to speak – when speaking to a cute guy.

Ultimately, both DJ and CM are able to effectively use the linguistic tools at their disposal to present similar, but also very different, jock identities. Both DJ and CM, through their posts,
acknowledge the importance of trance in the creation and maintenance of jock identities, and both
highlight the importance of manipulating linguistic form, marked in both instances by a selective
increase in occurrences of process types and linguistic forms associated with jocklect. However, DJ
and CM demonstrate that the particular shape a jocklect takes can vary from speaker to speaker. While
DJ increased his use of non-SAE spelling to index a particular moment in time (the 'falling-under' a
trance), CM achieved the same general effect through a different means: increasing his use of non-SAE
capitalization. As DJ began his posts, he already orients himself (partly through content, but also
through form) as a jock, and his increasing use of non-SAE spelling indexes him temporally as a jock
who is undergoing a trance. CM, on the other hand, begins his posts by orienting himself closer to the
coach continuum, and then increases his usage of non-SAE capitalization to demonstrate that he is
being tranced. As the effects of the trance wear off, he (largely) reverts back to SAE, putting distance
between his 'tranced' self and his current, non-tranced state. These different strategies, however,
produce similar outcomes: a recognizable orthography that palpably demonstrates the effects a trance
can have on a listener.

Conclusions:

This chapter explored the possibility that self-identified jocks and self-identified coaches on
OnYourKnees index their identities, in part, through the deployment and exaggeration of particular
syntactic structures and orthographic features. These structures and features, it is argued, have great
saliency in both maintaining ideologies of domination and submission between coaches and jocks, and
allow freedom for individuals to exploit orthographic features to discuss who they are, and what they
feel.
In terms of process types, posters on OnYourKnees engage with the lemmas JOCK and COACH in different ways, which reflects the ways in which they are seen on the messageboard: jocks and coaches engage with JOCK in relational processes that identify JOCK as a single, unified group, and in mental processes that describe the thoughts of jocks. However, self-identified jocks and coaches position themselves differently within these processes: jocks often talk about being and becoming muscle jocks, and wanting to achieve that state, while coaches talk about wanting to help jocks achieve their ideal identities. Jocks and coaches, on the other hand, utilize COACH most often in mental processes that associate them with agency and authority. Other posters, those who self-identify as neither jocks nor coaches, somewhat participate in the processes, but are also more likely to view jock and coach identities in a multitude of ways, reflected by their uses of various processes to describe jocks and coaches.

Similarly, the data above presents a rather complex picture of orthography on OnYourKnees, and the multitude of ways in which jocks and coaches can exploit orthographic tools to (partially) index their identities. Using Chambers' (2017) study as an initial starting point, this chapter demonstrated that self-identified jocks show greater rates of spelling non-conformity, first-person I non-capitalization, and sentence-initial capitalization than self-identified jocks. Surprisingly, contra Chambers' findings, self-identified jocks and coaches are equally as likely to retain first-person I in their writings. In addition, jocks, coaches, and those who self-identify as neither are likely to misspell certain words most frequently, but are likely to misspell words in different grammatical categories more frequently than others. This chapter has also demonstrated two examples in which posters are able to exploit the above-mentioned orthographic tools to index not only a jock identity, but a tranced jock identity.
These results have great relevance for the sociolinguistics of writing, especially those dealing with the importance of orthography as a marker of identity. As this chapter has shown, posters utilize a variety of orthographic features to help index their identities— but these features are not utilized by all members of the community at all points in time. Jocks can, and often do, put themselves in positions of agency within a sentence, spell words correctly, capitalize their I’s, and capitalize the first words of their sentences. Coaches sometimes misspell words and delete apostrophes from contractions, and sometimes speak about things happening to them. But what seems to emerge from this analysis is an understanding that orthography is just one of a variety of tools that can be used to index a particular identity. It is truly not just about what is said, but how it is said.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

This group seems to have kind of died so I'm leaving it. I hope the guys have good luck with becoming good dumb jocks!

