

Sexuality Stereotypes and Fantasies of Consumers of French Male Heterosexual Pornographic Media

BÉATRICE DAMIAN-GAILLARD

Professor
Arènes
University of Rennes
France

beatrice.damian@univ-rennes1.fr



This study examines the class and gender stereotypes that editors and editors-in-chief of the French male heterosexual pornographic press have of their readership's sexuality¹. The analysis is based on publishing houses' data (legal status, geographical location, sales revenue, number of employees, etc.), the editorial line of the publications that are representative of the sector², and individual interviews with four managers and nine editors³. The aim is to identify the commercial, professional and social issues underlying the creation and dynamizing of these stereotypes. Part one of this study focuses on the structures, actors and publications of a sector whose economic activity is strongly regulated⁴. It demonstrates the heterogeneity of existing editorial positions rooted in strategies identical to those implemented in the traditional magazine press: market segmentation, content specialization and the targeting of readers. These editorial positions frame the work of managers and editors in their relations to sources, audiences, the conception of the sexuality disseminated, professional values and their roles in the activity. Part two analyses the stereotypes constructed by editors-in-chief and journalists about the sexuality of their readers, what is at stake for them professionally and socially, and how these stereotypes are part of discursive strategies to shield their social status and career

Pour citer cet article, to quote this article, para citar este artigo :

Béatrice Damian-Gaillard, « Sexuality Stereotypes and Fantasies of Consumers of French Male Heterosexual Pornographic Media », *Sur le journalisme, About journalism, Sobre jornalismo* [En ligne, online], Vol 8, n°2 - 2019, 15 décembre - December 15 - 15 de dezembro.

URL : <http://www.surlejournalisme.com/rev>

from abasement⁵ because of the social illegitimacy of pornography (Beauthier, Méon, Truffin, 2010). It also examines how these stereotypes influence pornographic discourses and their modes of production, and more broadly how the agents of this medium circumscribe their readers' conception of masculinity and sexuality, exercising a domination based on prejudice, class and gender.

MAPPING MALE HETEROSEXUAL MEDIA

This media is a social, cultural, political and legal construct based on historicalized frameworks, rules, conventions and norms (Bozon, Giami, 1999) that define it. The display of real, yet staged, sexual acts, the discourses produced on sexuality and its uses distinguish it from other sectors of the press. These elements characterize a pornographic articulation (Goulemont, 1994), a discursive mechanism, in which reading “[...] has a physiological purpose: to make the reader desire an orgasm, to instill in him a state of tension and lack from which he will have to free himself by extra-literary means” (1994: 145). This eroticization of reading leads the reader into “the relentless universe of devouring passion” populated by heroes who, freed from social or physiological constraints, perform “[...] feats that make it possible to achieve an otherwise inaccessible quality of pleasure” (Goulemont, 1994: 58). An analysis of the material shows, however, that discursive variations do exist from which differentiated segments are created based on publishers' economic and organizational models

A segmented market and a plurality of economic and organizational models

The table below outlines the plurality of these models and proposes a mapping based on the legal characteristics of the publishing companies, the editorial positions of the magazines and the production conditions of these publications (team composition and work organization). This mapping distinguishes between companies that produce commercial press of collective sexualities (PCSC), and those of the XXX industry (PCX). The first includes magazines that feature multi-partner sexuality and publications that promote libertine classified ads. The second produces publications related to the pornography industry and includes two sub-categories: one addresses current events in the sector, while the other focuses on situation-specific content, partners in the sexual act, or sexual practices and specialties. The more specialized the subject, the more it constitutes a marketing niche, reflecting the spe-

cially subsets of pornography. This mapping is not immutable because of the two structural rationales of the production space, but it has implications for the work opportunities of actors and economic instability. Thus, a diversity of scenarios coexists depending on whether the actors are content to publish photos of film shoots without worrying about making this activity permanent in a stable company, or whether they work for publications belonging to larger enterprises. The situations analyzed therefore vary according to whether the magazines belong to conglomerates, their business models, and the terms and standards of content production. The economic stability of publishers can be measured along a spectrum that extends from minimal organizational mechanisms—one person, one newspaper—to publications integrated into press conglomerates or sex commoditization groups. A study of the activities of these various organizational structures reveals both extensive diversification strategies, and strategies to focus on a single market segment, but precise data is difficult to come by as there are no official distribution figures for these publications—they do not fall within the scope of the Alliance for Press and Media Data (*L'Alliance pour les chiffres de la presse et des médias-ACPM*) information gathering.

Situating respondents professionally, socially and sexually

The editors and managers interviewed were employed in the most economically stable enterprises of the pornographic press. All others rejected our requests either because they wanted to remain anonymous, or because they had connections with political movements (like the swingers' magazine *Couples and the Voltaire Network* (*Couples et le réseau Voltaire*), defenders of extreme right conspiracy theories), or because their company was in receivership. Respondents worked in PCSC or PCX groups, in teams supervised by a hierarchy (publisher, editor-in-chief, etc.) and organized according to functional specializations (editors, graphic designers, etc.) or even thematic specializations (sexology, XXX production, culture, readers' mail, etc.).

The respondents' accounts of their career demonstrated the diverse ways they participate in the sector, their commitment (and distance) from their activity, and how they became professionals. Though participants recognized the social impropriety and stigmatized nature of their activity, they did not claim the same skills or professional values. An analysis of their responses reveals three forms of participation in the activity.

Table 1: *Publication houses in the sector in 2012*

Organization	Segment	Publication with DVD	Organizational Structure	Type of Production
Lagardère—Active until 2014, then Reworld	PCSC	Union; Union – Special Letters and Emails	Media Company	Professional
Swingeuropa	PCSC	Swing Magazine; Swing Dating	Media Company	Professional
LVP Publishing (Deleted from the Business and Corporate Registry on 10.10.2018)	PCSC	The Parisian Review; Parisian Life	Independent Firm	Semi-Amateur
Taboo Letters	PCSC	Taboo Letters	Independent Firm	Amateur
Lazer Publishing	PCSC	Dating Directory	Independent Firm	Amateur
Couples	PSCS	Couples; The Couples Magazine	Independent Firm	Semi-Amateur
Sylver and Gold	PCSC	Leisure 2000; Too Indecent?; Club Exhib; Club Rhône-Alpes; Club South; Club Southwest; Club West; Club North and Belgium; Club East	Independent Firm	Semi-Amateur
1633	PCX	Playboy; Exhibitionist BFFs; QX; Specials; New Look Voyeur; New Look Pinup	Media Company	Professional
VCV, then Jaquie et Michel	PCX	Hot Video; J&M Mag	Media Company, then Sex Merchandizer	Professional
Multimedia press	PCX	Just 18 – Innocent Debutantes; Just 18—First Experience; 18-20 –Young Debutantes; Hardcore Amateurs—Women Who Love Sex; Interns; Hardcore Blondes; Student Debutantes; 10s—The Most Beautiful Hardcore Ladies; MILFs; Hefty Women; Ripe and Voluptuous; Perfection; Busty—Big Boobs	Media Firm	Professional
Phary (Closing As of 02.15.2019)	PCX	Club Top 40 – The Passion of Ripe Women; Leg Club; My Neighbors –Young and Naughty; Miss X; Sexy 40 – Hot MILFs	Independent Firm	Amateur
CRB	PCX	Bourgeois Cougars and Nymphos; French Beauties with Big Natural Boobs	Independent Firm	Amateur
Bravo Press	PCX	Bounga-Bounga; SM Passion; Prestige SM	Independent Firm	Amateur
French Pleasure	PCX	Porn Stars	Independent Firm	Amateur
Editions Ixora (Deleted from register on 02.28.2013)	PCX	Carnal – Beautiful, Round, Natural	Independent Firm	Amateur
Imagine + G—Production in 2012	PCX	Chobix, Marc Dorcel Magazine; Dorcel Special Edition	Sex Merchandizer	Professional
JTC	PCX	JTC Magazine	Sex Merchandizer	Professional
Concorde	PCX	Lolita; Sexual Personals; Hello Ladies; Busty	Sex Merchandizer	Professional

A professional choice that puts pornography and sexuality on the same level as other types of journalism...

