




Masculinity as an Educational Process in the Reproduction of Gender Roles

Hamidsyukrie ZM¹, Sumitro¹, Nursaptini¹, Imam Malik¹, Risma Ade Aryati¹, Baiq Yulia Rahma Dewi¹

¹Sociology Education, University of Mataram

*Corresponding Author: Hamidsyukrie ZM

Email: [: hamidsyukriezm@unram.ac.id](mailto:hamidsyukriezm@unram.ac.id)



Article Info

Article history:

Received 11 May 2025

Received in revised form 5

June 2025

Accepted 21 June 2025

Keywords:

Masculinity

Tradition

Father's Role

Husband's Role

Sade Indigenous Community

Abstract

This paper questions the symbolic production and educational reproduction of masculinity among the Sade community of Lombok, Indonesia. Based on ethnographic evidence, it critically analyzes the ways in which the traditional male authority is not only maintained through cultural practices and kinship systems but is actually taught, moralized and reproduced through generations. Although emergent forms of transitional masculinity, including male participation in household chores and shared household decision-making, may seem to be progressive, the results demonstrate that such changes frequently act to re-legitimize, rather than challenge, patriarchal authority. In this setting, masculinity is not so much a role as a symbolic regime, coded in ritual speech, spatial hierarchies, rights of inheritance, and public moral acknowledgment. The study will help in making critical contributions to the sociology of education by conceptualizing masculinity as a culturally constituted symbolic regime of governance and gendered pedagogy. It claims that learning in traditional societies is much more than schooling, and that it is carried out in ritualized speech, intergenerational imitation, and spatial-cultural coding. This gendered pedagogy socializes boys into power and speech and girls into service and silence and defines what is possible, permissible and desirable to both. The research criticizes equity-based educational interventions that focus on access or participation without focusing on the symbolic narratives of legitimacy and leadership. The results demand a radical reconsideration of gender-responsive education: an education that deconstructs the cultural logics of masculinity, de-centers patriarchal symbolism, and re-builds the moral architectures in which authority is learned and reproduced.

Introduction

The Sade community located in Rembitan Village, Pujut District, Central Lombok Regency, is one of the Sasak indigenous communities that still upholds traditional values and local wisdom. In this community, social and cultural life is carried out based on customary structures that have been passed down from generation to generation. One important aspect of the social structure of the Sade community is the role of men in the household, especially as fathers and husbands.

Masculinity in the context of indigenous communities such as Sade is not only related to biological identity as a man, but is also a social and cultural construction formed through customary norms, traditional symbols, and social roles attached to men in everyday life (Bahardur, 2024). In Sade society, men are expected to appear as family leaders, protectors of honor, and guardians of ancestral values. This role is often manifested in symbolic and concrete actions, such as decisions in traditional marriages, division of labor in the household, and collective decision-making in society (Hulaipah et al., 2024; Pandusaputri et al., 2024).

However, in the ever-evolving social reality, this traditional masculine role is challenged and negotiated (Risfiana & Imelda, 2023; Seyfi et al., 2020). Factors such as modernization, education, migration, and tourism that are developing in the Mandalika area have brought new values that influence household structures and gender relations in the Sade community (Holmes et al., 2020; Jackman, 2022). This condition raises important questions about whether the roles of fathers and husbands in the Sade community remain solid in the tradition, or whether they are beginning to shift and transform.

Studies on masculinity in local contexts like this are important to understand how male gender identity is constructed, maintained, or even negotiated in traditional social systems (Ernawati & Marta, 2020; Sairah & Chandra, 2022; Sugiarti, 2021). In addition, this study also contributes to the development of discourse on the sociology of communication and gender in the context of local culture, as well as being a bridge to see the dynamics of power relations and roles in traditional family institutions amidst the flow of social change (Nurrizka, 2016; Handaningtias, 2022; Jannah, 2022). The Sade community in Rembitan Village, Central Lombok Regency, is known as one of the Sasak indigenous communities that still maintains its traditional life relatively intact. Amidst the rapid flow of modernization in the Mandalika area, the Sade community still upholds ancestral values reflected in the architecture of the house, social relationship patterns, and patrilineal kinship system. In this context, the role of men as fathers and husbands in the household becomes an important part of the social and cultural order of the Sade community.