Take care everybody (HS, 114:1)

In the first fourteen months of its existence, OnYourKnees enjoyed a small-but-robust period of activity, where posters created and maintained a community that welcomed the sharing of desires, beliefs, and experiences of being men interested in jock and coach identities, and in the idea of erotic hypnosis. From March 2007 to August 2008, 687 posts appeared on the messageboard, representing 24% of all posts within its life. However, in August of 2008, at least one poster (HS, above) noted that the group seemed to be waining in popularity, and he publicly expressed his decision to no longer post on the messageboard. Although he did not follow through with his declaration and continued to post for years afterward (eventually becoming one of the messageboard's most frequent posters), his message suggests that, at least to some people, it was no longer fulfilling an important purpose.

In a way, this dissertation is an ethnography of a population that no longer exists: from 2017 to the present, only 8 new messages have been posted to OnYourKnees. This dearth of new posts continues a steady decline in posting activity that began in 2015, when the total amount of new messages dropped to 73, from 324 in 2014. It is unclear as to why this messageboard experienced such a steady decline: there does not seem to be evidence of any particular event that dissuaded posters from sharing their experiences, nor is there any talk about the lack of membership or attempts to encourage members to post. Posters on OnYourKnees, for a variety of reasons, might just decide to no longer associate with the messageboard, and simply 'move on.'
However, the posts that do exist on OnYourKnees represent a particular community who share their desires, their beliefs, and their understandings of themselves and the world around them. This dissertation attempted to understand the world that posters create on OnYourKnees, and the ways in which language contributes to the creation and maintenance of a very particular kind of eroticized world. To be a jock or coach on OnYourKnees means to participate in a world where multiple ways of being are discussed, explored, accepted, rejected, upheld, or erased. This dissertation studied how jocks and coaches negotiated identities, in part, through their use of language.

Many Critical Discourse Analysis studies assume that strands of ideology are woven throughout any text that is created by someone: that person has a particular world-view that infuses their words, and they (consciously or not) shape their language use to get readers to align with their conception of the world. All texts are saturated with such ideologies, and examining how such phenomena as modality and transitivity are deployed within a text can help understand how some people are constructed as being more powerful than others, and how those constructions have very real effects when a text moves beyond the reader and into the social realm. Texts that are used to inform others, suggest and critique policy, or even share stories with one another position the subject and reader in such a way as to favor particular readings of the text over others, and can serve to legitimate, dominate, or erase the identity of others.

This dissertation hopes to contribute to studies of Critical Discourse Analysis in important ways. First, as Chapter 3 argued, jock and coach identities are not created separately from one another. As individuals enact one identity, they simultaneously construct an Other that compliments their identity. For jocks, their desire to be submissive often necessitates the construction of a coach Other who becomes the ideal dominant, able to guide them in their journeys to become the ideal fit, obedient Jock. For coaches (who, it must continue to be said, are not represented on the messageboard nearly as
often as jocks), the desire to dominate brings into creation an ideal submissive Other, who is seen as properly obedient and focused on sports and personal fitness. What is perhaps especially important is that these identities are created not solely by one person, for dissemination to others: hundreds of posters, over a period of years, each contribute their own unique viewpoints and experiences to the world they create. This dissertation hopes to not only stress the importance of the co-construction of identity (including how multiple identities are continuously constructed, negotiated, or in some cases outrightly rejected) but also how a Critical Discourse Analytical framework can be used to analyze texts of which the voices and texts of multiple individuals are a part.

