



## “MEN ARE VICTIMS TOO”: DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF MALE VICTIMHOOD IN PAKISTANI AND BRITISH X DISCOURSE

Farzana Khan  
[miss.khan5051@gmail.com](mailto:miss.khan5051@gmail.com)

PhD Scholar, Department of English, Allama Iqbal Open  
University, Islamabad, Pakistan

Dr. Malik Ajmal Gulzar  
[ajmal.gulzar@aiou.edu.pk](mailto:ajmal.gulzar@aiou.edu.pk)

Associate Professor, Department of English, Allama Iqbal Open  
University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

### Abstract

Digital platforms have become important sites for negotiating gender identities, inequalities, and claims to victimhood. Within these spaces, male suffering is articulated through concerns such as emotional distress, domestic abuse, suicide, family conflict, economic pressure, legal disadvantage, and restrictive masculine expectations. This study examines how male victimhood is discursively constituted and legitimised in Pakistani and British male users' discourse on X, and how these constructions differ in relation to responsibility attribution, gender relations, institutional recognition, and masculinity. Drawing on a comparative corpus-assisted critical discourse design, the study analyses 3,000 unique tweets, comprising 1,500 Pakistani and 1,500 British posts collected between January 2020 and December 2024. Quantitative keyword and collocation analyses are integrated with qualitative concordance analysis. For qualitative analysis Socio-Cognitive Approach (van Dijk, 2008, 2016) is employed for interpretation. The findings revealed distinct but overlapping constructions of male victimhood. Pakistani discourse was predominantly event-centred, relational, and moral, foregrounding false allegations, reputational harm, marital relations, family responsibility, and the sacrificial provider. British discourse was more strongly institutionalised and therapeutic, emphasising mental health, domestic-abuse services, suicide prevention, equality, and restrictive masculinity. Across both corpora, male victimhood ranges from reformatory and rights-based claims for recognition to competitive and antifeminist constructions that frame women's gains or feminist politics as sources of male disadvantage. The study demonstrates that male victimhood is not a unified discourse but a contested field of meanings shaped by differing causal attributions and ideological orientations. It contributes to digital gender discourse research by distinguishing inclusive recognition of male vulnerability from adversarial constructions that legitimise male suffering through gender opposition.

**Keywords:** *Corpus-Assisted Discourse Analysis, Digital Discourse, Male Victimhood, Masculinity, X (Twitter).*

**Corresponding Author:** Farzana Khan (PhD Scholar, Department of English, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad Pakistan.)

**Email:** [miss.khan5051@gmail.com](mailto:miss.khan5051@gmail.com)

## 1. Introduction

Digital platforms have become prominent arenas in which gender identities, inequalities, and claims to victim status are publicly negotiated. On X, discussions of gender increasingly include assertions that men are overlooked as victims of emotional distress, domestic abuse, family conflict, economic pressure, legal disadvantage, or restrictive expectations of masculinity. These claims cannot be treated as a single ideological position. Some make socially neglected forms of male suffering visible, particularly suicide, loneliness, reluctance to seek psychological help, and the pressure to remain emotionally controlled and financially dependable (Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Seidler et al., 2016). Others use men's experiences to displace attention from women's inequality or to represent feminism, women's rights, and gender-sensitive institutions as sources of male oppression. Male victimhood is therefore both an account of harm and a discursive position through which responsibility, sympathy, and moral legitimacy are allocated.

The tension is especially visible in digital discussions of masculinity. Conventional masculine norms associate manhood with autonomy, toughness, control, protection, and economic provision. These norms can give men authority in gendered relations while also making vulnerability difficult to acknowledge. Male victims may consequently need to establish that their suffering is genuine without appearing weak, dependent, or deficient as men. Venäläinen (2020) shows that accounts of female-perpetrated intimate partner violence often negotiate precisely this contradiction. In more adversarial settings, personal pain may be incorporated into narratives of aggrieved masculinity, in which changing gender relations are interpreted as evidence that men have lost status, rights, or cultural recognition (Ging, 2019). The analytical problem is how victimhood is established, how suffering is explained, and whether recognition is sought through inclusion or gender opposition within wider digital debates about equality.

A comparison of Pakistani and British male-user discourse offers a productive way to examine these processes. Masculine vulnerability may be articulated through different cultural and institutional vocabularies. Pakistani discussions may draw on family obligation, marriage, provision, honour, public reputation, and contested gender rights. British discussions may more readily use the languages of mental health, domestic-abuse services, fatherhood, equality policy, or toxic masculinity. These are analytical possibilities rather than assumptions about nationally uniform cultures. X users do not represent entire national populations, and neither corpus can capture the full diversity of masculinities within Pakistan or Britain. Comparison is used instead to identify recurring discursive models and to examine how similar claims about male suffering acquire different meanings in the two datasets.

Existing literature has examined online misogyny, the manosphere, antifeminist backlash, feminist hashtag activism, and gendered self-presentation (Bamman et al., 2014; Ging, 2019; Jane, 2016; Jha & Mamidi, 2017). However, male victimhood remains under-examined as a comparative linguistic phenomenon. Studies often concentrate either on legitimate barriers affecting men, such as help-seeking and domestic-abuse recognition, or on reactionary online communities. This separation can obscure the fact that supportive, reformative, rights-based, and antifeminist claims may circulate through the same platform and may use overlapping terms such as men's rights, male victims, equality, abuse, and mental health. A corpus-assisted approach is needed to identify repeated lexical patterns, while concordance analysis is necessary to determine the ideological function performed by those patterns.

This study analyses the textual content of tweets collected through the X application programming interface using an authenticated API key. The dataset covers January 2020 to December 2024 and comprises two researcher-defined corpora: tweets by Pakistani male users and tweets by British male users. Because the corpora were assembled through different hashtags and keywords, the study does not interpret raw frequency differences as direct measures of national opinion. Instead, reciprocal keyword analysis identifies relatively salient vocabulary, collocation analysis examines recurrent lexical associations, and concordance analysis establishes how men's suffering, responsibility, feminism, institutions, and masculine norms are represented in context.

The study addresses two questions

1. How male victimhood is discursively constructed in Pakistani and British male users' discourse on X?
2. How do Pakistani and British constructions of male victimhood differ in X discourse?

By reducing the inquiry to these two related questions, the study connects quantitative patterns directly with qualitative interpretation. Its contribution lies in distinguishing discourse that broadens recognition of male vulnerability from discourse that makes recognition competitive by minimising women's experiences or reversing victim and perpetrator positions.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Masculinity, Hierarchy, and Vulnerability**

Masculinity is best understood as a socially organised set of practices rather than a fixed collection of male characteristics. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) describe hegemonic masculinity as the culturally authoritative form of masculinity that legitimates gender hierarchy while subordinating alternative ways of being a man. Masculinities vary across class, ethnicity, sexuality, age, religion, and institutional location. Nevertheless, ideals of strength, heterosexual competence, emotional control, independence, and

economic provision can become standards against which men evaluate themselves and others.