This first response concerns subjects 3 and 5 who were indignant that their work not be considered journalistic because of the subject matter: pornography. Both had training in schools not recognized by the journalism profession and initially worked in traditional media. They were therefore trained in the pragmatic conventions of professional journalism (relationship to sources, fact checking, gender and journalistic biases), and the values serving as guardrails for the activity (distance from sources, distinction between news and communication, etc.). They therefore believed they could

legitimately claim to be journalism professionals: “[...] it is because it is journalism. No more, no less. This is exactly what I was doing before” [Interview 5, PCX]. Neither of them claims to have a taste, knowledge, or expertise in pornography, its work, producers, actors, actresses, or economic evolution. Respondent 3 emphasized his specialty in sexology, and claimed to write only for the non-pornographic sections of the publication—readers’ letters, health columns or sections, for example—stating that:

“[t]he DVD of —, it really is a trick... It’s the product I like the least in the magazine. For me, we are completely getting away from journalism and into the porn industry.”

Table 2: Respondent Profiles

Interview Subject	Declared Social and Sexual Identity	Type de Publication	Qualifications
1	Female, 45, Bisexual/Open Marital Relationship/Editor	PCSC/Media Company	Degree in Foreign Languages and Translation Degree in Business Law
2	Male, 41, Heterosexual/Married and Monogamous/Editor-in-Chief	PCSC/Sex Merchandizing	Master’s in law, BA (New York University)
3	Male, 30, Heterosexual/Married and Monogamous/Editor	PCSC/Sex Merchandizing	Degree in English Degree in Journalism and Communication Masters in Semiotics, Graduate Program in the Arts (Cultural Vocations Option), Master ESJ (Graduate School of Journalism)
4	Male, 59, Heterosexual/Non-monogamous/Editor-in-Chief	PCSC/Sex Merchandizing	Masters in Psycho-Pedagogy and Educational Sciences
5	Male, 30-35, Heterosexual/Married and Monogamous/Editor	PCX/Media Company	Degree in Political Science Graduate Institute of Communication, Media and AV (ISCPA) Masters in Press Management
6	Male, 45, Bisexual/Open Marital Relationship/Editor	PCX/Media Company	Highschool Dropout
7	Male, 44, Heterosexual/Open Marital Relationship/Editor-in-Chief	PCX/Sex Merchandizing	BSc Military Service at l’ECPA (Army Institute for Film and Photography)
8	Male, 42, Heterosexual/Non-Monogamous/Editor	PCSC/Media Company	Master of Philosophy Florent Theater School (<i>Cours Florent de comédie</i>)
9	Male, 40, Heterosexual/Married and Monogamous/Editor	PCX/Sex Merchandizing	Degree in Social and Economic Administration University Institute of Pedagogy (<i>Institut Universitaire de Formation des Maîtres</i>)

I understand that it brings in money and all that... .. but that's not why I'm here. [...]. It doesn't correspond to my life, it doesn't correspond to my desires either."

In addition, these editors define themselves as monogamous and heterosexual, far removed from the models of sexuality published in their respective magazines, and want to protect their private lives from the possible impacts of their activity, one of them declaring that "[...], the day when at —, I am told if I want to continue working here, I have to work on the porn thing, I know it will harm my couple's life and I would stop working here immediately" [Interview 5, PCSC].

Sexual experts: A professional choice and specialization linking personal taste and sexual orientation

Interviews 1, 4, 6 and 8 illustrate a second form of participation in the activity. Respondent 4 joined the PCSC after working in non-pornographic media. He presented himself as very interested in sexuality both in the context of personal experience and as an object of knowledge. This curiosity was the driving force behind his construction of a libertine sexuality: "*Me, at one time, in college, [school] [fac] rhymed with fuck.*" Professional and personal orientations were closely linked from the outset of his career, as it was a sexual partner who introduced him to the profession. He first freelanced for cultural and leisure magazines, before joining a traditional press publication as assistant editor-in-chief. This experience enabled him to rejoin the media sector, where he was serving as editor-in-chief at the time of the interview. He was trained in professional journalism during these successive jobs, acquiring skills in terms of writing and prioritizing information, supervising an editorial team, and finally, as a manager of a press publication. After his appointment to this position he began transforming into skills all the knowledge, techniques and values accumulated during his professional and sexual experiences. These became resources that served the magazine's editorial line. In fact, the respondent defined himself as a professional in the production and commodification of male fantasies and as an activist for "*a certain form of sexual liberation.*" Three other respondents (1, 6 and 8), two males and one female, shared this arrangement between professional and sexual orientations. The males developed a taste for pornography at a young age, first as a masturbatory medium, then as an object of knowledge correlated with an interest in sexuality as a social practice for expressing desire. Their personal intimate paths—one espoused libertine sexuality; the other, a self-cen-

tered sexuality⁶—encouraged them to join the pornographic press thanks to the social networks established with managers of specialized publications and producers or actors of pornographic material they met at parties. Working in this sector allowed them to transform this social capital, sexual knowledge and acquired expertise into professional skills and competences on sexuality and pornography. For respondent 8 (PCSC), this recognition was reflected in the publication of specialized manuals on sexuality. The career of respondent 1 demonstrates the existence of a gendered differentiation in how she began participating in the activity. After obtaining her degree, she started working as a translator in the industrial sector. She left to work as a public relations assistant, but this was interrupted by a conflict with a member of her family with whom she worked. Indeed, she told a painful and compelling family story, which led her to seek out home-based work on a telephone sex hotline, where she said she used the skills she had acquired at school and her singing experience to write and record confessions or roleplays for clients. She was uncomfortable performing this activity, which she associated with prostitution, and took advantage of the closure of the company to quit. She then offered her services to a PCSC newspaper, which employed her on a temporary basis at first, then permanently, as an editorial secretary and editor. She said she had no difficulty doing her job because "*there's not much sexually that I hadn't tested at the time, so it didn't shock me at all.*" She describes a relationship with an abusive man, followed by another in which she had multiple partners, and at the time of the interview she was living with a woman in a non-monogamous relationship. According to her, these experiences explain why she was committed to instructing her readers about sexually transmitted diseases, contraception and high-risk sexual behavior. She saw her work as a social service.

