



Representation of Hegemonic Masculinity in Pakistani TV

Dramas

Qurat-ul-Ain Malik¹

Abstract

The study aims to analyze whether the most popular TV dramas aired in Pakistan reinforce the notions of hegemonic masculine attitudes and mindset. These masculine attitudes which perpetuate the notion of male superiority have been found to be the cause of many social problems. Using the theoretical framework of Hegemonic Masculinity developed by Connell as the foundation, the study thus aims to investigate the extent to which such notions are presented in dramas. The research is also aimed at exploring whether there has been a change in the depiction of masculinity over the years as well as judging the influence of the various demographic variables like age, class, education, marital status and place of residence on the representation of masculinity. Using quantitative methodology, the research analyzes 39 central male characters from 24 of the most popular television dramas aired in Pakistan in the five decades between 1968 till 2017. Findings show that although hegemonic masculine depictions are not the norm, some hegemonic traits such as authority and technical competence have been found to be more common as compared to other traits such as aggressiveness and subordination of women. Age, class, education, marital status and place of residence have been found to be significant influencers on the portrayal of hegemonic masculinity. Finally, contrary to expectation the depiction of masculinity did not follow a linear path, which indicates the need for further study of outside factors such as politics or economy in the form of market liberalization or government intervention.

Keyword: *Hegemonic Masculinity, Representation, Television Drama, Pakistan*

Introduction

Hegemonic masculinity is considered to be an “idealized, culturally ascendant masculinity” (Aullette, Wittner & Blakely,

¹ Assistant Professor at the Department of Media and Communication Studies, International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan

2009: 6), an idea of being male that not only suggests the superiority of the male gender but also puts it up on a pedestal as something to aspire to. Although the discourses on masculinity are generated across many sites such as the home, family, laws, state etc but they become more prominent when they are transmitted and circulated through the media (Gürkan & Serttaş, 2017). Media portrayals privilege certain viewpoints and opinions over others and lead to the propagation of the idea that the television reality is the actual social reality. Although gender roles not only in western society but most of the world have undergone a drastic change from the earlier times where only the men were the heads of the households and women were mainly housewives yet the media is still at times perpetuating the earlier stereotypes (Ashcraft & Flores, 2012; Torre, 1990)

Considerable research (Ali & Batool, 2015; Fogel, 2012; Gürkan & Serttaş, 2017; Giaccardi et al., 2016, 2017; Opliger, 2006; Srivastava & Roy, 2011; Torre, 1990) has pointed out the links between media portrayals and notions of patriarchy such as masculinity. These media portrayals have been found to reinforce the notions of conventional/ traditional masculine and feminine roles (Signorielli, 2009). These conservative gender views in turn have been found to be strongly associated with various negative results such as violence, harassment, prejudice and discrimination against women (Levant & Richmond, 2017).

This suggests that media portrayals of masculinity need to be assessed to determine what kinds of messages about gender norms are being perpetuated. The present study aims to analyze the extent to which the notion of Masculinity was propagated in

the data set of the most popular television drama serials aired in Pakistan.

Background: Television in Pakistan

Although Pakistani society is changing yet the process of change is very slow. This is mainly due to the prevalence of age old systems of patriarchy as well as lack of education and resources. All these factors have combined together to forge a society which is deeply conservative, collectivist and patriarchal (Hadi, 2017). In such a society the medium of television has always had a great potential to bring a positive change in the collective mindset of the masses.

Television arrived in Pakistan in 1964 through state run Pakistan Television (PTV). Initially the programming was telecast live and there were no records but from 1968 onwards recording facility arrived and records of the content made thereafter are available. From the very beginning, prime time television content has been divided into two main categories, news and entertainment programming. In the latter category Urdu dramas serials and series have remained the most popular genre (Chaudhry, 2016; Jiwani, 2013).

Television remained under state control through most of Pakistan's history, except for a short period during the early nineties. However, in 2002 the government gave licenses to satellite channels to start operations in Pakistan but all these licenses were for Satellite networks and the State owned PTV still dominates the scene with high viewership and terrestrial outreach (Gul, Obaid & Ali, 2017; Marwan, Jan, & Khan, 2017).