Masculinity in traditional societies is not only related to the biological identity of men, but is also a social construct formed by the prevailing system of values, norms, and cultural practices (Ernawati & Marta, 2020; Prayoga et al., 2021). Hegemonic masculinity explains that there is a dominant form of masculinity that is considered ideal and legitimized by society, which often plays a role in strengthening power relations between men and women (Andriana et al., 2023; Faadihilah et al., 2021). This hegemonic masculinity is not merely repressive, but is often present subtly through traditional roles attached to men, such as being the head of the household, decision maker, and protector of family honor (Ernawati & Marta, 2020; Prayoga et al., 2021; Sairah & Chandra, 2022). In Sade society, the role of father and husband is often considered a symbol of honor and social stability (Nursaptini et al., 2020; Udzma et al., 2023). A father is not only responsible for fulfilling economic needs, but also as a guardian of customs, regulator of relations between families, and holder of certain symbolic rights, such as in marriage or inheritance. Masculinity here is wrapped in tradition, meaning that male power and responsibility receive strong cultural legitimacy (Felix & Pandrianto, 2023; Kusuma & Zulkifli, 2023).

However, the social reality faced by the Sade community today cannot be separated from external influences, such as formal education, access to digital media, tourism, and interaction with outside communities (Bili, 2022; Yulianti & Syahriyah, 2023). This phenomenon triggers the negotiation of masculine identity in the household, especially in the division of domestic labor, the role of childcare, and the involvement of women in decision-making (Yulianti & Syahriyah, 2023). This is relevant to the view of social constructivism, which states that gender identity is not something that is fixed or natural, but is formed and continuously negotiated through social interactions and cultural structures. (Elvira & Santoso, 2022; Hidayat & Suharto, 2022; Puteri & Rudi, 2021).

Thus, it is important to examine how the roles of father and husband in the Sade indigenous society are maintained, interpreted, or even changed along with the evolving social dynamics. This study will not only describe the construction of masculinity within the framework of

tradition, but also see to what extent the form of masculinity has undergone transformation in the context of changing times. Based on the above, this study is relevant in enriching the discourse of sociology of communication and gender, especially in seeing how power relations, cultural symbols, and role communication take place in the household institutions of indigenous peoples. By raising the local context such as the Sade community, this study also contributes to the decolonization of the discourse of masculinity which has so far relied more on the experiences of Western society.

Methods

This study uses a qualitative approach with ethnographic methods to deeply understand the social realities related to the dominance of masculinity, the role of fathers and husbands, in the indigenous community of Sade Village, Pujut District, Central Lombok. In Sade Hamlet, customary rules prohibit women from becoming migrant workers, which is considered a form of cultural protection and preservation (Binasdevi, 2021; Rahmasari et al., 2023). However, this practice also contributes to gender inequality in education, with the awig-awig tradition limiting opportunities for women (NU Haq, 2023). Ethnography is a qualitative research approach rooted in sociology and anthropology, used to deeply understand social realities and cultural contexts (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The ethnographic approach was chosen because the issues raised cannot be measured quantitatively, but rather need to be explored through in-depth interpretation of the actions, symbols, and cultural narratives of the society being studied. Ethnography was chosen as the main research method because of its effectiveness in studying cultural issues and social phenomena (Miles & Huberman, 2014). As one of the oldest qualitative methods in social research, ethnography allows researchers to gain a holistic-integrative understanding of a culture through in-depth descriptions and qualitative analysis (Yin, 2014). In this study, the researcher acts as the main instrument (human instrument) who actively conducts observations, interviews, and interpretations of the data collected.

Location and Subject of Research

The study was conducted in Sade Village, a Sasak indigenous community that maintains its traditional values in its daily social and cultural structure. The subjects of the study were women aged between 17 and 40 years and married, who were considered to have experience, understanding, or direct involvement in the social dynamics studied. The selection of informants was carried out purposively and developed snowball, based on the relevance of the information needed.