Businessmen in it for profit

The third form of participation is based on another set of links between professional and sexual orientations. Respondents 2, 7 and 9, who view their activity through a commercial and managerial lens, are grouped here. They talk about making investments profitable, creating value for shareholders, economies of scale, or reducing production costs. They publish PCX journals consisting of reviews of XXX films with photographs, on-set interviews, or publications with personal ads, most of which focus on unattached sex or pick-up bars. Their work consists mainly in aggregating mock-up content produced by XXX professionals or by readers, thereby minimizing editorial tasks. Teams are

kept to a minimum, often working on one or more magazines at a time. They are composed of college grads and post-grads; some of whom have non-conformist sexual lifestyles, while others are married and monogamous. They view their publications as a masturbating medium for their readers. Because these publications are integrated within companies that produce XXX content or offer mail-order sexual products, they market sex: through the sale of XXX videos, sex accessories (sex-toys, lingerie, etc.), or through the exchange of services or sexual relations (personal ads). They therefore exist to address and promote other products, which shapes the entire production chain:

“we don’t get angry with anyone. We’re not looking for the scoop. We’re not looking for the picture that’s gonna piss off the girl... we’re not looking for that. If we don’t like it, we don’t publish it. We only circulate things that we like. I’m not saying we only talk about movies that we think are great! That’s not what I’m saying. I say that as long as there is nothing disturbing, as long as it doesn’t harm the company, society, our reality, we go for it, we get it out there” [Interview 7, PCX].

It is therefore clear that, although eight of nine respondents were from and/or belong to the middle class (respondent 1 comes from a working-class family)⁷, they have followed different professionalization pathways and developed different relationships with their work. These processes have also contributed to a construction of a relationship to sexuality—a model of sexuality in terms of practices, relationships and meanings—and more or less shared stereotypical beliefs (Tajfel, 1972; Amossy, Herschberg-Pierrot, 1997) that shape the sexualities represented in their work, and participate in a social, political, moral and commercial categorization of readerships (Cazals-Ferre, Rossi, 2004).

**THE STEREOTYPES EDITORS HAVE OF THEIR READERS
AND THEIR SEXUALITY: SOCIAL, PROFESSIONAL
AND EDITORIAL ISSUES**

Depending on their position in the sector, respondents construct varying abstract relationships to sexuality and stereotypical projections of their audiences. The initial interaction with the industry is based on knowledge built up simultaneously through their sexual and professional experiences. For example, PCSC actors mention the reading of scientific or media articles on the sexual practices of the French and others to keep themselves

informed of developments. Respondent 4, for instance, brought up during the interview the surveys of sociologist Michel Bozon and Nathalie Bajos⁸ and mentioned a sexology course taken during his university studies. The second interaction allows them to distance themselves from desire and advocate a contemporary model of virility⁹, particularly face-to-face with a researcher whose place in the interaction they find difficult to categorize outside her academic position. Indeed, they presuppose that, because she is a woman, she cannot be excited by pornography constructed from a heterosexual male perspective and that they cannot share male desires with her. And the difficulty is reinforced by the fact that she has chosen not to divulge her sexuality (Damian-Gaillard, Trachman, 2015). However, as we demonstrated in the previous section, most of the subjects we interviewed were middle class and in large part college educated¹⁰. In this context, they attempted to build a rapport with the researcher based on common social standing and a conception of sexuality by displaying a socially-derived contempt for a sexuality associated with the working classes, which they assume she cannot abide¹¹. Thus, their stereotyping allows them to include it in a judging system that functions as a social distinction between “us” (the researcher and the producers) and “them” (the consumers of these contents).

A populist, and culturally and sexually conventional readership

Respondents have limited access to marketing data but have ways to build pragmatic knowledge about their audiences that are more informal than strategic (Certeau, 1990). Some of them, for example, share the same practices and frequent the same sexual establishments as their readers (libertine clubs or massage parlors, for example). They have access to letters and emails sent to the editorial staff, and sometimes exchange correspondence with them. They then project onto their entire audience observations made during singular encounters (which is the hallmark of the stereotypical process). Thus, one respondent claimed to know them better and better because he *“speaks regularly with his readers, either by e-mail or by telephone. And [he] also thinks they feel they are understood and that they are committed to answering honestly”* [Interview 4, Editor-in-Chief, PCSC]. Circulation numbers together with interviewees’ prowess with the written word then become an indicator of membership to a certain social and socio-cultural category, education level and social sensibility. A representation common to all respondents emerged; that of *“[a] readership [that] is not an overly cultivated readership. I’m not talking about*

intelligence. It seems to me that it is a readership, Mr. and Mrs. Everyone.” This female PCSC editor draws on letters to create a map that cross-references letter-writing practices, sexual practices and even expectations of the publication:

“It’s not that we are not read in Île de France, but a lot in the provincial areas, I think. I think that in Île de France, people read a lot, but they write less. [...]. We have regions that are very rich in writing, Brittany, Vendée. Yes, they are hot in Brittany, they are hot the Bretons. Poitou-Charentes, all that. The Atlantic coast writes a lot. Maybe because the weather is not so good and they have more time, but we have more mail from Caen than from Marseille. [...]. We receive a lot of mail from foreign French-speaking countries, because we are also read a lot there. Mail that comes from Quebec, Belgium, Switzerland, too, but little from French-speaking Africa. But, here, French-speaking Africa, it’s going to be questions, a lot of questions, often medical”.

This fragmentary data gives rise to stereotypes of gender, class, age, and geographical origins of readers. A PCSC writer imagines them to be provincial, male and rather old: “[t]he main idea is to tell yourself that you work for a 55-60 year-old man in a relationship or not.” And if the interviewee imagines being read by women or teenagers, the desire to purchase is still attributed to the “man of the family”: “[In] a family, the teenager, he will take the magazine too, some couples will read it together, it will become a game. I think some women buy it, but frankly, I don’t think there are many. Women who read it, in my opinion, it is their husbands who buy it anyway” [Interview 3]. A PCX writer explained that young people read the magazines—despite being familiar with what is available on the Internet—because it facilitates stigmatized use: “We are rather in a rural environment and not necessarily a very young readership. [...]. So, it can be a very young readership, because the porn press has this advantage, for 18-year-olds, it’s that you can’t hide a computer under your pillow, while you can hide a magazine under your pillow” [Interview 9].

These editors construct an image of a readership that is both familiar because of an assumed gendered affiliation with pornography — “[It’s] obvious. Anyway, everything that is porn is still an extremely masculine environment” [Interview 9, PCX] — and distanced by the supposed differences in their social backgrounds. This representation justifies the adoption of an arm’s-length, stereo-

typic perspective that establishes an opposition between not only the upper social classes (upper managers, liberal professions, etc.) and the working classes (workers and employees), but also between Parisians and provincials. This discursive and cognitive process is perfectly embodied in the following statement by a PCSC writer, despite similarities in gender, orientation, sexual practices, and geographic origin:

“We see canvases, we see bedspreads, posters, paintings in super bad taste. ... It’s France, what do you expect? I mean, I come from Eure-et-Loir, so I come from the provinces... I like it, but I mean... I’ve been in Paris for ten years, and when I see that again, it reminds me of the 90s, when I was looking at the Deschiens¹², and I lived in Eure-et-Loir” [Interview 3].

