

12-16-2004

Critical Discourse Analysis of Sexual Enhancement Medication Ads

John-Paul Gomez
University of New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td>

Recommended Citation

Gomez, John-Paul, "Critical Discourse Analysis of Sexual Enhancement Medication Ads" (2004).
University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations. 179.
<https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/179>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by ScholarWorks@UNO with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF SEXUAL ENHANCEMENT MEDICATION ADS

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
The Department of English

by

John-Paul Michael Gomez

B.A. University of Colorado, 2001

December, 2004

© 2004, John-Paul Gomez

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the chair of my thesis committee, Dr. Abigail Konopasky, for the encouragement and advice she gave me during the stages of drafting this study. I would also like to thank her for the enthusiasm and clarity with which she introduced Critical Discourse Analysis to me and her other students. I would also like to thank the two other members of my thesis committee, Dr. Robert Sturges of the English Department and Dr. Rachel Luft of the Sociology Department. Dr. Sturges offered valuable insight and commentary and Dr. Luft provided an essential sociological perspective and assisted me in including much-needed gender theory in my final draft.

I would also like to offer my deepest gratitude to Dr. Peter Schock, Dr. Barbara Fitzpatrick, and Jennifer Sheridan of the Graduate Program for their support and encouragement during my time at the University of New Orleans. I would like to commend the faculty, staff, and graduate students in the English Department of the University of New Orleans, the individuals who continue to make the graduate experience fruitful and rewarding.

Table of Contents

Abstract	v
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	3
Critical Social Research and Marketing	3
Theory of Discourse	3
Generic Analysis	4
Fairclough and Critical Discourse Analysis	5
Mass Media and Mass Marketing	6
Gender Theory and Masculinities Studies	6
The Emergence of Viagra and Erectile Dysfunction	8
Chapter 3: Methodology	11
Chapter 4: Sexual Enhancement Medication Marketing Texts	14
Magazine Advertisements	14
Television Commercials	18
Discussion	24
Chapter 5: Conclusion	26
References	30
Appendices	31
Vita	38

Abstract

This study contributes to the expanding critical range of discourse analysis by analyzing texts used to market Viagra and other “sexual enhancement medication,” pharmaceuticals that treat “erectile dysfunction.” Applying elements of Norman Fairclough’s *critical discourse analysis* framework, this study examines as cultural artifacts Viagra, Levitra, and Cialis print advertisements and television commercials and it offers insight into the institutional discourse of “sexual enhancement medication” and how this discourse constructs male identity and subjectivity.

Chapter 1 Introduction

During the past few years consumers have faced marketing campaigns for “sexual enhancement medication” (SEM), marketing that profoundly influences how we view ourselves, others, and in particular, the standard of male virility. Since the pharmaceutical company Pfizer released Viagra in 1998, millions of men in the United States have taken the SEM that is supposed to treat “erectile dysfunction” (ED). In 2003 Viagra had more than \$2 billion in global sales and at the time Pfizer was the sole mass-marketed SEM manufacturer (Naughton 46). In the last year two more SEM’s, Levitra and Cialis, have entered the market and each one carried with it its own particular marketing strategies; we now witness increased efforts by all SEM manufacturers to construct male subjectivity in relation to ED. Marketing for these pharmaceuticals is transmitted through mass media: television, radio, traditional print, the Internet, public space advertising such as billboards and advertisements on public transportation, and countless other media. Viagra, initially believed by many to be passing fad, a drug for old, impotent men, or a national joke, is now firmly cemented as one of the most popular ‘lifestyle drugs’ in the United States and much of the world.

SEM marketing is based on advertising a ‘treatment’ *and* its ‘disorder,’ on selling not only the drug but the condition it treats. In doing this the marketing aims to prescribe the ideal male body and its proper, mechanical sexual relation with other bodies; for this end it constructs male subjectivity as medical subjectivity, that bodies are functional or dysfunctional, healthy or diseased, normal or abnormal. The strategies aim to convince subjects to accept these criteria in absolute terms. SEM marketing implicitly and explicitly makes normative claims about sexual relationships and the physiology of sex: in other words, SEM marketing attempts to clearly distinguish normal from abnormal sexual behavior.

SEM marketing *discourse* consolidates the manifold discourses of masculinity and male sexuality—of virility, of reproduction, of perversion, of codes, of desire, of gaze—into a unitary discourse that subsumes these other discourses and locates male sexuality in a vaguely clinical standard of virility. To admit ED is to put one’s sexuality on display, to expose one’s sexual being, and to publicly confess. The discourse of SEM, as I demonstrate later in Chapter 4, aims to situate *all* males as ED sufferers, and the only division is between those who have confessed to ED and those who have not. We can locate this ‘confessional’ aspect of ED and SEM discourse in Foucault’s *History of Sexuality* in which he explores the way nineteenth century medicine, psychiatry, and pedagogy assembled a discourse of sexuality “from the sexual mosaic” of collected confessionals. After this assemblage, he writes, “Western societies...began to keep an indefinite record of these [confessors’] pleasures” (63-4). Medicine, psychiatry, and pedagogy constructed categories of sexual perversions, of oddities, of pathologies, of typologies, and of models of the body as a machine: in the case of SEM marketing, now functional, now dysfunctional, now virile, now impotent.

Successful marketing must naturalize the identities and relations it constructs, and in doing so it must embark from identities and relations that already exist. I look to masculinities literature and gender theory to contextualize not only the timeliness of this study, but also ways that SEM advertising reproduces, modifies, and creates new

gender stereotypes. SEM marketing and gender stereotypes are dialectically related; marketing shapes and is shaped by the culture in which it exists. Yet when new products and SEM's are created, marketers must exhibit a more prominent status in the dialectical relationship; new products and services do not always correspond to preexisting needs and wants. Thus marketers create new identities and relations for their target audiences, or they create identities and relations that modify old ones. The profitability and increasing use of SEM demonstrates the marketers' accomplishment, due in large to successful audience construction through the construction of subjectivity. To understand more about SEM discourse, I apply elements of Fairclough's *critical discourse analysis* (CDA) framework, a framework that is based in critical social theory. I analyze as cultural artifacts specific marketing texts—three magazine advertisements and three television commercials—and attempt to find in these the multifarious constructions of the ED 'victim' / SEM 'consumer.'

In the broadest sense the questions I address in this study are: what characterizes the institutional marketing discourse of SEM? What does it presuppose about its audience? How does it construct identities, relations, and subjectivity? How does it construct masculinity and/or masculinities?

Chapter 2 Literature Review

The theories and research I apply to this study can be put in the following general categories: the relationship between critical social research and marketing; various theories of discourse and the theory of discourse that is appropriate for this study; generic analysis, which aims to identify intertextuality, interdiscursivity, and hybridity and how generic analysis provides insight into SEM discourse; Fairclough's rationale for CDA and its aims as a mode of critical social research; mass media and marketing in postmodernity; masculinities literature and gender theory; and the social and institutional history of SEM as set forth in Loe's book about Viagra, "the little blue pill."

Critical Social Research and Marketing

In *Analyzing Discourse* Fairclough describes CDA as a form of critical social research that

begins from questions such as these: how do existing societies provide people with the possibilities and resources for rich and fulfilling lives, how on the other hand do they deny people these possibilities and resources? What is it about existing societies that produces poverty, deprivation, misery, and insecurity in people's lives? What possibilities are there for social change which would reduce these problems and enhance the quality of the lives of human beings? The aim of critical social research is better understanding of how societies work and produce both beneficial and detrimental effects, and of how the detrimental effects can be mitigated if not eliminated... [It] designs and changes its research [...] to try to respond to the great problems of the day.

(202-3)

For many social researchers, marketing is one of these "great problems of the day." In free-market economies marketing attempts to define 'normal' and 'abnormal.' It diagnoses lack and prescribes fulfillment; the former is the cause for much "misery and insecurity," and the latter, spurring excessive consumerism on a global scale, is the cause of "poverty" and "deprivation" around the world: the exploitation of workers, environmental damage, and the erosion of democratic controls over transnational corporations. Although marketing is just one aspect of capitalism, it is the most conspicuous, and it is the aspect most available for individual subjects to criticize and oppose, thus, ideally, reform. Taking a critical position against marketing is an important step in mitigating or perhaps eliminating some of the detrimental effects, the soreness of lack and the excessive waste of fulfillment. Because SEM marketing locates itself within the discourse of lack and fulfillment, of impotency and virility, SEM marketing texts should be critically analyzed as a cause of misery and insecurity with regard to the subjectivities they construct in which *lack* is the central feature.

Theory of Discourse

The use of *discourse* in social theory can be traced to Foucault, who himself defines it different ways in different works. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* he describes discourse as "the general domain of all statements, and sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements" (80). The definition I work with is somewhat more

specific. Discourse can be characterized as the totality of statements made in a *societal conversation* by an indeterminate group of *conversation*-participants, some with more influence on the totality of the *conversation* than others; this definition is useful because it highlights disparities between participants. In SEM discourse, the participants with more influence are of course the institutions that diagnose ED and prescribe SEM: the marketing firms.

Discourse should not, on the other hand, be viewed as independent of social relations; it should not be understood as an assembly of, to use Saussure's terminology, signifiers detached from signified social realities. Fairclough's conception of discourse is "language as a form of social practice" (*Language* 20), and here "language" can be applied broadly "to refer to spoken or written language use" and other semiotic activity such as "visual images and non-verbal communication" (*Media* 54). In this study I synthesize *discourse as societal conversation* and *discourse as social practice*. With such a definition we can analyze texts—cultural artifacts—without a constant referral to social practices, yet we can draw from the analyses to make claims about social practices, identities, relations, and subjectivities. In this study I critically analyze the discourse of SEM by analyzing marketing texts because these texts dominate the discourse and (as in the above definition of discourse as a conversation) function as nodal, primary participants in the societal conversation of ED and SEM.

Generic Analysis

An important part of Fairclough's framework and a method I employ in my analyses is generic analysis. A *genre* is "a way of using language which corresponds to the nature of the social practice that is being engaged in" (*Media* 76), and genres "can be identified at different levels of abstraction: highly abstract 'pre-genres' such as Narrative or Report, which generalize over many different forms of narrative and report at a more concrete level, disembedded genres [that become detached from a particular context], and situated genres which are tied to particular networks of social practice" (*Analysing* 216). An example relevant to this study is the *marketing "pre-genre"* (in which there is always diagnosis and prescription), the *drug ad "genre"* (in which medicalized language is almost always employed), and the *SEM marketing text "situated genre"* in which virility is located at the center of male subjectivity.