Literature Review

Time and again it has been pointed out that the masculinity is not a biological phenomenon, and has infact been constructed by the society as its own interpretation of the male body (Connell, 1996; Connell, 2000; Stets and Burke, 2000). Males present in any particular culture and society than enact this masculinity (Srivastava & Roy, 2011). This suggests that society, culture and cultural institutions produce and reproduce masculinity which otherwise is not an innate bodily trait (Connell, 1996; Connell, 2000). Further, this notion of gender did not exist prior to the emergence of societies (Connell, 1996; Srivastava & Roy, 2011). Connell (2000) also went on to state that Masculinity is actually a social position as well as a set of practices that are enacted not just by individuals but also by institutional structures as well as global relations of dominance. Although the dominant image of male gender is that of Hegemonic Masculinity (Connell, 1993) but it is a normative image which means that although these traits express the desires and aspirations of real men, very few men actually correspond to it (Carrigan, Connell & Lee, 1985; Connell, 1987; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Hadi, 2017). Finally, though there has been some critique (Moller, 2007) leveled at the notion of hegemonic masculinity, it has withstood the test of time.

The notion of hegemonic masculinity or male superiority is used as a justification for the unfair division of resources between the genders and allows the males to become the decision makers of the females in their surroundings (Srivastava & Roy, 2011). Connell (1995) calls this the patriarchal dividend and goes on to say that the dividend that is gained is in the form of honor,

prestige and authority to make decisions. It has also been observed that all men do not benefit from these power structures yet they all have an interest in maintaining and defending them. Factor such as race, sexuality, ethnicity, class and status play a significant role in determining who gets more of the dividend and any male who does is not a elite is generally as disadvantaged as any female (Connell, 1997). Research has pointed out that the media representation of hegemonic masculinity tends to favour the white males in comparison to the colored males (Luyt, 2012). It has been found that though masculinity appears to be a prized notion yet it places considerable demands on the individuals which result in social, psychological, economic as well as physical pressures on the males (Adil, Shahed & Arshad, 2017; Aurat Foundation, 2016; Greig, Kimmel & Lang, 2000).

The masculine hegemony is practiced sometimes overtly and sometimes so subtly that no fixed practices and positions will be identifiable as markers (Ashcraft & Flores, 2012; Hadi, 2017). It has also been observed that this identity comprises of different characteristics which are sometimes even contradictory (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; International Center for Research on Women, 2012). Connell (1993) has identified four characteristics as the main markers of masculinity which are authority, aggression, advanced capability of dealing with technology, and the subordination of women. In a recent research by Aurat Foundation (2016) about masculinity in Pakistan, almost the same markers were observed which included aggression, strength, control, dominance and courage. The first trait of being authoritative is denoted by being

independent, active and hardworking (Bhasin, 2006; Courtenay, 2000; Greig, Kimmel & Lang, 2000).

The second trait of being aggressive is denoted by strength, competitiveness, toughness (Courtenay, 2000; Greig, Kimmel & Lang, 2000). Aggressiveness has been found to be closely associated with violence which is represented often through the possession and use of firearms, which are also equated with power. Moura (2005) calls this kind of masculinity “militarized masculinity”. However, Connell (1995) suggests that war and violence are not portrayed positively in all masculine cultures as some cultures can regard it very highly while others consider it to be contemptible. In this sense, it is usually the anti-hero who displays more aggressive behavior and traits (Bustamante, 2019). Aggression and violence have been found to be linked with power as it has been observed that males resort to violence when their authority is challenged (Messerschmidt, 2000; Moore, 1994). Considerable research has pointed out that it is more often men than women who are shown to be perpetuating aggression of all types (Signorielli, 2003; Sink & Mastro, 2017). Further males are not only shown to be perpetuating violence but are also often shown to be bearing violence in the form of torture or physical harm (Brown, 2002).

The third characteristic is that of technical competence because research (Lie, 1995; Wajcman, 1991) has indicated the strong links between masculinity and technology. Lie (1995) suggested that men prove their gender identity by displaying the knowledge and use of technology. Further, the familiarity with technology is a quality which all men are shown to possess

irrespective of individual differences. Also, the kinds of technology with which men are shown to interact used to be primitive but with the passage of time they have also evolved.

The last characteristic of hegemonic masculinity is subordination of women, which is the economic, political and social control of men over women and giving more importance to the talents and roles of males while at the same time belittling the talents and roles of females (Donaldson, 1993). Also the hegemony of males has been institutionalized by their domination of women and promotion of biased and patriarchal notions which reinforce male control over women's bodies and their minds (Ali & Batool, 2015; Aurat Foundation, 2016; Torre, 1990). A significant feature of sub-ordination of women is the aggressive and violent attitudes of males towards females because of their insecurity about the masculine identity (Heise, 1997; Moore, 1994). Masculinity is also strongly linked with sexuality whereby only the normative heterosexual identity is the acceptable norm (Tabasum & Khan, 2015).

