The concept of ‘Hegemony’ deriving from Antonio Gramsci’s analysis of class relations, refers to the cultural dynamic by which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life. At any given time, one form of masculinity rather than others is culturally exalted. Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women (Connell, 1995:77)\(^1\)

This is not to say that the most visible bearers of hegemonic masculinity are always the most powerful people. They may be exemplars such as film actors, fantasy figures etc. Individual holders of institutional power or great wealth may be far from the hegemonic pattern in their personal lives.

Nevertheless, hegemony is likely to be established only if there is some correspondence between cultural ideal and institutional power, collective if not individual. So the top levels of business, the military and Government provide a fairly convincing corporate display of masculinity, still very little shaken by feminist women or dissenting men. It is the successful claim to authority more than direct violence that is the mark of hegemony (though violence often underpins or supports authority).

Often hegemonic masculinity embodies a ‘currently accepted’ basis for the dominance of a particular masculinity is eroded. When conditions for the defence of patriarchy change, the bases for the dominance of a particular masculinity are eroded. New groups may challenge by women. Hegemony then is a historically mobile relation.

Hegemony relates to cultural dominance in the society as a whole. Within that overall framework there are specific gender relations of dominance and subordination between groups of men. Gay masculinity is the most conspicuous but it is not the only subordinated masculinity. They are subordinated not only politically and culturally but also through legal violence (such as imprisonment under sodomy statuses), street violence (ranging from intimidation to murder) economic discrimination and personal boycotts.

Some heterosexual men and boys too are expelled from the circle of legitimacy. The process is marked by a rich vocabulary of abuse: wimp, milksop, nerd, sissy, jellyfish, ladyfinger, mother fucker, sister fucker etc. here too the symbolic blurring with femininity is obvious.

Normative definitions of masculinity face the problem that not many men actually meet the normative standards. This point applies to hegemonic masculinity. The number of men rigorously practicing the hegemonic pattern in its entirety may be quite small. Yet, the majority of men gain from its hegemony since they benefit from the patriarchal dividend the advantage men in general gain from the overall subordination of women.
Marriage, Fatherhood and community life often involves extensive compromises with women rather than naked domination or an uncontested display of authority. A great many men who draw the patriarchal dividend also respect their wives and mothers are never violent towards women, do their accustomed share of the house work, bring home the family wage and can easily convince themselves that feminists must be loud, vociferous and bra-burning extremists.

Thus hegemony, subordination and complicity are relations internal to the gender order. The interplay of gender with other structures such as class, race and caste creates further relationships between masculinities. Marginalization is always relative to the authorization of the hegemonic masculinity of the dominant group. Dalit masculinities are marginalized in the wider context of upper caste masculinities. Henceforth, terms like hegemonic or marginalized masculinities are not fixed character types but configurations of practice generated in particular situations in a changing structure of relationships. Any theory of masculinity worth having must give an account of this process of change. Also, Masculinity and Femininity have to be located in the world of social agency.

The structures of gender relations are formed and transformed over time. It had been common in historical writing to see this change as coming from outside gender—from technology or class dynamics, most often. But change is also generated from within gender relations. The dynamics is as old as gender relations. It has however, become more clearly defined in the last two centuries with the emergence of a public politics of gender and sexuality.
With the women's suffrage movement and the early homophile movement, the conflict of interests embedded in gender relations became visible. Interests are formed in any structure of inequalities, which necessarily defines groups that will gain and lose differently by sustaining or by changing the structure. A gender order where men dominate women cannot avoid constituting men as an interest group concerned with defence and women as interest group concerned with change. This is a structural fact independent of whether men as individuals love or hate women, or believe in equality or abjection and independent of whether women are currently pursuing change.