Data collection technique

Data were collected through three main techniques, namely non-participatory observation, used to record the social activities of the community directly without being involved in their activities. Next, the semi-structured interview technique, conducted using interview guidelines for individuals who are considered to have important information related to masculinity, the role of fathers and the role of husbands. The third technique, namely documentation studies, was conducted to examine various documents, local archives, or written narratives that are relevant to cultural practices, customary laws, or local policies related to the research issue.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis was conducted interactively based on the Miles and Huberman model, which includes: Data reduction, namely filtering and summarizing raw data into essential findings, followed by Data presentation, namely organizing data narratively or in thematic tables to

facilitate interpretation. The last step is drawing conclusions and verification, namely compiling meanings based on relationships between data, reviewed reflectively and critically. This approach allows researchers to clarify, categorize, direct, discard unnecessary information, and organize data to draw and verify final conclusions (Miles & Huberman, 2014). The last step in this research is to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings. The technique used is triangulation, which includes: source triangulation, by comparing data from various informants and technical triangulation, namely comparing the results of observations, interviews, and documentation.

Results and Discussion

Traditional Masculinity in the Household

Classic manhood in the Sade community is not circumstantial or marginal, it is a totalistic symbolic order in which gendered power is institutionalized, naturalized and cross generationally produced. It does not exist as an unchanging or grounded value but rather as an engineered culture of legitimacy with religious belief, customary law (*awig-awig*), ritual practice, and spatial organization being intertwined with the said value. Masculinity, in this context, is a socio-cultural infrastructure, which validates the imbalanced distribution of gender roles and reiterates the male domination by controlling labor, language, ritual, and spatial rights.

Hegemonic masculinity is not imposed, it is one of cultural grace, in that this male gender status is not maintained by pushing women outside the arena of power by force but by enticing the women to relinquish their challenges to the centre of power in the name of tradition, good and order. Here masculinity is not necessarily a characteristic or identity, but a form of government.

The division of labor at the Sade household is not only spatial, it also makes gender not a role, but a geographical assignment of meaning and status. This is as posited by Informant IQ.N:

“Sak mame jek ye piak lukisan, jari guide, muk aku jek jari IRT, nenun, kance lalo nang bangket terutame. Mun masalah nyuci, masak, itu pekerjaannya perempuan.”

(Men make paintings, become guides. For me, I become a housewife, weave, and help my husband in the fields. Washing and cooking are women’s work—men rarely do it unless the wife is sick.) — Informant IQ.N

The concretization of such a description of masculine activity: it is external, visible, and monetized, as opposed to feminine domesticity: interior, repetitive, and invisible makes concrete what Doreen Massey (1994) referred to as the spatialization of power because men are understood in terms of mobility, independence, and projection, and women in terms of rootedness, dependence, and enclosure. Such gendered division of space and work reflects the traditional orthodox woman = nature / man = culture dichotomy proposed by Ortner (1974), which has received many criticisms but still forms the basis of the societal structure of traditional patriarchal societies.

Invisibilization of woman work in spinning and childcare shows a kind of what Fraser (1997) calls misrecognition: woman work is not only not paid, it is metaphorically deprived of value in the moral economy of the family. The reason behind men performing as little housework as possible is justified as something virtuous as opposed to nothing being done and reflecting what Kimmel (2010) claims to be one of the notions of patriarchy known as the cult of male exemption.

No procedure in the male domain is as enacted as the masculine authority as practiced in traditional Sasak marriage called merarik. This ceremony mandates a man to elope with a woman (after clearing it with the family in secret) and so it is promoted as an affair of love and something culturally important. However, it is also the rite of symbolic conquest: the performance of the male agency and objectification of women. The union is organized, haggled over and sealed by the male, who by definition of the term becomes the physical territory on which the manly pride is manifested. The woman is here transformed into the territory that becomes symbolically the object upon which this pride is played out.

This corresponds well with the theory of a ritual as reproductive ideology advanced by Bloch (1989), which states that the enactment of a ceremony does not just glorify the social order, but reproduces and renders it sacred. In Sade, merarik becomes a patriarchal re-legitimation ritual, which constitutes the masculinity not by biological maturity, but by the introduction of circulation of control, exertion of negotiation, generation of continuation of the lineage.

What is more, the ritual silences the woman not by prohibition but by the symbolic story of consent which corresponds to the criticism of liberalism in gender theory by Mahmood (2005). In the analysis of Islamic piety movements, Mahmood claims that women should not be allowed to interpret the issue of agency outside of the moral and discursive patterns of culture. Likewise, in merarik, the Sade woman here is not acting under a cultural script that imposes the experience of being dominated on her because the script says that obedience is a virtue and male predominance is a tradition, but because going along with the wishes of the man in the society is intelligent.