Men and their vulgar sexuality, a symbol of a “has been” virility

This distancing, which reflects a process of categorization not without social contempt, extends to the readers’ imagined sexual tastes, practices and fantasies. The devaluation of the “vulgar consumer” recurs in the respondents’ discussions, especially among editorial managers of PCX and in response to the commercial forms of the activity. Respondent 7, for example, said he was sorry about the results of three readership surveys conducted by his magazine:

“[...] but which proved us right. [...]. Through the readers’ letters, we realized that nine out of ten questions are: ‘How do you make sodomy work?’ [...]. They want what they want: porn, ass, porn, ass and cock! That’s all they’re interested in.” These stereotypes of working-class virility arise from “a whole telescopic imagery, from peddling, engravings or illustrations accompanying this animal vision of a screaming and drunkard people [...] a populist virility automatically located outside the traditional models of civility and delicacy” (Farge, 2011: 427), and whose contemporary figures are those of the truck driver and his coarse sexuality, and the sexually frustrated and misogynistic man: “They are often retired people, unemployed... [...]. Perhaps a little more integrated, but who have, let’s say, ‘a problem’ of some kind. Maybe very low self-esteem... A kind of hatred of women... So, it’s people who are almost de-socialized... people who don’t know how to talk to a woman. [...]. They don’t want to learn, and we’re

not here to tell them, we're here to provide them with a fantasy. [...]. The woman is a person who says 'no' to them. She is the enemy. They would like, like everyone else, for the woman to be a friend, a partner, anything you want, but for them, that doesn't happen. [...]. So, if we tell them: 'Charlotte is a slut, what she likes is to have sex with strangers on the first night,' the guy, he'll say to himself: 'Oh yeah, it's true, there are girls like that.' And in fact, indeed, there are some like that. But in our product, you can't do otherwise: you have to show them things like that, because that's what they expect" [Interview 2].

In doing so, respondents distinguish between "bad sexuality" (that of readers—the pornography consumers), considered problematic from the point of view of relations between men and women, and "good sexuality and masculinity," consensual and phantasmagorically inventive, but not economically profitable. For example, a film producer and editor-in-chief of several publications explains that imposing his sexuality upon his audience would be counterproductive: "You are tempted to want to take a slightly different approach. I say it's a mistake. To the extent that when you do trade shows, that's when you realize that the questions are always the same. So yes, they've been asking the girl for six years: 'What's your favorite position? Do you like your dicks big or small?' That's what the reader is interested in. And there's nothing I can do about that" [Interview 7]. Categorizing socially their readers enables these professionals to assert social superiority over those audiences they stigmatize while claiming expertise on the production and economic valuation of sexual fantasies (Damian-Gaillard, Trachman, 2015).

STEREOTYPES THAT INFLUENCE THE STAGING OF SEXUAL FANTASIES IN THE PORNOGRAPHIC PRESS

These processes of self-distancing based in part on the deployment of stereotypes influence the discursive principles of heterosexual male pornographic media as much as commercial strategies. They contribute to the development of a complex grammar for categorizing legitimate and illegitimate heterosexual fantasies and the definition of a political economy of desire (Rubin, 2010)—of which heteronormativity is the foundation—as well as the asymmetry of gender relations and relationships to sexuality. This is achieved not only by legitimizing, essentializing and naturalizing the categories of gender and sex-

uality and their attributes and hierarchy, but also through a long process of forming sexual (dis)tastes, in which pornographic formulation participates. They also serve to bring to light the respondents' gender-disaggregated relations.

A framework shaped not only by professional conventions and values but also by stereotypes

Among the respondents, we find the usual argument that content should be adapted to the purported expectations of readers; expectations that are more imagined than corroborated by studies. Thus, respondent 9 (PCX) reduces a reader's motivation for buying a magazine to "[...] the equation: 'I go to my newsstand, I spend 8.90 or 9.90 euros: do I get value for my money? I have films, out of 116 pages, I demand that at least 90 of them be 'wankable,' that's all I care about.'" This vision influences the choice of subject, the bias, and the writing of the articles. It also structures relationships with sources (producers, pornographic actors, owners and frequenters of libertine clubs or other places of collective sexuality, sexologists, doctors, etc.). In PCX, this leads to not talking about the real conditions of shooting pornographic films in articles, because to mention them does not coincide with the commercial and editorial orientations of magazines: the production of fantasies. Not reported are the make-up sessions, enemas, actors' tricks to maintain an erection or simulate an orgasm, etc. These guidelines favor articles that are more infomercials than anything because "[w]e sell fantasy. We sell dreams. Obviously, we're not going to say that in the middle of the scene, they take a break, that they talk, that they drink something... It doesn't make you dream. We're not going to say that the girl, she arrives on the set in the morning not wearing this or that.... [So] we embellish a little bit the reality, that's also what the readership is asking for. We sell... For us, porn—even if that's the most difficult part—is to keep a little aura of mystery... It must remain a fantasy" [Interview 9, PCX]. PCSC interviewees see their relationship with their readership differently—as having a more medical and political rapport with sexuality, including the publication of surveys on these issues. They produce content that informs, educates and raises awareness about aspects of sexuality, defending a hedonistic conception of sexuality conceived as essential to an individual's physical and psychological development (Rebreyent, 2008). They legitimize their activity by emphasizing the expertise of the information published, whatever the field covered: prevention (condom use and STDs, etc.); sexual techniques promoting pleasure and orgasm (carnesses, foreplay, positions, sex-toys, etc.); and their ability to "get the scoops":

“What magazine first produced its layout using computer-generated images? We did. We did it and Arte did a show about it. [...] We have the scoop. We were the first to talk about squirting women, almost nobody talked about them. We don’t have a preppy stylish image, but a clean image like PG13 family sex. I like this image because it’s... — who’s that young journalist who was at a party, there’s a guy who says: ‘—, my parents read that, it’s family sex.’ But I prefer that, because we are a bit like mainstream TV, in terms of market, we are the mainstream of sex” [Interview 4].

All interviewees agree on one decree: do not portray sexual acts between men. This would call into question the categories of practices and fantasies that underlie this industry, which is distinct from gay pornography, and, above all, would cause them to lose readers. Though *“this barrier is respected on both sides, insofar as on the heterosexual side, we do not want to mix with the gay community at all. And vice versa”* [interview 6, PCX], all respondents acknowledge the artificiality of this frontier as witnessed by the complexity and diversity of individual sexualities—of which they have empirical knowledge through their own sexual paths and their professional or scientific activity through sociological surveys on sexuality¹³. Thus, respondent 4 (PCSC) refers to the repressed homosexuality of some readers, perceptible through their stories: *“[...] for example, guys who get caught by their girlfriend, who use sex-toys, things, dildos. [...] There’s also the ‘cuckolded and horny’ side, which means that there are guys who are very happy to see their girlfriend fuck another guy before their eyes. So, for me, that’s repressed homosexuality sometimes, because then he finds his girlfriend, and as if by chance, he’ll lick her and, there’s still sperm from the other guy. They don’t realize that it’s just a homosexual fantasy.”* Respondent 6 (PCX), when asked why his publication is only interested in porn actresses, tells of the qualms of readers when told about men, even actors: *“Because once again, we realized that as soon as we talked about men in the magazine, as soon as we did something about men, we either had letters saying: ‘Well, that’s it, we’re not fags,’ in general, or it might interest a certain number of female readers, but there are very few of them. Or it interests the actors themselves, the professionals.”* He attributes these qualms to the social and gendered characteristics of the readership, and to the assumptions of his colleagues:

He “is between 30 and 45 years old, mostly male, with a certain number of couples, too, but very few women. I think that single wom-

en must be about 8%, something like that. [...] And then of a rather average social level: employees, workers, many too, in men’s circles. In the army, many soldiers, in prisons, it is the most read magazine. [M]ajority male and macho enough, well, patriarchal enough. [Me], who had always been very open about sex, very tolerant, who had a vision a little... almost I wouldn’t say ‘hedonist,’ rather a guy on the fringe. When I first came into this business, I quickly offered a gay supplement. But I was confronted, within the editorial staff, with an outcry... They looked at me as if I were an alien.”