Men gain a dividend from patriarchy in terms of honour, prestige and the right to command. They also gain a material dividend. For example, in rich capitalist countries, men’s average incomes are approximately double women’s average incomes. Men are much more likely to hold state power: for instance men are ten times more likely than women to hold office. Shirin Rai(2002) who studied women parliamentarians in tenth Lok Sabha views that in 1991 women constituted 5.2% of the total members comprising 545 people in Lok Sabha and 9.8% of 250 members in Rajya Sabha. In 1999, 8.8% of parliamentarians were women. Interestingly there is a caste angle too in this political dimension. The numbers of women who are able to avail Indian caste based reservation are negligible. While 225 of parliamentary seats were reserved for Scheduled Castes, women occupy only 4% of the reserved seats. Thus most of the women MP’s in the tenth parliament belonged to upper castes. There were six women from the Brahmin caste,
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which represents a sizeable 17.14 percent of women MP's while as a population Brahmins comprise only 5.52% percent of the population. Given these facts, the 'Battle of Sexes' is no joke. Social struggle must result from inequalities on such a scale. It follows that the politics of masculinity cannot concern only questions of personal life and identity.

A structure of inequality on this scale, involving a massive dispossession of social resources, is hard to imagine without violence. It is, overwhelmingly, the dominant gender who holds and uses the means of violence. Men are armed far more often than women. Indeed under many gender regimes women have been forbidden to bear or use arms (A rule applied, even within armies). Patriarchal definition of femininity (dependence, fearfulness, docile) amount to the cultural disarmament that may be as quite as effective as the physical kind. Domestic violence cases often find abused women, physically able to look after themselves who have accepted the abuser's definitions of themselves as incompetent and helpless. Two patterns of violence follow from this situation. First, many members of the privileged groups use violence to sustain their dominance. Intimidation of women ranges across the spectrum from whistling and passing lewd comments in streets, office harassment, domestic assault, acid throwing by dejected lovers etc. second, violence becomes important in gender politics among men. Most episodes of major violence (counting military combat, homicide and armed assault) are transactions among men. Terror is used as a means of drawing boundaries and making exclusions for example, in heterosexual violence against gay men. Often, violence can become a way of claiming or asserting masculinity in group struggles.
There are now numerous studies on the organizational construction of masculinities in the armed forces of Germany, Britain, United States, Australia, Israel and Turkey (Quoted in Connell, 1995: 259). We also have illuminating accounts of the shaping of masculinities in armed or partly armed resistance movements, in Palestine (Peteet 2000) and in South Africa (Xaba). There are also studies on the aftermath of war and the gendered process of international peace-keeping as in the case of Bosnia (Cockburn and Zarkov). There are also some illuminating studies of the gendered cultural processes that usually support—but sometimes undermine—War. In a complex study of Soviet cultural and political history, Novikova (2000) traces the gender imagery that sustained military morale in earlier periods but which unravelled during the Afganistan intervention and resulted in a sharp reversal in gender politics after the collapse of the USSR. Similarly Gibson (1994) traced the rise of a hypermasculine ‘Paramilitary culture’ in the USA during the period after the defeat in Vietnam. Henceforth, policies against violence may be ineffective or even counter-productive unless the gender dynamics involved are understood.

Some violence prevention programs began in the 1990s to use ideas from masculinity research, both in broad public campaigns and to develop strategies for difficult groups such as adolescent youth (Denborough, 1996)⁹ and prison inmates (Kuper 2001)¹⁰.

It is important that this strategy should spread, but it is essential that it should be informed by up-to-date understandings of masculinities. Keys to this work will be the capacity to grasp the situational specificity of masculinities, violence and violence prevention and the capacity to move from the individual level to the level of institutions and nations. The continued development of our understanding of masculinities is an important part of the knowledge we need to build a more peaceful, survivable world.

Central to much current thinking among sociologists to theorize masculinity and sexuality is the suggestion that masculinity is socially constructed. What sustains and underpins the production and reproduction seeable as ‘Male’ or ‘masculine’?

