Note: This article has been accepted in *Boyhood Studies*. The version below may differ slightly from the published version, which should be regarded as definitive.

Leisuring Masculinities in British Indian Childhoods: Explorations at the Intersection of Gender Order and Generational Order

Utsa Mukherjee, University of Southampton

Abstract: In this article, I draw upon a qualitative study with 11- to 12-year-old middle-class British Indian boys and their parents to unpack the ways notions of young masculinities are negotiated within the context of children's leisure. Taking a relational approach, I argue that leisure-based masculinities of children are simultaneously generationed and gendered. By interrogating the intersection of what Raewyn Connell theories as "gender order" and what childhood sociologists call the "generational order," I demonstrate that leisure-based young masculinities are forged within children's inter- (parent-child) and intra- (child-child) generational relationships around leisure. I conclude with a call for greater engagement with intersectional frameworks in the study of boys' masculinity that simultaneously recognizes the gender and the generational structures of children's everyday lives.

Keywords: British Indian, fathering, generational order, gender order, intersectionality, leisure, masculinities

Introduction

In this article, I explore leisure-based masculinities of middle-class British Indian boys from the perspective of both the boys and their parents. Leisure-based masculinities here refer to patterns of masculinities that are enacted in the context of sports and leisure. I specifically draw focus on how these leisure-based masculinities are negotiated within social

relationships and thereby interrogate processes that are simultaneously gendered and generationed. Taking an intersectional approach, I show that forms of masculinities that are constructed and performed within children's everyday leisure spaces can help unravel the gendered as well as generational politics that inflect childhoods and parenthoods and mark the relations between the two. Taking leisure as a site of the "gender-configurations of practice" (Connell 2000: 28), I ask how young masculinities are negotiated by children in interaction with parents and other children in the context of leisure. Here, I use leisure as an umbrella term that in the case of middle-class children encompasses organized activities (for example, sports), family leisure (for example, parent-child leisure activities) as well as casual leisure (for example, unstructured play and solitary screen-based leisure) (Mukherjee 2020). Such dedicated attention to leisure in middle-class childhoods is particular timely given the significant shifts currently underway within children's leisure schedules as more and more middle-class children in the UK are participating in outside-of-school organized leisure activities and in home-based digital leisure (Holloway and Pimlott-Wilson 2014; Mullan 2019). It is therefore important to account for the "gender projects" (Connell 2000) unfolding within these changing leisure geographies of childhood.

I begin by reviewing the extant literature on children's masculinities, and leisure. Then I enlist an intersectional framework to show how boys' leisure-based masculinities are implicated simultaneously in gender and generational orders. Next, I draw on my qualitative study with professional middle-class British Indian parents and their children—living in and around London—to explore the leisure-masculinity nexus. I conclude with a call for Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities (CSMM) to engage more directly with the intersection of age and masculinity.

Leisuring Childhoods and Masculinities

With the emergence of CSMM, multiple—often competing—theoretical approaches have been developed (see Borkowska 2018 for an overview of masculinity theories). However, they largely converge on the point that masculinities are plural and socially constructed; constructions that cite—either directly or symbolically—male bodies without carrying any isomorphic relationship with male biology (Connell 2000; Halberstam [1998] 2018).

The literature linking children's masculinities and leisure is voluminous but more often than not they focus on teenagers and youth—instead of younger children—and approach this question from the vantage point of gender and sexuality studies (Atkinson and Kehler 2012; Maor 2019; McCormack 2012). Sport has historically been a male reserve (Dunning 1986) and thus participation in sports for boys becomes a rite of passage into manhood (Messner 1992). Consequently, it has been a prominent site for the policing of masculinities among boys (Drummond 2020) and an institutional site for naturalizing men's power and privilege over women (Messner and Sabo 1990). In this context, Raewyn Connell (1995, 2000) offers a robust theorization of the social relations between different masculinities. According to her, there are relations of hierarchy between different masculinities where one is dominant over other subordinate masculinities. Although the hegemonic form of masculinity is not necessarily the most commonplace, it dominates over others either implicitly or through violence. These hierarchies are not static but subject to change. Overall Connell's feminist theorization of the link between masculinities and power enables us to name men as men and thereby deconstruct men—who were previously invoked as an undifferentiated category (see Hearn 2011).