Editors’ work consists largely of gathering, formatting or rewriting content produced by other actors (readers, XXX film producers, etc.) to conform with the editorial guidelines of the magazines. To carry this out, interviewees again base their work on their impressions of their readership and their expectations. The mail from one of the magazines studied is emblematic of this, where it is a question of *“[...] avoiding humdrum stuff. Because readers must be able to recognize themselves in the mail, but they must also be able to find something different from their own daily lives. So, well, we’re looking for a little more exoticism. —My colleague sums it up by saying: ‘Mom and pop who do it in bed on Friday nights, it’s not really our place.’ I’m not necessarily as categorical as that, because in fact, they can be people who are actually moms and pops and, it may have happened on a Friday night, but we can spice up the story if it’s a little weak, and we can also find, in fact, the material, in what has been written, and bring it out so that suddenly, the mail will be more interesting”* [Interview 4]. After the “good stories” have been selected, the editors organize them in such a way that they conform to the four phases of the sexual act: excitement, plateau, orgasm, and resolution, as described in the Masters and Johnson report, which is already somewhat dated as it was published in 1966 in the United States (Carol, 2011). Formatting also plays a role in *“[...] a space-time. It’s like a play, we’re between 3500 and 6000 characters. We can’t go any longer...”* [Interview 4]. Then comes the work on the fonts (titles, headings, introductory paragraph, illustration). This rewriting of the letter therefore conforms to very precise guidelines framing a definition of pornographic discourse, seen as a social script of sexuality in the sense that it *“[...] never represents ordinary sexual acts in an ordinary context”* (Giami, 2002: 34), but rather non-ordinary acts in unconventional contexts, the ordinary being interchangeable with monogamous conjugal sexuality.

And to achieve this, PCSC editors sometimes ask letter writers for clarification, illustrations or photos, for example. These requests steer the read-

ers' production, by encouraging them to perform certain acts, or to modify their self-presentation, as demonstrated by the respondent 4's comments: "[and] we even refined this, because on some photos, I told them: 'it would be nice if you put on a thong, and everything, because we will put you on the cover without showing your face.' And then comes the casual exchange. And then she sent me their authorization with their faces uncovered because we're hyper square because anyone can file a complaint. [...]. And very often, first names are changed as a precaution." The challenge is both to satisfy the purported desires of readers and avoid lawsuits. Thus, respondent 4 explains that it is "[ultra] simple, but it's off-limits. We didn't put the priest thing in the charter, but we know that, between us. Rabbi what's-his-name, we're going to be suspicious of things related to religion, because there are ultra-fanatical people out there." Also excluded are stories that are staged "[...] where the girls are in a forced situation, something that would look like rape. [...]. For me, it's forced, so nothing. BDSM (bondage, discipline, domination, submission, sadomasochism), we don't do. [...]. Because we are prescribers of behavior somehow, that is, people consider us, if it is in —, we can do it. So, we are careful." Stories involving minors are also excluded, as child pornography is illegal, whether real or fantasy. If professionals find a scene described sexually exciting, they may change the age of the characters, however. They are also obliged to consider the laws in the countries where their magazines are published, as for example: "[...] in Switzerland, [where] urolagnia is illegal. Well, scatology is illegal in Switzerland too, but above all it's disgusting. It's not our readership, it's a niche anyway. As a matter of principle, sadomasochistic stories, where there is no respect for women, sadomasochism without consent" [Interview 1].

These interviews demonstrate that the existing collaborative co-production relationships between editors and their readers reinforce stereotypical representations of sexual practices and desires that respondents have of their readers, while at the same time encouraging them to conform to a restrictive and stereotypical definition of sexuality and pornography.

Stereotypes as foundational to interpretations of sexuality and gender

Though the work of editors may be based on professional norms and values, it is also shaped by a pre-existing lens through which gender and sexuality are characterized. Thus, three of the respondents support a differentiated approach to female and male sexuality, based on a cultural or essential-

ist approach to gender identities¹⁴. For example, respondent 8 (PCSC) is convinced that genital anatomy influences the perception of the body, because "[...] there are still things that are at stake at the hormonal, biological level." According to respondents 4 and 1 (PCSC), men and women do not feel and perceive their "sexual gymnastics" in the same way (Goulemot, 1994), due to the existence of gendered sexual standards. Beyond the "possible invariables of virility" such as the importance of penis size, new "imperatives of virility" are imposed on men, particularly concerning the duration of the sexual interaction and his partner's pleasure (Harroche: 2011). Respondent 4 points out that men express little emotion, focus more on actions, while women, more observant and sensitive, "[...] tend to talk about touch, smell, while men are in action, I do this, I do that. Women, they are in the mood. They know how to describe better than men." Respondent 1 goes on to say that women

"[...] go further in what they tell, [...] they detail much more their emotions, [...], their feelings, even their sexual feelings, the progression of pleasure, of the relationship. While the man will be a little more, as is often the case in various accounts, man will go more to the essential, let's say. So, more like 'I had a hard-on, I fucked her, she came, I came.' He's not going to give too many details about his pleasure either. The woman will detail, the rise of her pleasure, will detail her feelings, if her hands and toes are tingling, if her head is spinning, what do I know? For men it's more [...], and it's not a criticism, it's a fact, it's quite rare for men to give all these details, as if it were, out of shyness, I think. Because it is not usual for a man to say I had such and such an emotion."

The discursive strategies deployed by respondents during interviews also revealed their own gender socialization towards a female who is a researcher, or a researcher who happens to be female, depending on their preference to consider it one or the other¹⁵. The way they demonstrate¹⁶ their masculinity highlights how male respondents perceive themselves in this relationship, both as professionals and as men. It also reflects what they think the researcher's expectations are, and her desires and repulsions with respect to pornography and their activity as pornographers. We identified three tactics in support of this observation.

The first tactic is that of "aggressive masculinity" (Sohn, 2009), the most typical example of which was the interview with the respondent 7, a non-graduate and editor-in-chief in PCX whose

work consists in producing pornographic scenes based mainly on fantasies of male sexual domination of women. Because he assumed that the researcher would only criticize and be offended by these representations, he immediately padded his performance as a dominant male as if he wanted to conform to the stereotype of the sexist and macho pornographer. To achieve this, he employed strategies based on a multifaceted approach to physicalizing the interview. It began with imposed embraces and kisses at the beginning of the interview, making it very clear that he intended to control the way the interaction unfolded, despite her status as researcher. He involved her in pornographic scenarios of which he was the master under the pretext of explaining something to her:

"[t]he guys, they show what they want, and as in any case, they never expose themselves as they really are—we never see ourselves as we are—and besides, there is a fantastic show for that, which is Barenaked Beauty [Belle toute nue]. I think it's great! Because it shows so much that we never see ourselves as we are... That is, they have chicks in their panties... I take you, I put you in your panties, and I take six chicks, of different sizes, and I say: 'Line yourselves up.' And you never put yourself in the right place. That's great! That's great! And socially, it's exactly the same: we never see each ourselves..."