One feature of postmodernity is the accelerated dissolution of conventional genres, and accordingly texts are not simply "in a 'genre' [and] they often mix or hybridize different genres" (*Analysing* 216). Evidence for these mixtures can be in the form of *intertextuality* (parts or whole texts included as elements in other texts). Genre mixing and intertextuality often signify *interdiscursivity* (discourses represented in or blended with other discourses) and a creative instance of interdiscursivity can also be termed a discursive hybrid, a discourse that, although composed of preexisting discourses, represents the existence of a new social practice. Analysis of interdiscursivity is an important part of the analysis of SEM marketing texts because of the salient interdiscursive features in them; this sort of analysis is important in understanding the construction of subjectivity in these texts and can expose tensions between competing discourses, which I explore below in a Levitra commercial that incorporates the two conflicting discourses: heroic male solitude and heroic male solidarity. Analyzing interdiscursivity is also useful in understanding how certain

discourses, such as medical discourse, are used to alienate audiences from their supposed ED, and how other discourses, such as the discourse of friendship and male communion, are used to include audiences in an informal, public discussion of their supposed ED.

Fairclough and Critical Discourse Analysis

What distinguishes Fairclough and other CDA practitioners from discourse analysts is that Fairclough and the CDA practitioners concern their analyses with overt political and social issues. In *Language and Power* Fairclough states his work has two purposes, one theoretical and the other more practical, to “help correct a widespread underestimation of the significance of language in the production, maintenance, and change of social relations of power,” [and] “to help increase the consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of some people by others, because consciousness is the first step toward emancipation” (1). In this it is important to investigate “‘common sense’ assumptions which are implicit in the conventions according to which people interact linguistically, and of which people are not generally not consciously aware” (2). Citing Ricoeur, Scannell locates critical analyses like CDA inside the hermeneutics of “suspicion” that aims to cast doubt on the hermeneutics of “trust” that “reproduces unquestioningly...a distorted dominant reality that mystifies social inequalities” (254-6). Fairclough and CDA practitioners provide a multi-layered, multidirectional analytical framework that casts doubt on discourse and language as neutral representations of reality. Their strategies however are neither nihilistic nor, in the Derridian sense ‘deconstructionist.’ Their theoretical groundwork does suggest a ‘truth,’ and they work to uncover the opacity that discourse and discursive practices create on divergent ‘truths.’ Researchers and theorists must at some point deal with divergent truth claims, Fairclough states, because “[t]he only way of gaining access to truth is through representations of it, and all representations involve particular points of view, values, and goals, and truth, he adds, “is a slippery business, but abandoning it altogether is surely perverse” (*Media* 46-7). Thus although I claim no ‘truthful’ male subjectivity, I do claim that SEM discourse-constructed male subjectivity is more artificial, causes more distress, and is in a sense more of a ‘simulation’ than those subjectivities that came before it.

SEM marketing works to standardize subjectivity, diagnose a dysfunction to all men (even if the ‘dysfunction’ is dormant), and prescribe, of course, its own treatment to an ‘ailment’ it actively constructs and reconstructs. In doing so, SEM marketing is affecting change in society. Tied up in SEM discourse are the discourses of medicine, rigid social order, masculinity, female suppression, and compulsory heterosexuality. On the periphery—but still in the service of these dominant discourses—are oppositional orders: the discourses of sickness, of rebellion, of femininity, of female supremacy, and even compulsory homosexuality. It is also important to note the other discourses to which SEM is tied: transnational drug trade, globalization, and the ‘privilege’ of medical discourse in postmodernity. These discourses create and propagate ‘common-sense’ that sees these changes, for better or for worse, as natural and inevitable. Of course, all social change cannot be reduced to discourse, but, as Fairclough argues, “It is an important characteristic of the economic, social, and cultural changes of late modernity that they exist as *discourses* as well as processes that are taking place outside

discourse, and that the processes that are taking place outside discourse are substantively shaped by these discourses” (4). It is with this foundation that I critically analyze SEM text as a discourse that has a dialectic relation with social ‘reality,’ whatever that may be.

Mass Media and Mass Marketing

Thompson defines a new type of social relationship called “mediated quasi-interaction,” characterized by a separation between the context of production of a communicative act from the context of reception of a communicative act. These separations include time and locality. This social relationship supplants “mediated interaction,” such as a telephone call, which supplanted “face-to-face” interaction. In a “face-to-face interaction” the deixis, the “here-now” context of a conversation is fairly clear. In a “mediated interaction,” the deixis is diminished, though participants have relative parity in the communicative act. In mediated-quasi interaction, such as the airing of a television commercial, communication is monological, dispersed to many from one or a few participants. Feedback in such an interaction is negligible, confined to oblique paths, delivered through the connection between purchasing habits and advertising.

What is problematic about the proliferation of such interactions, especially regarding mass marketing campaigns waged on a global scale, is that individuals have little efficacy in influencing identities, relations, and subjectivities that are constructed. Although it seems that with the proliferation of the Internet—chat rooms, personal web logs, message boards, and email—oppositional strategies can be simultaneously globally waged. Nonetheless marketing is everywhere that there is a market to be had. Marketing campaigns are funded by ever-increasing amounts of money and capital, and are transmitted more rapidly through more media with more and more success. We are bombarded with marketing in television commercials, magazine and newspaper ads, radio spots, Internet pop-up ads, and highway billboards. Chouliaraki and Fairclough describe advertisements as “cultural commodities” (10) that have two functions: to advertise commodities and to advertise themselves, to persuade subjects to accept them and the ideological assumptions they carry. With this sort of global, post-industrialist commodification of signs, language too is “increasingly commodified” and is treated accordingly as a commodity (10). When language is treated as a commodity, vacuous and a means-to-an-end, cynicism and apathy ensue. One goal of CDA and this study is to reaffirm the importance of language as socially constitutive, that constructions of marketing language, although designed to manipulate, can similarly be opposed by language: by using language to critically analyze language that is constructed primarily as a means of coercion.

Masculinities Literature and Gender Theory

Exploring masculinities is important in this study because SEM marketing does not only focus on *virility*; it also constructs a *masculinity* and implies a site at which *masculinity* is *virility*. Masculinities literature explores manifest forms of masculinity, forms that are diverse, fluid, sometimes contradictory, and are often linked to culture, class, ethnicity, and many other sociological categories. Connell warns, however, that in researching masculinities we must not consider ethnicity and other categories “add-ons,” because doing so works to support the essentialist view that masculinities are based on and a

result of an essential maleness (34). Essentialist positions work against critical social theory because they blur the distinction between innateness and construct, and they limit the scope of democratic, conscious *change* that is an important part of critical social theory.

Much of the groundwork for contemporary masculinities studies was laid during the 1980's, a decade during which the field of feminist studies was undergoing considerable changes and experienced "considerable unease" regarding how 'women' were constructed in feminist writing. By focus on shared, even innate characteristics of "Universal Women," some feminist scholars were ignoring the differences between women (Cornwall 9). Another major shift in feminist studies was that attention was being given to 'maleness' and 'masculinity' as diverse constructs and not as the necessarily fixed oppressive institutions that some feminists held. Gardiner claims that "[a]ttempts to understand the cinematic 'male gaze' and misogynous culture led feminist scholars to pay more attention to male subjectivities and male bonding, inaugurating feminist masculinities studies as an academic field" (5). In many ways masculinities studies was and still is contingent on feminism, using the same terminology, critical perspectives, and sometimes even proposing a similar "victim" model that situates male subjects against an oppressive gendering regime. Some scholars see crises in both fields because of the challenging insights offered by postmodernist and queer theories, claims such as that perhaps it is no longer viable to employ traditional binaries: women and men and femininity and masculinity (9). Butler asserts that not only is gender a construct, but so is sex, which is "forcibly materialized through time" (2). "If gender is the social constriction of sex," she asserts, "and if there is no access to this 'sex' except by means of its construction, then it appears not only that sex is absorbed by gender, but that 'sex' becomes something like a fiction, perhaps a fantasy, retroactively installed at a prelinguistic site to which there is no direct access" (5). She proposes "a return to the notion of matter, not as a site or surface, but as a *process of materialization that stabilizes over time to produce the effect of boundary, fixity, and surface we call matter*" (9). In an exploration of SEM identity/subjectivity construction, her proposal is valuable because we can observe the "processes" during which *masculine gender* materializes and stabilizes as *male sex*. That is, *masculine* constructs (such as sturdiness or vigor) that may not have a fixed referent (such as a cultural legacy or some sort of vaguely identifiable physiological basis, although these are not necessarily fixed) stabilize as signifiers of maleness; the construct of virility thus retroactively creates a qualification for and engenders male sex. In the Viagra magazine advertisement I analyze in Chapter 4, for example, the term *mischief* is employed to represent a subject's masculine past, and because the subject was mischievous he is engendered male.

Even though much ethnographic and sociological work has been done on categorizing masculinity types, there is still much disagreement as what, if any, general characteristics can be classified as necessarily masculine or inherently referenced to males. Benyon writes that "[p]erhaps what we are currently witnessing at the start of the twenty-first century is nothing less than the emergence of a more fluid, bricolage masculinity, the result of 'channel-hopping' across versions of 'the masculine'" (6). Manifold masculinities, however fluid and ambiguous they may be, are often attributed to what he refers to as post-Fordist consumer-led economy (11). Manifold masculinities in mass media are in part due to "[a]dvertising's need to capture and hold the

consumer's attention." What emerges is "not a single masculinity, but masculinities in the plural" (MacKinnon 93). Many theorists contend that even though there are manifold masculinities, there are still orders of masculinities, or "hegemonic masculinities," which, according to Connell, in *Masculinities* define how best to 'be a man' in particular contexts. In the process other masculinities are rendered inadequate and inferior (Beynon 16). This is apparent in the analysis of the Levitra commercial I discuss in Chapter 4. Here two masculinities are constructed in opposition to one another: an inferior masculinity of stoic resignation and a hegemonic masculinity of cooperative engagement.

With the boundaries and configurations of gender and sex blurred, exploring masculinities can be problematic. Connell contends "Masculinity *refers to* male bodies (sometimes directly, sometimes symbolically and indirectly), but it is not *determined* by male biology... Masculinities are configurations of practice within gender relations, a structure that includes large-scale institutions and economic relations as well as face-to-face relationships and sexuality. Masculinity is institutionalized in this structure, as well as being an aspect of individual character or personality" (*The Men* 29). In general I use masculinity to refer to *characteristics of the ideal male subject as evidenced in the analyses*. In doing so I depart from the work that has been done to typify masculinities and instead approach them with postmodern awareness as fluid, context- and goal-oriented (such as that Viagra marketing aims to construct masculinity in terms of vaguely medicalized descriptions of virility), and as Mort contends, as hybrid characteristics that cannot "be attributed to a single source" and are the "condensation of multiple concerns which temporarily [run] together" (15). In SEM texts there is often not a single masculine prototype, but a congregation of masculine characteristics, some traditional, some hybrid, and some new.