Division of economic decision-making sheds more light to this gradation of authority in terms of gender. Informant IQ. N said so (as she put it)

“Kalau laun barang belek jek melen tengizin mara tan aden mun ak beli bangket jek melen ngeraos anden ak mbeli montor...”

(...for major items like a rice field or motorbike, I must ask my husband first...)

This is a testimony of the structural rationality of what Kandiyoti (1988) refers to as the patriarchal bargain namely women can be given ownership of routine household logistical management, but are locked out of the strategic financial decision-making process, which has an intergenerational implication. It is therefore a concept of economic sovereignty that is masculinized even in cases where the women are outsiders in income generation via craftwork. This is reciprocated by Folbre (1994) in what he terms the social undervaluation of the labor of women, whereby productive activities of women- weaving or childcare is all an extension of domestic responsibility and are not regarded at par with the formal labor. The symbolical value is also gender: men consume, make decisions and bargain; women help, serve and obey.

Also, the conditional access of women to the power of money is a representation of a two system (material and symbolic) structure of dominations. According to Goetz and Sen Gupta (1996), access is not agency, what constitutes a real empowerment does not only involve having a say in matters but possessing a say in how one says it. Even when the household survives because of the work of women in Sade, they are not placed structurally in a position to determine the strategic direction of the household. In Sade, there is a direct observation of semiotic architecture of patriarchy. Men occupy the berugak (communal terrace), an environment of talk, negotiation and hospitality, women are placed in the dapur (kitchen area) woven into silence. The berugak is not simple place, but a phase of masculine visibility, a spatial technology through which discursive and political power is exercised. The so-called

front stage of acting that Goffman (1959) spoke of, is, in Sade, not only defined by gender: a man only can speak in the name of the household.

This affirms the Lefebvre (1991) theory concerning the space as a social product and working ideologically. Masculine colonization of symbolic space, both by the literal and the metaphorical sense, is turned into a regime of performance by which boys are trained to talk and girls to be slaves. The non-participation of the women in decision making is not imposed by any legislation but by the so-called symbolic violence defined by Bourdieu (2001) as a non-ostentatious, standardized, and internalized dominance that makes structural inequality seem natural.

Table 1. Masculinity as a Hierarchical System of Role Valuation

Domain	Masculine Role	Feminine Role	Structural Implication
Labor	Tour guiding, farming, painting	Weaving, cleaning, childcare	Men = visible production; Women = invisible reproduction
Economic decision-making	Strategic (land, vehicles, inheritance)	Operational (food, basic supplies)	Masculinity = economic sovereignty
Ritual	Speaker, negotiator, initiator (<i>merarik</i>)	Object of exchange, silent participant	Ritual = masculinity as social power
Space	<i>Berugak</i> (public voice)	<i>Dapur</i> (domestic silence)	Space = moral pedagogy of gender
Socialization	Taught to lead, speak, decide	Taught to obey, serve, accommodate	Masculinity = ontological superiority

It is not the sequence of gendered roles that arise out of the Sade community but rather the intricate structure of patriarch rationality and this is a system that inverts power into space, ritual, economics and speech. Masculinity, in this case, is logic control, strategy of distribution, and moral education. It teaches boys that they should anticipate power and girls how to normalize their exclusion. It is not only Sade whose symbolic, structural, and ritual enforcement of masculinity are examples of crystalization; it is a transnational hegemonic masculinity at a local level, just as Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) describe, a performance of the global trend of gender domination, and projected through custom and culture.

Negotiation and Role Demarcation of Transitional Masculinity

Masculinity in the Sade community does not melt away in the flux of the terrain, but readjusts. With economic friction, technological intrusion, and soft intrusion of different gender imaginaries into the tourism and education sector, the traditional script of male dominance, which is still functional, is being revised rather controlled and incomplete not on the basis of ethical transformation. But even as men initiate their steps into spaces and activities once constitutionally feminine, they go there in calculated, conditional and uneven ways, more just a performance than politics, mere survival strategy and not a moral conquest the least..