These ideals are relevant to male victimhood because they can make suffering difficult to recognise. A man who experiences abuse, depression, financial failure, or family breakdown may be positioned as deficient if vulnerability is interpreted as incompatible with manhood. Research on psychological help-seeking shows that men's reluctance to seek support is shaped partly by contextual expectations of self-reliance and emotional restraint (Addis & Mahalik, 2003). Seidler et al. (2016) similarly found that conformity to traditional masculine norms affects how depression is understood, expressed, and managed. Such findings do not support the essentialist claim that men are naturally silent. They indicate that disclosure carries gendered social meanings and that masculine credibility may depend on appearing controlled.

The relationship between masculinity and victimhood is therefore contradictory. Men may benefit from patriarchal arrangements while also experiencing harm from particular masculine expectations. Recognition of male suffering need not deny structural inequalities affecting women, just as analysis of gendered privilege should not render men invulnerable. A relational approach makes it possible to ask which men receive authority, which forms of suffering remain unrecognised, and how appeals to victimhood interact with existing gender hierarchies.

## **2.2. Male Victimhood and Aggrieved Masculinity**

Victimhood becomes politically significant when personal experiences are interpreted as evidence about the position of men as a social group. In online settings, accounts of loneliness, suicide, divorce, domestic abuse, custody disputes, false allegations, or economic pressure can be connected to broader claims that society neglects men. Some of these claims seek services, recognition, or reform. Others construct changing gender relations as a collective injury to masculinity. Ging's (2019) account of the manosphere is important here. Although men's-rights activists, pickup artists, and "men going their own way" differ in their concerns, their discourse often combines masculine grievance with antifeminist explanations. Men are represented as disadvantaged by feminism, female power, equality policies, or the erosion of conventional authority. Vulnerability is therefore joined to entitlement: suffering is invoked not only to request support but also to justify the restoration of masculine dominance. García Mingo and Díaz Fernández (2023) describe this process as a regime of male victimhood in which personal pain, selective evidence, and political blame are organised into a coherent antifeminist worldview.

Male victimhood should not, however, be reduced to manosphere ideology. Venäläinen (2020) demonstrates that men discussing female-perpetrated intimate partner violence must negotiate the tension between victim status and masculine agency. Their

accounts may preserve dignity by emphasising endurance, rationality, or moral superiority. This does not make the reported harm unreal; it shows that victim identities are discursively produced. Speakers must establish what counts as abuse, why the victim could not prevent it, who is responsible, and what response is justified. This distinction is central to the present study. Reformatory discourse recognises male vulnerability and seeks broader support without denying women's experiences. Rights-based discourse focuses on legal or institutional recognition. Competitive victimhood presents sympathy, protection, or public attention as a scarce resource, so that recognition of women is interpreted as neglect of men. Antifeminist victimhood goes further by identifying feminism or women's social gains as the principal cause of male injury.

### **2.3. Gender Conflict and Digital Discourse**

X provides conditions in which these orientations can coexist and circulate rapidly. Hashtags connect dispersed posts to larger debates, while repetition and retweeting allow short formulations to acquire the appearance of collective consensus. Platform brevity also favours compressed contrasts such as "men suffer too," "women have more rights," or "patriarchy hurts men." Such statements may express solidarity, correction, provocation, or ideological reversal depending on their context. Retweeting and hashtag use cannot therefore be interpreted automatically as endorsement (boyd et al., 2010). Research on online sexism demonstrates that hostility is not limited to direct insults. Jha and Mamidi (2017) show that sexist discourse may be hostile or benevolent, with apparently protective statements reproducing dependency and conventional gender roles. Jane (2016) argues that online misogyny is structural because platform practices and institutional responses shape who bears the cost of abuse. Fox et al. (2015) further demonstrate that producing sexist hashtag content can reinforce hostile attitudes. Women may consequently be represented as manipulative, institutionally protected, emotionally privileged, or undeserving beneficiaries of equality measures.

The ideological effect of male-victim discourse often depends on comparison. A post may request recognition for male domestic-abuse victims without questioning services for women. Another may cite male victimisation to argue that policies addressing violence against women are discriminatory. The first is additive; the second is zero-sum. Competitive victimhood is therefore identified through responsibility attribution, comparison, and proposed remedies rather than through the presence of a particular hashtag.

### **2.4. Gendered Language, Comparison, and the Research Gap**

Cross-national corpus comparison requires caution because linguistic patterns reflect topic, audience, sampling, and network structure as well as social identity. Bamman et al. (2014) found that lexical variation among Twitter users did not map neatly onto a stable male-female binary; language styles were associated with social networks and

identity performance. The present study consequently treats “Pakistani male users” and “British male users” as analytical corpus labels, not as homogeneous categories or evidence of innate gendered language. The use of different collection hashtags creates an additional constraint. A corpus gathered through mental-health terms will naturally contain more therapeutic vocabulary than one gathered through #MeToo or #MenRights. Keyword differences must therefore be interpreted as properties of the supplied datasets, not as direct evidence that one national population is more concerned with a topic. Corpus-assisted discourse analysis addresses this problem by combining statistical salience with contextual examination (Baker et al., 2008). Keywords identify unusually frequent items, collocations reveal recurrent associations, and concordances show how those associations function in complete posts. Previous work examines hegemonic masculinity, help-seeking, online misogyny, manosphere ideology, and male intimate-partner victimhood. Less attention has been paid to how reformative and adversarial forms of male victimhood occur across Pakistani and British social-media datasets. The present study addresses this gap by examining not only whether men are described as victims, but which victim models recur, what actors are blamed, how women’s suffering is positioned, and whether proposed responses expand gender protection or reorganise it through competition.

### **3. Theoretical and Analytical Framework**

The study is principally informed by Socio Cognitive Approach (van Dijk, 2008, 2016), which connects discourse, cognition, and society without treating textual forms as direct reflections of social structure. Social conditions become relevant to discourse through participants’ interpretations of communicative situations, represented as context models (van Dijk, 2008). These models influence what speakers select as relevant, credible, and appropriate. In the present study, references to suicide, abuse, provision, false allegations, feminism, or institutional neglect are therefore examined as selections shaped by broader beliefs about masculinity, victimhood, gender equality, and social responsibility. Social cognition provides the link between individual tweets and recurring group meanings. Van Dijk (2016) argues that socially shared knowledge and ideology organise how events and actors are understood. A specific incident may consequently be represented through a more general model of the sacrificial provider, the emotionally silenced man, the falsely accused man, or the male victim ignored by institutions. The analysis asks how these models are linguistically produced: which actors are foregrounded, what causes are presupposed, whose agency is obscured, and what response is presented as legitimate.

Van Dijk’s (1998) ideological square supports analysis of polarised gender representation. It involves emphasising positive qualities of an in-group and negative qualities of an out-group while de-emphasising in-group faults and out-group merits. In male-victimhood discourse, men may be represented as responsible, hardworking,

silenced, or unfairly treated, while women, feminists, courts, or equality institutions may be represented as privileged, manipulative, hostile, or indifferent. The framework is applied through the categories of positive self-presentation, negative other-presentation, generalisation, comparison, presupposition, denial, responsibility attribution, and victim–perpetrator reversal. The SCA is supplemented by Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities. Connell and Messerschmidt’s (2005) reformulation of hegemonic masculinity allows the analysis to consider masculine authority and masculine vulnerability together. It recognises that men occupy unequal positions and that dominant expectations may harm men who cannot or will not perform toughness, control, heterosexuality, or economic provision. This perspective prevents the analysis from assuming either that all men are privileged in the same way or that experiences of suffering remove men from gendered relations of power.