In their London-based study with 11- to 14-year-old boys and girls, Stephen Frosh, Ann Phoenix, and Rob Pattman (2002) found that the canonical narrative of masculinity among boys rests on maintenance of difference from girls and espousal of "hardness,"

"sporting prowess," "cussing" and antagonism to schoolwork. Similarly, Harriet Bjerrum Nielson's (2004) research with boys and girls aged 11 to 15 in scout camps found that despite local cultural variations, across camp sites in Europe gender hierarchies among children were symbolically reproduced through division of labor and the use of space within the camp site. These instances point toward a situated understanding of children's masculinities wherein boys learn masculine ideals through engagement in social practice (Light 2008). In contrast to these theorizations, a body of literature has emerged arguing that although some form of masculinity might be more popular than others, no form of masculinity is any longer hegemonic thanks to the significant recent decline in homohysteria (the fear of being perceived as gay) among boys and younger men in the West, which has led them to embrace a more inclusive understanding of masculinity (Anderson 2009; McCormack 2012). These studies reject Connell's conceptualization of hegemonic masculinity as outdated — representing a social reality of intense homophobia during the 1980s and 1990s.

The inclusive masculinity theory (Anderson 2009) treats the index of homophobia as the chief tool to understand masculinity and downplays questions of power. It therefore fails to grasp how race, class, age, and other differentiating categories do not stand outside patterns of masculinity; they implicate each other. On the other hand, the conceptual framework of intersectionality, which refers to the simultaneous and interlocking effects of multiple categories of difference (Bassel and Emejulu 2010), creates affordances for unpacking the differences among men. Intersectionality emerged from Black feminist scholarship and activism, which drew attention to the absence of Black women's voices from previous gender-based and race-based studies wherein the former focused on white women and latter on Black men. And as others have argued (Christensen and Larsen 2008; Hearn 2011), this lens of intersectionality complements Connell's (1995) theorization of masculinities in at least two ways. First, hegemonic masculinities as a concept was developed

by Connell partly as a critique of the prevalent sex role and patriarchy theories, and partly as a response to the intersectionality debate as applied to men (Hearn 2011). Second, the multiple masculinities Connell refers to can be seen "as intersections of gender and other social divisions" such as class, race, sexuality, and others—processes that drive the construction of hegemony, marginalization, dominance/subordination, and complicity (Hearn 2011: 91).

The need for such an intersectional understanding of masculinity is particularly illustrated in the literature on British South Asian boys. Paul Connolly (1998: 19) found that 5- to 6-year-old children in an English primary school drew on racial discourses to present South Asian boys as "effeminate, quiet and non-physical"—which led to the latter's exclusion from football and "fighting games" in the school playground. This further prompted South Asian children to withdraw from these spaces. Likewise, studies have found that Physical Education (PE) professionals held similar racialized perceptions about South Asian children's sporting abilities based on pseudo-scientific understanding of race (Fleming 1994). Although school playgrounds or PE classes are not the only avenues of children's leisure, these insights go some way to explain the under-representation of British South Asians in professional football (see Burdsey 2007). These racialized stereotypes shape children's disposition toward sports and other "physical" leisure activities and over time crystallize into structural barriers that endure—British Asians players continue to be under-represented in footfall academies and professional leagues (Kilvington 2019). Although policy interventions have been made to embed social justice issues within physical education teacher education, the latter still remains "an overwhelmingly white, embodied space . . . where race and racism as professional issues are largely invisible" (Flintoff et al. 2015: 559; also see Dowling and Flintoff 2018).

Cricket, however, offers a different view since, unlike professional football, sub-continental teams are leaders in international cricket. Consequently, there is a sizeable participation of British South Asians in English cricket. Their cricketing abilities and masculinities, have nonetheless been racialized with stereotypes about "the 'wily' Indian spin bowler . . ., and the 'wristy' Indian or Pakistani batsman" set against the "aggressive" Black Caribbean fast bowler (Malcolm 1997: 267)—myths that have in turn been contested by minority ethnic cricketers in Britain. Therefore, race and racism reinscribe hierarchies of masculinities and create material opportunities for some while excluding others.

In pursuing the links between boys' masculinities and their leisure lives, researchers have prioritized sport and physical education settings and engaged with peers and coaches, but largely eschewed the family as a site of leisuring masculinities. It is important to fill this gap since parents are known to influence not only school-age children's leisure choices but also inform their attitude toward and valuation of leisure (Shannon 2006). Moreover, particular leisure activities such as sports have emerged as dominant cultural contexts for contemporary fathering (Fletcher 2020).