The construction of masculinity has not been the same throughout history. Different cultures, and different periods of history, construct masculinity differently (Aurat Foundation, 2016; Connell, 1995; Connell, 1996; Connell, 2000; de Neve, 2004; Hadi, 2017; Hu, 2018; Kimmel, 2005; O'Hanlon, 1997). Differences in the conception of masculinity have been observed with the advent of the new industrial-capitalistic economies (Connell, 1996). Researches (Ayça, 1987; Hu, 2018) about male lead protagonists in have observed that that there has been a change in the depiction of the masculine personality from the traditional to

the modern. This shift was denoted by a more well-groomed appearance as well as a more emotional personality. Similarly, Akca & Ergül (2014) found that the persona of the hegemonic male is now shown to be a neo-liberal entrepreneur in line with the western notions of power where now money rather than strength is equated with power but this masculine character still retains some elements of the traditional male. However, Jordan (2002) pointed out another phenomenon whereby the male leads in popular films are now more often presented with hyper-masculine traits to counter the de-masculinization due to globalization and capitalism.

Another factor which influences the depiction of masculinity are the changes in the fears and apprehensions of the masses which lead to different issues being brought to the forefront in media depictions. Thus, the representation of masculinity was found to have transformed from the confident and authoritative doctor figure of the post WWII era in the United States to the virile Cow Boy in the early cold war era (White, Oliffe and Bottorff 2012).

Masculinities differ not just with time but also place; thus, when analyzing masculinity, it is important that local social context should also be taken into consideration. Citing the example of India, O'Hanlon (1997) pointed out prior to its colonization, there existed, martial or "war-like" masculinity" which was used by the colonizers to achieve their own objectives. However, the other notion is that the British colonizers created an image whereby the British masculinity represented by rationality, progress, action was shown to be superior to the Indian

masculinity, the later being denoted by superstition, irrationality, weakness, passiveness and lack of self-control (Srivastava & Roy, 2011). Even within the subcontinent there were differences between Hindu and Muslim masculinity, the later being more sexual and violence prone than the former (Gupta, 2001). Research (Aurat Foundation, 2016; Brandth & Haugen, 2005) has also indicated differences in the rural and urban setups regarding the perception of masculinity. It has been found that in rural settings, the men did not need to prove their masculine identity but changes in the socio-cultural environment of the country and movements towards urban locations, allowed more and more women greater independence who are thus challenging the traditional social norms and masculinities. This has led to a “crises of masculinity” or “demasculization” whereby the males have to resort to violence against women to reclaim their masculinity (Aurat Foundation, 2016). Research (Hadi, 2017; Swatay, 2012) regarding the concept of masculinity in Pakistan showed that for Pakistani males masculinity connotes power, virility, strength, violence, financial competence, control over the women in the house, not doing any house hold chores and most importantly not being soft or effeminate in manner, attire or speech.

The concept of masculinity though being very useful in pointing out the differences relating to age, race, sexuality, ethnicity, caste and class in the hegemonic and subordinated or marginalized masculinity only emphasizes the polarity of these concepts whereby one is the total opposite of other (Chopra, Osella & Osella, 2004). Ashcraft & Flores (2012) suggest that masculinity is enacted in the public sphere represented by the

work-place more often than in the private sphere which is generally associated with intimacy, emotion, sexuality etc. Strong links have been observed between masculinity and occupation (Bhasin, 2006; Hasan, Aggleton & Persson, 2017; Hadi, 2017; Signorielli, 2009), whereby some occupations and occupational positions are considered to be more masculine. For example, blue collar labor intensive work is shown to be more masculine as compared to white collar work. On the other hand, senior management is also shown to possess a degree of masculinity because of its power and dominance (Ashcraft & Flores, 2012).

Based on available literature on masculinity as well as a local contextualization of the phenomenon, the following research questions were proposed;

RQ 1. Whether the most popular TV dramas aired in Pakistan have reinforced the notions of Hegemonic Masculinity and which aspects of Hegemonic masculinity were shown to be more prevalent?

RQ 2. Whether there has been any evolution in the depiction of masculinity over the five decades between 1968 and 2017?

RQ 3. Whether the depiction of hegemonic masculinity differs with demographic variables such as age, education, marital status, class and place of residence?

Methodology

The population of the study was all the Prime Time television dramas of local origin aired from 1968-2017 on the state owned channel Pakistan Television (PTV) which was the only TV station operating throughout the period and has a reach of 99% of the audience (PEMRA, 2010; Hashmi, 2012). Foreign dramas, drama

series, sit-coms, soap operas and programs aired before or after the prime time (7:00 pm- 10:00 pm) were omitted from the population.

In order to conduct an in-depth study of the five decades, the sample was shortened and the most popular drama for every second year was selected. This list was prepared with the help of information provided by the marketing department of PTV which keeps a record of the revenue generated for each play. The year 1971 was excluded as many national level conflicts including a war with neighboring India and the breakup of the country greatly affected the production of new dramas. Thus in all, 24 dramas were selected for analysis.