Six categories organise the qualitative interpretation. Vulnerability discourse represents men through depression, loneliness, suicide, abuse, or restricted help-seeking. Burden discourse centres provision, protection, labour, and family sacrifice. Institutional grievance attributes harm to courts, laws, workplaces, services, or public policy. Critical-masculinity discourse identifies patriarchal expectations, compulsory toughness, or emotional restraint as causes of male suffering. Competitive victimhood compares men’s difficulties with women’s experiences in ways that present recognition as a limited resource. Antifeminist victimhood represents feminism, women, or equality measures as the principal sources of male injury. At the textual level, attention is paid to nomination, predication, agency, modality, wording, and numerical comparison. These features show how victims are made credible, how blame is distributed, and how certainty or doubt is attached to claims. These categories are treated as overlapping analytical patterns rather than fixed labels. A tweet may, for example, combine genuine concern about male suicide with a competitive claim that women receive excessive institutional attention. Keyword and collocation results identify recurrent lexical environments, while concordance analysis determines how responsibility, comparison, and proposed remedies shape their ideological meaning. This integration allows the study to distinguish discourse that expands recognition of vulnerability from discourse that seeks legitimacy through gender opposition.

#### **4. Research Methodology**

This study employed a corpus-assisted discourse analytical approach to examine representations of male victimhood and masculinity in Pakistani and British male Twitter/X discourse. Keyword, collocational, and concordance analyses were integrated to identify recurrent linguistic patterns and interpret their discursive meanings across the two corpora.

##### **4.1. Research Design**

The study adopted a comparative corpus-assisted critical discourse design. Quantitative corpus procedures were used to identify lexical items and associations that occurred with unusual prominence, while qualitative concordance analysis examined how those patterns represented social actors, causes, responsibilities, and proposed remedies. The integration links recurrent patterns with gender ideology without treating frequency as self-explanatory (Baker et al., 2008). The unit of analysis was the textual content of an individual tweet. Profile biographies, images, videos, linked webpages, follower networks, and engagement metrics were not included.

#### **4.2. Data Collection and Corpus Composition**

The data were collected through the X application programming interface using an authenticated API key. Search queries consisted of hashtags and keywords relevant to gender, feminism, masculinity, male victimhood, men's rights, gender roles, and related public debates. The collection period extended from January 2020 to December 2024. Different search terms were used to construct the Pakistani and British datasets; consequently, the corpora were not treated as random or fully matched samples of national discourse. The analysis compares the discursive patterns available in the supplied corpora and does not estimate the prevalence of particular views among Pakistani or British men. The files supplied for analysis contained 1500 Pakistani and 1500 British tweets. The users had previously been classified by the researcher as Pakistani male or British male during construction of the parent corpus. Only tweet text was retained in the cleaned analytical files. Dates were not attached to individual posts in these files, so the study analysed the corpus across the full five-year period rather than conducting annual or diachronic comparisons.

#### **4.3. User Classification and Inclusion Criteria**

Users were classified on the basis of publicly available profile information rather than inferred from tweet language alone. Accounts were first screened to exclude organisations, commercial entities, institutional accounts, and identifiable automated accounts. Male-user classification relied primarily on explicit self-identification, including pronouns and self-descriptions such as *man*, *male*, *father*, or *husband*. Where explicit identification was unavailable, classification required more than one consistent profile indicator; names or profile photographs were not used as sole evidence. Geographic classification was based primarily on explicit profile location or self-identification with Pakistan or the United Kingdom, supplemented, where necessary, by consistent institutional or biographical information. Accounts for which gender or geographic affiliation remained ambiguous were excluded. The labels "Pakistani" and "British" therefore refer to the operational classification adopted for corpus construction rather than verified citizenship or ethnicity.

#### **4.4. Data Cleaning and Quality Control**

Tweet boundaries were identified through the numbered <Tweet> and <EndTweet> tags. HTML entities were decoded, spacing and case were normalised, and hyperlinks and user mentions were removed for lexical calculation. Hashtag words were retained because they carried topical and ideological meaning. After normalisation, duplicate and irrelevant tweets were removed, leaving 1500 and 1500 unique records.

#### 4.5. Keyword Analysis

Reciprocal keyword analysis compared the adjusted Pakistani corpus with the British corpus and then reversed the comparison. Log-likelihood measured the statistical strength of frequency differences, using  $LL \geq 10.83$  as the threshold corresponding to  $p < .001$ . Because statistical significance can be affected by corpus size, log ratio was also used to indicate effect size and direction. Raw frequencies were normalised per 10,000 tokens. Interpretive tables excluded geographical names, collection artefacts, and unrelated topical words. Analysis focused on items relevant to male victimhood, masculinity, abuse, family relations, allegations, feminism, equality, and institutional recognition.

#### 4.6. Collocation and Concordance Analysis

Collocation analysis examined the nodes *men*, *male*, *masculinity*, *victim*, *victims*, *feminism*, *allegations*, and *suicide*. Collocates were calculated within a span of five words to the left and five words to the right. LogDice was used as the principal association measure because it allows comparison across nodes and is less directly affected by corpus size than raw co-occurrence. Minimum-frequency thresholds were checked alongside association scores so that rare accidental pairings were not interpreted as stable patterns.

Concordance lines were then read in their complete tweet contexts. Coding examined the type of harm, masculine role, attributed cause, represented out-group, institutional response, comparison with women's suffering, and proposed remedy. Posts were assigned one or more of six analytical categories: vulnerability, burden, institutional grievance, critical masculinity, competitive victimhood, and antifeminist victimhood. Coding was iterative; ambiguous cases were reconsidered against category definitions and surrounding concordance evidence rather than classified from isolated words.

#### 4.7. Operationalisation of the Analytical Framework

To operationalise the Socio-Cognitive Approach (van Dijk, 2008, 2016) for the present analysis, a set of discourse features was selected from SCA framework according to their relevance to the construction and legitimation of male victimhood...

**Table 1**

*SCA Analytical Framework Applied in the Study*

| SCA feature | Analytical focus | Relevance to the research questions |
|-------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
|-------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|

|                                   |                                                                             |                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Context models / social cognition | Shared beliefs shaping meanings of masculinity and victimhood.              | Explains how male victimhood is constructed and varies across corpora. |
| Positive self-presentation        | Men represented as responsible, silenced, sacrificial, or unfairly treated. | Shows how male victimhood is legitimised.                              |
| Negative other-presentation       | Women, feminism, or institutions represented negatively.                    | Identifies ideological opposition and blame.                           |
| Generalisation                    | Individual cases/statistics extended to men or women as groups.             | Shows how personal experiences become collective claims.               |
| Comparison                        | Men's suffering contrasted with women's suffering or recognition.           | Distinguishes inclusive from competitive victimhood.                   |
| Presupposition                    | Implicit assumptions about causes of male suffering.                        | Reveals underlying ideological meanings.                               |
| Denial / backgrounding            | Alternative causes, male privilege, or women's suffering minimised.         | Identifies selective ideological emphasis.                             |
| Responsibility attribution        | Blame assigned to women, feminism, institutions, norms, or masculinity.     | Explains differences in causal framing across corpora.                 |
| Victim-perpetrator reversal       | Men repositioned as victims and others as sources of harm.                  | Shows how victim status and moral legitimacy are redistributed.        |

*Note.* Only SCA features explicitly applied in the article are included.