The above studies reveal that understanding children's leisure-based masculinities must consider the way configurations of masculinity are constructed within parent-child as well as child-child relations. Existing studies on young masculinities have largely missed these multi-scalar generational dynamics. In what follows, I develop the theoretical framework of this article by drawing on Connell's (2000) relational understanding of masculinities alongside Leena Alanen's (2001) conceptualization of the generational structures of childhood.

Unpacking Masculinities at the Intersection of Gender Order and Generational Order

Connell (2000) treats masculinity as a concept that names patterns of gender practice. This notion of gender practice is anchored in her theorization of "gender order." The notion of "gender order" was first used by Jill Julius Matthews (1984), but it was in the hands of Connell (1987) that the concept was integrated into a relational theory of gender. Put simply, "[t]he structure of gender relations in a given society at a given time may be called its gender order; and the structure of gender relations in a given institution may be called its gender regime" (Connell 2012: 1677). It is implicit in this relational model of gender that both gender regime and gender order are products of history, and they constantly undergo transformation. This relational perspective sees gender as "a way of structuring social practices" (Connell 2000: 29). And it is through these patterned relations between men and women—and among men and among women—that gender categories are brought to life. Connell's (2000) relational approach has been fruitful to the feminist study of sport, both for contesting male domination and for integrating these issues with the analyses of class and race relations in sport (Messner and Sabo 1990). Rather than simply applying Connell's (2000) typology of masculinities, in this article I put to work her wider conceptualization of gender order, the link between power and masculinities, and the latter's relational dynamics with notions of femininities.

Although Connell (2000) addresses schools as sites of masculinity formation, her understanding of gender regimes in school does not tap into the generational structures of childhood and its intersection with the gender order. Relational thinking in terms of age and generation has been spearheaded by the new social studies of childhood that burst into the academic scene in the last decades of the twentieth century. Childhood studies acknowledged age as "an embodied form of difference that is both materially and discursively produced and embedded in relations of power and authority" (Thorne 2007: 150). To account for the social

construction of age, childhood scholars have developed the notion of "generation order" (Alanen 2020; Leonard 2016) to theorize the ways child-adult and child-child relations are patterned within a society at any given time. Alanen (2020), one of the architects of this approach, explicitly acknowledges the influence of Connell's (1987) relational theory of gender on her thinking. Just as Connell's (1987, 2000) notion of gender order refers to a set of more localized gender regimes, the notion of generational order names an inventory of generational structures (for example, the familial generational structure) within which children's everyday geographies are embedded (Alanen 2020). The nuclear family embodies a generational structure in which the relations are internal. That is to say, each category (for example, that of a parent) is dependent on the other (child)—the existence of one presupposes the other. The interdependency in the parent-child relations does not flow in one direction (parent to child), it is rather reciprocal. Thus, if parenting names the practices of those occupying the position of the parent, then the reciprocal positional performance of the holder of the child position can be termed "childing" (Mayall 1996). And since childhoods and parenthoods are gendered identities, we can think of them as subject positions that are anchored simultaneously in the gender order and the generational order. Using this conceptual framework, I draw upon my empirical study with middle-class British Indian families to explore children's leisure-based masculinities from the perspective of both parenting and childing.

The Study

The data presented in this article are drawn from a wider qualitative study that examined the everyday leisure experiences of children and their parents across ten middle-class British Indian families. Indians are one of the biggest minority ethnic groups in the UK—making up 2.5 percent of the population of England and Wales (Office for National Statistics 2018).

British Indians have achieved marked professional success, and there is now a significant middle-class segment within this community. Indeed, Indians in the contemporary UK are simultaneously positioned as a model minority and a racialized Other.

Based on narrative interviews with eight fathers, ten mothers, five boys, and seven girls across ten Indian families living in and around London, here I interrogate the constructions and enactment of masculinities in the context of leisure. Given the focus on British Indian children—about whose leisure experiences we know very little—I drew a purposive sample. I recruited the families through community contacts, snowballing, and by canvassing on British Indian community groups on Facebook. All the parents in the study had university degrees, were homeowners, and were heterosexual married couples. Barring four housewives, the parents worked in professional capacities in IT, software, banking, education, and telecommunications. The participating families therefore constitute the growing segment of middle-class racialized minorities in Britain whose voices are largely missing from the current literature on middle-class parenting (see Rollock et al. 2015). The boys were between the ages 11 and 12 and lived in two-parent households. I conducted one-to-one semi-structured narrative interviews with each parent and the child where I asked them open-ended questions about the child's leisure schedules and explored their subjective meaning-making around and experiences of leisure. All names used here are pseudonyms.