The Emergence of Viagra and Sexual Enhancement Medication

Loe examines the Viagra "phenomenon" and its emergence at the end of the twentieth century as a "blockbuster" drug that has inspired competitors to try and capitalize on the billions of dollars in profit. Viagra and other drugs rely on the medicalization of subjectivity, the principal configuration of humans as biological beings in various stages of dysfunction, disrepair, and disease. Medicine needs its ailment, which is why "[n]ew medical categories are under construction, older diagnoses are expanded, and medical solutions such as pills, creams, and devices proliferate" (11). Loe explores a disturbing trend, that more and more the successes of drugs like Ritalin, Prozac, and Viagra are contingent on the *construction* of disorder. For this, pharmaceutical companies must define normality and order so they can define abnormality and disorder. Accordingly, even though pharmaceutical ads and medical experts claim that half of all men over age forty suffer from some form of ED, these ads and experts maintain that ED is not "normal" (18).

According to Loe, sildenafil, the chemical name for Viagra, was originally tested by Pfizer as a cure for angina. When some of the male test subjects reported as a side effect they were having erections, the side effect was duly noted. It was only after this accidental discovery of sildenafil's 'other use' that Pfizer's scientists, with renewed interest in penis physiology, 'worked back' to understand how sildenafil caused

erections (41-44). Pfizer, then, had to research conditions for a 'dysfunction' they knew little about but had a drug to treat. Consequently, they began constructing "erectile dysfunction." For several years after this discovery Pfizer was reluctant to market a pill that might be viewed as just another phony aphrodisiac like Spanish fly or rhinoceros horns. Pfizer, clearly, did not want the discourse they were constructing to be confused with other, less reputable discourses. This was a period marked by cautious development, carefully controlled studies, and the construction of ED as a serious medical condition that afflicts millions of American men. Also at this time the diagnostic term "sexual dysfunction" replaced "sexual dissatisfaction," the latter being discarded because it suggested the 'problem' was rooted in psychology. Soon Pfizer created the name Viagra, which to many people suggested a mix of "vigor" and "Niagara" (45-53).

According to Loe, in addition to the period during which ED evolved and ED diagnoses grew, there have been four other distinct periods of framing Viagra. The first was a period marked by skepticism and fear of the new drug; the second was a period marked by a discursive focus on elderly men, and during this time Bob Dole, the elderly, reserved former politician was spokesperson; the third was a period marked by a discursive focus on the romance of Viagra; and the fourth, ongoing period is marked a discursive focus on youthful vigor and masculinity. Only the first of these framings, argues Loe, was not a result of Pfizer's efforts. These shifting focuses correlate to shifting target audience. More and more the advertisements are aimed at men who only have "mild" ED (55-59).

Much of Pfizer's success is due to its dissemination of its influences of medical spheres. HMO's and insurance companies that initially refused to cover treatment costs for ED found themselves pressured by health experts and urologists (many of whom were specialists affiliated with Pfizer), irate ED 'victims' who, using Pfizer's criteria, felt they suffered from a very serious medical disorder, and lawsuits (60-61). But legal legitimacy does not necessarily equate to social/medical legitimacy, so hundreds of Pfizer-affiliated 'experts' raided the airwaves, appearing as 'disinterested' medical experts yet whose celebratory articles, speeches, and appearances aided in convincing a majority of the public that sexual "dissatisfaction" was sexual "dysfunction." ED now exists as a medical category and the discourse of Viagra is now the discourse of SEM. To attract customers, Loe states, SEM manufacturers insist on a male subjectivity as a "poorly functioning male machine" (67) that is in need of repair. Now Viagra, Levitra, Cialis, and a host of 'herbal' SEM's vie for the billions of dollars spent each year to fix the male machine. Loe states that pharmaceutical companies have tried, without much success, to apply the model of a "broken" machine to the female body, but these companies have faced several problems in marketing an SEM to treat "Female Sexual Dysfunction" (FSD). Some of these problems are with the 'science,' and some are due to vocal opposition to the idea of expanded medical "ownership" of women's bodies (125-165).

Facing marketing efforts that aim to bring all men into the discursive practices of Viagra, it is important to analyze the discourse of SEM from a variety of critical angles, to expose the assumptions that underlie SEM marketing texts, and to determine and evaluate the subjectivity these texts create. It was only recently that Levitra and Cialis entered the SEM market, yet even now new categories of ED are being developed by these different companies, categories that will match with the different pharmaceuticals'

supposed 'advantages' (as it the case with '36-hour Cialis'). In short, the discourse of SEM is expanding and solidifying as a matter of medical 'fact.' Its epistemological foundation and ontological classifications are being seen more and more as 'natural.' The divergences within the discourse itself (such as which SEM facilitates more of a natural 'sexual spontaneity'), as they too deepen and widen, will obscure the nakedness of the steps that were taken to create the discourse in the first place. And although, as Loe illustrates, pharmaceutical companies have yet to succeed on a large scale with the creation of similar diagnoses and prescriptions for women, it is likely, with the vast resources of these companies, that this time is not too far away.

Chapter 3 Methodology

The six marketing texts I analyze—three magazine advertisements and three television commercials—do not represent all contemporary SEM marketing texts, but, because they were all broadcast and printed within weeks and months of each other, they are similar cultural artifacts. I choose the three magazine advertisements because, while looking for SEM marketing texts, I came across them in several places, mostly men's magazines. The three commercials were chosen for a similar reason, because I was aware that they were being broadcast on several major television networks while I first put together this study.

Fairclough's CDA framework is multidirectional and layered, and the elements of the framework I employ are contingent upon what media I analyze. Because the three magazine advertisements and the three television commercials I analyze are, in some respects, quite different from each other, some methods are valuable in one analysis while in another they are not valuable. There are some methods, like generic analysis, that are applicable in any media text. I briefly analyze visual semiotics only when necessary for a discourse analysis, when linguistic semantics are contingent on visual semiotics. In the analyses of magazine advertisements I first consider the "salient constructions," the textual constructions that seem to have visual and semantic primacy over other, usually smaller constructions. In the commercials I note the music and include in the semiotic analysis. Also, in these texts lexical and syntactic ambiguity are common, so frequently I locate these at the center of the analyses.

Linguistic Analysis

Vocabulary: I look at vocabulary in terms of usage, appropriateness within the discourse, polysemy (multiple meanings), and ambiguity. How, for example, does calling the male character in a Viagra ad "that guy" (see Viagra commercial [1] below) construct his identity? Why, in the Viagra magazine advertisement, are "mischief" and "making love" both used to express sexual intercourse?

Modality: Modality refers to the 'mood' that establishes the general intent of a speaker, a speaker's degree of commitment to a literal signification of her words, or a statement's credibility. For example, in the Levitra commercial below, Mike Ditka's imperative construction *take the Levitra challenge* establishes his intent for the viewer to follow this order. In the Cialis advertisement, the construction *you can be + [adjective] when you + [verb]* establishes a different modality: advice giving.

Tense: Looking at tense is important as analyzing the modality (as modal...) and tense is especially important in looking at marketing, especially postmodern marketing that creates a here-now that incorporate past, present, and future. An example of this is in the Viagra magazine advertisement: *thanks to Viagra, you're back*. This confuses tense, is in present tense refers to future action. SEM texts, in order to diagnose and prescribe in the same utterance, often employ this sort of confusing tense.

Halliday's process types: Halliday's processes are represented, grammatically, in clause-types, and clauses can simultaneously represent different processes. An analysis of clause types can be useful in a broader ideological analysis; clause construction reflects how the chaos of existence is solidified into grammatical processes. In the Viagra magazine ad, *get back to mischief* is simultaneously existential (*get back to how you used to be*), material (*get back to the time-place you were*), behavioral (*get back to how you used to behave*), and so on.

Tone and Style

These are largely matters of interpretation. Tone, the quality of sound or pitch, will apply only to the commercials and can 'mark' a construction in terms of emotive signification. Style here means adherence to a clearly identifiable language convention (such as formal or informal, passive or aggressive, and so on.) I put these together because they can both suggest intertextuality and interdiscursivity. In the Levitra commercial, Ditka's tone is low and his style is evaluative—he employs clear *it's* + [adjective] declaratives—and authoritative.

Generic Analysis

The two methods of generic analysis I adopt from Fairclough are 1. An analysis of genre mixtures in a particular text and 2. An analysis of individual genres in a particular text. Some genres are quite recognizable, but "they vary considerably in terms of their degree of stabilization, fixity, and homogenization" (*Analysing* 66). There is no genre list, so generic analysis is often a matter of cautious interpretation. It is important to note here that generic analysis provides glimpse into sites of struggle and change in discourses. In this study intertextuality, interdiscursivity, and hybridity can be seen as attempts to formalize, for example, the discourse of potency, or informalize, for example, the discourse of medicine. The Viagra magazine advertisement could be located within different levels of genre: the "pre-genre" of narrative, the genre of 'the stereotype of the bored husband shopping with his wife,' and the "situated genre" of the Viagra-husband encouraging his wife to buy lingerie.

Analysis of Identity and Subjectivity

Although these two categories are similar (in that they both reflect 'selfness') I distinguish them for a reason: I use *identity* to characterize one's individuality vis-à-vis the identities of others. For example, an SEM text might construct a 'husband-as-virile-man' identity, this construction is contingent on a social relationship; the text will not (usually) attempt to construct the identity of the man 'virile-husband and schoolteacher.' I use *subjectivity* to signify a more organic individuality, a totality of identities. An SEM text may for example construct a subjectivity of a man a 'whose happiness is contingent on adhering to a code of masculinity.' Not every marketing text constructs subjectivity. And in fact discourses, often, but not texts, construct a totality of identities that qualify as subjectivity. The analyses of identity and subjectivity—especially when a 'non-traditional' masculinity or masculinities are constructed—will also take into account gender theory and masculinities literature, which, as I mention above, posit a postmodern fragmentation of masculinity.

Analysis of Relations

Here I look for the construction of a network of identities and subjectivities; this is the consideration of identities and subjectivities as they also construct 'the other.' In SEM texts, for example, the relationship of a heterosexual couple might be constructed so as the woman's identity is contingent on the man's virility: his failure is her lack. In other SEM texts in which there are no representations of heterosexual couples, but instead a communion of men, relations might be constructed more in terms of brute hierarchy, homo-social gaze, or violent competition.

Ideological Analysis

Here I look at the construction of ideology—a unity of identities, subjectivities, beliefs, and so on—that all orient toward some goal or value. I believe that individual textual analyses do not give enough scope for an ideological analysis, and even sets of similar discourses may not easily yield an ideology. However, I do try in my discussion to bring the analyses together for insight into the ideological implications of at the construction of ideology.

Order of Analysis

In the magazine advertisements my analysis begins with a brief visual description and then follows the text from top-to-bottom, from left to right. I do not analyze disclaimers, logotypes, or small-type 'standard pitches' that generally do not vary much from text to text. As I construct each analysis, I sometimes relate a line of analysis to a previous one, but I usually only do this when they conflict, contradict, and modify one another: when tension is created. At the end I construct a more general analysis of the text.