There are broadly two possible ways of answering the question sociologically. The first is structural in form. In it, masculinity as regards the individual is treated as the outcome of a developmental process atleast in part social. The second focuses on the individual as actor. Here, masculinity is seeable as sustained by the continual work of ‘Presentation and Management’ on the actors part. The model is dramaturgical. Goffman

is an example of it. Only on two occasions, we can find Goffman dealing with the topic of the relations of men and women directly (Goffman in Arrangements between Sexes, 1977, Gender Advertisements, 1979)

"In an important sense, once Goffman wrote that there is only one completely unblushing male in America: a young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual, protestant, father, of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight and height and a recent record in sports... Any male who fails to qualify in any of these ways is likely to view himself during moments at least as unworthy, incomplete and inferior" (Goffman, E 1963:128).

Similarly, transsexuals in their quest of gender display try to sustain self-representation as a properly gendered person.

Theories of gender, with hardly an exception focus either on one-to-one relationship between people or on the society as a whole. But the practice of sexual politics bears mostly on institutions: discriminatory hiring in companies, non-sexist curricula in schools and so on. Much of the research that is changing current views of gender is about institutions like workplaces, markets and media.

An important area of concern is the contemporary trends in Indian society and the projections of masculinity in the project of techno-centric/developmental model, communal/ fundamentalist assertion and militaristic/narcissistic nationalism. In the post Second World War World, since and development have been added with national security/ defence as additional reasons of state (Nandy, 1988, 1)\textsuperscript{11}. Development, as a

post-colonial project, was reduced to continuation of the process of colonization – it has become an extension of the project of wealth creation in the economic vision of modern western patriarchy which is based on the exploitation and degradation of nature and on the exploitation and erosion of other cultures. Science and technology are not gender-neutral. In this analysis, mal-development becomes a new source of male-female inequality. Nature and women are turned into passive objects, to be used and exploited for the uncontrolled and uncontrollable desires of alienated man. Mies and Shiva (1993) develop an eco-feminist perspective situated in the necessities of everyday life systems. One feels the need to add globalization in the purview of the analysis.

While discussing the trends of communal/ fundamentalist assertion and taristic/ narcissistic nationalism, it can be pointed out that much of the recent violence in South Asia can be traced to the systematic efforts being made to impose American style melting pot model where primordial identities are supposed to melt upon Indian realities, which can be described as salad bowl of cultures where the ingredients retain their distinctiveness. A significant aspect of post-colonial structures of knowledge in the third world is a peculiar form of imperialism of categories produced and honed in the West. When religion, politics or religion-and-politics is discussed, there is an invisible reference point of the Western Man (Das, 1990, 81)\(^{12}\). Usually, modern scholarship tends to see zoolatry as retrogression into primitivism and as pathology of traditions. On closer look, it turns out to be a by-product and a technology of modernity. An interesting point of entry into the problem is provided by the parallels recently drawn between the rise of

fascism in Europe in the 1920s and 1930s, and that of the Hindu right in India in the last few years, notes Sumit Sarkar. Hindu nationalism does not have a long past in India. Hindutva had a number of important futures (Nandy, 1998): It rejected/devalued the little cultures of India and sought to chalk out a new pan-Indian religion called Hinduism; religion more as an ideology than as a faith; sought to masculinize the self-definition of the Hindus and thus martialize the community; accepted modern science, technology,

Baconian social philosophy which contributed to the development and sustenance of state power and promised to homogenize the Indian population. In this redefinition, the concept of Hindu is given a predominantly territorial component and the imagery of father and is borrowed from European nationalism and introduced into a culture that had specialized in sacralising the country as mother. To thus masculinize mother India, Savarkar had to even drop the word bhumi, land that was grammatically feminine (Nandy, 1998). Nandy points out that it is from the non-modern India, from the traditions and principles of religious tolerance encoded in the everyday life associated with the different faiths of India, that one will have to seek clues to the renewal of Indian political culture.

For Bourdieu (2001), masculine domination is carried through symbolic violence created mainly through symbolic channels of communication including recognition and even feelings. This is explored in dialogue with other theoretical words in the field. But Bourdieu is not indifferent to the fact that men, too, are prisoners, and insidiously victims, of the dominant representations. The impossible ideal of virility, for examples, is the source of an immense vulnerability, including a kind of fear of the
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female, firstly in oneself, and which leads at times, paradoxically, to frantic investment in all the masculine games of violence – ranging from body-building and combat sports to even gang rapes. It is time to ‘rethink’, ‘unlearn’, and move from ‘machismo to manhood’ and announce ‘tenderness is strength’.