The interviews were analyzed and interpreted using an intersectional and co-constructionist narrative approach. The narrative method offers a window into how and why lived experiences are storied by people and the cultural resources that are drawn upon in the process (Riessman 2008). By extending Catherine Kohler Riessman's (2008) dialogic model, the co-constructionist approach (Esin et al. 2013: 204) draws focus on the "co-construction of a story between speaker and listener" while also considering the "broader social construction of that story within interpersonal, social and cultural relations." The interview narratives can

therefore be seen as co-constructions between my participants and I—a middle-class young Indian man. These narratives are embedded in intersecting social identities of race, class, and gender. Embracing this intersectional approach created affordances to examine how parents and children in the study constructed notions of masculinities. Although the narrative cases presented here cannot be generalized to the entire population of British Indians, they can be generalized to theory (Riessman 2008) in terms of thinking about the intersection of age and gender. In interpreting these narratives, I used in tandem the hermeneutics of restoration and that of demystification (Josselson 2006)—that is, I simultaneously unpacked subjective meanings and decoded meanings that were implicit. The narrative cases presented below therefore do not offer a representative picture of British Indian young masculinities, but they help us unravel the intersection of gender and generational structures in the way young masculinities are produced within middle-class British Indian families.

Using the hybrid theoretical framework of gender and generational orders assembled earlier, I will now show how British Indian children's leisure-based masculinities are enacted across generational relationships. This intersection of age and masculinity is further interlocked with processes of race and class, a question I will return to in the conclusion. First, I unpack fathering practices as a way of shaping children's leisure-based masculinities. Then, I lay down the narratives through which children co-construct notions of masculinities in the time-spaces of leisure.

Fathering Young Masculinities through Leisure

In participating families, leisure-based fathering emerged as pivotal to fathers' parenting practices. These leisure-based fathering approaches not only cemented father-child bonds, but also propelled ideas about masculinities—and by corollary that of femininities—through the enactment of specific leisure practices and through creating gendered valuations of leisure.

For instance, when I asked Jignesh—a management consultant based in London—about the organized leisure activities of his daughter Anandi (8) and son Chirag (12), both of whom attend private schools, he described them in following terms:

> She [Anandi] goes to swimming. She tried cricket as well. She didn't want to go to cricket for example. So, we tried. It's not that we only, sort of, you know [choose activities based on gender]. For example, Chirag doesn't like dance. I mean he's rubbish at dancing and it's clear that he's a sports boy. And it's also slightly natural for boys to be into sports and for girls to be into, sort of, music and dance and all this. It's just [so].

Similarly, in my interview with Jignesh's wife Bhavna—a practicing medical doctor—she echoed a similar framework of gendering through leisure as she put it: "In terms of Chirag, cricket is his oxygen. So that drives him. And with Anandi it's the dance. Right now, it seems we have a dancer and a sportsman."

According to both Jignesh and Bhavna their son has a disposition toward sports—particularly cricket—and their daughter toward dance. These dispositions, they believe, sit neatly with the expected scripts of innate gender preferences as far as leisure interests are concerned. In setting out these ideas, they also distance themselves from any perception that they—as highly educated professionals—discriminate between leisure choices based on gender. They resolve this tension by portraying those choices as individual preferences of their children buttressed by the shared myth of gender-based natural dispositions. However, when probed further, Jignesh told me later in the interview that he religiously follows cricket whenever the Indian team plays a game and his son watches those matches on the TV with him. He further admits that since Chirag has always seen his father follow cricket, Chirag has

started taking an active interest in the sport himself. Indeed, Jignesh expends a great deal of time talking about cricket with his son and on weekends they play cricket together in the backyard. Therefore, it is the constant cricket-related support and encouragement Jignesh provides to his son that produces Chirag's interest in the sport. And through these cricket-related interactions and shared leisure experiences they inform each other's gendered and generational subjectivities. In this way, fatherhood is being enacted through the fathers' involvement in their children's sports and in turn young masculinities are being constructed by children in interaction with the gendered practices and discourses—as described above— that are folded into leisure spaces. Moreover, as London-based middle-class professionals Jignesh and Bhavna have considerable economic and cultural resources at their disposal, which they deploy in playing the organized leisure market, picking up or jettisoning the leisure options available around them in consultation with their children.