For the television commercials I also begin with a brief visual-spatial description, and then I analyze the text in chronological order, referring back when necessary to earlier lines of analysis. At the end I construct a more general analysis of the text.

Chapter 4 Sexual Enhancement Medication Marketing Texts

In this chapter I apply the methodology to SEM marketing texts. The first set of analyses focuses on three magazine advertisements and the second focuses on television commercials. Detailed descriptions of the advertisements and commercials are located in the appendices.

Magazine Advertisements

A. Cialis advertisement

The salient imagery (approximately 2/3 of the page) is a photograph of a woman, on the left, bathing in a tub. On the right a fully dressed man is squatting and desirously looking at her. In his hands he holds a glass of orange juice. The camera focus is soft. The morning light is on his back and on her face.

There are three textual constructions that are salient in this advertisement:

1. You *can't hurry love*.
2. And why would you want to?
3. When the moment is right, you can be ready with 36-hour Cialis.

In these three constructions there are four nouns: the reader (*you*), *love*, *the moment*, and *36-hour Cialis* (and implicitly the loved one). Of the four, one is animate, two are abstract, and the last is inanimate. The first construction brings the reader into the discussion of SEM in two ways: first, second-person deixis *you* identifies the reader as the addressee of the construction. Second, the modal directive *can't* creates the mood of prohibition and aligns the viewer with the negation of the construction: the false claim *you CAN hurry love*. Also, *can't hurry love* is intertextual; it connotes the 1960's song by the Supremes that extols the uncomplicated virtue of patience. Another aspect of this construction is that the transitivity of *hurry* and nominalization *love* diminishes the agency of the subject who is unable to 'get' an erection; it separates his body from himself and in a sense blames *love*, that which is unresponsive. Already the viewer is constructed as one who is naïve about *love* (or sex, or relationships; at this point it is not clear) and requires guidance about an issue so fundamental to life that songs are sung about it.

The conjunction *and* that begins the second construction has a few possible functions. First, it mimics informal conversation, eschews the formal 'rule' that prohibits beginning a sentence with *and*. *And* also mimics informal conversation because it suggests an afterthought: *You can't hurry love [pause] and why would you want to?* This interrogative modality and auxiliary verb *why + would* functions in two distinct ways: the interrogative positions the viewer as subject to the scrutiny of the guidance-giver, and the future tense adds to the now-naïveté the future-naïveté: the imagined love act committed in shameful ignorance.

While the first two constructions act as the marketing diagnosis, the third construction recalls the diagnosis and gives the prescription. The relation between the

diagnosis and prescription is conditional: *when* [conditional] *you can be* [attribute] *with* [possession]. The definite article *the* of *the moment* functions in a few ways: first, it creates a sort of solidarity between reader and guidance-giver; [*the*-definite *moment*] is quite semantically different from [*a*-indefinite *moment*]; *the moment* implies privileged knowledge of the reader's *moments*.

It is difficult to isolate the style, discourse, or even genre under which this marketing text might be categorized. The language interrogates and patronizes, but it is also playful and pedagogic. Analyzing the visual semiotics, it is similarly difficult to locate this text in any genre. The 'voice' is ambiguously gendered; it is prohibitive yet supportive, full of taunt but also full of guidance. We can perhaps say that because this ad is without gender, differentiation, it is similarly outside of genre.

The identities constructed here are stereotypical: the man appears to have, while eating breakfast, decided he would like to engage the woman in the bathtub. He is the agent here: she is situated defensively in the bathtub, and he is squatting down, looking at her intently. The construction of relations (derived from the text semiotically intersecting with the image) both grants the man agency, and, as mentioned above, absolves him of it. He is there, knowledgeable that he *can't hurry love* and that *the moment is right*. His agency if co-agency with participants out of his domain of control: *love, the moment*, and implicitly, the woman at whom he gazes. The modal construction *can be ready with Cialis* is in his domain of control. *Love*, the female object, and now the man himself are all implicated in *the moment*.

That *36-hour* is used to modify *Cialis* emphasizes the contradictory nature of the message: sexual arousal is something spontaneous and natural, and even with drug-consumption sexual arousal will remain spontaneous, perhaps become even more spontaneous (hence natural) than before. This correlates to the visual layout of the advertisement; the orange lighting and glass of orange juice signifies morning, which is not perhaps a 'conventional' time for sex. In the final paragraph agency is clearer but still contradictory and ambiguous. The sentence *Cialis gives you up to 36 hours to relax and take your time, 36 hours to be spontaneous and respond to your partner when the moment is right* suggests that *Cialis* is creating the conditions for natural spontaneity.

Because ED was constructed as a dysfunction, an abnormality, the logic of taking a drug to be more natural is not problematic. Here *Cialis* compliments nature by prompting spontaneity. In a medicated society inhabited by medicalized subjects, the natural state of *not* being medicated is in a sense a dysfunction in-and-of itself; it signifies lack, abnormality, and pathology.

B. Levitra advertisement

This advertisement is cluttered with small-type text and seems to rely more on visual semiosis than semantics. In the photograph in the top-right corner, a man sits on a couch looking directly at the camera. His expression is one of contentment, perhaps confidence. While he is looking at the camera a woman sits behind looking at him from the top of the couch. She is smiling more markedly than he is. He is dressed in casual beige business attire and she is dressed in lingerie. That they are dressed differently and the lighting connotes morning or dusk suggests to me, again, a reinforcement of old

stereotypes: he is either preparing to go to work while she stays at home, or he has just returned from work while she has stayed at home most of the day.

The most salient construction is: *LEVITRA is a clinically proven treatment for erectile dysfunction (ED) that consistently improves erection quality*. Packaged here is the solution to a “dysfunction,” support for its effectiveness (it is *clinically proven*), and a specific result of its consumption, that Levitra *improves erection quality*. The language style seems to be a blend of a business report (which focuses on the practical aspects of the product) and of medicine, of science. Although the significations of the modifiers (*clinically proven, consistently, and erection quality*) are vacuous, in the context of the ‘straightforwardness,’ the construction as a whole is not vague; it wraps into one nice semantic package a clear commercial appeal. *LEVITRA* is head of the construction, and all the elements are subordinate to it. What is given in this first construction is the relevant information, the ‘map,’ much like a thesis statement, to the rest of the text in which the main points are bulleted and correspond to the order of qualities in the first construction.

For most men, LEVITRA*

- Works to improve erection quality
 - Improves duration, hardness, and the ability to attain an erection
- Works fast
 - No other oral ED treatment is proven to work faster
- Works time and again!

The language is clear and *erection quality* is even supplemented with the criteria *duration, hardness, and the ability to attain*. Other significations of ‘commerce’ come from the verb *works*, which is at the head of each of the bulleted points. *Works* is multifunctional. The first instance (*Works to improve*) is suggestive of how a man might *work*, labor, toil; the second one (Levitra *works fast*) is suggestive of how employee might work, in sense, *work* here connotes a contractor for one’s body; and the third instance (Levitra *works time and again*) suggests it is reliable, trustworthy. Another instance of multifunctionality or polysemy is in the last construction: *QUALITY WHEN IT COUNTS*. In this context *counts* denotes ‘matters,’ but it simultaneously connotes calculating and figuring: the activities of the accountant. *It* could function as the pronominal for quality, or *it* could merely be a placeholder, for when social circumstances requires quality. Last, another salient textual feature is the imperative *ask your doctor if a FREE TRIAL is right for you*, and that *free trial* is capitalized also suggests this advertisement is directed toward a reader who is concerned with savings. In the bottom-right corner is a photograph of the same man, but here he is smiling in a pronounced manner. The visual layout of the two images, the larger one on top and the smaller on bottom, suggests causation: before he was content, confident, in a sense unyielding, but in the other photograph he is a yielding, expressive, happy client.

The man’s facial expression, as I interpreted, suggested contentedness or confidence, but in the context of the linguistic style, his expression could also be described as disinterested in *love* and *the moment* (to use two examples from the Cialis ad) but self-centeredly concerned with his *erection quality*.

The focus on Cialis *working fast* is also distinctive to this ad. Recall the Cialis that emphasized freedom from time constraints, ‘windows’ of opportunities during which *the*

moment would be right. These two ads also signify the division Foucault discusses, how categorization multiplies beyond its grasp the proliferation of ontological categories. Soon we may expect to see ED broken down more than into cases of mild, serious, or severe. ED might be broken down into socially contingent categories, level of familiarity the partner(s), type of childhood, and so on.

C. Viagra advertisement

The connection here between the visual and textual elements is very clear. A black and white photograph of a man smiling mischievously is contrasted with two bright blue horns on either side of his head. The effectiveness of this advertisement relies on intertextuality—the likelihood that reader is familiar with Viagra marketing that exposes the blue horns as the top of the ‘V’ of Viagra. The text above his head is *Get back to mischief*, an imperative to return to some prior state of real or imaginary virility or sexual activity. Near the bottom of the layout is *Thanks to VIAGRA you’re back...which means making love is better for you and your partner*. Thus there is inconsistency between the tense of the upper and the lower constructions. Above, the imperative is to do something in the future; it is a call to action. In the bottom, the tense is in the present. This temporal ambiguity is common to postmodernist texts, especially in advertising wherein lack and solution are simultaneously marketed. The top clause functions, in a Hallidayan analysis, several possible significations: a material process, a process of *doing*, returning to place and time, and a relational process, a process of *having an attribute*. So the going (*get back*) is simultaneously going back to a local, and going back to possessing an attribute (mischievousness). The marketing strategy here seems to purposefully unite locale and personal attribute, a place in space and time and the real or imagined qualities one possessed at that place and time. Either way the quality of mischievousness is separated from the participant; it is the goal to be reached. In the second case the quality is innately connected to the participant, it is an *existential* process: *you’re back*, as in the Cialis advertisement above (A), makes the influence of the drug on the man’s composition seem *more* natural than the condition of not taking it. It brings him back to the idealized youthful state of natural spontaneity. This is contradicted, complicated by the next construction: *which means making love is better for you and your partner*. The comparative *better* shows the superiority of one identity over the other: the past-identity (with newly provided Viagra enhancement) over the present-identity (without the treatment, with the old problem). Parity is signified with *for you and your lover*, a selling point typical of the original Viagra marketing campaign that featured Bob Dole as its spokesperson. In these early ads ED was approached not as a matter of a lack of virility but more as a problem that damaged the sexual pleasure potential older couples shared. *For you and your lover* also is also distinctive regarding of the first two advertisements, the first of which obscured agency and presented ED as a matter of an individual’s inability to act when *the moment is right*, and the second of which presented ED as an problem for a man to solve alone by making an informed purchase. This third advertisement is intertextual; it exhibits features of old and new Viagra marketing strategies.