“Sak mame jek lalo begawean separu lalo nang bangket, separu lalo jari guide. Lamun ite sak nine jek pegawean bale marak masak, meriri, nyapu. Ndak tau nulung begawean bale jekn kecuali lamuth sakit jek separu nulung bait aik kance ngeler sak berat-berat.”

(Some men go to the fields, others become guides. As women, we work at home—

cooking, cleaning, sweeping. Men never help with housework unless we are sick, and even then, only with the heavy parts.) — Informant F

This stratified narration breaks the myth that the engagement of males in the domestic sphere has turned into the norm. It establishes quite on the contrary the principle of male domestic immunity a symbolic power whereby withdrawal from feminized labor is not laziness but defensive maintenance of power status. It is what Hochschild (1989) called the second shift burden where women, not necessarily because of their productive contribution, have the full amount of reproductive work. In a way, male assistance is no longer reflexive but it is reactive: it is a humanitarian act instead of an ethical adjustment. The logic is of the same level, patriarchal: male assistance, female submission.

“Mun mame nie lalo ngantor, kalo sak nine lalo begawean bale tetep jek. Paling mame sak ndak begawean bali malah nonton atau istirahat.”
(If the man works outside, the woman continues her work at home. But if the man doesn't work, he watches TV or rests.) — Informant N

This information is highly disclosing: the imbalance of the obliguity is preserved. Men labor is considered sporadic and optional as women do; anytime anywhere. Men are not supposed to redeem themselves even when unemployed or when they are off duty at home. This is what Bourdieu (2001) refers to as symbolic violence, the non-coercive power of determination which attaches values to action and inaction on a gender-related basis. In this case, the rest of men is culturally approved, rest of women, where does it exist, and this inequality is never called by its name, it is institutionalized.

“Kalau mame jek lalu bantu—sak nyuci, masak, reri—bale pasti dikatain sama warga. Dibidang laki-laki takut istri. Ndak jek malu kami.”
(If a man helps—washing, cooking, cleaning—people will gossip. They'll say he's afraid of his wife. It's embarrassing for us.) — Informant R

It is not just a piece of sociolinguistic paraphernalia, this is how gender is policed. The policing of masculine identity in Sade does not run only through the expectation but also through the scornful attack in society. Rescuing turns to castrating. Male bendability is a punishable offense; it is taunted. This shows the continuation of what Kimmel (2010) refers to as the homosocial performance of masculinity which is that men do not perform in order to satisfy themselves, but to be able to remain legible to other men. In that regard, transitional masculinity cannot be inhabited practically unless it is at some cost to the society. The mockery in itself is a part of discipline, as it confirms the limits of possible masculine behavior. So, regardless of the fact that men want to be more equal, the community does the enforcement thing on their behalf.

“Sekarang kadang kami rembuk bareng. Sak urusan anak sekolah, atau beli hape, mesti diskusi. Tapi ndak semua. Kalau tanah atau rumah, itu tetap urusannya mame.”
(Now we sometimes discuss things together—about the kids' school or buying a phone. But not everything. If it's land or house, that's still the man's business.) — Informant Q

Such a division of authority in the decision-making process highlights the selective stretchiness of gendered influence. Transitional masculinity finds a place to talk about such areas that are coded as lightweight or non-strategic as consumer electronics, school needs, and child clothing, but has undisputed control still of property, inheritance, and capital. This supports the assertion presented by Goetz and Sen Gupta (1996) on the substitution of symbolic participation by substantive control. Visions of the woman are not restricted; she is

only limited to advising on an area within the boundary of male supremacy. The discussion is stretched; the authority is not.

Husbands observed during this recurrent observational visit were shown interacting with children- carrying them, playing with them and sometimes feeding them. This looks progressive at the face value. The care was episodic, though, and focused on leisure. There was no feeding and bathing. Affective involvement, certainly; administrative effort, on the contrary. One of the male respondents responded to the question: Why?:

“Itu urusan perempuan. Kami main saja biar dekat, tapi ndak tahu caranya mandiin atau nyiapin susu.”

(That’s women’s business. We just play so we’re close, but I don’t know how to bathe them or make milk.)