Before commencing the actual study a pilot test was conducted of five episodes of the drama serial which was not a part of the final sample. Two coders were selected to check for inter-coder reliability as well as testing of the coding frame. Each coder was a post- graduate student who had completed their coursework. The coders were trained in five sittings to learn protocol for analyzing the drama, practice coding, familiarizing them with the codebook. Coders made their judgments based on the character's visual appearance, behavior, mannerisms, and dialogues. Coding took place over a 20-week period. To assess agreement amongst the coders, inter-coder reliability was measured via Krippendorff's alpha which had a value of 0.793.

To measure evolution of the depiction of hegemonic masculinity, data was divided into five decades. Incidentally, these five decades also correspond to the socio-political changes which were taking place in the country during those times. These

five decades are 1968-1977, 1978-1987, 1988-1997, 1998-2007, 2008-2017.

Hegemonic Masculinity was measured via the characteristics identified by Connell (1993). The indicators for hegemonic masculinity were taken to be technical competence, authority, aggressiveness and sub-ordination of women. Each of the indicators was coded as 1 if present and 0 if not present or not applicable. These were operationalized in the following manner;

Authoritative: When the character was shown to be displaying self confidence and in a commanding position in relation to other characters who are shown respect and obey him.

Aggressive: When the character is shown to behave in a forceful and determined manner as showing the inclination to confront or attack some other character.

Technological Competence: When the character is shown to be relating to or using any kind of technology, from the more primitive such farm equipment to the more recent such as factory machinery or even computers.

Subordination of Women: When the characters were shown to regard or treat the females in their lives (wives, love interests) to be insignificant or having lesser importance.

Findings

The research was conducted after an analysis of 39 main male protagonists in 24 of the most popular plays aired in Pakistan from 1968 to 2017. The unit of analysis was the behavior and actions of any of the 39 characters in each scene and in all, 2581 scenes featuring these 39 characters were coded.

RQ1: Whether the most popular TV dramas aired in Pakistan have reinforced the notions of Hegemonic Masculinity and which aspects of Hegemonic masculinity were shown to be more prevalent?

The breakdown of each indicator of the study (See Table 1) revealed that the most common indicator of hegemonic masculinity was authority which was present in 68.1% of the scenes, technical competence was present in 24.4% of the scenes, aggressiveness was present in 16% of the scenes and subordination of not women was found in only 11.4% of the scenes.

Table 1: *Indicators of Hegemonic Masculinity in Drama Serials in Pakistan*

	percentage
Authority	68.1 %
Technical Competence	24.4%
Aggressive	16 %
Subordination of women	11.4 %

Computation

The four indicators each with a value of 1 when present, were computed together to form the variable hegemonic masculinity thereby giving 0 as the minimum value and 4 as the maximum value. The mean value of the computed variable Hegemonic Masculinity was 1.1991 with a standard deviation of 0.86929 (See Table 2). These findings reveal that hegemonic masculinity is not the norm in media portrayal of males.

Table 2: *Descriptive Statistics of computed variable Hegemonic Masculinity*

	N	Mean	SD
Hegemonic Masculinity	2581	1.1991	.86929

RQ 2: Whether there has been any evolution in the depiction of masculinity over the five decades between 1968 and 2017?

Findings of the study ($F(4, 2576) = 13.914, p = 0.00$) revealed that there were significant differences in the depiction of masculinity over the years (See Table 3).

Table 3: ANOVA test- Evolution of masculinity over the years in Drama Serials in Pakistan

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	41.232	4	10.308	13.914	.000
Within Groups	1908.406	2576	.741		
Total	1949.638	2580			

Detailed analysis (See Table 4) of the depiction of masculinity revealed significant differences such that the portrayal inclined towards the most hegemonic portrayal during the second decade ($M = 1.326, SD = 0.883$) followed by more recent times. Interestingly the least hegemonic portrayal was found to be in the earliest decade ($M = .971, SD = 0.962$) followed by the third decade ($M = 1.00, SD = .834$). This shows that the trend of masculine depiction is non-linear and the depiction has actually regressed rather than progressed with the changing times.

Table 4: Detailed analysis of evolution of masculinity in Drama Serials in Pakistan

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
First decade (1968-1977)	277	.9711	.96265
Second decade (1978-1987)	687	1.3261	.88308
Third decade (1988-1997)	354	1.0000	.83480
Fourth decade (1998-2007)	428	1.2407	.85509
Fifth decade (2008-2017)	835	1.2335	.81903

RQ 3: Whether the depiction of hegemonic masculinity differs with demographic variables such as age, education, marital status, class and place of residence?