The categories presented in Table 1 were used as interpretive tools rather than as mutually exclusive coding categories. A single tweet could realise several SCA features simultaneously; for example, a post could combine positive self-presentation of men with negative other-presentation of women or institutions, generalisation from an individual case, and responsibility attribution. Accordingly, the analysis focused on the interaction

among these features within complete concordance contexts rather than identifying them from isolated lexical items. Particular attention was given to how these strategies legitimised male victimhood, assigned responsibility for suffering, and distinguished inclusive recognition of male vulnerability from competitive or adversarial gender constructions.

#### 4.8. Interpretation, Limitations, and Ethics

Differences were interpreted cautiously because the corpora were collected through different hashtags and keywords. A British keyword could reflect the collection design as well as a wider discursive preference. Statistical comparison was therefore used to locate patterns, not to make claims about national attitudes. X users are also not representative of national populations, and publicly visible posts may over-represent highly engaged or polarised speakers (Tufekci, 2014). Usernames and direct identifiers were excluded from the analytical text. Only public tweet content was examined, and examples are paraphrased where verbatim quotation could make an individual easily searchable. Ethics approval, data-storage arrangements, API conditions, and user-classification procedures are reported.

### 5. Findings

#### 5.1. Reciprocal Keyword Patterns

Reciprocal keyword analysis (Baker, 2006; Malik, 2026) compared each national corpus against the other. Log-likelihood was used to identify statistically unusual frequencies, with  $LL \geq 10.83$  treated as significant at  $p < .001$ . Log ratio was used to indicate the size and direction of the difference. Geographical names, platform artefacts, and terms unrelated to the study were removed from the interpretive tables. The most salient Pakistani keyword was *men*. It occurred 555 times, or 123.70 instances per 10,000 tokens, compared with 416 occurrences, or 72.87 per 10,000, in the British corpus ( $LL = 67.52$ ; log ratio = 0.76). The difference was not simply a matter of more references to male actors. The Pakistani list also contained the highly distinctive form *menrights*, which appeared 22 times compared with once in the British corpus ( $LL = 29.05$ ; log ratio = 4.25). The family nouns *wife* and *husband* were similarly Pakistani-key, as were *killed* and *allegations*. Together, these words placed male victimhood in an interpersonal field involving marriage, family obligation, violent death, disputed claims, and reputational consequences.

**Table 2**

*Selected Pakistani Keywords Relative to the British Corpus*

| Keyword | PK frequency | PK per 10,000 | UK frequency | UK per 10,000 | per | LL | Log ratio |
|---------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----|----|-----------|
|---------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----|----|-----------|

|             |     |        |     |       |       |      |
|-------------|-----|--------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| Men         | 555 | 123.70 | 416 | 72.87 | 67.52 | 0.76 |
| Menrights   | 22  | 4.90   | 1   | 0.18  | 29.05 | 4.25 |
| Wife        | 21  | 4.68   | 1   | 0.18  | 27.50 | 4.19 |
| Husband     | 20  | 4.46   | 1   | 0.18  | 25.95 | 4.12 |
| Killed      | 34  | 7.58   | 8   | 1.40  | 24.20 | 2.37 |
| Allegations | 15  | 3.34   | 3   | 0.53  | 11.89 | 2.49 |

*Note.* PK = Pakistani corpus; UK = British corpus; LL = log-likelihood. Frequencies are normalised per 10,000 tokens.  $LL \geq 10.83$  was treated as significant at  $p < .001$ . The table shows that men, menrights, marital actors, killed, and allegations are comparatively salient in the Pakistani corpus.

The British corpus was distinguished by a more explicit conceptual vocabulary. *Feminism* occurred 248 times, compared with 77 Pakistani occurrences ( $LL = 58.17$ ; log ratio = 1.33 in the British direction). *Masculinity* was especially distinctive: its British frequency was 105, or 18.39 per 10,000 tokens, whereas the Pakistani frequency was 16, or 3.57 per 10,000 ( $LL = 53.52$ ; log ratio = 2.33). *Equality*, *feminist*, and *abuse* were also significantly British-key. Male victimhood in this corpus was therefore more likely to be named through established political, institutional, and psychological categories. Pakistani posts more often approached the issue through concrete actors and cases; British posts more often situated it within an abstract debate about masculinity, equality, abuse, and feminism.

**Table 3**

*Selected British Keywords Relative to the Pakistani Corpus*

| Keyword     | UK frequency | UK per 10,000 | PK frequency | PK per 10,000 | LL    | Log ratio |
|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-----------|
| Feminism    | 248          | 43.44         | 77           | 17.16         | 58.17 | 1.33      |
| Masculinity | 105          | 18.39         | 16           | 3.57          | 53.52 | 2.33      |
| Equality    | 133          | 23.30         | 43           | 9.58          | 29.14 | 1.27      |
| Feminist    | 70           | 12.26         | 19           | 4.23          | 20.08 | 1.51      |
| Abuse       | 47           | 8.23          | 13           | 2.90          | 13.13 | 1.47      |

*Note.* UK = British corpus; PK = Pakistani corpus; LL = log-likelihood. Frequencies are normalised per 10,000 tokens.  $LL \geq 10.83$  was treated as significant at  $p < .001$ . The table shows that feminism, masculinity, equality, feminist, and abuse are comparatively salient in the British corpus.

Hashtag distribution supported this interpretation. **#MenRights** occurred 22 times in the Pakistani corpus but only once in the British corpus. By contrast, **#InternationalMensDay** occurred 20 times in the British corpus and seven times in the adjusted Pakistani data, while **#MentalHealth** occurred 13 and six times, respectively. **#MenToo** was comparatively balanced, with 28 Pakistani and 25 British uses, but its concordances differed markedly. Pakistani instances were frequently attached to complaints about false allegations, double standards, or the absence of recognition for men. British instances more often accompanied domestic-abuse provision, sexual victimisation, reporting, or the slogan that abuse has no gender. These differences show why hashtag frequency alone could not establish ideological meaning. Not all substantively important words were statistically key. *Suicide* occurred 16 times in Pakistan and 18 times in Britain, while *male* occurred 44 and 82 times and *victims* 15 and 43 times, respectively. Their relative frequencies differed, but the contrasts did not reach the selected LL threshold. This result is analytically important: a term may be central to a discourse without distinguishing one corpus from the other. In the Pakistani data, *suicide* acquired significance through its unusually concentrated association with false allegations; in the British corpus, it was distributed across public-health campaigns, statistics, theatre, charities, and International Men's Day posts. Keyword status therefore indicated comparative distinctiveness, whereas concordance distribution revealed how a shared issue was differently organised.