The situated constructions of young masculinities through fathering practices are not restricted to sport alone. Across several other sites of father-child leisure interactions, gendered projects are co-produced. One such instance is father-son digital leisure spaces as Simi—mother of Suraj (11)—describes: "Suraj loves PS4. So, my husband buys all the games under the sun for him on PS4. He gets a lot of attention with Manoj on the PS4 side. They play together a lot, more so now because they got this new game that they're crazy about."

Simi, an HR professional at a multinational firm in London's financial center, lives with her husband Manoj—an IT program manager at a multinational bank in London—in a gated community on the edge of London. Their son Suraj (11) goes to a fee-paying private school not far from their home and has a busy schedule of organized leisure activities including cricket, football, and hockey. Manoj regularly accompanies Suraj to sports coaching. Apart from these structured leisure lessons, Suraj also has a range of digital leisure

resources at his disposal, which fill his home-based unstructured leisure times. In the extract above, Simi alludes to one such activity—playing video games with his father. Consistent with previous studies (Kinzie and Joseph 2008; Masanet 2016), there was a clear gender difference across the sample in children's attitudes toward video games: all the boys in the study played them regularly while very few girls had access to or showed interest in video games. Simi's description above goes some way into explaining these gender differences in children's video game consumption. Manoj and his son Suraj playing video games together is not simply a parent-child "co-use of media" (Livingstone and Helsper 2008). The video game console here emerges as a key site—both a constitutive agent and a material setting—for cementing their father-son bond, which in turn drives the construction of masculinities in this context. Indeed, these leisure-based fathering practices reproduce the gender inequalities as sons receive targeted attention from fathers with digital leisure activities. With the proliferation of home-based gaming consoles, children and young people now constitute a core market for these media products. And instances such as these further entrench the symbolism of video games as a masculine domain where fathers and sons can "hang out" and shape each other's gendered and generational identities and performances through a shared interest. Much like Jignesh and Bhavna, Simi and Manoj are high-earning professionals who can play the leisure market at will and tailor their children's leisure lives. Even then, as these instances highlight, the options available are gendered and the way parents draw on prevailing ideas and selectively encourage some activities for their children over others create configurations of practice through which young leisure-based masculinities are produced.

Childing Young Masculinities through Leisure

Middle-class British Indian children construct their leisure-based masculinities not solely through their intergenerational (child-parent) relations; their participation in intra-

generational (child-child) relations too produce patterns of gender practice. In interaction with peers and siblings, boys create and challenge notions of masculinities. It must, however, be recognized that the everyday geographies of these boys are organized around middle-class and multi-ethnic spaces in and around London, which provide the institutional context and resources for their understanding of masculinities.

Twelve-year-old Rohit, who lives in a middle-class neighborhood at the edge of London, plays badminton regularly. He loves badminton but distances himself from certain other sports which he considers "too rough"—thereby distinguishing between forms of masculinities that participation in different sports demands. He explains further: "Badminton is a good sport. It's not that rough . . . You know, it's always good if you're good at a sport. Other sports are too rough . . . rugby, football . . . You know you can get hurt easily and people, when people play [rugby or football] seriously, they play too rough. They push you and stuff."

Rohit often plays badminton with his next-door neighbor and friend Aditya (11). In my one-to-one interview with Aditya at his home, he shared views identical to Rohit's in terms of thinking about contact sports as "rough": "Rugby or football . . . is really rough and I don't like really rough sports. And football is like so many people who go coaching and stuff for it. And I don't like it as much." The way Rohit and Aditya sort different sports in accordance with how "rough" or "good" (i.e. not rough) they are points toward different constructions of masculinities vis-à-vis different sports. Both these boys are actively positioning themselves in relation to other boys by championing a particular ideal of masculinity that centers on gentleness and conviviality, while rejecting those masculinities that valorize aggression and brute force. While previous scholars have documented how hardness and sporting prowess defined subjective understanding of masculinities among young boys (Frosh et al. 2002), here Rohit's and Aditya's identification with gentleness bear