We see at this point what Ratele (2014) refers to as surface-level fathering, that is, men undertake affection but not the care infrastructure. It is some sort of symbolic fatherhood, which is very visible, emotionally effective, but formally empty. It is not equality in action, a pattern of fatherhood; it is an aesthetic of involvement. More detailed inquiry in the course of the oral interviews showed that it is more probable that on the transitional masculinity to come out in a household exposed externally the latter, i.e. suspected of the members to have been the schooled, or touched on by tourism or temporarily migrated. For instance:

“Dulu kami ndak pernah mikir harus tanya istri. Tapi sekarang kalau ndak rembug malah ribut. Apalagi kalo istri juga kerja.”

(Before, we never thought we had to ask our wives. But now, if I don’t ask, there’s conflict—especially if she also works.) — Informant M

Based on this, what it implies is that transitional masculinity is not so much a value transition as it is a conflict management proposition. The discussion is one of the strategies of rupture avoidance rather than a philosophy of gender justice. This is a concession not conversion. Masculinity has only so much pressure as one can take to prop up the order of relations and legitimacy of people. It is best elicited in the approach used by Kandiyoti (1988) describing the relationship between bargaining and patriarchy: the acceptance of this strategy by men occurs when the price of inflexibility is higher than that of flexibility.. Accordingly, transitional masculinity does not imply a success-story of the gradual development but a survival mode of patriarchy in a bind. It is a matter of strategic mutation and not ideological death. It takes the position of superiority, remaining to seem to compromise. It provides the view of the women yet it does not grant them sovereignty. It allots, but not controls power.

Certainly, the crisis of gender education, gender policy, gender socialization thus implied is urgent here: in the regime of celebratory depoliticization of such models of masculinity, we can expect precisely this result, unless we can manage to turn that order around. Boys in this kind of families do not learn equity, they learn diplomacy. It is not the girls being freed it is being soothed over. These adjustments are only superficial without any change in structure of who is making the decisions, who takes a rest, who has to take an apology, who can say no. Therefore, transition masculinity in Sade is a velvet cage not the bridge to equality. The smoothness of its surface hides its bars. It has to be questioned, not romanticized.

Cultural and symbolic masculinity making of Sade community

Masculinity in Sade cannot be perceived as a list of determined actions or attitudes. Instead it works as culturally legitimized ontology, realized in a form of rituals, space codes, discourses of kinship, performative silences, and symbolic sovereignty acts. It is a text to an action not

just to what men act, but what the community thinks they are allowed to act, by virtue of custom, cosmology and ancestry. Within this structure, the male position is not chosen, or defended, it is inherited, and moralized, and this produces an architecture of power so thoroughly rooted, it seems to be non-negotiable, divine, ancestral, or neutral.

“Sak mame jek due bagian ngeraus lamun merarik, sak nine tinggal diam.”
(Only the men speak during a merarik [marriage ritual], the woman stays silent.) — Informant H

This is not a division of labor which actually works--it is a ritual authorization of speech rights.. In merarik, a ritual that establishes marital legitimacy and instigates kinship alliances, only the man is given performative power to speak, saying what is desired, what is intended, what are the terms and what is the commitment. The woman, who is in the center of completeness, does not have the voice. She remains uncriticized and unopinionated in her silence, as this behavior is viewed upon as decorum, virtue, and humility. Even though the voice is essential in our forgetful remembering of agency (Mahmood, 2005), we cannot presume agency on the basis of being heard. It is possible that silence is also a cultural script but this script should be read critically. here it does not even act as resistance, but as epistemic subordination: her muteness does not speak, it is spoken.

This is associated with the system of ritual outlined by Bloch (1989) under which communal rituals act as a re-write of legitimacy of those existing hierarchies by sanctifying them. The silence of the bride in merarik does not constitute a blank, a vacancy, but a communicative construct of subjugation with dignity aestheticized into a silence. Here, in a way, narrational control equals and translates into masculinity. And it is at the conjectural, transitional moment of life that the subjectivity of the woman disappears, when he or she should say I

“Lamun ada tamu datang, sak mame jek due hak nyambut, ngajak masuk, ngasih sambutan. Sak nine jek ye lagek jek nyiapin kopi.”