Or he told stories in which he introduced the researcher to multi-partner sexuality or pornography, because it is a reminder that he also had intimate and professional expertise, certainly sexual, but through which he claimed to dominate women and the researcher. Or he positioned himself as a lecturer:

"I will explain one thing to you. That is to say, what I was trying to tell you earlier is that if you want, there's not a guy who's going to say no. If I open some doors for you, you're going to go straight into it. I'm talking about the guys.... But even girls, I mean.... I know very few girls who have refused experiences, because life is like that! Because when you're with a regular joe—it's not a criticism, of course—there's no problem, except if your guy, he starts opening some doors, believe me, if he knows how to do it...—and then there's nothing wrong!—you're going to go straight through it. Because life is made up of experiences. And you're like everyone else! You want to have experiences! That is to say, you'll never make me believe that for

twenty years, with the same guy... I don't believe in it at all."

His position is also expressed in a conservative conception of gender relations, according to which a woman is not supposed to have expertise in organizational and economic issues, or in sexuality—territories considered to be masculine. These tactics are deliberate intrusions into the researcher's intimacy to better destabilize her and, in so doing, "put her in her place", that is, under the dependence of a man: "We are in a relationship, I love you. To love you is to want your good. All right. A guy, a real stallion catches your eye. I hope he makes you come! Go ahead, sweetheart!"

The second tactic reflects a sexually conquering and libertine masculinity. It is more prevalent among PCSC editors. The interview with respondent 4 revealed the issues underlying this approach. From the outset, he asserted this sexuality, and controlled the exchange to direct it towards seduction, his desire being to use the exchange as a prelude to a sexual relationship with the researcher. After the tape recorder was turned off, he invited her to an aikido weekend, being an instructor himself. He systematically sexualized the research relationship. For example, he asked the researcher for the name of her perfume, on the grounds that he could not identify it. Or he diverted one of her questions to make sure that, on the one hand, she liked men, and on the other hand, that she was available for sexual experiences. For example, while she asked him about the production companies with which he collaborated, he referred to the scene of the crazy masseur, regularly proposed in the DVDs included in the magazine, and distorted the meaning of his remark ("I know") to give an intimate tone to the conversation: "Oh, well, in real life or on the DVD?" This respondent viewed all social relationships with a woman as a sexual opportunity if she met his beauty criteria, and also presented himself as an expert on sexuality in terms of experience and knowledge. For example, during the interview, he talked about his relationships with his female friends, demonstrating his ability to make his partners fantasize and get aroused:

"Well, just the other day, a chick I saw again, fortunately, a stroke of luck, whom I had dated 7 years ago, it's not going well with her boyfriend, so she came back and everything. And this chick is Julia Roberts' double, but young, because now Julia Roberts is less sexy. And this chick says to me, 'I can stay at your place?' I said to her, 'No problem.' And later we were talking in bed and she tells me, we'd talk fantasy and, so

I got out 2-3 sex toys because I'm starting to become a specialist, and she started telling me, 'yeah, that thing will rip you open.' And then we talked about fantasy and she said, 'Me, my fantasy, do you know what it is? You're not going to believe this.' So, I said to her, 'Well, no, no, go ahead, tell me, it's okay.' She said to me, 'It's to get fucked by a tramp.' So, she would bring up that image when we were caressing each other, stuff like that."

Here too, there was gender asymmetry in sexual relations since the man was the one who knew and mastered the sexual script, even if he demonstrated a less aggressive masculinity than the previous interviewee.

The third tactic reveals a masculinity *"that can be vulnerable"* and is embodied by respondent 6 (PCX). For the duration of the exchange, he chose never to question the interviewer about her sexuality or desires. He also emphasized sensitivity and affection when dealing with female researcher, whom he recognized as belonging to a culture of legitimacy because she was a university post-graduate and employed at the university. In addition, not knowing her sexual orientation made him have doubts about her relationship with men. He staged, through trial and error, an image of himself and a sexuality he thought would be acceptable to her. Thus, this respondent did not attempt to assign the researcher to a subordinate position, an object or a subject of desire. His discourse was, however, fraught with tension: on the one hand, sexual, technical and effective expertise, an explanation of gender relations, and on the other, a distance from vulgarity. He constantly vacillated in this in-between because he did not know exactly what male sexuality and what definition of masculinity she valued politically and that, eventually, awoke his desire. His lack of certainty notwithstanding, he tried to seduce the researcher and the woman, which led him to hold falsely contradictory positions. He made no secret that, like many men, pornography was an integral part of his initiation to sexuality during his adolescence, particularly as a masturbatory support. He also depicted himself as a shy young man with women, losing his virginity later than most. Nevertheless, he said that his taste for pornography persisted to the point that he transformed it into a professional expertise and integrated production space when he was 26-27 years old. He described this social world as male-dominated, *"with a patriarchal vision of sex"*, hetero-centric, even homophobic. He said that his shyness was a barrier in his first interviews with porn actresses. He claimed to participate in non-monogamous sex-

uality but rejected collective sexual practices that he considered vulgar. He advocated an erotic approach to sexuality, which is not defined by performance imperatives. In doing so, he partially disassociated himself from the sexual images published in his publication:

"Pornography interested me as a subject of emotions. For me, pornography can only be integrated into an intrinsically erotic context, for one. There must be many things. So, it wasn't the actress I was interested in. I've never been a fan of actresses. It was rather the narrative, the way to get to the act itself, everything around it. The act itself, by the way, didn't interest me that much, it's more everything around it, the way you get there. In the end, it is the whole erotic part of pornography that no longer exists."

He attributed his occasional sexual relations to a demystified relationship with sex and because he no longer believed in the fidelity of his partners. Several times during the interview, he talked about their infidelities and said he suffered as a result. To the point that today he anticipates them or shares them with his partners to nourish their sexual desire and no longer live them as betrayals. This respondent had a taste for sexuality that is open to practices that are non-conformist but not threatening or aggressive to women, unlike those represented in the publication where he works. This *"controlled, calmed masculinity"* (Sohn, 2009) is emblematic of upper-class masculinity, where *"[t]he insidious forms of male domination result from a contemporary interweaving between the secular demands of the virile tradition and the egalitarian principles of today's democratic societies"* (Haroché, 2011: 20).