### 5.3. Collocational Constructions

Collocations were calculated within a five-word span on each side of the node, with logDice used as the association measure. In both corpora, the strongest substantively relevant collocate of *men* was *women*: the Pakistani co-frequency was 134 (logDice = 11.72), and the British co-frequency was 82 (logDice = 11.32). Male victimhood was therefore rarely constructed independently of women. Men were recognised through comparison, contrast, alliance, blame, or competition with female social actors. The Pakistani node *allegations* produced an unusually coherent cluster. Its strongest collocates were *false* (co-frequency = 10; logDice = 13.37), *suicide* (9; 13.22), *wife* (6; 12.42), and *harassment* (8; 11.98). The node *suicide* reproduced the same semantic chain through *committed*, *allegations*, *false*, *college*, and *harassment*. Concordance inspection showed that this was not a diffuse national theme but a concentrated case narrative concerning a Lahore lecturer who died by suicide after a harassment complaint had reportedly been cleared. The repeated sequence joined accusation, exoneration, marital abandonment, damaged reputation, depression, and death. Its recurrence transformed a specific case into a general warning about #MeToo and the vulnerability of men to unproven claims.

**Table 4**

*Selected Pakistani Collocates*

| Node        | Collocate  | Co<br>-<br>frequency | LogDice | Semantic<br>relation                         |
|-------------|------------|----------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------|
| Men         | Women      | 134                  | 11.72   | comparison<br>and relational<br>positioning  |
| Allegations | False      | 10                   | 13.37   | disputed<br>credibility                      |
| Allegations | Suicide    | 9                    | 13.22   | fatal<br>consequence                         |
| Allegations | Wife       | 6                    | 12.42   | marital<br>consequence                       |
| Allegations | harassment | 8                    | 11.98   | #MeToo<br>and reputational<br>grievance      |
| Suicide     | Committed  | 11                   | 13.46   | fatal<br>outcome                             |
| Suicide     | False      | 9                    | 13.17   | accusation<br>as cause                       |
| Suicide     | Harassment | 9                    | 12.13   | reputational<br>and<br>psychological<br>harm |

*Note.* Collocations were calculated within a five-word span on each side of the node, with LogDice used as the association measure. The Pakistani collocational pattern links allegations with false claims, suicide, wife, and harassment, while suicide is associated with accusation, reputational harm, and fatal consequence.

The British collocational environment was broader and less dependent on one case. Around *male*, the strongest victimhood-related associations were *victims* (13; logDice = 11.73), *suicide* (5; 10.68), *violence* (6; 10.63), *domestic* (5; 10.61), and *abuse* (6; 10.57). Around *masculinity*, the principal relevant collocates were *toxic* (9; 11.25), *menshealth* (7; 11.03), *mentalhealth* (7; 10.92), and *mensmentalhealth* (5; 10.57). These associations placed male suffering within a recognisable public-health and service vocabulary. They also linked masculinity itself to debate: it could be criticised as toxic, redefined as modern or positive, or discussed as a factor shaping help-seeking and wellbeing.

**Table 5**  
*Selected British Collocates*

| Node                    | Collocate    | C<br>o-<br>frequenc<br>y | LogDi | Semantic<br>relation                        |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------------|
| Men                     | Women        | 82                       | 11.32 | comparison<br>and relational<br>positioning |
| Male                    | Victims      | 13                       | 11.73 | explicit<br>victim recognition              |
| Male                    | Suicide      | 5                        | 10.68 | psychologica<br>l vulnerability             |
| Male                    | Violence     | 6                        | 10.63 | exposure to<br>violence                     |
| Male                    | Domestic     | 5                        | 10.61 | domestic<br>abuse                           |
| Male                    | Abuse        | 6                        | 10.57 | victim and<br>service discourse             |
| ity<br>masculin         | Toxic        | 9                        | 11.25 | critique of<br>restrictive norms            |
| ity<br>masculin         | menshealth   | 7                        | 11.03 | health-<br>oriented masculinity             |
| ity<br>masculin         | mentalhealth | 7                        | 10.92 | emotional<br>support and<br>awareness       |
| ity<br>masculin<br>alth | mensmentalhe | 5                        | 10.57 | institutionali<br>sed advocacy              |

*Note.* Collocations were calculated within a five-word span on each side of the node, with LogDice used as the association measure. The British collocational environment links male victimhood with explicit victim recognition, suicide, violence, domestic abuse, mental health, and critiques of restrictive masculinity.

#### 1.1.1. 5.4 Concordance-Based Discursive Models

Close reading of concordance lines was conducted to examine how the patterns identified through keyword and collocational analyses were realized in their immediate textual contexts. This contextual analysis revealed six overlapping discursive models through which male vulnerability and victimhood were constructed in the two corpora. Representative concordance lines are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

**Table 6**

*Selected British Concordance Lines Supporting the Discursive Models*

| weet No. | Left words)                                               | Context (10 ode | N                                                               | Right Context (10 words) |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| K-876    | U be pressured to 'Man Up'. It's alright for boys and     | m en            | to cry. Talking saves lives and we need to be                   |                          |
| K-1089   | U men a week in the UK end their life by                  | s uicide        | That's 12 a day. It's the biggest killer of men                 |                          |
| K-1097   | U Male                                                    | s uicide        | rates are three times higher than women. Better understand your |                          |
| K-753    | U a decade to get refuge places in London for male        | v ictims        | of domestic abuse - it has now happened. Thank you              |                          |
| K-953    | U continue to think it's still OK to literally erase male | v ictims        | It applies to men but the announcement says: "Thousands more    |                          |
| K-955    | U Today is the launch of Supporting Male                  | v ictims        | of Domestic Abuse Day where over 40 organisations across the    |                          |
| K-769    | U New play, Fatherland, about #fatherhood &               | m asculini ty   | opens: Manchester 1-22 July theatre #fathers #dads dadlife      |                          |
| K-874    | U In the UK                                               | m en            | are stereotyped to be breadwinners which forces young men into  |                          |
| K-871    | U Nearly three times as many men than women are           | v ictims        | of homicide in the UK. We must do everything to                 |                          |
| K-779    | U The crisis in                                           | m asculini ty   | is caused by 3rd wave #feminist ideology. It's time to          |                          |

|       |                                                            |                |                                                                                           |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| K-747 | the audience on<br>whether real men are allowed<br>to cry? | asculini<br>ty | beingaman                                                                                 |
| K-752 | Soft, fragile, toxic -<br>what is                          | asculini<br>ty | Our photography exhibition<br>#Masculinities: Liberation through<br>Photography is now on |

*Note.* Selected KWIC lines illustrate the six concordance-based models discussed in Section 5.4. Each line shows up to 10 whitespace-delimited words on either side of the node; tweet boundaries are retained where fewer words are available.