Several tests were run to explore whether the depiction of masculinity differs with demographic variables. An independent sample T-test was run to find out whether the depiction of hegemonic masculinity differed with education (See Table 5). Findings ($t(1761.422) = 3.586, p=.000$) of the study revealed that there were significant differences between educated (Mean=1.247 Std=0.82303) and uneducated (Mean=1.1156, Std=0.93890) males whereby the former was shown to display more hegemonic behaviors.

Another t-test was conducted to find out the influence of place of residence on the depiction of masculinity (Table 5). It was found ($t(1834.465) = -2.879, p=.004$) there were significant differences between urban (Mean=1.1626, Std=0.863) and rural (Mean=1.266, Std=0.875) males regarding the depiction of hegemonic masculine behaviors with greater instances of rural males showing hegemonic masculine behaviors.

Table 5: *Influence of education and place of residence on the depiction of masculinity in Drama Serials in Pakistan*

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	T	Df	Sig
Educated	1638	1.2473	.82303	3.586	1761.422	.000
Not educated	943	1.1156	.93890			
Urban	1673	1.1626	.86318	-	1834.465	.004
Rural	906	1.2660	.87500	2.879		

With reference to age, application of the ANOVA test revealed ($F (.720, 31.522) = 43.789, p=.000$) the presence of significant differences (Table 6). It was found that all the age groups namely children ($M=.2500, SD=.59869$), Young males ($M=1.1859, SD=.81827$) mature males ($M=1.3765, SD=.96770$) and elderly males ($M=1.3757, SD=.96417$) differed significantly whereby the tendency to display hegemonic behavior was growing with age (Table 7).

With reference to class differences (Table 6) it was found ($F (.748, 10.938) = 14.627, p=.000$) that socio-economic class did influence the depiction of hegemonic masculine behaviors. Further, the depiction of masculinity by elite ($M=1.2969, SD=.83727$) and middle class males ($M=1.2184, SD=.86824$) was similar but the masculinity of the working class male ($M=1.0717, SD=.88988$) was quite different from both of them and displayed fewer tendencies of hegemonic masculinity (Table 7).

With reference to marital status (Table 6) it was found ($F (.749, 9.412) = 12.566, p=.000$) there were significant differences between single ($M=1.1667, SD=.81836$), married ($M=1.1817, SD=.91876$) divorced/separated/widowed males ($M=1.4681, SD=.94848$). The most hegemonic masculine behavior was shown by divorced/separated/widowed males, followed by married males. The least hegemonic masculine behavior was shown by the unmarried males (Table 7).

Table 6: ANOVA test, Influence of age, class and marital status on the depiction of masculinity in Drama Serials in Pakistan

		Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age Difference	Between Groups	94.565	3	31.522	43.789	.000
	Within Groups	1855.073	2577	.720		
	Total	1949.638	2580			
Class Difference	Between Groups	21.876	2	10.938	14.627	.000
	Within Groups	1927.762	2578	.748		
	Total	1949.638	2580			
Difference in Marital Status	Between Groups	18.823	2	9.412	12.566	.000
	Within Groups	1930.815	2578	.749		
	Total	1949.638	2580			

Table 7: Detailed analysis of the Influence of age, class and marital status on the depiction of masculinity in Drama Serials in Pakistan

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age			
children and teenagers	84	.2500	.59869
Young (19-34)	1904	1.1859	.81827
Mature (35-49)	255	1.3765	.96770
Elderly (Over 50)	338	1.3757	.96417
Class			
Elite	879	1.2969	.83727
middle class	893	1.2184	.86824
Working Class	809	1.0717	.88988
Marital Status			
Single	1482	1.1667	.81836
Married	864	1.1817	.91876
Widowed	235	1.4681	.94848

Thus, it was found that demographic factors like age, education, marital status, class and place of residence were influencing the presence or absence of hegemonic or non-hegemonic behaviors.

Discussion

The aim of the research was to analyze the portrayal of masculinity in dramas aired in Pakistan over a period of five decades. Findings of the study revealed an overall satisfactory picture, when viewed in totality; there weren't many instances of hegemonic masculinity in TV drama serials airing in Pakistan. However, some traits were found to be more common such as that of possessing or displaying authority a finding in keeping with previous literature (Bhasin, 2006; Courtenay, 2000; Greig, Kimmel & Lang, 2000). The second most common trait was technical competence.