CONCLUSION

Pornographic discourses are widely consumed and result in discursive mediatization (Détrez, 2002: 98) that shape consumers' perception of their bodies, sensations and emotions. They do so by conveying ideals of beauty, performance, love and sexual aspirations. In fact, these discourses contribute to the development of discursive categories that organize a perception of the social world and its components and hierarchies. Stereotypes occupy a central place in these processes of categorizing sexuality where *"the idea of power and virility is at the heart of male domination: as an ideal, the aspiration to surpass limits, in strength, sport, sex, money, profit, and all this in a society that refuses not only to the male sex, but to everyone"*

else, the very idea of finiteness, the slightest hint of impotence” (Haroche, 2011 : 29). The heterosexual participants in the pornographic press we met, however, do not all share the same forms of commitment to their activity, or the same relationships to pornography, sexuality and gender. These differences structure their relationship to their work and their audiences despite being constrained by a common editorial line when employed by the same publication. They also show that pornography does not exist as a homogeneous entity in the singular and how necessary it is to understand its complexity as reflected in the heterogeneity of its production

spaces, which are composed of structures, multiple actors, and deploying diverse staging of sexual acts. A monolithic vision of pornographic production, limited to audiovisual productions broadcast on certain websites, like the popular *youporn* or *xhamster*, conceals the fact that it is an object of constant struggle and debate between conceptions held by socially situated actors on the sexualities to be promoted, tolerated or condemned, including within the sectors of pornographic activity.

Réception de l'article 7 février 2018
Acceptation le 26 mars 2019

NOTES

¹ Essentially conducted between 2010 and 2013 at which time we identified 19 publishers producing about 100 magazines sold at newsstands, on the Web and by subscription. The sector is monitored for changes in data (Damian-Gaillard: 2012).

² The analysis focused on the titles of publications, the themes covered, the journalistic genres, specializations, sources and illustrations, as well as the modes of describing sexual acts, their protagonists, the staging of sexual acts and the construction of the discursive identity of the journalist and the reader.

³ Interviews last on average 2 hours and 15 minutes.

⁴ This framework is based on Article 227-24, amended by Act No. 2011-267 of 14 March 2011 (Article 5) relating to the protection of minors. Thus, these publications must respect the principle that “[...] the fact of either manufacturing, transporting or disseminating by any means whatsoever and whatever the medium, a message of a violent or pornographic nature or likely to seriously violate human dignity or to incite minors to engage in games that physically endanger them, or of trading in such a message, shall be punishable by three years’ imprisonment and a fine of EUR 75 000 when the message is likely to be seen or received by a minor.”

⁵ The devaluation of their social status takes place at several levels: professional when it refers to the gap between the expected position and the acquired position; social in relation to their family situation (downward or upward mobility path); and even academic when it marks a gap between the aspirations built by the education system and the opportunities actually offered when entering the labour market. See Bourdieu P., 1978, “Classement, déclassement, reclassement”, Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales, n°24, p. 2-22.

⁶ M. Bozon defines this model as that of individual desire: “[...] the regular emergence of desire, accompanied by the conquest (real or fantasized) of the desired object, is one of the conditions for maintaining the subject’s sexual identity. [...] In this less externalized orientation, which is more oriented towards the individual himself, frequent renewal of partners is not essential and sexual desire is often interpreted as a drive: rather, it is actually a narcissistic use of sexuality” (2001: 18).

⁷ Their parents are or have been lawyers, doctors, writers, teachers, executives in public companies, commercial companies, accountants, or employees of local institutions.

⁸ “Enquête sur la sexualité en France. Pratiques, genre et santé”, La découverte, Hors collection, 2008.

⁹ Virility refers to the “principles of behaviour and actions that designate, in the West, the qualities of the realized man, in other words, the most ‘perfect’ of the male” (Vigarello, 2011: p. 11). It is “based on an ideal of physical strength, moral firmness and sexual power,” and it is distinguished from masculinity by “an anthropological [and not sociological] foundation of extremely ancient representations” of the social roles of men and women on the basis of “unequal structures, of archaic origin but still present, whose transmission over time implies the transformation of history into nature” (Courtine, 2011 : 8).

¹⁰ Four respondents have a Bac+ 5, 1 a Bac+4, 1 a Bac+3 and 1 a Bac+3 and a certificate to teach primary school.

¹¹ On middle-class investment in sex work, see Bernstein E., “Sex work for the middle class: Gender, sexuality and society,” No. 2, 2009, online: <http://gss.revues.org/index1058.html>

¹² French television series created by Jérôme Deschamps and Macha Makeïeff based on their play *La Famille Deschiens* and broadcast since 1993 on Canal+. It features humorous sketches caricaturing lifestyles and the supposed “common sense” of the working class.

¹³ See Bajos N., Beltzer N., 2008: “In line with my perspective proposed by Kinsey et al. [1948], people were invited to situate their sexuality on a gradient ranging from exclusive heterosexuality to exclusive homosexuality. Three dimensions were explored in the survey: attraction to a person of the same sex, sexual practices with a person of the same sex and finally the definition that people give of their sexuality,” p. 245.

¹⁴ J. Butler uses the term heterosexual matrix “[...] to designate this grid of cultural intelligibility that naturalizes bodies, genders and desires” (2005: 66).

¹⁵ The reflection is based on the work of R. Connell, for whom “rather than trying to define masculinity as an object (a natural type of personality, a behavioural mean, a norm), we should focus on the processes, interactions and relationships that construct gender. ‘Masculinity,’ if it were possible to briefly define this term, could simultaneously be understood as a place within gender relations, a set of practices by which men and women engage in this place, and the effects of these practices on body experience, personality and culture” (2014: 65).

¹⁶ On this point, refer to Butler J.’s book, 2005.