**Table 7**

*Selected Pakistani Concordance Lines Supporting the Discursive Models*

| weet<br>No. | Left Context (10 words)                                                                  | ode                 | Right Context (10 words)                                                   |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| K-1029      | — far more #men than #women<br>commit                                                    | s<br>uicide         | in #Karachi, the exact ratio<br>being 6.1:1. insightful piece by           |
| K-52        | Mr Afzal, Lecturer at Govt<br>College Lahore has committed                               | s<br>uicide         | after false harassment<br>allegations. His wife left him and<br>his        |
| K-1603      | a university lecturer in Lahore<br>committed suicide due to false                        | a<br>llegatio<br>ns | We must entertain the<br>possibility of false allegations<br>ruining men's |
| K-275       | In #Pakistan, Women are Above                                                            | n<br>en             | They should treat us<br>Equally. #MenRights                                |
| K-276       | in #Pakistan, especially in Cities,<br>Women have more Rights than                       | n<br>en             | We (Men) need to Stand Up<br>for Our Right, Its                            |
| K-50        | such issues. I wonder if it's the<br>identity of the                                     | v<br>ictim          | or that of the aggressors that<br>is making many good                      |
| K-1718      | faces additional barriers due to<br>societal expectations and stereotypes<br>surrounding | n<br>asculini<br>ty | vulnerability, and power<br>dynamics.                                      |

|        |                                      |          |                                    |
|--------|--------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|
| F      | and two admins from Soul Brother     | n        | anti-feminism,                     |
| K-1720 | Pakistan, to unpack toxic            | asculini | homophobia, the incel culture, and |
|        |                                      | ty       | where do we go                     |
| F      | Pakistani men when they read the     | n        |                                    |
| K-1726 | word                                 | asculini |                                    |
|        |                                      | ty       |                                    |
| F      | The other side of the picture. Let's | n        | out there who support              |
| K-1932 | acknowledge the great                | en       | women empowerment and play         |
|        |                                      |          | their part                         |

*Note.* Selected KWIC lines illustrate the six concordance-based models discussed in Section 5.4. Each line shows up to 10 whitespace-delimited words on either side of the node; tweet boundaries are retained where fewer words are available.

The first was the **emotionally silenced man**. This model was present in both corpora, but it was much more elaborated in the British material. British posts opposed the instruction to “man up,” stated that crying did not diminish manhood, and linked talking with suicide prevention (UK-876, UK-1077, UK-1089). Other posts directed users towards campaigns, community walks, counselling, or government health initiatives (UK-809, UK-818, UK-885, UK-901). These concordances did more than state that men suffered: they named symptoms, identified barriers to disclosure, and proposed institutional or communal responses. Pakistani examples acknowledged that men experienced anxiety, abuse, and emotional breakdown, but they more often took the form of corrective reminders that men “have emotions” and “struggle too” (PK-223, PK-535). The construction was recognitional rather than service-oriented.

The second model was the **falsely accused and reputationally destroyed man**. This was the most concentrated Pakistani victim narrative. Several posts repeated almost identical details concerning the lecturer’s harassment case, his reported exoneration, the departure of his wife, and his subsequent suicide (PK-52, PK-1589, PK-1597). Others extended the case into a wider proposition that false allegations destroy lives, harm genuine victims, and reveal the unacknowledged danger of #MeToo (PK-380, PK-1603). Lexically, the man was presented as cleared yet socially unrecoverable: formal exoneration could not restore reputation, marriage, or psychological stability. British data contained criticism of false accusations, but it was less frequent and less tightly associated with one exemplary event (UK-277, UK-934).

The third model was the **institutionally neglected victim**. British concordances referred to male refuges, domestic-abuse campaigns, reporting mechanisms, community organisations, and national health policy. Posts celebrated the establishment of refuge places for male victims in London, publicised a Supporting Male Victims of Domestic Abuse Day, and criticised official announcements that appeared to erase male victims (UK-753, UK-898, UK-953, UK-955). Here, victimhood was made credible through organisational names, service provision, statistics, and policy demands. Pakistani posts expressed institutional grievance principally through the idiom of rights. #MenRights appeared with claims that women received greater recognition, that men were also oppressed, or that men needed an organisation of their own (PK-275, PK-276, PK-670, PK-920). The dominant demand was acknowledgement and equal treatment rather than a detailed account of existing or required services.

The fourth model was the **sacrificial provider and protector**. It was most visible in the Pakistani concordances. Men were described as guardians, husbands, fathers, brothers, leaders, and protectors whose social value lay in carrying family responsibilities (PK-1918, PK-2009). One International Men’s Day post referred to men struggling to feed

their families, while another described men as carrying “the weight of the world” across multiple roles (PK-1919, PK-2009). The discourse made burden visible, but it also preserved provision and protection as defining masculine virtues. British posts discussed fatherhood, lone fathers, and male responsibility, yet these were more often connected with care, relationships, and changing gender norms than with sacrificial breadwinning (UK-735, UK-769, UK-1387).

The fifth model was the **competitively victimised man**. In Pakistani examples, women were sometimes described as being “above men,” possessing more rights, or receiving recognition while male suffering remained invisible (PK-275, PK-276, PK-670). British posts used a similar comparative structure when male homicide figures or domestic-abuse statistics were contrasted with institutional policies focused on “women and girls” (UK-246, UK-871, UK-953). The claim was not merely that men suffered; it was that recognition of women had produced or demonstrated neglect of men. This zero-sum framing differed from inclusive posts that explicitly acknowledged female victims while requesting parallel attention to men (PK-535, UK-871, UK-2135).

A smaller but analytically important set of concordances constructed the **man harmed by masculinity** rather than by women or feminism. British posts discussed toxic masculinity, positive masculinity, male-centred therapy, and the pressure to perform toughness (UK-9, UK-188, UK-737, UK-1644). The causal agent in these accounts was a restrictive gender norm: men were harmed because vulnerability, help-seeking, or non-dominant identities were treated as incompatible with manhood. Comparable Pakistani material was less frequent but included recognition of male-child abuse, emotional distress, and the burdens placed on boys by customary economic expectations (PK-1718, PK-1878). This model differed from competitive victimhood because it did not require women to be constructed as beneficiaries or perpetrators. Instead, it opened the possibility that gendered structures can disadvantage men and women in different ways.

**Table 8**

*Concordance-Based Models of Male Victimhood*

| Model                    | Pakistani realisation                                        | British realisation                                                          | Dominant function                             |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Emotionally silenced man | reminders that men have emotions and need support            | suicide prevention, rejection of “man up,” counselling and community support | legitimising male vulnerability               |
| Falsely accused man      | #MeToo misuse, damaged reputation, marital loss, and suicide | occasional concern about false allegations and custody                       | relocating victimhood from accuser to accused |

|                                     |                                                                         |                                                                        |                                                               |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Institutionally<br>neglected victim | claims for<br>men's rights and equal<br>recognition                     | refuges, reporting,<br>campaigns, health strategies, and<br>services   | demanding<br>institutional<br>inclusion                       |
| Sacrificial<br>provider             | breadwinner,<br>protector, guardian,<br>and family supporter            | caring father, lone father,<br>and emotionally present man             | moralising<br>or reformulating<br>masculine<br>responsibility |
| Competitively<br>victimised man     | women framed<br>as more privileged or<br>more visible                   | male statistics contrasted<br>with women-and-girls policies            | constructing<br>recognition as a<br>zero-sum resource         |
| Man harmed<br>by masculinity        | limited<br>criticism of provider<br>pressure and emotional<br>restraint | explicit criticism of toxic<br>masculinity and compulsory<br>toughness | locating<br>harm in gender<br>norms rather than<br>women      |

*Note.* The table summarises six recurrent models of male victimhood identified through concordance analysis and contrasts their Pakistani and British realisations and dominant discursive functions.