A careful look at our culture has already revealed the following:

There is considerable ambiguity as far as the notion of masculinity is concerned. It is time that historically our society remains predominantly male-oriented. Yet, the cultural projection of womanhood has always been complex and ambiguous. On the one hand, we see the image of a subdued woman, almost a puppet in the hand of a ‘male protector’ be it a husband or a father or a brother. But then there are also ideals of intellectually vibrant and active and learned Vedic women like Maitreye or Gargi. We also see the aberration of the maternal power, the primordial energy and a symbiotic relationship of Purusha and Prakriti. Likewise, masculinity is not a narrative of one-sided domination over women. Instead as our reading of the archetypes suggest, we see a very complex reading of masculinity. Krishna’s masculinity embraces femininity, his political skill and diplomacy is integrated with this erotic, sensual and childlike appeal. In a way, -- is a dancing masculinity – full of androgyny reconciling war and love, child and adult, man and woman. Likewise, Shiva is incomplete without Parvati. And Rama, despite all his heroism, remains immensely soft, filled with a high degree of calmness, patience and endurance. And these ideals as we have suggested have further been developed by mysticism, Bhakti tradition ‘and Gandhi’s experience. It is indeed a complex and ambiguous situation because here is also a society which is witnessing female infanticide, dowry death, rape, violence, objectification of women and all sorts of brutal
masculinities. Even a casual visit to an average Rajasthan/Haryana village would suggest the brutality of male domination. Possibly this conflict between some aspects of the empirical reality and the cultural ideals is often being manifested in our lives in cinema. Politics and other articulations.

And as is evident over the last few years, there has been a surge of interest in the study of men and masculinity. Men are starting to respond to the challenges of feminism. Fresh definitions of ‘masculinity’ abound, affirming old myths in attempts to create new males. From the ‘wounded male’ to the ‘new man’, images of reconstructed men appear on advertising bill-boards and television and in magazines and newspapers and films. These responses to feminism not only attempt to ‘unwrap masculinity’ but also to reassert male prerogatives. Perhaps ‘what has changed is not male power as such, but its form, the presentation and the packaging’.

Now, as in the past, the term ‘men’ is used as an unmarked universal category to stand for humanity in general. Over the last two decades, feminists have challenged the ideological and material entailments of such implicit male bias. It is ironic that the logic of feminism as a political position has often required the notion of ‘men’ as a single, oppositional category. Founding their position on the assertion that ‘the personal is the political’, feminists have consistently raised awkward questions about the status quo in both the community and the academy. More recently, however, the feminist political project has faced a number of theoretical and methodological challenges from within. Several of these challenges have had a direct bearing on the genesis of this research endeavour.
Three basic steps are intrinsic to the present research strategies to view the world more reflexively (Cornwall and Lindisfarne, 1994, 2-10). The first is to try to dismantle the conventional categories which dominate thinking on a particular subject. Thus anthropologists may ask themselves what they mean by their use of the terms ‘man’ or ‘woman’ and to what extent their own notions of gender are likely to intrude in their attempts to understand gender relations among others. Or they may start with a notion such as ‘masculinity’ on which everyone seems to agree. By looking in detail at everyday usage and the contexts in which people talk of masculinity, its complexity soon becomes apparent.

The second step is comparative. Comparative enquiries rely on detailed descriptions of social interactions and how social labels are used in different social contexts. By examining the difficulties of translating particular meanings of masculinity from one social setting into another, anthropologists challenge the existence of any apparently straightforward universal category and raise questions about the social contexts in which such categories are used.

The third step occurs when anthropologists draw on the insights of ethnographic studies to examine their own preconceptions. Here, through ethnography, we ask to what extent the familiar oppositions – male/female, man/woman and masculinity/femininity – are everywhere belied by a much more complex social reality. Much of this complexity hinges on the way people understand the relation between gender and power.