Second, this dissertation hoped to provide a framework through which Critical Discourse Analysts can examine the multiple ideologies that weave through a particular stretch of text. Although Critical Discourse Analysis provides multiple frameworks through which to view the relationship between language and power, many studies focus their attention on a single ideology that runs throughout the text. If texts are sites of competing ideologies, however, than it becomes important to identify those ideologies and study how they interact with each other. For messageboard participants on OnYourKnees, the world they create (as argued in Chapter 3) is partially influenced by ideologies of hegemonic masculinity that support the dominance of one type of man (the coach) over other men (jocks), and which privilege certain types of activities (physical fitness, desires to be hypnotized, submission to coaches) and ideologies (an orientation to working-class values, the desire to be dumb) that support these contours of dominance and submission. However, as was argued in Chapter 4, participants simultaneously align with a larger BDSM community through both their words (in the form of the use of honorifics) and their beliefs (especially the importance of trust and consent among all participants in any messageboard activity). Each of these ideologies, it was argued, relies on a distinct understanding of power: power either emanates from the dominant, as it has often been argued
in studies of hegemonic masculinity, or it is a resource to be used by members of a community to index temporary stances of dominance and submission that can flow from one person to the next, as Newmahr (2010a) has argued. Ultimately, for jocks and coaches on OnYourKnees, power exists simultaneously in both forms: as both ingrained in the status of coaches, and in all messageboard participants who have say in determining who are 'authentic' practitioners of BDSM, and who have permission to participate in the community in the first place (as discussed in Chapter 5).

Third, this dissertation incorporates qualitative and quantitative studies of orthography into a Critical Discourse Analysis. Especially in a text such as that on OnYourKnees, in which multiple posters contribute their unique voices to the creation and maintenance of a world, paying attention to how posters exploit orthographic variables to enact individual identities becomes especially important in understanding how ideologies are woven throughout a text. As Chapter 6 argued, posters utilize a variety of textual features to speak about themselves and others. Jocks, for example, participate in processes that equate their individual selves to a larger jock identity filled with wants and desires, associate coaches with realms of agency, and utilize a variety of orthographic tools (including spelling innovations and lack of adherence to sentence-initial and first-person I) to help index that identity.

Coaches, on their part, participate in these processes too, speaking about individual jocks as part of a larger community and idealizing themselves as agents who think and do. Their stricter adherence to standard American English spelling and capitalization norms also brings into focus their position as individuals of both authority and agency. Those who self-identify as neither also participate in these processes, although to lesser extents. If orthography is a social space where individuals can express themselves, as Sebba (2007) and others have claimed, all posters on OnYourKnees certainly exemplify this.
However thorough this dissertation may seem to readers, more work can always be done. Below, I identify two avenues for further research that I feel, although they fall outside the specific purview of this dissertation, represent important steps forward in applying this research to other domains:

**Race and the messageboard:** One of the research questions largely unaddressed in this dissertation is the extent to which OnYourKnees represents a 'White' public space: a space where "Whites are invisibly normal, and in which racialized populations are visibly marginal and the objects of monitoring" (Hill 1998, 682). These public spaces (of which OnYourKnees can be consider one, if in a virtual world) "may entail particular or generalized locations, sites, patterns, configurations, tactics, or devices that routinely, discursively, and sometimes coercively privilege Euro-Americans over nonwhites" (Page & Thomas 1994, 111). What is considered 'White' space is often not identified as such, but nonetheless demonstrates multiple (often insidious) ways in which the experiences and input of Whites are acknowledged and valued in ways that those of other races are not. Even the realm of BDSM activity, which ostensibly is non-judgmental and welcomes the participation of all individuals regardless of race, has been criticized for incorporating racial difference into scenes in historically- and socially-loaded ways (for example, in mock 'slave auctions,' e.g. Smith & Luykx 2017), and for minimizing the unique experiences of African-American women and queer-identified individuals within BDSM communities (Adigweme, 2011).

It is interesting to think about the extent to which OnYourKnees can be considered a White space. Of note, first of all, is the idea that the image that welcomes individuals to the homepage of OnYourKnees (see Image 1-1 in Chapter 1) is composed of three white men. Second, within the entire corpus, there is very little talk about race. This lack of talk can be interpreted in one of two ways: it is
possible, for example, that race is simply not something that posters think about, or that they think is important to their experiences on OnYourKnees. However, race is not entirely absent on OnYourKnees, and the little discussion that revolves around it points to a second possibility: that most posters on OnYourKnees are assumed to be White, and as such there is no need to discuss racial difference (since there is no one on the board who is racially different).