Across the concordances, three recurrent discursive strategies organised these models. **Generalisation** moved from a single case or statistic to claims about men as a category. **Responsibility attribution** selected feminism, women, institutions, family expectations, or masculine norms as the cause of harm. **Comparison** established whether women's experiences were treated as parallel, privileged, or irrelevant. These strategies explain why superficially similar claims carried different political implications. A request for a male refuge and a claim that women receive excessive protection both foreground institutional absence, but the former proposes an additional service whereas the latter derives male exclusion from female recognition. This distinction became central to interpreting ideological orientation, because lexical similarity did not guarantee comparable social meanings or proposed remedies.

### 5.5. Comparative Synthesis

The corpora shared a concern with recognition, but they differed in how recognition was linguistically secured. Pakistani male victimhood was predominantly event-centred, relational, and moral. It was organised around husbands, wives, allegations, violent outcomes, family duty, and assertions of unfairness. British discourse was more conceptual and institutional. It named masculinity, abuse, mental health, services, public campaigns, and equality frameworks. The Pakistani corpus more often established male innocence through sacrifice or unjust accusation; the British corpus more often established victim status through clinical categories, statistics, and institutional provision. This contrast was not absolute. British posts also contained antifeminist grievance, while

Pakistani posts included inclusive support for men's mental health and criticism of restrictive expectations. The decisive distinction was causal attribution. Reformatory concordances located harm in emotional repression, inadequate services, rigid gender roles, or failures of legal recognition. Competitive concordances located harm in feminism, women's visibility, or policies designed for women. Male victimhood therefore emerged not as one discourse but as a field of competing explanations about who causes suffering, whose pain receives legitimacy, and whether gender justice should be expanded or redistributed through opposition.

**Table 9**

*Comparative Synthesis of Keyword, Collocation, and Concordance Findings*

| Analytical level        | Pakistani corpus                                                                                                                           | British corpus                                                                                                                                                              | Comparative synthesis                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Keywords</b>         | Men (555), menrights (22), wife (21), husband (20), killed (34), and allegations (15) were comparatively salient.                          | Feminism (248), masculinity (105), equality (133), feminist (70), and abuse (47) were comparatively salient.                                                                | Pakistani discourse foregrounded male actors, marital relations, allegations, and concrete harms; British discourse foregrounded conceptual, equality, masculinity, and abuse vocabularies. |
| <b>Hashtag patterns</b> | #MenRights was strongly concentrated (22 vs. 1). #MenToo (28) often accompanied false-allegation, double-standard, and recognition claims. | #InternationalMens Day (20 vs. 7) and #MentalHealth (13 vs. 6) were more frequent. #MenToo (25) more often accompanied abuse recognition, reporting, and service discourse. | Similar hashtags could perform different ideological functions; frequency alone did not determine meaning.                                                                                  |
| <b>Collocations</b>     | Men–women (134; LogDice 11.72). Allegations                                                                                                | Men–women (82; 11.32). Male clustered with victims (13; 11.73), suicide                                                                                                     | Pakistani associations concentrated on                                                                                                                                                      |

|                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                       | clustered with false (5; 10.68), violence (6; 10; 13.37), suicide (9; 13.22), wife (6; 12.42), and harassment (8; 11.98).                                                                                         | (5; 10.68), violence (6; 10.63), domestic (5; 10.61), and abuse (6; 10.57); masculinity clustered with toxic and mental-health terms.                                                                            | accusation, reputation, marital consequence, and suicide; British associations centred on victim recognition, domestic abuse, mental health, and critiques of restrictive masculinity.        |
| <b>Concordance models</b>             | Prominent models: falsely accused/reputational ly damaged man; sacrificial provider; rights-based institutional grievance; competitive victimhood. Emotional vulnerability was present but less service-oriented. | Prominent models: emotionally silenced man; institutionally neglected victim needing refuges/services; man harmed by restrictive masculinity; caring/fatherhood discourse. Competitive victimhood also occurred. | Pakistani victimhood was more event-centred, relational, reputational, and moral; British victimhood was more therapeutic, institutional, and explicitly critical of restrictive masculinity. |
| <b>Overall discursive orientation</b> | Recognition was often secured through innocence, sacrifice, family duty, rights claims, and comparative injustice.                                                                                                | Recognition was often secured through clinical/public-health categories, statistics, campaigns, services, and equality frameworks.                                                                               | Across both corpora, male victimhood ranged from inclusive/reformati ve recognition to rights-based and adversarial constructions. The key difference lay in causal attribution               |

and whether  
recognition was  
additive or zero-  
sum.

*Note.* PK and UK frequencies are raw counts from the final 1,500-tweet corpora. LogDice values are reported only for selected collocations. The synthesis reflects the findings reported in the article and should be interpreted as corpus-specific rather than as direct measures of national opinion.

The table 9 demonstrates that male victimhood is constructed differently across the two corpora while retaining some shared concerns. Pakistani discourse is more strongly organised around interpersonal relations, false allegations, reputational harm, family responsibility, and rights-based grievance, whereas British discourse more often frames male vulnerability through mental health, domestic-abuse recognition, institutional support, and critiques of restrictive masculinity. At the same time, both corpora contain inclusive as well as competitive constructions of victimhood. The comparison therefore suggests that the key distinction lies not simply in whether men are represented as victims, but in how responsibility for their suffering is attributed and whether recognition is sought through inclusion or through gender opposition.

## 6. Discussion

The analysis demonstrates that male victimhood on X was discursively heterogeneous. The same broad claim—that men suffer and are insufficiently recognised—supported at least three political orientations. A reformative orientation sought mental-health support, domestic-abuse provision, and less restrictive masculine norms. A rights-based orientation demanded equal recognition, legal protection, or institutional inclusion. An adversarial orientation treated women’s gains or feminist politics as evidence of male displacement. This variation supports Venäläinen’s (2020) argument that masculine victimhood is not self-evident but must be made credible within cultural expectations that associate masculinity with strength, autonomy, and agency.

The British corpus most clearly produced a therapeutic model of male vulnerability. Its keyword and collocation patterns linked *masculinity* with mental health, suicide, public discussion, community support, and service provision. Such discourse challenged the expectation that men should remain self-reliant and emotionally controlled. This finding is consistent with research showing that conformity to traditional masculine norms can shape men’s recognition of distress and willingness to seek professional help (Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Seidler et al., 2016). Calls to reject “man up,” talk openly, and use available services expanded the range of legitimate masculine practices. Nevertheless, recurring descriptions of men as characteristically silent could also stabilise the very gender distinction they attempted to challenge.