some affinity to what Jon Swain (2006) calls a "personalized" model of masculinity. They are not rejecting sports per se but categorizing different sport based on their respective masculine ideals and then choosing one over the others. The boys' narratives also indicate that physical aggression and intimidation within sport pitches ("They push you and stuff") endure. In rejecting what they understand as rough and aggressive contact sports, they are not implying that masculinities have become inherently inclusive. At the same time, they are not simply reproducing the racial myths about South Asian sport masculinities discussed earlier. Instead, building on Swain (2006), I argue that both Rohit and Aditya are displaying agency through their understanding of the sporting landscape and by appropriating the narrative of softer masculinity as a matter of personal preference. Both the boys attend grammar schools.[i] Grammar schools are particularly academically orientated, catering to academic high achievers drawn largely from middle-class backgrounds. Beside its academic infrastructure, Rohit and Aditya's grammar school also has facilities for a number of sports including badminton, cricket, football, and table tennis. The school website stresses the need to develop "well-rounded" young people with a "wide range of interests and achievements." Despite the lack of observation data from the school, these narratives indicate an institutional context where the idea of extra-curricular achievement is celebrated but the choice of such activities is left to the pupil. This institutional culture interacts with the peer culture of the boys— described above—to shape their masculinities.

The accounts of the two boys presented above highlight how intra-generational (child-child) relations inflect the lived geographies of young masculinities as much as intergenerational (parent-child) relations do. They bring into relief the fact that despite the so-called softening of masculine ideals, power relations are still relevant to the understanding of how different models of masculinity play out within children's leisure spaces. This sense of

change and continuity is crucial to refining Connell's theory and taking the CSMM debates forward.

Conclusion

In this article, I have looked into leisure-based masculinities of middle-class British Indian children through the twin theoretical lenses of gender order and generation order. In doing so, I have demonstrated how masculinities as gendered projects are forged by children in interaction with parents and peers. Such concurrent explorations of children's inter- and intra-generational interactions sets this study apart from others that have eschewed the familial generational structure of childhood as far as children's leisure-based masculinities are concerned. The generational relationships in children's lives—as elaborated in this article—are reciprocal in nature but they are not relationships of equals. Parents, as previous studies have repeatedly shown, play a key role in shaping children's leisure schedules and leisure attitudes. Fathers engineer gendered spaces of leisure through which they cultivate relationships with their sons and thereby channel notions of masculinities. Through these interactions with their fathers, boys negotiate their subjective understandings of masculinity. Another key generational aspect of leisure-based young masculinities revolves around children's relationships with other children. The accounts above indicate that boys craft their understanding of the way masculinities are positioned within different sporting cultures, which then form the basis for their sense of identification with specific forms of masculinity over others. I further emphasized how, despite changes in masculine ideals and the decline of homophobia, processes of hierarchization of masculinities are at play among children—and children are aware of these power dynamic within leisure spaces.

I have put Connell's (2000) theorization of hegemonic masculinities to work, not simply to refer to an isolated form of masculinity but as an overarching framework for

studying the plurality of masculinities and power, and the way these processes are embedded in gender orders. While previous scholars have probed the interaction between masculinities and the social divisions of class, sexuality, and race—the intersection between age and masculinity is relatively undertheorized, making it a "neglected intersectionality" in the CSMM literature (Hearn 2011). Thus, by homing in on the interplay between gender and generational orders within middle-class British Indian children's leisure spaces, this article has advanced the intersectionality debate within CSMM in multiple directions. First, by putting CSMM in dialogue with childhood studies, it has shown how young masculinities are forged within children's generational relationships, which in turn are embedded in the wider social context. Second, by giving dedicated attention to an ethnic minority community like the British Indians, this study decenters white middle-class male bodies that have provided the dominant frame for understanding masculinities (see Halberstam [1998] 2018). Approaching questions of masculinity and power through the prism of race and racism has revealed how cultural legacies of particular leisure activities (for example, cricket) inform Indian diasporic leisurescapes while racial stereotypes about British South Asian masculinities have crystallized into structural barriers in sports like professional football. Third, I have shown how the gender projects within middle-class British Indian families bear class connotations wherein parents deploy their economic and cultural resources in playing the (gendered) leisure marker for their children, while the children themselves forge their notions of masculinities in interaction with peers in the largely middle-class environments they inhabit. Therefore, knitting Connell's ideas with the notion of generational structures has enriched our understanding of children's masculinities and taken the intersectionality debate within CSMM to new directions.