RÉFÉRENCES

- Amossy, R. et Herschberg Pierrot A., 1997, *Stéréotypes et clichés. Langue, discours, société*, Paris, Nathan.
- Bajos, N., Beltzer, N., 2008, « Les sexualités homo-bisexuelles : d'une acception de principe aux vulnérabilités sociales et préventives », Bajos N., Bozon M. (dir.), *Enquête sur la sexualité en France. Pratiques, genre et santé*, La Découverte, pp.243-271.
- Beauthier, R., Méon J-M., Truffin B., (dir.), 2010, *Obscénité, pornographie et censure. Les mises en scène de leur sexualité et leur (dis)qualification (XIXe-XXe siècles)*, Editions de l'université de Bruxelles.
- Bozon, M., 2001, « Orientations intimes et constructions de soi. Pluralité et divergences dans les expressions de la sexualité », *Sociétés contemporaines*, n°41-42, vol. 1-2, pp. 11-40.
- Bozon, M., Bajos N. (dir.), 2008, *Enquête sur la sexualité en France. Pratiques, genre et santé*, La découverte, coll. « Hors collection social ».
- Bozon, M., Giami A., 1999, « Les scripts sexuels ou la mise en forme du désir », *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, n° 128, pp.68-72.
- Bourdieu, P., 1978, « Classement, déclassement, reclassement », *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, n°24, pp.2-22.
- Butler, J., 2006, *Défaire le genre*, Editions Amsterdam, coll. « Les belles Lettres ».
- Carol, A., 2011, « La virilité face à la médecine », Vigarello G. (dir.), *Histoire de la virilité*, Seuil, coll. « Histoire », Tome 3. *La virilité en crise ? Le XXe-XXIe siècle*, pp.31-70.
- Cazals-Ferre, M.-P., Rossi, P., 2004, *Éléments de psychologie sociale*, Paris, Armand Colin.
- Connell R., *Masculinités. Enjeux sociaux de l'hégémonie*, Éditions Amsterdam, 2014.s
- Courtine, J-J., 2011, « Introduction. Impossible virilité », Vigarello G. (dir.), *Histoire de la virilité*, Seuil, coll. « Histoire », Tome 3. *La virilité en crise ? Le XXe-XXIe siècle*, pp.7-11.
- Damian-Gaillard, B., Trachman M., 2015, « Le sexuel, le savant et le vulgaire. Retour sur deux enquêtes sur la pornographie », Guionnet C., Rétif S. (dir.), *Exploiter les difficultés méthodologiques. Une ressource pour l'analyse en sciences sociales*, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, pp.47-65.
- Damian-Gaillard, B., 2012, « Entretiens avec des producteurs de la presse pornographique : des rencontres semées d'embûches... », *Revue scientifique internationale Sur le journalisme*, octobre, Vol.1, n° 1, pp.84-95.
- De Certeau, (de) M., 1990, *L'invention du quotidien. 1. Arts de faire*, Gallimard, coll. « Folio-Essais ».
- Détrez, C., 2002, *La construction sociale du corps*, Seuil.
- Farge, A., 2011, « Virilités populaires », Vigarello G., 2011, « Introduction. La virilité, de l'Antiquité à la modernité », Vigarello G. (dir.), *Histoire de la virilité*, Seuil, coll. « Histoire », Tome 1. *L'invention de la virilité. De l'Antiquité aux Lumières*, pp.427-451.
- Giami, A., 2002, « Que représente la pornographie ? », *Morale sexuelle*, Vol. 4, pp.33-65.
- Goulemot, J-M., 1994, *Ces livres qu'on ne lit que d'une main. Lecture et lecteurs de livres pornographiques au XVIIIe siècle*, Minerve.
- Haroche, C., « Anthropologie de la virilité : la peur de l'impuissance », Vigarello G. (dir.), *Histoire de la virilité*, Seuil, coll. « Histoire », Tome 3. *La virilité en crise ? Le XXe-XXIe siècle*, pp.15-30.
- Rebreyend, A-C., 2008, *Intimités amoureuses. France 1920-1975*, Presses Universitaires du Mirail, coll. « Le temps du genre ».
- Rubin, G., 2010, *Surveiller et punir. Anthropologie politique du sexe*, Epel, coll. « Les grands classiques de l'érotologie moderne ».
- Tajfel, H., 1972, « La catégorisation sociale », Moscovici S. (dir.), *Introduction à la psychologie*, vol.1, Larousse.
- Sohn, A-M., 2009, « Sois un homme ! ». La construction de la masculinité au XIXème siècle, Seuil, coll. « L'univers historique ».
- Vigarello, G., 2011, « Introduction. La virilité, de l'Antiquité à la modernité », Vigarello G. (dir.), *Histoire de la virilité*, Seuil, coll. « Histoire », Tome 1. *L'invention de la virilité. De l'Antiquité aux Lumières*, pp.11-15.

Sexuality Stereotypes and Fantasies of Consumers of French Male Heterosexual Pornographic Media.

Stéréotypes sexuels and fantasmes des consommateurs de médias pornographiques hétérosexuels masculins français.

Estereótipos e fantasias de sexualidade de consumidores de mídia pornográfica heterossexual masculina francesa.

En • Based on a survey of the French male heterosexual pornographic press, this paper addresses the class and gender stereotypes writers and editors have of their readership and their sexuality. The analysis is based on publishing company data, editorial guidelines for publications representative of the sector and individual interviews with four managers and nine editors. It identifies the commercial, professional and social issues underlying the construction and deployment of these stereotypes. The study is divided into two parts. The first sheds light on the heterogeneity of existing editorial positions that result from strategies such as market segmentation, content specialization and targeting of readers (as practiced in the conventional magazine press). The second part analyzes the stereotypes advanced by editors-in-chief and journalists about the sexualities of their readers, and their own professional and social challenges, demonstrating how these stereotypes are part of discursive strategies to counteract the social abasement of their career due to the social illegitimacy of pornography. It also examines how these stereotypes influence pornographic discourses and their modes of production, and more broadly how the agents of this press confine their readers to a certain category of masculinity and sexuality, exercising a type of domination based on class and gender stereotypes.

Keywords : pornographic media, audiences, stereotypes, sexualities, journalism.

Fr • Basé sur une enquête sur la presse pornographique hétérosexuelle masculine française, cet article s'intéresse aux stéréotypes de classe et de genre que les journalistes et les rédacteurs en chef ont sur leurs lecteurs et leur sexualité. L'analyse s'appuie sur les données des éditeurs de ces médias, les lignes éditoriales de publications représentatives du secteur et des entretiens individuels avec quatre directeurs de publication et neuf éditeurs. L'étude identifie les enjeux commerciaux, professionnels et sociaux qui sous-tendent la construction et le déploiement de ces stéréotypes. Ce travail est divisé en deux parties. La première met en lumière l'hétérogénéité des positions éditoriales existantes, résultant de stratégies telles que la segmentation du marché, la spécialisation des contenus et le ciblage des lecteurs (comme cela se pratique dans la presse magazine classique). La deuxième partie analyse les stéréotypes véhiculés par les rédacteurs en chef et les journalistes sur la sexualité de leurs lecteurs ainsi que leurs propres défis professionnels et sociaux, en montrant comment ces stéréotypes s'inscrivent dans des stratégies discursives qui tendent à contrer l'humiliation sociale de leur carrière due à l'illégitimité de la pornographie dans la société. Enfin, cette recherche examine également comment ces stéréotypes influencent les discours pornographiques et leurs modes de production, et plus largement comment les agents de cette presse confinent leurs lecteurs à une certaine catégorie de masculinité et de sexualité, exerçant une forme de domination fondée sur les stéréotypes de classe et de genre.

Mots-clés : presse pornographique, publics, stéréotypes, sexualités, journalisme.

Pt. Com base em uma pesquisa da imprensa pornográfica heterossexual masculina francesa, este artigo aborda os estereótipos de classe e gênero que escritores e editores têm de seus leitores e de sua sexualidade. A análise é baseada na publicação de dados da empresa, diretrizes editoriais para publicações representativas do setor e entrevistas individuais com quatro gerentes e nove editores. Ela identifica as questões comerciais, profissionais e sociais subjacentes à construção e implantação desses estereótipos. O estudo está dividido em duas partes. A primeira esclarece a heterogeneidade das posições editoriais existentes que resultam de estratégias como segmentação de mercado, especialização de conteúdo e direcionamento de leitores (como praticado na imprensa convencional de revista). A segunda parte analisa os estereótipos adiantados por editores-chefes e jornalistas sobre as sexualidades de seus leitores e seus próprios desafios profissionais e sociais, demonstrando como esses estereótipos fazem parte de estratégias discursivas para neutralizar o rebaixamento social de sua carreira devido à ilegitimidade social da pornografia. Também examina como esses estereótipos influenciam os discursos pornográficos e seus modos de produção e, de maneira mais ampla, como os agentes desta imprensa confinam seus leitores a uma determinada categoria de masculinidade e sexualidade, exercendo um tipo de dominação com base nos estereótipos de classe e gênero.

Palavras-chave : imprensa pornográfica, audiências, estereótipos, sexualidades, jornalismo