This Viagra marketing text is characterized by hybridity; it is not entirely clear how to offer a generic analysis: taking Viagra is a way to be singularly naughty and a way to

benefit one's *lover*; taking Viagra proposes returning and regressing, but taking Viagra also proposes progress. There are several explanations for this ambiguity. First, for Viagra's first few years on the market there were no serious competitors, thus marketing was more about convincing male subjects they were afflicted with ED than it was a matter of distinguishing Viagra from other drugs. Second, institutional limitations on the degree of 'explicitness' in these advertisements are kept in place by laws and marketing concerns: SEM must be seen as a serious medical treatment for a serious medical disorder. Third, the relationship between texts and society and culture is dialectical (*Media* 34); the texts constitute and are constitutive of society and culture. Consider the next segment of text:

- Compliments of VIAGRA
the erectile dysfunction treatment that started it all
- VIAGRA works fast* and provides reliably rigid erections.*
 - 96% of men were satisfied with how well VIAGRA worked in a 4-year, open-label study.

Here we can observe intertextuality, hybridity, and a mix of voices and styles. *Compliments of VIAGRA* is a consumer-friendly style. *Compliments of*, like *complementary*, suggests a free gift, an after-dinner mint given by a café, or a perk offered by a credit card company.

Here Viagra is *the erectile dysfunction treatment that started it all*. This sort of nostalgic language for the company that started *it all* is a peculiar construction considering SEM has only been in existence for a few years. Nonetheless Viagra is a "blockbuster drug" that did clear a social path for Levitra and Cialis. The term *erectile dysfunction* is also relatively new. *It all* implies a phenomenon, a trend, an extraordinary event and it also implies something that is still happening. This sort of ambiguous, contradictory connotative value demonstrates the overall hybridity of this text. The pop-culture, trendy, nostalgic language is followed by a more businesslike, straightforward language that gives in a bulleted list the reasons for taking Viagra. The benefit of *reliably rigid erections* can be compared to the above Levitra text that offers the qualifiers *hardness*, *duration*, and *quality*. *Reliably rigid erections* is an adverb + adjective + noun construction; it is a single attribute of Viagra and its head is *reliably*, which again suggests the nostalgia for a real or imagined state. *Hardness*, *duration*, and *quality* are all qualities by themselves, and at the head of this set is *hardness*. This Viagra text also demonstrates intertextuality by using *erections*, a word that did not appear until recently in SEM advertisements. Early on it was risqué, 'mischievous,' too radical. But *reliably* does not connote something new and radical, but rather, something old and trustworthy. *Rigid* does not carry the same semantic effect as does *hardness*. *Rigid*, it seems, is as commonly applied to corpses, conventionality, or political conservatism as it is a signifier for sexual virility.

Television Commercials

G. Viagra commercial (1)

The visual narrative of this commercial is of a woman and a man spending a day window-shopping. The composition is in black and white for the same effect as the

above print advertisement: at the moment of the man's sexual 're-awakening,' 'regression,' or 'progression' he grows the bright blue horns that now epitomize Viagra marketing. In this commercial the man is uninterestedly, at times anxiously, following the woman while she shops. At times they move in different directions and the woman pulls him back to her side. During this an off-screen male voice says: *remember that guy who used to be called wild thing...that guy who wanted to spend the entire honeymoon indoors...remember the one who couldn't resist a little mischief*. That this begins with the imperative *remember*, as above, asks the viewer to recall a past that may be real or imaginary. The imperative pulls viewers into a preexisting discussion that may or may not be relevant to their lives. *Remember* connotes nostalgia for a behavior that may have never existed. There are two significant aspects of *that guy*. As in the Cialis advertisement, this subjective position in the construction separates the now-man from the then-man, man 'the commercial viewer' from man 'the subject of the commercial and ED sufferer.' *Guy* connotes youth, and because in the construction *guy* refers to someone who existed in the past; the division between the now-man and the then-man is made even more distinct.

The passive construction *used to be called* also provides some insight into the construction of identities. What is missing here is *who* used to call him *wild thing*. This brings up an interesting aspect of television commercials that is not as prominent in magazine advertisements. In the three print advertisements it seems quite certain that the ideal viewer is male; the SEM is advertised via the construction of a male subjectivity. In this commercial, however, the ideal viewer is not as obvious. There are two approaches to *used to be called wild thing* and they both consider who is doing the calling. First, it could be either of the two on-screen participants, but this is unlikely because if that was the case the constructions would probably be *who used to call himself wild thing* or *who you used to call wild thing*. Perhaps the agents are his friends. Perhaps the agents are past partners. I think it is more likely that the agents of calling are left out for a reason: the ambiguity leaves space for viewers to supply their own connotation of a real or imagined reputation.

Next the viewer is told to remember *that guy who wanted to spend the entire honeymoon indoors* [and] *the one who couldn't resist a little mischief*. Grammatically, it is ambiguous if the legacy of being called *wild thing* is explicitly connected to the one who *wanted to spend the entire honeymoon indoors*. Here, too, there might be contradictory, if not only ambiguous, connotations. The first description suggests a public reputation of sexual unruliness, of promiscuousness. The second description is implicitly more traditional and private. The public nature of the first attribute is replaced by the more private nature of the second attribute, behavior that is *indoors*, sealed from public commentary and discussion, intimate, secretive. The first attribute is of a high-school braggart; the second is of an ideal, committed husband.

The next segment of the voice-over synthesizes the divergent configurations of idealized pasts: *yeah, that guy...he's back*. The unitary, referential *that guy* combines the pasts into an ideal now-man who was both unruly and promiscuous and tame and loving. The subjectivity this constructs for the viewer is dependant on how or if the viewer can relate to either of the imaginary pasts. Male subjectivity is constructed here as *once unruly, now tame*, but also *now unruly again*. His past is represented as sexually exploitative. His present is represented as *sexually explosive in the context of a*

heterosexual, monogamous relationship. Female subjectivity is constructed as a *past witness to his exploits, a past recipient of his virility, a presently unfulfilled sexual being, and a soon-to-be fulfilled sexual being.* Her past is not represented. Her present is characterized by *lack.* Her future is represented as *contingent on his virility.*

We can now see the relational aspects of this text. The narrative is centered on the centrality of male sexual potency, and in this narrative the female exists only in relation to the man who, in varying stages, possesses the ability to please her, but without him she is lacking. Lastly, the message is that for a man to relive his exploits and for a woman to passively receive fulfillment, the course of action is to *ask your doctor if Viagra is right for you.* This text locates virility at the center of heterosexual relationships.

H. Viagra commercial (2)

This commercial is quite different from the above because it primarily depicts men outside of heterosexual relationships and instead presents them as members of a sort of male communion (which, in the next analysis, is even more distinctive). The narrative progression here consists of, initially, men leaving their homes in celebration to congregate in the street in a joyous display of shared ecstasy. The Viagra logo appears and disappears from the screen several times. Queen's "We Are the Champions," a song that is frequently played at sports victory celebrations, underscores the emotive connotation of joy. The men emerge from their homes in picturesque neighborhoods to dance, leap, and embrace in a public square. Businessmen and mailmen fling their briefcases and mailbags in the air prompting a perpetual release and subsequent rain of papers and letters. There are two women depicted, one in the background and one foregrounded, arm-locked with a man with whom she is spinning around. Overall, though, women are absent in this commercial. It is a commercial of men with other men. Also, unlike most SEM commercials, there are two African American men depicted. Also included in this communion of potent fraternity is a man in a wheelchair who spins freely while others dance around him.

The male voice-over, in a slow, deliberate, tempting tone is: *ahh the feeling of asking your doctor about Viagra...wanna try Viagra for the first time find out if a free sample is right for you/or go to Viagra dot com for more information.* These few clauses characterize the entirety of the celebration. The first expression, *ahh*, is informal, onomatopoeic, and is multifunctional. First, it connotes release. It signifies post-coital exhalation and the triumph over ED. (Although there is no mention of ED, erections, or 'broken' sexuality, I think it is fair to say that most viewers would immediately recognize the Viagra logo.) *Ahh* also suggests a sudden realization, a discovery. Lastly, *ahh* suggests contentment. All of these possible connotations are further complicated by the cause of the *ahh*, *the feeling of asking your doctor about Viagra.* As I discuss above, in the SEM marketing *asking* has many significations. It can signify a willingness to question one's virility; it can signify a man's willingness to question the criteria for female sexual pleasure; it can signify an admission of "dysfunction" (whether or not the "dysfunction" is real); it can signify the decision to seek Viagra; and, of course, it can signify approaching a medical professional about ED.

The language is so ambiguous that viewers may have no choice but to accept the problem and solution on the terms offered by the visual semiotics. In this town it is not just white men, or old men (or perhaps in this case, even only heterosexual men) who suffer from ED. It is *all* men in every upper-class town in every part of the country who suffer from ED and can rejoice because, in the same instant upon viewing the commercial, they learn there is a cure and are given instructions how to get it.

The next construction is: *wanna try Viagra for the first time find out if a free sample is right for you*. *Wanna* might be characterized as informal, and here the pressure to take the pill is not formed with the imperative *ask your doctor*, but rather, in the form of question that tempts the viewer to engage in the celebration and communion of once-impotent-but-now-potent men. If these men all take Viagra, then the voice-over's role is to initiate the viewer into this sect. The *wanna try Viagra for the first time* construction coupled with the tone (which, as I mention above, is slow, deliberate, tempting) suggests mischievousness; it connotes doing something bad but fun. Next is the creatively constructed imperative *find out if a free sample is right for you*. *Find out* suggests independence, exploration, and learning. The conditional *if* posits a yes-or-no (definitely not maybe) dichotomy. And *a free sample is right for you* almost functions independently of the conditional because how could something that is free not *be* right?

Overall the visual semiotics and linguistic semantics create two divergent lifeworlds that are unified by the viewer's ultimate decision to supply a connotation for the *ahh* for all of the public celebration. The language offers viewers a means for escaping the solitary conditions of private, unspoken ED, and that is to engage with the discourse that constructs all male subjects as *necessarily* afflicted with ED, if not only by a matter of degrees. Unlike the above texts this marketing device implicates all men in a shared condition—a condition that has little to do with relationships with women, little to do with the efficiency of mechanical body parts, little to do with pride, ego, and shame, and everything to do with discursive emergence from private spaces into the liberated realm of public admission and celebration. This commercial is a good representation of Viagra's manifold marketing strategy, which is to call younger and younger men to engage the discourse, to accept the diagnosis that all men suffer from ED.

I. Levitra commercial

This commercial is unique because it only depicts men and unlike the celebratory, jubilant men of the second Viagra commercial, the men in the Levitra commercial are divided in two types: tough, focused, sweaty football players, and disinterested, bored, and even lazy baseball players. Here, unlike all the other advertisements and commercials, two ideologies—and two discourses—are represented as warring, in competition. The two discourses are that of militaristic male solidarity and passive negotiation and disintegration. The significant overlap of visual semiotics and linguistic semantics is very important here, so I describe the commercial in more detail than the other two. There are six distinct, oppositional segments and a two more that frame the war (see appendices for details about my method of transcription):

1. Quick-paced guitar and drum music begins.

1. On the right of the screen is former NFL coach Mike Ditka, who is renowned for toughness. He is casually dressed in a sweater and in his hands he holds a football. On the top-center of the screen is white text: "Mike Ditka NFL Hall of Fame Player and Coach." On the bottom is a purple strip that ends where Ditka sits. On the left of the strip is the Levitra logo; a candle flame (part of the logo) is on to the left. In the background is a screen. On the screen a rapid succession of football maneuvers are depicted: a kick, a throw, a catch, a tackle, and another catch. Players are physically close to each other. As Ditka speaks he uses assertive hand gestures, pointing at the camera.