If unquestioned, a cultural premise that associates men with power amounts to a mystification, benefiting some people and disadvantaging most others. It is useful to
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think of those ideologies which privilege some men (and women) by associating them with particular forms of power as ‘hegemonic masculinities’. Hegemonic masculinities define successful ways of ‘being a man’; in so doing, they define other masculine styles as inadequate or inferior. We call these related masculinities ‘subordinate variants’. As we shall see, one reason why the rhetoric of hegemonic versions of masculinity is so compelling is that it rests on an apparent certainty; that ‘a man is a man’ everywhere, and this means the same thing everywhere.

Essentialist interpretations of the male/female dichotomy are a major problem in comparative studies of gender. In any given setting, gender differences are often presented and perceived as absolute and dichotomous. Moreover, such gender differences, when viewed from a historical or cross-cultural perspective, often appear stable or repeat themselves as variations on a single theme. However, essentialist explanations cannot explain variation and the fact that cultural forms are never replicated exactly. An essentialist male/female dichotomy cannot account for the ways people are gendered in different places at different times. Once comparative studies expose a diversity of meanings, the idea of ‘being a man’ can no longer be treated as fixed or universal.

Sex roles were understood as patterns of social expectation, norms for the behaviour of men and women, which were transmitted to youth in a process of ‘socialization’. In effect, social behaviour was explained as a massive display of conformity – which somehow seemed appropriate in the 1950s. Nevertheless the idea of a ‘male role’ also led to some intelligent studies of changing gender expectations for men, and difficulties faced by men and boys in conforming to the norms.
In the 1970s the 'sex role' idea was radicalized by feminism. The idea of gender-as-conformity became an object of dismay rather than celebration. Feminist analysis of how women's sex role oppressed women soon led to a discussion, among both feminist women and pro-feminist men, of the way men's sex role oppressed men also.

This idea underpinned a burst of writing, even a small social movement, on the theme of men's liberation as a parallel endeavor to women's liberation. But it led to little new research beyond the existing conventions of paper-and-pencil masculinity/femininity scales. A vague concept of 'the male role' of 'men's role' persists in much recent talk and writing, but means little more than stereotypes or norms or even just sex differences.

In the 1980s a third approach to the gender of men matured, sometimes called social constructionism. Its main academic base is in sociology but there are vigorous branches in anthropology, history and media studies. Key intellectual underpinnings are the feminist analysis of gender as a structure of social relations, especially a structure of power relations; sociological concerns with subcultures and issues of marginalization and resistance; and post-structuralist analysis of the making of identities in discourse, and the interplay of gender with race, sexuality, class and nationality.

With ethnographic and life-history methods as key research techniques, in the last two decades there has been a cascade of studies of the social construction of masculinity in particular times and places. We might think of this as the 'ethnographic moment' in masculinity research, in which the specific and the local is in focus. The ethnographic moment brought a much-needed gust of realism to debates on men and masculinity, a corrective to the abstractions of role theory. This social research moved in a very different direction from the trend in popular culture at the same time, where vague
discussions of men’s sex roles were giving way to the mystical generalities of the ‘mythopoetic’ movement and the extreme simplifications of religious revivalism. Though the rich details of individual historical and field studies defy easy summary, certain empirical conclusions emerge from this body of research as a whole, which have more than local significance.

It is clear from the new social research as a whole that there is no one pattern of masculinity that is found everywhere. We need to speak of ‘masculinities’, not masculinity. Different cultures, and different periods of history, construct gender differently. There is now massive proof of this fact in comparative studies, especially ethnographies. We might therefore expect that in multicultural societies there will be multiple definitions and dynamics of masculinity. Diversity is not just a matter of difference between communities. Diversity also exists within a given setting. Within the one school, or workplace, or ethnic groups, there will be different ways of enacting manhood, different ways of learning to be a man, different conceptions of the self and different ways of using a male body.