Surprisingly however, aggressiveness was not as visible as expected with only 16% of the scenes showing such behaviors. Another surprising finding pertained to the sub-ordination of women, which was judged by the presence of a dominating or conflicting behavior with their partners which was found in only 11.4% of the scenes. This finding was in total contrast to significant previous literature which talks about dominance (Ali & Batool, 2015; Aurat Foundation, 2016; Torre, 1990) or conflict (Heise, 1997; Moore, 1994). Overall, it appeared that traits which can be termed as positive are more visible as compared to the negative traits such as aggressiveness and subordination of women.

The second research question was aimed at finding out whether there has been a difference in the depiction of masculinity over the years since the inception of television drama in the country. Findings suggest that there were significant differences in how masculinity was displayed over the decades, a finding which is keeping with significant previous literature (Aurat Foundation, 2016; Connell, 1995; Connell, 1996; Connell, 2000; de Neve, 2004; Hadi, 2017; Hu, 2018; Kimmel, 2005; O'Hanlon, 1997). The significant difference about masculinity depictions which was observed was that the common trend of the shift from the traditional to the modern (Ayça, 1987; Akca & Ergül, 2014) was not followed. On the contrary the depiction followed a more nonlinear route whereby the second and fourth decades showed a more hegemonic portrayal as compared to the first and third decade. Although, the main causes for these changes in representation need to be explored further but some facts of common knowledge can provide a plausible answer. The second decade in the sample corresponded to the emergence of an extremely right wing government under the leadership of General Zia-ul-Haq who ruled the country from 1978-1988 and took several initiatives to take the country towards Islamization especially by monitoring and influencing media content (Talbot, 1998). The fourth decade in the sample corresponds to the martial law regime of another General Pervez Musharraf (1999-2008), however his government allowed a great deal of media liberalization primarily by allowing private broadcasters to start operations in Pakistan (Gul, Obaid & Ali, 2017). The emergence of competition greatly influenced local media content and there was

a run for ratings. The drastic changes in the depiction could have been the result of this war for ratings with the private media houses. Interestingly, the decades with the least hegemonic portrayal were during the rule of center or left wing democratic regimes. This phenomenon points to the strong influence of government and ruling ideologies on media content. Further, in more recent times commercialization has also emerged as a strong factor in influencing gender depiction.

The last research question was whether the depiction of masculinity differs with demographic factors like age education, marital status, class and place of residence. Findings revealed that all analyzed demographic factors influence the presence or absence of depiction of hegemonic masculinity. Literature (Ashcraft & Flores, 2012; Bhasin, 2006; Hadi, 2017; Signorielli, 2009) had indicated that occupation plays a significant influence on the enactment of masculinity, however, the present research instead focused on the class and place of residence as an indication of occupation rather than occupation itself. This was done as the occupations of the majority of the characters under observation could not be classified in the blue collar- white collar dichotomy. However, the grouping into elite, middle class and working class gave a clearer picture of how money and social status influence the enactment of masculinity. Contrary to expectation, the behavior of the elite and middle class was found to be more hegemonic in comparison to the working class males, a phenomenon which supports the “crisis of masculinity” notions; i.e men display greater hegemonic behaviors when their masculinity is challenged. With reference to education it was

found that the education significantly influenced the display of masculinity whereby surprisingly there were more instances of educated males displaying such behaviors. Regarding age and marital status, it was found that the powerful patriarch's some of whom were also widowers showed the most traditional behaviors while the unmarried young males were found to be more liberal with regard to their behavior. This in some ways corresponds to the findings of previous studies (Ayça, 1987; Akca & Ergül, 2014) which indicated a shift in the depiction of masculinity from the traditional to the modern. Regarding the place of residence, the present findings supported the previous literature (Aurat Foundation, 2016) that the rural males were showing more hegemonic masculine behaviors as compared to urban males.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be said that the conception of masculinity in a developing country like Pakistan with a traditional conservative society reveals some interesting facts. Age, education, marital status, class and place of residence were found to be significant indicators of masculinity proving Connell's (1995; 1996; 2000) notions that the construction of masculinity varies with time, culture and space.

Secondly, the general trend observed was that the more negative traits of masculinity such as aggression and subordination of women were not as visible in TV dramas as compared to more positive traits such as authority and technical competence which is a hopeful sign. Also, the depiction of masculinity did not follow a linear path from the more conservative hegemonic depiction to a more liberal depiction.

Findings have suggested that the ideology propagated by the rulers has a strong influence on the state owned media content. Further, the advent of commercialism in a previously state monopolized terrain led to a deterioration of masculinity depiction. New regulation allowed for the proliferation of media outlets but the quality of media content was actually found to be on the decline. This suggests that need to study the relationship of hegemonic masculinity and commercialism in future research.