1. Ditka says to the camera: *why do I love football it's fast it's action-packed play after play.*

2. Music slows.

2. Levitra logo and flame disappear. Cut to a medium-shot of a baseball catcher watching an umpire sweep dust off home plate. Cut to baseball player with bat on his shoulders, grunting and stretching. Behind him other players casually linger. Cut to older man, perhaps a coach, in the dugout slowly lifting a phone receiver off the wall and putting it to his ear.

2. Ditka voice-over: *baseball...it's not quite the same.*

3. Music quickens.

3. Logo and flame reappear. Cut to medium-shot of a large football player in a purple jersey taking off a gold helmet. Steam rises from his head. Cut to close-up of a player holding a gold helmet dripping with fluid. Cut to medium-shot of players running in slow motion away from the camera. Cut to medium-shot as camera pans over the legs of players walking together. Their pants are covered with dirt and there is uniformity in their movement. Cut to close-up of a perspiring player's face covered by his facemask. He smiles and in slow motion slaps another player on the back. Cut to medium-shot of several players involved in a tackle; all fall to the ground.

3. Ditka says to the camera: *in football in rain or snow or whatever we play...we stay in the game.*

4. Music slows.

4. Logo and flame disappear. Cut to medium-shot of umpire walking across dry baseball field and taking off his facemask. He looks up at the sky and holds out his hand. Cut to close-up of his hand. A drop of water falls in slow motion onto his palm. Cut to close-up of an older man (a coach, perhaps) in a baseball uniform sitting in the dugout. He is drenched by water. He frowns and takes off his cap. Cut to medium-shot of players looking out from dugout into the rain. One player blows a bubble-gum bubble that pops and deflates.

4. Ditka voice-over: *baseball...it's not quite the same.*

5. Music quickens.

5. Logo and flame reappear. Cut to medium-shot of a football player running and preparing to catch a pass. Cut to close-up of a player jumping and catching a football. Cut to shot of lopsided television screen (thus the viewer sees this as a screen within a

screen [the one behind Ditka] within a screen [the television set]) that replays the catch from a different angle. Cut to medium-shot of players with helmets raised in the air. They are in a circle, jumping, embracing. All are covered with perspiration.

5. Ditka says to the camera: *in football...it's Levitra.*

6. Music slows.

6. Logo and flame disappear. Cut to medium-shot of baseball players in dugout. They look bored and they gaze in different directions. One player spins his batting helmet on his finger. Cut to another medium-shot of players sitting in dugout. The camera pans to the right across each player looking bored. One talks on a phone; one arranges a glove on his hand; one tosses a ball up and down; and one fidgets with a cap. The bright lighting gives them a washed-out hue.

6. Ditka voice-over: *Baseball...could use Levitra.*

7. Music quickens.

7. Logo and flame reappear. Small text appears on the top of the screen: "Individual results may vary." Ditka, now standing, pumps the football in his right hand as if preparing to throw. He assertively waves his left finger at the screen. Cut to medium-shot of rapid sequence of football players in formation. Cut to a player throwing the football. Cut to a player catching it.

7. Ditka says to the camera: *take the Levitra challenge like I did it works for me.*

8. Fade to orange background and a close-up shot of flame. Levitra logo fades into the center of the screen. Above the flame, in yellow, appears: "TAKE THE CHALLENGE." Below "LEVITRA.COM" appears and below that, in smaller font, is "1-866-LEVITA." On either side on the bottom there are two other corporate logos.

8. Off-screen male narrator says: *take the Levitra challenge talk to your doctor visit Levitra dot com today to see if a free trial is right for you.*

9. Levitra logo and flame reappear at the bottom. The text "BY PRESCRIPTION ONLY" appears in the lower-right side of the screen. Cut to medium-shot of Ditka standing with a football in his hand. Cut to long-shot of Ditka throwing the football toward the camera. The ball goes through a swinging tire on the left of the screen. Ditka shakes his fists in the air. Music ends.

9. Ditka shouts at the camera: *football you gotta love it...and you gotta love that!* An off-screen muted voice shouts: *Whoo-hoo!*

Here we are immediately given a response to the question we do not ask: *why do you, Mike Ditka, like football?* Like most marketing the aim is to engage consumers in discussions about problems that may not really exist, that they may know little about, or that they may know about but choose to deal with in other ways than buying the advertised product. As viewers we are also brought into Ditka's lifeworld by the signification of the television screen behind him. On this screen football players are huddling, planning, organizing, and executing coordinated group efforts. Because most viewers would recognize Ditka and because he, too, sits by a screen watching others act, so too do we share the dysfunction of not engaging with the group. He says that

football is *fast* and *action packed* and that football players are above all resilient. They stay in the game *in rain or snow or whatever*. Baseball, conversely, *is not quite the same*. In football, he says, *it's Levitra*. Baseball, he contends, *could use Levitra*.

We can analyze the language here in terms of ideology, perhaps even two distinct social-political ideologies. The first is that men should be unwavering, unyielding, and let their individualism be subsumed by group identity. Ditka's forceful presence and his assertive language do not allow space or time for opposition. His linguistic constructions are declaratives and five times he uses *it's* + adjective to characterize football and baseball. He constructs an assertive imperative (*take the Levitra challenge*) and this syntactic structure is repeated and augmented by the four imperative constructions in the voice-over (*take, talk, visit, and see*). Baseball is characterized by two negative constructions (*it's not quite the same*, repeated) and one weak auxiliary verbal phrase (that baseball *could use Levitra*).

Unlike the other advertisements, what is prominent here is the emphasis on the here-now, what football *is* and what football players *do*. I believe that the two competing (and I use "competing" lightly since the discourse of passive negotiation is represented in the discourse of militarism) do not exhibit interdiscursivity and hybridity of sports and war. Rather, I think sports discourse is often militaristic; good sports teams are characterized by subsuming individualism for the group, following orders, accepting injury and self-sacrifice, and focusing on a single goal: winning. Where interdiscursivity might be apparent here is in Ditka's representation of baseball, a sport that has similar values but is distinctive in that it is susceptible to weather (games are often rained-out) and baseball games afford more individualism to players.

Only in his final statement to we get a sense of qualification. The imperative *take the Levitra challenge like I did* is supported with *it works for me*. This construction contrasts his earlier style, and we could even say it would be more fitting in the representation of baseball. Similarly, as he says this, he is standing alone, singularly attempting to throw a football through a swinging tire.

And how might we figure this commercial into the discourse of SEM? The Levitra-consuming ED community is represented by silent obedience. (The final, muted *whoo-hoo* seems almost to punctuate the silence) The ED community that does not use Levitra is similarly characterized by silence, but their silence coincides with their physical stasis, their sloth. The football players' silence, on the other hand, is a sign of intense focus as they are preoccupied with moving, laboring, suffering, and succeeding. The similarities between the two groups, namely that they are all sports players, is suggestive of a unitary existence. In relation to ED, there are those have some form of ED and do nothing about it, and those who have some form of ED yet keep moving. For the baseball players, their silence is their impotency; for the football players, their silent obedience is their virility.

Discussion

In considering these analyses as a set, it becomes apparent that the discourses of ED, SEM, and SEM marketing largely do not exist as distinct discourses separate from other discourses. Each text seems to be somehow embedded in a broader discourse, a genre of communicative conventions that define the content of the texts. The first analysis, of the Cialis advertisement, highlights the broader discourse, *romantic/sexual* spontaneity.

The discourse of SEM is located within this other discourse, and SEM use is tied into the conventions of the larger discourse. The Levitra ad seems tied into the discourse of practicality and commerce; like the Cialis ad, its 'other' is constructed as the passive recipient of potency, the one who stays remarkably, unceasingly available. But whereas the Cialis ad patently advertises patience and perhaps even an appreciation for *the moment*, the Levitra ad advertises the opposite: rapidity, an annoyance with *the moment*, and even a sense of urgency. The Viagra ad features a now-man that is unison of his (idealized, perhaps fictionalized) sexual past, a legacy that is appropriated into the present and the future.

The first Viagra commercial also constructs subjectivity that is a unity of idealized sexual legacies. It constructs the 'other,' in this case female other, as the passive, willing, waiting, lacking recipient of the reemergence of this legacy, and, like the man, the one who benefits from this reemergence. It appropriates what might be called an exploitative past into an exploitative present. The second Viagra commercial constructs male subjectivity as *necessarily* afflicted by ED, and constructs the males into two groups: those who have not *confessed* to ED, those who are privately afflicted and dwell in dark, private spaces privately suffering, and those who have publicly *confessed*, who now can join the community of men who have opened their sexuality to public scrutiny, and who now can take part in the public celebration. In this commercial ED is something that not only *afflicts* the community of men but also only *affects* the community of men. The Levitra commercial presents a similar world in which all men are afflicted, but the division here is not between the *confessed* and the *non-confessed*, but between those who have not exerted their masculinity and do not take Levitra, and those who adhere to a strict male code of social cohesion, who physically engage with other men, whose bond is an organic unity, who both produce organic fluid and are produced by organic fluid. Here men are defined by their homo-social relations with other men, and all adhere to a violent prohibition against impotence.

Chapter 5 Conclusion

All of these texts share a unitary goal: to engage the reader or viewer in the discourse of ED and SEM. In this sense, the texts are in the first order advertisements of themselves. In the second order they advertise SEM.

The magazine advertisements all share specific features: in all three text signifies genre, and the text embeds the ads in certain contexts and discourses. The Cialis ad works by pulling the viewer into a hybrid discourse of romance and of erection anxiety, of spontaneity and preparation. The Levitra ad overall functions as a business proposal, a matter of a service needed and of an efficient, reliable solution; the ad includes little in the way of interdiscursivity. The Viagra ad engages readers in a discourse of SEM that is still essentially the discourse of Viagra. With intertextual features the advertisement locates Viagra as the locus of SEM, as the drug that *started it all*.

The television commercials similarly exhibit intertextuality, interdiscursivity, and hybridity, but because commercials include audio elements, movement, and duration, discourses are represented with more depth. The first Viagra commercial, like the Viagra ad, calls for male subjects to return to 'themselves,' to return a life they possibly never experienced, a life of sexual mischievousness and promiscuity. In this call for men to be naughty again partners (specifically females here) are relegated to not even an objective status; females are virtually absent except as semantic placeholders, vague presences whose only stake in ED is that it is the cause of female lack.