Different masculinities do not sit side-by-side. There are definite social relations between them. Especially, there are relations of hierarchy, for some masculinities are dominant while others are subordinated or marginalized. In most of the situations that have been closely studied, there is some hegemonic form of masculinity present – the most honoured or desired.

The patterns of conduct in our society defined as masculine may be seen in the lives of individuals, but they also have an existence beyond the individual. Masculinities
are defined collectively in culture, and are sustained in institutions. Institutions may construct multiple masculinities and define relationships between them.

It can be noted that men’s bodies do not determine the patterns of masculinity, as biological essentialism and pop psychology would have it. Men’s bodies are addressed, defined and disciplined and given outlets and pleasures, by the gender order of society. But men’s bodies are to blank slates. The enactment of masculinity reaches certain limits, for instance in the destruction of the industrial worker’s body. Masculine conduct combined with a female body is felt to be anomalous or transgressive, like feminine conduct combined with a male body. Research on gender crossing shows that a lot of work must be done to sustain an anomalous gender. Gender is the way bodies are drawn into history; bodies are arenas for the making of gender patterns. This was a point underplayed by ‘male role’ discussions, and is underplayed even in some of the more recent research. It is important, then, to register the importance of such processes as violence and body culture in the construction and politics of masculinities.

Men appear to be missing from much gender and development policy. The change of terminology from women in Development (WID) to Gender and Development (GAD) represented a shift towards recognizing the need to analyse social relationships between men and women and to be more aware of factors such as class, age and personal agency in these. Despite this shift in emphasis, in much development policy there remains little recognition of the need to analyse and understand the lives of men as well as women. This idea stems from the recurrent themes in the current literature available on me and masculinity in gender and development discourse.
In a way, this brings us to the discussion of masculinities and globalization. It has always been recognized that some issues go beyond the local. What happens in localities is affected by the history of the whole country, but what happens in localities is affected by the history of the whole world. Locally situated lives are now (indeed have long been) powerfully influenced by geopolitical struggles, global markets, multinational corporations, labour migration, and transnational media. To understand local masculinities, then, we must think in global terms. Connell offers a framework for thinking about masculinities as a feature of world society, and for thinking about men's gender practices in terms of the global structure and dynamics of gender. To understand the masculinities on a world scale, first we must have a concept of the globalisation of gender. World gender-order can be defined as the structure of relationships that connect the gender regimes of institutions, and the gender-orders of local society, on a world scale. Modern global society was historically produced by the economic and political expansion of European states from the fifteenth century on, leading to the creation of colonial empires. It is in this process that we find the roots of the modern world gender-order. The colonial and post-colonial world has tended to break down purdah systems of patriarchy in the name of modernization, if not of women’s emancipation. At the same time, large-scale organizations have appeared notably the state and corporations, which, with few exceptions, are culturally masculinised and controlled by men. In post-colonial capitalism the power of local elites depends on their relations with the metropolitan powers. So the hegemonic masculinities of neocolonial societies are uneasily poised between local and global cultures. The positioning of men and the making of
masculinities may be analysed at any of the levels at which gender practice is configured, including the body, personal life or collective social practice. At each level we need to consider how globalisation influences configurations of gender. The impact of global forces on personal life can be seen in individual life histories. Sometimes the link is indirect. At the level of collective practice, masculinities are involved in the cultural remaking of gender meanings under globalisation; they are also affected by a rather different process, the reshaping of the institutional contexts of practice. The growth of global mass media, especially electronic media, is an obvious vector for the globalisation of gender. Popular entertainment circulates stereotyped gender images, deliberately made attractive for marketing purposes. International news media are also controlled or strongly influenced from the metropolis, and circulate Western definitions of authoritative masculinity, criminality, desirable femininity, etc. But there are limits to the power of global mass communications. Some local centers of mass entertainment differ from the Hollywood model; for example, the Indian popular film industry centered in Mumbai. Further, media research shows that audiences are highly selective in their reception of media messages. More important than cultural standardization is a process that began long before electronic media existed – the export of institutions. Gendered institutions not only circulate definitions of masculinity and femininity. Gendered institutions, creating specific conditions for social practice, call into existence-specific patterns of practice.
The Findings: Looking Back and Reflecting

The introduction briefly presents the background, need and the relevance of the study. It seeks to explain that the gendered practices of everyday life reproduce a society's view of how men and women should act. As adolescents, they conduct their behaviour through gender scripts. Schools, parents, peers and the mass media guide young people into the gendered work and family roles. As adults, they take on a gendered social status in their society's stratification system. Thus gender is both ascribed and achieved.