Although, as had been discussed in previous chapters, many posters use personal-ad-style posts to express their desire to find someone to dominate (or be dominated by), racial preference is rarely discussed. However, (1) below represents one of the few instances where racial preference is made distinctly clear:

(1) I am looking for white men to become my sex slave through the process of hypnosis. You will obey and serve me. You have no will power. Your mind belongs to me now. I want only white men. NO minorities should apply. Only weak white men. [DR, 240:1]

In (1), DR explicitly states that he is looking for white men to become his sex slave: he makes it explicitly clear that NO minorities should apply. Only weak white men. Here, DR clearly states a racial preference, and any individual who does not identify as white (or, it can be inferred, does not phenotypically present as white) should not bother contacting DR. (It is interesting to think that the phrase NO minority should apply evokes similar wording that has historically been used in newspaper-style want ads and job applications during the beginning of the 20th century). DR thus constructs white men as the object of affection, and his most preferred user of the messageboard.

It must be said that DR's post does not go unremarked by other members of the messageboard:

(2) I sincerely hope you're not the same guy the got kicked off numerous sites for trying some kind of induction in a public hypno forum and that post is an obvious attempt at one, badly disguised
too.... if you are the same black "master" (and I use the term loosely for that guy) that's been reported as a rank amateur and because of his ignorance has caused numerous problems with subs and their tists, you must be insane pulling the same stunt and expecting a different result. Whether it is or not you should know, that practice is **NOT COOL in ANY hypno themed public forum.** [HT, 240:1]

In (2), HT recognizes DR's post as an attempt to trance other individuals, a phenomenon that is recognizable by a series of syntactic and lexical choices and that results in banishment from the messageboard (as discussed in Chapter 5). In his post, HT makes it known to the messageboard community that DR has attempted similar activities on other messageboards and has been punished for it, even going so far as to call him a *rank amateur*. He claims that his behavior, ultimately, is **NOT COOL in ANY hypno themed public forum.** But the question must be asked, what behavior is HT claiming is inappropriate? HT identifies DT as a *black master* (a seeming allusion to DT's race, although DT did not disclose his own race in (1)), but seems to be basing DT's illegitimacy on the basis of his attempts to trance other individuals without their consent. DT's preference for White men seems to be unremarked on by HT, or by any other member of the messageboard. Does this mean that DT's preference for white men is seen as acceptable on the messageboard, minimizing the real effects that racial preference may have on readers of OnYourKnees? It is in ways like this in which race manifests itself on OnYourKnees: small remarks that are seemingly insignificant to members of the messageboard, but may have larger ramifications for understanding the potentially complicated ways in which race plays a role in the world of OnYourKnees. Further research can be done in this arena.

**Extension beyond the immediate environment of the messageboard:** This dissertation concerns itself with one messageboard, a small group of members, and their individual linguistic practices. None of what has been discussed in this dissertation can be said to be applicable to other such
communities without extensively researching the individual ideologies, beliefs, and experiences of members of those communities. To what extent, for example, are the individual orthographic features present on OnYourKnees to help index a jock or coach identity also prevalent in other online forums dedicated to erotic hypnosis? Can we speak of a 'tranced' orthographic style that can be demonstrated to be consistent from community to community, across messageboards? If there are differences, what may those differences look like? Perhaps the research present in this dissertation can lead to more research among other erotic-hypnosis communities to determine the roles in which orthographic play can contribute to hypnotizer-hypnotized identities. Here, a focus on non-English-language messageboards would be especially helpful: do other languages utilize different orthographic tools to index these identities?