The second two commercials represent communions of men and suggest a shared ethos in these communions. This second Viagra commercial calls for men to joyously escape from the dark solidarity of existences characterized by denial and restraint. Here all men are suggested to be triumphant against a shared ailment, ED. This commercial exhibits interdiscursive features: it draws on the discourse of sports and of pop psychology that encourages people to admit, own, and even celebrate their feelings. This commercial equates admission of defeat and dysfunction with victory. The Levitra commercial also depicts a communion of men, but here it is divided into two seemingly warring clans. The commercial seems to display interdiscursivity, but as discussed above, to a large extent the discourse of sports *is* the discourse of war: of power struggles, of rivalries, of sacrifice, and of men battling men on a field. Similarly, the language here does not attempt to synthesize texts and discourses, but rather, provide one distinct discourse, and in this, represent the discourse of another as dull, lazy, and boring. The Levitra commercial makes drug use seem like the ultimate signification of masculinity.

Scientific and medical 'innovation' can create new discourses, new social relationships and ways of using language. SEM is similar to other recently developed and marketed pharmaceuticals because it is supposed to improve 'lifestyle,' a term I suppose means something like happiness and improved relationships with others. SEM is not so different from anti-depressants and anti-anxiety medication. They all are marketed to not only improve one's 'solitary' well-being, but also to facilitate better relationships with other people. How SEM is unique, though, is that the relationships it purports to improve are based on physiology, specifically, that improved potency leads to improved relationships. Also unique to SEM is that its marketing, explicitly or

implicitly, does not only construct the subjectivity of the potentially more potent male; it constructs a subjectivity of the other, which is why some of the constructions the analyses revealed are disturbing. They are disturbing because they generally either cast the other as the muted, passive recipient, or ignore the other and locate the site of sexuality and pleasure in the man's virility, *his* equipment, *his* pride.

When I first began putting together this study I had in mind two types of SEM texts. In addition to marketing texts, I planned to also look at private language use associated with Viagra and compare it with in the institutional language. I wanted to see how people approached terms like "erectile dysfunction" and "sexual enhancement medication," if they privileged these terms, and how they used them in sentence constructions. During my research I came across an article about an unofficially-Pfizer-sanctioned ED message board and chat room. The article's author claimed participants in two forums were just as likely to be "clubbers" and "sex tourists" as they were to be legitimate ED cases. When I tried to access the message board and chat room I found that the website had been dismantled. I conducted a Google search with the terms "Viagra," "message board," and "chat room." Eventually I found a men's health message board that had a Viagra thread. There were many postings from men who posed questions to SEM users about ED or SEM. When I began to transcribe some of the postings, I was delighted and shocked to find people adopting prominent characteristics of the marketing language in private use. Not only were some using the vocabulary of Viagra, ED, and SEM, they were using the *same* clausal constructions, styles, and narrative presentations that are used in the marketing text. A newcomer to the message board, for example, might, in his first posting, peevishly begin to tell his story of "troubles," that, for example, he knows "you can't hurry love" but he wants to be ready when "the moment is right" and he'd like to know if "there is a cure" for how he feels. Of course at some point somebody (perhaps even a Pfizer employee posing as someone who is disinterested in any one SEM) will recommend he *ask his doctor*.

So my original intention was to focus not so much on one CDA, but look at how private language use is influenced by institutional language. I wanted to apply a formal method to analyze in what ways subjects treated and adopted institutional language. If individuals, I thought, are adopting institutional clausal constructions to characterize their sexual relationships, surely these are instances in which marketing changes subjectivity and cases of how ideology is transmitted and received. Eventually, due to time and space restrictions, I did not take my analysis that far. Also, when I began to analyze SEM marketing, I found there were levels of complexity in each text, and analyzing these, I was certain, would give insight into, perhaps 'demystify' and 'de-medicalize,' ED and SEM. More researchers and analysts should make efforts, as does Teun van Dijk, to learn how cognitive-models can be used to trace discursive features moving across discourses. To do so would make less opaque the influence discourses—in this case marketing discourse—has on individuals.

Loe's work on Viagra offers insight into the marketing practices of Pfizer and how pharmaceutical companies sometimes create, or classify a disorder to suit a drug that already exists. Loe explores drug companies' attempts to capitalize on their success with ED and male SEM by applying the same strategies to create and market Female Sexual Dysfunction and how, to an extent, these attempts have been thwarted by 1. feminists' vocal opposition to the medicalization of bodies and 2. difficulties in

understanding and ‘fixing’ female physiology. What complicates criticism of drug companies’ efforts to produce SEM for women and men is that in some cases individuals *are* dysfunctional, and that some people genuinely need and want SEM. But mass marketing does not just target those who *need* the product or service, it targets everybody, and even if one completely avoids marketing, does not watch television, does not read magazines, and so on, one cannot completely avoid other aspects of how marketing ‘works’: how it is transformed and reproduced by people in conversations. This transformation and reproduction should be a focus for future studies.

There are some important areas I have neglected to fully address in this study, and these absences should eventually be addressed by further critical investigation. Perhaps the most glaring absence is feminist study of the pathologization of the female body. Incorporating this would have given the study more width and insight into the medical ‘gaze’ that plays a large role in the construction of human subjectivity. Along the same line, in my analyses I frequently mention how ‘the other’ is constructed vis-à-vis the male subject. This other, usually female (as in the case with all three magazine advertisements and the first Viagra commercial) is constructed in complex, contradictory, and oppressive ways. The constructions of ‘the other’ are fundamental to the overall construction of male subjectivity in these ads as they construct identity vis-à-vis the wants, expectations, and subject-positions of ‘the other.’ This is another area that deserves critical attention. Lastly, there are elements of homoeroticism, particularly in the second Viagra commercial and the Levitra commercial. Homoeroticism in these ads also functions in complex and contradictory ways—in some instances to construct an affinity between all men, sometimes to reverse the critical male gaze onto itself, and sometimes to put forward an ambiguous sexuality so, perhaps, to be more inclusive of all male consumers. This aspect of SEM ads also deserves critical attention.

Several CDA practitioners, Fairclough among them, argue that CDA should be taught in public schools and should be part of the public education curriculum. Companies spend billions of dollars trying to convince us to buy more things; marketing strategies are increasingly becoming more nuanced, more pervasive, and, in my opinion, more sophisticated. The result of good marketing is that it adds to already rampant consumerism, constructs identities and subjectivity, and has unimaginably negative consequences on the quality of life everywhere. CDA is a tool to attack (by demystifying and making less opaque) the discourses of consumerism. Some of the ways to oppose SEM marketing identity, relations, and subjectivity construction are to continue to critically analyze marketing of all sorts, to take apart and attack its presence in our lives. A less academic, more activist position might be to, as Bohman suggests, facilitated by the growth of internet use and online communities and dialogue. The internet offers a “public sphere that is not subject to the specific linguistic, cultural and special limitations of the bounded national public spheres” (135). In this new sphere, and as more people turn to other individuals on the internet for advice, information, and social interaction, the influence that traditional mass marketing exerts will likely diminish.

The marketing of pharmaceuticals and “blockbuster drugs” is just one part of a culture that proposes quick solutions to ‘disorders’ that are themselves constructed. Many critics, Loe among them, claim that with all the marketing emphasis on male bodies, male performance, male desire, and how to make the male body “work,” what is ignored are the relationships themselves and the other’s, the partner’s needs and

wants. Drug marketing is also a hazard because to market drugs you must also market an ailment (or an awareness of it). Facing marketing that aims to not only inform but also convince, people are finding themselves in a position to self-diagnose a condition they may have not previously even known about. Armed with self-diagnoses they visit their doctors with specific treatments in mind. And, as in the case of ED, more often than not doctors are willing to sacrifice awkward ED diagnosis; the doctor will take the patient's word for it. A good policy would be to once again prohibit direct-to-consumer drug marketing, but drug companies have such powerful lobbying influences in the government, I cannot image a prohibition could happen soon. Facing marketing that distorts, deceives, and manipulates, CDA is a tool subjects can use to make less opaque exploitative relationships in society.

References

- Bell, Allan and Peter Garrett. "Media and Discourse: A Critical Overview." *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Allan Bell and Peter Garret, eds. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Bohman, James. "Expanding Dialogue: The Internet, the Public Sphere and Prospects for Transnational Democracy." *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*. Ed. Nick Crossley and John Michael Roberts. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie and Norman Fairclough. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999.
- Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995.
- . *The Men and the Boys*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2000
- Cornwall, Andrea. "Men, Masculinity and 'Gender in Development.'" *Gender and Development* 5 (1997): 8-13.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- . *Discourse and Power*. New York: Longman, 1989.
- . *Media Discourse*. New York: St Martin's, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon, 1972.
- . *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.
- Gardiner, Judith Keegan. Introduction. *Masculinity Studies & Feminist Theory: New Directions*. Ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner. New York: Columbia UP, 2002. 1-30.
- Halliday, M. A. K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold, 1994.
- Loe, Meika. *The Rise of Viagra: How the Little Blue Pill Changed Sex in America*. New York: New York UP, 2004.
- Mort, Frank. *Cultures of Consumption: Masculinities and Social Space in Late Twentieth Century Britain*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Naughton, Keith. "The Soft Sell." *Newsweek* 2 Feb. 2004: 46-7.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Trans. Wade Baskin. Ed. Charles Bally and Albert Reidlinger. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.
- Scannell, Paddy. "Media-Language-World." *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Allan Bell and Peter Garrett, eds. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Thompson, John B. *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995.

Appendices

Appendix A: *Golf Digest* Cialis advertisement

Images

On the top and bottom are two strips of text. In the middle (approximately 2/3 of the page) is a photograph of a woman, on the left, sitting in a bathtub. On the right is man squatting and looking at her. In his hands he holds a glass of orange juice. The camera focus is soft. The morning light is on his back and on her face. On the bottom right is the Cialis logo.

Text

[In white on the photograph]

YOU *can't hurry love*. AND WHY WOULD YOU WANT TO?

[Below]

WHEN THE MOMENT IS RIGHT, YOU CAN BE READY WITH 36-HOUR CIALIS.

[Bottom strip]

Cialis (see-AL-iss) is the only erectile dysfunction (ED) tablet clinically proven to both work fast and work for up to 36 hours.* Cialis gives you up to 36 hours to relax and take your time, 36 hours to be spontaneous and respond to your partner when the moment is right.

Ask your doctor if prescription Cialis is right for you. See important safety information above and Patient Information on following page.

Appendix B. *Golf Magazine* Levitra advertisement

Images

The background is mostly purple with white text. In the top-right corner is a photograph of a man looking at the camera and sitting crossed-legged on a red couch. He is wearing beige pants and a beige shirt. Behind, sitting on the top of the couch and looking down at him, is a woman wearing lingerie. They are both smiling, although the woman's smile is more pronounced. Below the photograph is an orange strip with text on it. On the left of is the medical disclaimer. On the bottom right is small image of the same man, but here his smile is very pronounced. On the bottom right is the National Football League (NFL) logo.