The first chapter analysed review of literature which is related to the key concepts of the study. Apart from looking at the recent discourses on masculinities it looked at the rich psycho-social studies on the construction of masculinities. It also focused on the role of socializing agents like family and school apart from other popular modes of construction of masculinities like—sports, media and advertising etc. it also studies popular archetypes of Indian masculinity like Rams, Krishna and Shiva apart from exploring the ancient texts of Mahabharata and Kamasutra. Psychoanalytic literature on Indian masculinity was also reviewed in this chapter.

The second chapter was a discussion on various theoretical frameworks employed in the study of family violence and masculinity. Apart from studying macro theories like conflict, patriarchal and feminist theories it also discussed micro theories like symbolic interactionalism too in this chapter along with the recent trends in the study of masculinities.

The third chapter explained the methodology used in the research endeavor. Using phenomenological approach, the study sought to explore the role of masculinity in the
phenomenon of wife-battering. The study also looks at the way class, caste and gender shape up masculinities as well.

Chapter four discussed the various discourses on gender in India and the response of Indian State in curbing violence against women. This chapter also looked at the complex trajectories of Hindu right in the construction of an aggressive and violent Hindu masculinity.

Chapter five was an analytic view of the comparative perspectives of linkages between masculinity and violence among Dalits and Upper-Castes in two villages of Rural Andhra Pradesh. In this chapter man’s roles were understood mainly through three roles... Provider, Protector and Procreator. It also analyzed the pattern of violence between Dalits and Upper-Castes along with studying the main causes of wife-battering. The case studies of this chapter offered a first hand account of violence perpetrated by husbands.

Chapter six analyses the aggregate data of the two villages. It sought to study various aspects related to masculinity which linked it directly to violence. Control and power emerged as two important characteristics of masculinity. Maintaining order in the family and dominating others along with possessing leadership qualities are viewed as the expression of power in both public and private domains. Sexuality emerged as a critical area where performance of masculinities leads to violence. Majority of the male respondents of the study viewed that they use violence as a resource of
reinstating order. This chapter also discussed the trends of violence by demographics and lastly it pointed out some key recommendations which emerged out of the study.

The study highlighted the complex linkages between masculinity and violence and how masculinities are clearly shaped by social and economic processes, violence is used not just to maintain control and dominance, but also to counter any imagined threats of the same. Often men use violence as a resource to reinstate order. The data indicates that violence is multi dimensional—men engage in multiple types of violence—be it physical, emotional, control or sexuality also suggests that men who are insecure about their gender identity compensate with hyper-masculine behaviour. Henceforth, interventions and prevention strategies need to employ a dual focus of exploring alternate means of resolving conflicts, achieving a sense of equal power and control and to have negative sanctions for violent behaviour.

The research endeavor points out that identities, roles and relationships that are associated with gender have come about as a result of human agency. That is they are neither innate, nor given but constructed made and remade by human beings as they lived, worked, loved and procreated. The relegation of women in the realms of sexuality, reproduction and mothering has a direct link to their social status.

Some further questions of research would be that are women victims of patriarchal systems or they partial collaborators? Why women wear the marks of their subordination, their imposed inferiority with such pride? Why women cannot or refuse the name violence perpetrated on them? Why men are expected to act tough and hide
emotions? Why do men get trapped into the web of hegemonic masculinity? What are those factors which compel men to perform masculine roles all the time? These are some of the questions which need to be further researched on.
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS IN TWO VILLAGES
CASE STUDIES WOMEN
A TRAINING PROGRAM OF LOCAL NGO - CRADE