References

- Adil, F., Shahed, S. and Arshad, H. (2017). The Burden of Being a Man in a Patriarchal Society. *Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 7(4), 1-15.
- Akca, E. B. & Ergül, S. (2014). The Representation of Masculinity in Television Series: Hegemonic Manhood and Struggle of Different Masculinities in the North South Array. *Global Media Journal TR Edition*, 4 (8), 13-39.
- Ali, R. & Batool, S. (2015). Stereotypical Identities: Discourse Analysis of Media Images of Women in Pakistan. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Gender Studies*, 4(1), 690-717. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17583/generos.2015.1502>
- Ashcraft, K.L. & Flores, L.A. (2012). Slaves with White collars: persistent performance of Masculinity in Crises. In Mary Celeste Kearney (Ed.) *The Gender and Media Reader*, New York: Routledge
- Aullette, J. W., Wittner, J. & Blakely, K. (2009). *Gendered Worlds*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Aurat Foundation (2016). *Masculinity in Pakistan: A Formative Research Study*

Journal of Media Studies 36(1)

- Ayça, E. (1987). Where is Turkish Cinema going? *The Cinema* (4).
- Bhasin, K. (2000). *Understanding Gender*. Delhi: Women Unlimited.
- Brandth, B. & Haugen, M.S. (2005). Doing Rural Masculinity – From Logging to Outfield Tourism. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 14(1), 13-22.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0958923042000331452>
- Brown, J.A. (2002). The Tortures of Mel Gibson Masochism and the Sexy Male Body. *Men and Masculinities*, 5(2), 123-143.
- Bustamante, L. A. (2019). Disabled Masculinity as a Metaphor of National Conflict in the Cold War Era: Orson Welles' *The Lady from Shanghai* (1947). *Revista de Estudios Norteamericanos*, 23, 1-22.
<https://doi.org/10.12795/REN.2019.i23.01>
- Carrigan, T., Connell, R. & Lee, J. (1985). Towards a new Sociology of Masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 14(5), 551-604.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00160017>
- Chopra, R., Osella, C. & Osella, F. (Ed.) *South Asian Masculinities: Context of Change, Sites of Continuity*. Delhi: Women Unlimited.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, R.W. (1996). The Politics of Changing Men. *Australian Humanities Review*, 6, 53-73.

- Connell, R. W. (1997). Gender politics for Men. *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 17(1/2), 62-78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb013292>
- Connell, R. W. (2000). *The Men and the Boys*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society*, 19, 829-859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Cornwall, A. & Lindisfarne, N. (1994). *Dislocating Masculinity: Gender, Power, and Anthropology*. In Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne (Ed.) *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*. London and New York: Routledge
- Courtenay, W.H. (2000). Constructions of Masculinity and their Influence on Men's Well-being: A theory of Gender and Health. *Journal of Social Science and Medicine*, 50, 1385-1401. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(99\)00390-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00390-1).
- deNeve, G. (2004). The workplace and the neighbourhood: locating masculinities in the south Indian textile industry. In R. Copra, C. Osella and F. Osella, (Ed.) *South Asian Masculinities: Context of Change, Sites of Continuity*. Delhi: Women Unlimited.
- Donaldson, M. (1993). What is Hegemonic Masculinity? *Theory and Society*, 22(5), 643-657. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00993540>
- Fogel, J.M., (2012). A Modern Family: The performance of "Family" and Familialism in contemporary television

series (Doctoral dissertation), The University of Michigan, Michigan.

Giaccardi, S., Ward, L. M., Seabrook, R. C., Manago, A., & Lippman, J. (2016). Media and modern manhood: Testing associations between media consumption and young men's acceptance of traditional gender ideologies. *Sex Roles*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0588-z>

Giaccardi, S., Ward, L.M., Seabrook, R.C., Manago, A., & Lippman, J. (2017). Media use and men's Accepted Manuscript 33 risk behaviors: Examining the role of masculine ideology. *Sex Roles*, 1-13. DOI 10.1007/s11199-017-0754-y

Greig, A., Kimmel, M. & Lang, J. (2000). Men, Masculinities & Development: Broadening our work towards gender equality. Gender in Development Monograph Series #10

Gul, M., Obaid, Z. & Ali, S. (2017). Liberalization of Media in Pakistan: A Challenge to Democracy. *The journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 25 (2), 37-54.

Gupta, C. (2001) *Sexuality, Obscenity and Community*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gürkan, H. & Serttaş, A. (2017). The Representation of Masculinity in Cinema and on Television: An Analysis of Fictional Male Characters. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(1), 402-408. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26417/ejms.v5i1.p402-408>

Hadi, A. (2017). Patriarchy and Gender-Based Violence in Pakistan. *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, 4(4), 297 -304.