Pakistani male victimhood was more frequently constructed through interpersonal and reputational relations. The salience of *wife*, *husband*, *allegations*, and *menrights*, together with the collocational chain connecting false allegations with suicide, produced the model of a man whose social identity could be destroyed even after formal exoneration. Repetition of the lecturer case converted an individual event into a shared interpretive frame for evaluating #MeToo. In Socio-Cognitive terms, the case operated as an event model through which subsequent accusations could be understood as potential threats to male honour, marriage, livelihood, and life (van Dijk, 2008). Its discursive force came from movement between the particular and the general: one reported tragedy became evidence of a wider structure of male vulnerability.

The provider model revealed a related contradiction. Pakistani posts made economic and familial pressure visible by describing men as protectors, guardians, and bearers of responsibility. Yet this recognition often depended on the same traditional role that generated the burden. Connell and Messerschmidt's (2005) reformulation of hegemonic masculinity helps explain this tension. Dominant masculinity can confer moral authority upon providers while making masculine value conditional upon endurance, control, and usefulness. The discourse therefore challenged neglect of men without necessarily challenging the gendered division of responsibility.

Competitive victimhood was the clearest point at which recognition became ideological polarisation. Claims that women possessed more rights, or that policies concerning violence against women erased male victims, positioned public concern as a finite resource. Van Dijk's (1998) ideological square is evident here: male suffering was foregrounded, male advantage or violence was backgrounded, and institutional attention to women was represented as out-group privilege. Similar patterns have been identified in scholarship on aggrieved masculinity, where experiences of injury are interpreted through narratives of feminist excess and declining male status (Ging, 2019). García Mingo and Díaz Fernández (2023) likewise show how male pain can be organised into a broader regime of victimhood that supports antifeminist politics.

The findings nevertheless caution against equating male-victim discourse with antifeminism. British campaigns for refugees and Pakistani appeals for mental-health recognition did not require denial of women's victimisation. Some posts explicitly acknowledged harms experienced by both genders and requested parallel institutional attention. Their orientation was additive rather than competitive. The key analytical distinction is therefore not between "genuine" and "false" suffering, which cannot be established through corpus evidence alone, but between discourses that broaden protection and those that secure male legitimacy by diminishing women's claims.

Methodologically, the findings also show why keyness cannot substitute for discourse interpretation. *Suicide* was not a significant national keyword, yet it's

collocational and concordance patterns revealed sharply different constructions: a reputational consequence of accusation in Pakistan and a public-health problem in Britain. Similarly, #MenToo occurred at comparable levels but supported distinct arguments. Corpus measures identified where to look; they did not determine whether a post was inclusive, reformative, competitive, or antifeminist. That judgement required examination of agents, causes, comparisons, and proposed remedies within complete posts and their immediate surrounding lexical environments.

Cross-national interpretation must remain sensitive to corpus construction. Different hashtags and keywords shaped the lexical opportunities available in each dataset. The British corpus contained more material gathered around masculinity, International Men's Day, and mental health, whereas the Pakistani corpus contained stronger clusters around #MenRights, #MeToo, and specific incidents. The findings consequently describe the supplied corpora rather than national male opinion. Even with this limitation, the combination of keywords, collocations, and concordances revealed a meaningful difference in discursive organisation: British victimhood was more often institutionalised through therapeutic and service vocabularies, while Pakistani victimhood was more often moralised through family responsibility, reputation, accusation, and comparative injustice.

## 7. Conclusion

This study examined the discursive construction of male victimhood in Pakistani and British male-user discourse on X between January 2020 and December 2024. Keyword analysis showed that the Pakistani corpus foregrounded *men*, *menrights*, marital actors, violent outcomes, and allegations, whereas the British corpus gave greater prominence to *masculinity*, *feminism*, *equality*, and abuse. Collocation and concordance analysis demonstrated that these lexical differences corresponded to distinct, although overlapping, models of victimhood.

Pakistani discourse most strongly constructed the falsely accused man, the reputational damaged husband, and the sacrificial provider. British discourse more often constructed the emotionally silenced man, the male victim requiring services, and the subject harmed by restrictive masculinity. Across both corpora, claims about men's suffering ranged from inclusive demands for recognition to competitive narratives in which attention to women was represented as neglect of men.

The study's principal contribution is its distinction between reformative, rights-based, and adversarial constructions of male victimhood. Reformative discourse expanded support by challenging emotional repression or institutional exclusion. Rights-based discourse demanded recognition and equal protection. Adversarial discourse converted male injury into evidence of feminist or female privilege. These orientations cannot be identified through hashtags alone; their meaning emerges from collocation, causal attribution, comparison, and concordance context.

More broadly, the analysis shows that acknowledging male vulnerability does not require a denial of gendered inequality. A non-competitive approach can recognise men's emotional, legal, and institutional needs while retaining attention to the unequal structures through which harms are produced, socially recognised, and evaluated. Future research should compare matched thematic datasets, retain tweet-level dates and collection terms, and examine reply sequences to determine how male-victimhood claims are endorsed, contested, or redirected in interaction.

### References

- Addis, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2003). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American Psychologist*, 58(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.58.1.5>
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. Continuum.
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., KhosraviNik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McNery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society*, 19(3), 273–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508088962>
- Bamman, D., Eisenstein, J., & Schnoebelen, T. (2014). Gender identity and lexical variation in social media. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18(2), 135–160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12080>
- boyd, d., Golder, S., & Lotan, G. (2010). Tweet, tweet, retweet: Conversational aspects of retweeting on Twitter. In *2010 43rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (pp. 1–10). IEEE Computer Society. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2010.412>
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829–859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Fox, J., Cruz, C., & Lee, J. Y. (2015). Perpetuating online sexism offline: Anonymity, interactivity, and the effects of sexist hashtags on social media. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 52, 436–442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.024>
- García Mingo, E., & Díaz Fernández, S. (2023). Wounded men of feminism: Exploring regimes of male victimhood in the Spanish manosphere. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 26(6), 897–915. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13675494221140586>
- Ging, D. (2019). Alphas, betas, and incels: Theorizing the masculinities of the manosphere. *Men and Masculinities*, 22(4), 638–657. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X17706401>
- Jane, E. A. (2016). *Misogyny online: A short (and brutish) history*. SAGE.
- Jha, A., & Mamidi, R. (2017). When does a compliment become sexist? Analysis and classification of ambivalent sexism using Twitter data. In *Proceedings of the*

- Second Workshop on NLP and Computational Social Science* (pp. 7–16). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W17-2902>
- Malik, H. A. (2026). Analyzing language in high-profile judicial verdicts of Pakistan: A corpus-forensic perspective. *Social Sciences Spectrum*, 5(1), 224–250. <https://doi.org/10.71085/sss.05.01.480>
- Seidler, Z. E., Dawes, A. J., Rice, S. M., Oliffe, J. L., & Dhillon, H. M. (2016). The role of masculinity in men's help-seeking for depression: A systematic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 49, 106–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2016.09.002>
- Tufekci, Z. (2014). Big questions for social media big data: Representativeness, validity and other methodological pitfalls. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 8(1), 505–514. <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v8i1.14517>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. SAGE.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and knowledge: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Venäläinen, S. (2020). Reversing positions: Constructions of masculine victimhood in online discussions about intimate partner violence committed by women. *Men and Masculinities*, 23(3–4), 772–787. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X18824374>