Utsa Mukherjee is an ESRC Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Southampton. He received his PhD in Sociology from Royal Holloway, University of London. Located at the intersection of childhood studies and leisure studies, his research draws focus on social identities, children's agency, and inequalities. Email: u.mukherjee@soton.ac.uk

References

Alanen, Leena. 2001. "Explorations in Generational Analysis." In *Conceptualizing Child-Adult Relations*, ed. Leena Alanen and Berry Mayall, 11–22. London: Routledge Falmer.

Alanen, Leena. 2020. "Generational Order: Troubles with a 'Travelling Concept.'" *Children's Geographies* 18 (2): 141–143. doi: 10.1080/14733285.2019.1630715.

Anderson, Eric. 2009. Inclusive Masculinity: The Changing Nature of Masculinities. New York: Routledge.

Atkinson, Michael, and Michael Kehler. 2012. "Boys, Bullying and Biopedagogies in Physical Education." *Thymos: Journal of Boyhood Studies* 6 (2): 166–185. doi:10.3149/thy.0602.166.

Bassel, Leah, and Akwugo Emejulu. 2010. "Struggles for Institutional Space in France and the United Kingdom: Intersectionality and the Politics of Policy." *Politics & Gender* 6 (4): 517–544. doi:10.1017/S1743923X10000358.

Borkowska, Katarzyna. 2018. "Approaches to Studying Masculinity: A Nonlinear

Perspective of Theoretical Paradigms." *Men and Masculinities*.

doi:10.1177/1097184X18768376.

Burdsey, D. 2007. *British Asians and Football: Culture, Identity, Exclusion*. London:

Routledge.

Christensen, Ann-Dorte, and Jørgen Elm Larsen. 2008. "Gender, Class, and Family: Men and

Gender Equality in a Danish Context." *Social Politics* 15 (1): 53–78. doi:

10.1093/sp/jxn004.

Connell, Raewyn. 1987. *Gender and Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, Raewyn. 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, Raewyn. 2000. *The Men and the Boys*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, Raewyn. 2012. "Gender, Health and Theory: Conceptualizing the Issue, in Local

and World Perspective." *Social Science & Medicine* 74 (11): 1675–1683.

doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.06.006.

Connolly, Paul. 1998. *Racism, Gender Identities and Young Children*. London: Routledge.

Dowling, Fiona, and Anne Flintoff. 2018. "A Whitewashed Curriculum? The Construction of

Race in Contemporary PE Curriculum Policy." *Sport, Education and Society* 23 (1):

1–13. doi: 10.1080/13573322.2015.1122584.

Drummond, Murray. 2020. *Boys' Bodies: Sport, Health and Physical Activity*. London:

Palgrave Macmillan.

Dunning, Eric. 1986. "Sport as a Male Preserve: Notes on the Social Sources of Masculine

Identity and Its Transformations." *Theory, Culture & Society* 3 (1): 79–90.

doi:10.1177/0263276486003001007.

Esin, Cigdem, Mastoureh Fathi, and Corinne Squire. 2013. "Narrative Analysis: The
Constructionist Approach." In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Analysis*,
ed. Uwe Flick, 203–216. London: Sage.

Fleming, Scott. 1994. "Sport and South Asian Youth: The Perils of 'False Universalism' and
Stereotyping." *Leisure Studies* 13 (3): 159–177. doi:10.1080/02614369400390121.

Fletcher, Thomas. 2020. *Negotiating Fatherhood: Sport and Family Practices*. Cham:
Palgrave Macmillan.

Flintoff, Anne, Fiona Dowling, and Hayley Fitzgerald. 2015. "Working through Whiteness,
Race and (Anti) Racism in Physical Education Teacher Education." *Physical
Education and Sport Pedagogy* 20 (5): 559–570.
doi: 10.1080/17408989.2014.962017.

Frosh, Stephen, Ann Phoenix, and Rob Pattman. 2002. *Young Masculinities*. Basingstoke:
Palgrave.

Halberstam, Jack. (1998) 2018. *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hearn, Jeff. 2011. "Neglected Intersectionalities in Studying Men: Age(ing), Virtuality,
Transnationality." In *Framing Intersectionality,* ed. Helma Lutz, Maria Teresa
Herrera Vivar, and Linda Supik, 89–104. Farnham: Ashgate.

Holloway, Sarah L., and Helena Pimlott-Wilson. 2014. "Enriching Children,
Institutionalizing Childhood? Geographies of Play, Extracurricular Activities, and
Parenting in England." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 104 (3):
613–627. doi:10.1080/00045608.2013.846167.