- Hasan, M.H., Aggleton, P. & Persson, A. (2017). The makings of a man: social generational masculinities in Bangladesh. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27(3), 347-361. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2017.1388773>
- Hashmi, M. (2012) At the limits of Discourse: Political Talk in Drag on Late Night Show with Begum Nawazish Ali. *South Asian History and Culture*, 3(4), 511-531. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19472498.2012.720065>
- Heise, L.L. (1997). Violence, Sexuality and Women's Lives. In R.N. Lancaster and M. di Leonardo (Ed.), *The Gender Sexuality Reader: Culture, History, Political Economy*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Hu, L. (2018). Is masculinity 'deteriorating' in China? Changes of masculinity representation in Chinese film posters from 1951 to 2016. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27(3), 335-346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2017.1399867>
- International Center for Research on Women (2012). Men, Masculinity and Domestic Violence in India.
- Jordan, M. (2012). Marxism, Not Manhood; Accommodation and Impasse in Seamus Heaney's Beowulf and Chuck Palahniuk's Fight Club. *Men and Masculinities*, 4(4), 368-379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X02004004006>
- Khan, A. (2015). Ideological Contestation(s): The "Televised" Cultural Politics of Gendered Identity. *The journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 23(2). 83-96.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2005). *The Gender and Desire Essays on Male Sexuality*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Journal of Media Studies 36(1)

- Levant, R. F., & Richmond, K. (2007). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the male role norms inventory. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 15(2), 130-146. <https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.1502.130>
- Lie, M. (1995). Technology and Masculinity: The Case of the Computer. *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, 2, 379-394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135050689500200306>
- Luyt, R. (2012). Representation of masculinities and race in South African television advertising: a content analysis. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 21(1), 35-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2012.639176>
- Marwan, A. H., Jan, F. & Khan, A.U. (2017). Dominance of US Officials in the Pakistani TV Channels: A Case Study of the Media Coverage of Osama Bin Laden's Death. *The Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 25 (1), 1-12.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (2000). *Nine Lives: Adolescent Masculinities, the Body, and Violence*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press
- Moller, M. (2007). Exploiting Patterns: A Critique of Hegemonic Masculinity. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 16(3), 263-276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589230701562970>
- Moore, H. (1994). The problem of explaining violence in the social sciences. In Penelope Harvey and Peter Gow (Ed.) *Sex and Violence: Issues in Representation and Experience*. London: Routledge.
- Moura, T. (2005). Between micro-war and macro-peace: Masculinities and femininities in gang warfare in Rio de Janeiro, Presented at the Hegemonic Masculinities in

International Politics Conference, Manchester University
Centre for International Politics.

- O'Hanlon, R. (1997). Issues of Masculinity in North India History. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 4, 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/097152159700400101>
- Oppliger, P.A. (2007). Effects of gender stereotyping on socialization. In R.W. Preiss, B.M. Gayle, N. Burrell, M. Allen, & J. Bryant (Ed.), *Mass Media Effects Research: Advances through Meta-Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- PEMRA Pakistan Electronic Media Regulatory Authority, 2010 Annual Report
- Signorielli, N. (2003). Prime-time violence 1993-2001: Has the picture really changed? *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 47(1), 36-57.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4701_3
- Signorielli, N. (2009). Race and sex in primetime: A look at occupations and occupational prestige. *Mass Communication and Society*, 12, 332-352.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15205430802478693>
- Sink, A., & Mastro, D. (2017). Depictions of gender on primetime television: A quantitative content analysis. *Mass Communication & Society*, 20(1), 3-22.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2016.1212243>
- Srivastava, S. & Roy, R. (2011). *Understanding Masculinities: Culture, Politics and Social Change*. South Asian Network to Address Masculinities.

Journal of Media Studies 36(1)

- Stets, J.E. & Burke, P.J. (2000). Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 224-237. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2695870>
- Swatay, Z.A. (2012). Analysis of the Pressures of Masculinity: The Case of Pakhtun Men/Boys in District Swat.
- Tabasum, I.A. & Khan, M.K. (2015). Search for Conjugal Bliss in Cat on a Hot Tin Roof. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 23(3), 73-82.
- Talbot, I. (1998). Pakistan, A Modern History, New York, USA: St. Martins Press.
- Torre, E. (1990). Drama as a Consciousness-Raising Strategy for the Self-Empowerment of Working Women. *Affilia*, 5(1), 49-65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088610999000500104>
- Wajcman, J. (1991). *Feminism Confronts Technology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- White, C., Oliffe, J.L. & Bottorff, J.L. (2012). From the Physician to the Marlboro Man: Masculinity, Health, and Cigarette Advertising in America, 1946–1964. *Men and Masculinities*, 15(5), 526-547. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X12461917>