Text

[Middle of page in white]

**Quality Counts
Count on LEVITRA**

[Below, in white and orange type]

LEVITRA is a clinically proven treatment for erectile dysfunction (ED) that consistently improves erection quality.

For most men, LEVITRA*

- Works to improve erection quality
Improves duration, hardness, and the ability to attain an erection
- Works fast
No other oral ED treatment is proven to work faster
- Works time and again!

Ask your doctor if a FREE TRIAL is right for you

LEVITRA
(VARDENAFIL HCL)
QUALITY WHEN IT COUNTS

Appendix C. *Golf Magazine* Viagra advertisement

Images

The ad is roughly divided in half horizontally. On the top is a black and white photograph of a man's bust. He is dimly smiling, contentedly, and looking into the camera. To the right and behind him is, in large blue type, Viagra. The V is obscured, except for the top, which gives the man blue horns. The bottom half of the ad has a white background.

Text

[Top, in black type, above man's head]
Get back to mischief.

[Below, on bottom half, in black type]

Compliments of VIAGRA
the erectile dysfunction treatment that started it all

- VIAGRA works fast* and provides reliably rigid erections.*
- 96% of men were satisfied with how well VIAGRA worked in a 4-year, open-label study.

Thanks to VIAGRA, you're back...which means making love is better for you and you partner.*

Ask your doctor if VIAGRA is right for you.

Television Commercials

When speaking occurs during distinct visual segments, I note the concurrence with repeated numerals (1,1 and 2,2 and so on). Similarly, I note simultaneous action with repeated numerals. Otherwise, I note only the beginning and end of entire verbal/audio elements. When music is played through the commercial, I note it at the beginning of the description. I distinguish short and long lapses in speaking with slashes and ellipses, respectively.

Appendix D. Viagra commercial (1)

Music: medium-paced lounge music
The commercial is in black and white.

1. Low-angle shot of a man and woman walking toward the camera. They begin to walk in different directions when the woman grabs the man's hand and pulls him to the right of the screen.
2. Cut to close-up shot of the woman looking at a shoe in a store while behind her the man looks bored. Man's voice-over begins: *remember that guy who used to be called wild thing...that guy who wanted to spend the entire honeymoon indoors...remember the one who couldn't resist a little mischief...yeah, that guy...he's back...Viagra/not all medications are for everyone ask your doctor if Viagra is right for you.*
3. Cut to medium-shot of woman looking at a storefront window while the man stands behind her.
4. Cut to medium-shot of man looking around, alone, leaning against a store window. When the woman comes out he jumps to attention and follows her.
5. Cut to close-up shot the two looking at a shoe in a window display. The woman walks to the left out of the frame and the man remains, alternately looking at the shoe and the woman.
6. Cut to medium-shot of the two walking to the right of the screen. The woman seems to be leading. The man stops abruptly and looks at a window display.
7. Cut to medium-shot of lingerie display in storefront.
8. Cut to close-up of the two looking at the display. The woman covers her mouth, surprised. She turns around smiling and looks at her husband who is also smiling.
9. Cut to zoom-in of man's head. He smiles mischievously as two glowing blue horns grow from either side of his head. On his forehead appears the text, in white, "He's back." He walks out of the frame while and the two blue horns reveal to themselves to be the top of a "V" that spells Viagra.
10. Cut to medium-shot of man and woman in a storefront. This time the man is in front. On the top of the screen in blue appears large text "Viagra." On the bottom left is the blue Pfizer logo and on the bottom right, in white, appears "blue.viagra.com" and below "1-888-4VIAGRA." The man steps inside the store and, when the woman hesitates, he bows and takes her hand. He then quickly pulls her inside the store.
11. Voice-over ends. Cut to black screen.

Appendix E. Viagra commercial (2)
Music : Queen's "We Are the Champions"
All action is in slow motion.

1. Shot of a man (a) running [rightward] out of a house with his arms in the air.
2. Fade-in white "Viagra" logo in bottom-right corner.
2. Cut to man (a) running [leftward] past man (b) who is also running [rightward] and who also has his arms raised. Man (a) jumps and spins while man (b) jumps. Behind them are a well-trimmed bush and a nice home. Viagra logo disappears.
3. Cut to older, balding man (c) scurrying [rightward] of a house; he comes out of the shadow of the porch into daylight and looks up, smiling.
4. Cut to close-up of man (a) running [leftward], still smiling and with his arms in the air.
5. Cut to man (a) running [leftward] past an overweight man (d) washing a car in a driveway, dancing and rotating his pelvis.
6. Viagra logo reappears.
6. Cut to postman (e) running [rightward] past hedge. Postman throws mail in the air. Viagra log disappears.
7. Cut to frontal shot of man in suit (f) swinging his briefcase in the air while papers spill out.
8. Cut to low-angle shot of two men (g and h) embracing, spinning, while each raises an arm in the air. In the background pieces of paper are falling.
9. Cut to postman (e) running [leftward] past man (f) who is jumping. In the background a woman (i) is jumping.
9. Voiceover begins: *ahh the feeling of asking your doctor about Viagra...wanna try Viagra for the first time find out if a free sample is right for you/or go to Viagra dot com for more information.*
10. Cut to close-up of man (a) running [leftward] while indistinguishable figures in the background are leaping.
11. Cut to man in a wheelchair (j) smiling and spinning while behind him an unidentifiable man dances.
12. Cut to a large group of people dancing and a couple spinning each other with arms locked; papers are falling from the air.

13. Fade in large, centered Viagra logo.

13. Cut to people in front of a fountain (foregrounded are men a, b, and f) dancing and jumping. On the bottom a white band appears and in black is the text: "Ask about the free 6-pill sample pack." A large blue pill is on the top right in band and is backgrounded by a white bulge. The text is replaced by: "Viagra.com / 1-888-4-VIAGRA." Voiceover ends.

13. Fade to black.

Appendix F. Levitra commercial

1. Quick-paced guitar and drum music begins.

1. On the right of the screen is former NFL coach Mike Ditka, who is renowned for toughness. He is casually dressed in a sweater and in his hands he holds a football. On the top-center of the screen is white text: "Mike Ditka NFL Hall of Fame Player and Coach." On the bottom is a purple strip that ends where Ditka sits. On the left of the strip is the Levitra logo; a candle flame (part of the logo) is on to the left. In the background is a screen. On the screen a rapid succession of football maneuvers are depicted: a kick, a throw, a catch, a tackle, and another catch. Players are physically close to each other. As Ditka speaks he uses assertive hand gestures, pointing at the camera.

1. Ditka says to the camera: *why do I love football it's fast it's action-packed play after play.*

2. Music slows.

2. Levitra logo and flame disappear. Cut to a medium-shot of a baseball catcher watching an umpire sweep dust off home plate. Cut to baseball player with bat on his shoulders, grunting and stretching. Behind him other players casually linger. Cut to older man, perhaps a coach, in the dugout slowly lifting a phone receiver off the wall and putting it to his ear.

2. Ditka voice-over: *baseball...it's not quite the same.*

3. Music quickens.

3. Logo and flame reappear. Cut to medium-shot of a large football player in a purple jersey taking off a gold helmet. Steam rises from his head. Cut to close-up of a player holding a gold helmet dripping with fluid. Cut to medium-shot of players running in slow motion away from the camera. Cut to medium-shot as camera pans over the legs of players walking together. Their pants are covered with dirt and there is uniformity in their movement. Cut to close-up of a perspiring player's face covered by his facemask. He smiles and in slow motion slaps another player on the back. Cut to medium-shot of several players involved in a tackle; all fall to the ground.

3. Ditka says to the camera: *in football in rain or snow or whatever we play...we stay in the game.*

4. Music slows.

4. Logo and flame disappear. Cut to medium-shot of umpire walking across dry baseball field and taking off his facemask. He looks up at the sky and holds out his hand. Cut to close-up of his hand. A drop of water falls in slow motion onto his palm. Cut to close-up of an older man (a coach, perhaps) in a baseball uniform sitting in the dugout. He is drenched by water. He frowns and takes off his cap. Cut to medium-shot of players looking out from dugout into the rain. One player blows a bubble-gum bubble that pops and deflates.

4. Ditka voice-over: *baseball...it's not quite the same.*

5. Music quickens.

5. Logo and flame reappear. Cut to medium-shot of a football player running and preparing to catch a pass. Cut to close-up of a player jumping and catching a football. Cut to shot of lopsided television screen (thus the viewer sees this as a screen within a screen [the one behind Ditka] within a screen [the television set]) that replays the catch from a different angle. Cut to medium-shot of players with helmets raised in the air. They are in a circle, jumping, embracing. All are covered with perspiration.

5. Ditka says to the camera: *in football...it's Levitra.*

6. Music slows.

6. Logo and flame disappear. Cut to medium-shot of baseball players in dugout. They look bored and they gaze in different directions. One player spins his batting helmet on his finger. Cut to another medium-shot of players sitting in dugout. The camera pans to the right across each player looking bored. One talks on a phone; one arranges a glove on his hand; one tosses a ball up and down; and one fidgets with a cap. The bright lighting makes gives them a washed-out hue.

6. Ditka voice-over: *baseball...could use Levitra.*

7. Music quickens.

7. Logo and flame reappear. Small text appears on the top of the screen: "Individual results may vary." Ditka, now standing, pumps the football in his right hand as if preparing to throw. He assertively waves his left finger at the screen. Cut to medium-shot of rapid sequence of football players in formation. Cut to a player throwing the football. Cut to a player catching it.

7. Ditka says to the camera: *take the Levitra challenge like I did it works for me.*

8. Fade to orange background and a close-up shot of flame. Levitra logo fades into the center of the screen. Above the flame, in yellow, appears: "TAKE THE CHALLENGE." Below "LEVITRA.COM" appears and below that, in smaller font, is "1-866-LEVITA." On either side on the bottom there are two other corporate logos.

8. Off-screen male narrator says: *take the Levitra challenge talk to your doctor visit Levitra dot com today to see if a free trial is right for you.*

9. Levitra logo and flame reappear at the bottom. The text "BY PRESCRIPTION ONLY" appears in the lower-right side of the screen. Cut to medium-shot of Ditka standing with a football in his hand. Cut to long-shot of Ditka throwing the football toward the camera.

The ball goes through a swinging tire on the left of the screen. Ditka shakes his fists in the air. Music ends.

9. Ditka shouts at the camera: *football you gotta love it...and you gotta love that!* An off-screen voice shouts: *Whoo-hoo!*

Vita

J.P. Gomez was born in Denver and received his B.A. from the University of Colorado. While he is in Colorado he enjoys spending time with his nieces and nephew. He lived in New Orleans for three years before moving to Spain with his girlfriend. In his spare time he enjoys reading about history and political philosophy, growing vegetables, and cooking.