On a larger level, it would be fruitful to explore how other BDSM-identified communities incorporate strands of BDSM ideologies into their senses of Self and Other, and what other ideologies might compete with or compliment them. Taking Leppänen's (2016) study of 'doggielect' as an example, is it possible to examine how individuals on a BDSM-themed messageboard focused on pup play (a particular style of BDSM that involves submissives acting like household pets, and dominants like their owners) use language to index their identities as pups or owners. Is there a human 'doggielect' that emerges? How might ideologies of pet ownership and behavior interplay with BDSM ideologies, specifically ideologies of power? Analyzing how different communities interact with BDSM ideologies while retaining their individual foci can help to understand how, on a larger level, BDSM ideologies are seen as important forces that shape the lives of messageboard members.

Speaking to those who participate on messageboards: This dissertation focused on naturally-occurring data from a publicly-accessible messageboard, without any interference from the researcher. Nothing was elicited, and no attempts were made to contact anyone associated with the messageboard. On one
level, this approach allowed for the corpus on OnYourKnees to be studied in its 'natural' state. However, interviewing and interacting with those who post on messageboards such as this can provide valuable information into the degrees in which posters are actively conscious of the ways they speak about themselves and each other, and any potential exploitation of orthographic tools they may engage in. Such data would be invaluable in helping to understand how individuals on messageboards deliberately (or not) construct their identities, and how they decide what choices to make to represent themselves online.

Ultimately, this dissertation argued that all messageboard posters on OnYourKnees utilize various ideologies, belief systems, and linguistic/orthographic tools to index their identities. It is this researcher's hope that this study contributes to the larger conversation revolving not only around the usefulness of Critical Discourse Analysis as a framework for language study, but also for a greater understanding of how individuals speak about themselves and others in highly-complex ways.
Appendix 1: occurrences of *you* within (9 (Chapter 4)), and relevant material processes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line number</th>
<th>clause</th>
<th>material process of clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You as subject:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You are a bodybuilder.</td>
<td>(attributive) relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You eat like a bodybuilder.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>You enjoy working out</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>You only eat what helps you to become a better bodybuilder.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>You will only eat foods that help you build muscle and stay healthy.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>You will only eat foods that help you build muscle and stay healthy.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>You wake up wanting to work out.</td>
<td>behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>You go to work wanting to work out.</td>
<td>behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>You go to lunch wanting to work out.</td>
<td>behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>You leave work wanting to work out.</td>
<td>behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>You workout every day after work.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>You want to work out.</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>You workout safely to exhaustion.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>You workout safely to muscle fatigue.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>You workout safely like a bodybuilder.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>You workout safely with every rep at full intensity.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Once you start to work out, you won't be satisfied until you are fatigued.</td>
<td>(attributive) relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Once you start to work out, you won't stop until your exhausted.</td>
<td>(attributive) relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Once you start to work out, you work out like a bodybuilder.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>After every workout you shower.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>After working out, you can go home happy.</td>
<td>behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>You love to plan your meals every day.</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>You take pride in packing your workout clothes every night.</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>You like to exercise.</td>
<td>mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>You exercise like a bodybuilder.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>You eat like a bodybuilder.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>You only eat foods that help you build muscle and stay healthy.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Working out everyday makes you happy.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eating healthy foods makes you horny.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Getting horny makes you hard.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Being hard reminds you to eat healthy.</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Working out makes you happy.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Intensity makes you horny.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Getting horny makes you hard.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Being hard reminds you to eat healthy.</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Showering makes you horny.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Getting horny makes you hard.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Being hard reminds you to eat healthy.</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Getting home makes you horny.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Getting horny makes you hard.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Being hard reminds you to eat healthy.</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Every meal you plan will help you build muscle and stay healthy.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Planning healthy, bodybuilding meals makes you horny.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Getting horny makes you hard.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Being hard reminds you to eat healthy.</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working out everyday makes you happy</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>You only eat foods that help you build muscle and stay healthy.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Eating healthy foods makes you horny.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Getting horny makes you hard.</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Being hard reminds you to eat healthy.</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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