Josselson, Ruthellen. 2004. "The Hermeneutics of Faith and the Hermeneutics of
Suspicion." *Narrative Inquiry* 14 (1): 1–28. doi:10.1075/ni.14.1.01jos.

Kilvington, Daniel. 2019. "Two Decades and Little Change: British Asians, Football and

Calls for Action." *Soccer & Society* 20 (4): 584–601.

doi:10.1080/14660970.2017.1366902.

Kinzie, Mable B., and Dolly R. D. Joseph. 2008. "Gender Differences in Game Activity

Preferences of Middle School Children: Implications for Educational Game Design."

Educational Technology Research and Development 56 (5/6): 643–663.

doi:10.1007/s11423-007-9076-z.

Leonard, Madeleine. 2016. *The Sociology of Children, Childhood and Generation.* London:

Sage.

Light, Richard. 2008. "Learning Masculinities in a Japanese High School Rugby Club."

Sport, Education and Society 13 (2): 163–179. doi:10.1080/13573320801957079.

Livingstone, Sonia, and Ellen J. Helsper. 2008. "Parental Mediation of Children's Internet

Use." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 52 (4): 581–599.

doi:10.1080/08838150802437396.

Malcolm, Dominic. 1997. "Stacking in Cricket: A Figurational Sociological Reappraisal of

Centrality." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 14 (3): 263–282. doi:10.1123/ssj.14.3.263.

Maor, Maya. 2019. "Masculinities in the Middle: Policing of Masculinity, and the Central

and Marginal Roles of Adolescent Boys in Adult Martial Art Groups." *Sociology of

Sport Journal* 36 (1): 97–105. doi:10.1123/ssj.2018-0003.

Masanet, Maria-Jose. 2016. "Persistence of Gender Stereotypes in the Media Consumption

Habits of Adolescents: Drama for Girls and Humor for Boys." *Cuadernos.info* 39:

39–53. doi:10.7764/cdi.39.1027.

Matthews, Jill Julius. 1984. *Good and Mad Women*. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.

Mayall, Berry. 1996. *Children, Health and the Social Order*. Buckingham: Open University

Press.

Messner, Michael A., and Donald F. Sabo. 1990. "Toward a Critical Feminist Appraisal of Sport, Men and the Gender Order." In *Sport, Men and the Gender Order*, ed. Michael A. Messner and Donald F. Sabo, 1–15. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics

McCormack, Mark. 2012. *The Declining Significance of Homophobia*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Messner, Michael A. 1992. *Power at Play*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Mukherjee, Utsa. 2020. "Towards a Critical Sociology of Children's Leisure." *International Journal of the Sociology of Leisure* 3: 219–239. doi:10.1007/s41978-020-00060-5.

Mullan, Killian. 2019. "A Child's Day: Trends in Time use in the UK from 1975 to 2015." *British Journal of Sociology* 70 (3): 997–1024. doi:10.1111/1468-4446.12369.

Nielsen, Harriet Bjerrum. 2004. "European Gender Lessons: Girls and Boys at Scout Camps in Denmark, Portugal, Russia and Slovakia." *Childhood* 11 (2): 207–226. doi:10.1177/0907568204043057.

Office for National Statistics. 2018. "Population of England and Wales." https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/national-and-regional-populations/population-of-england-and-wales/latest#by-ethnicity (accessed 27 June 2020).

Riessman, Catherine Kohler. 2008. *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rollock, Nicola, David Gillborn, Carol Vincent, and Stephen J. Ball. 2015. *The Colour of Class*. London: Routledge.

Shannon, Charlene S. 2006. "Parents' Messages about the Role of Extracurricular and Unstructured Leisure Activities: Adolescents' Perceptions." *Journal of Leisure Research* 38 (3): 398–420. doi:10.1080/00222216.2006.11950085.

Swain, Jon. 2006. "The Role of Sport in the Construction of Masculinities in an English

   Independent Junior School." *Sport, Education and Society* 11 (4): 317–335.

   doi:10.1080/13573320600924841.

Thorne, Barrie. 2007. "Editorial: Crafting the Interdisciplinary Field of Childhood Studies."

   Childhood 14 (2): 147–152. doi:10.1177/0907568207078324.

Notes

i. State-funded, highly selective schools in England that admit pupils through a competitive

exam at age 11.