(When guests arrive, only the man welcomes, invites them in, gives the speech. The woman quietly prepares the coffee.) — Fieldnote Observation

This information vulnerates the parody play of the state of the civic command. Food or welcome is not the only hospitality in Sade because the ritual is highly coded as the mark of the speaker and proponent. The berugak is the physical and symbolic centre of social life where language, narrative and political gestures are turned into visual forms and reviewed by men. Instead, women are put on the periphery, then they are separated by walls, behind service, behind speech. Spatial-symbolic distribution of operations supports the idea of habitus generated by Bourdieu (2001), according to which some bodies are educated to construct the demeanor of belonging to some place, posture, and silence.

It is not, however, a platform of wood; the berugak is an epistemological assertion: that men are the legitimate speakability of the home and the society and the world. The tiring effort to prepare coffee by women gets invisibilized as a matter of simple routine. It does not mark prestige—it confirms servitude. This aligns with Lefebvre’s (1991) analysis of produced space as ideological inscription. Masculine space is discursive and strategic; feminine space is functional and invisible.

“Mame sak due gubug, mame sak due tanah, mame sak ngasih ijin. Nine ngurusin dalam rumah.”

(The man owns the house, the land, gives permission. The woman manages what’s inside.) — Informant O

In this case, spatial and symbolic relations become reduced to a pattern of cultural determinant: masculinity the discourse of property, control, external face of legitimacy, femininity the work of the interior, the background, the emotional and nutritional base of continuity. Women work is essential and critical, but has always been made post-political: appreciated but never glorified. The man, as pemilik tanah (landowner) is a symbolic ruler, an interpreter between the authority of the ancestors and physical presence in the living space.

This reflects the classic model of woman as nature, man as culture, advanced by Ortner (1974), but more precisely, follows the critical account of such an ideology by such authors as Federici (2004) and Razavi (2007), who ask that in such patriarchal-peasant economy, the symbolic access of land by men has no economic reality, but rather, is an ideological strategy to rediscover cosmology around men. And in Sade, men do not only have land inherited to them—they have inheritance of the discourse of legitimacy itself.

“Lamun nyambut lebaran, sak mame ngatur arah do’a, sak nine nyiapin makan. Lamun kematian, sak mame sak meraus, sak nine jek ye nyiapin tempat nang dapur.”
(During Eid, the man leads the prayers, the woman prepares the food. During a funeral, the man speaks, the woman prepares the kitchen.)

Men talk and women wait both in life and in death. Be it living life vicariously or grieving its loss, the masculine roles are fulfilled by symbolic authorship whereas the feminine role is logistics and technical. This strengthens the argument by Yuval-Davis (1997) who states that, men are constructs thought of as telling of nations, morals, and memory and women are mandated with their endorsement but they never determine them.

Here, the religious aspect of this power is essential. Sade masculinity is theologically fortified: it is the man who presides over a prayer, who accompanies souls during funerals and who represents the family. This trend of spiritualizing male dominance is similar to the Connell & Messerschmidt (2005) deepening of hegemonic masculinity to enforce an obligatory moral superiority, to which male-headed leadership is not only effective but essential. This gender role through religion cannot be under theorized. It makes male power not culturally acceptable but God-issued. In educational and developmental contexts, such as those advocated by Nussbaum (2003), this form of symbolic power becomes the most intractable—because it is encoded not only in law but in belief, prayer, and salvation.

“Alhamdulillah anak perempuan sudah sarjana. Itu berkat ayahnya yang kerja keras.”
(Thank God our daughter has a degree. That’s thanks to her father’s hard work.) — Informant A

Even female education levels, which have been employed as an indicator of development by many NGOs and gender-sensitive policymakers due to its regularly ignored female dimension, has here been discursively rescribed back to the father. It is posed not as female accomplishment, but as the male provision. This relationship demonstrates the caution given by Fraser (1997) regarding redistribution without recognition: although there is success in terms of structural gains (e.g. when a daughter gets an education in university) the patriarchy continues to hold symbolic authority.

This indicates a crucial observation: patriarchy not only refuses to empower women, it also takes over its discourse. The well-educated daughter proves a monument of _male sacrifice rather than female aspiration_. It is in such a way that this stealing of recognition is what Arendt (1958) termed as the theft of agency by controlling the narrative. The event is

experienced by the woman, and by the man it is told. the degree is duly obtained; the honor falls to him.

“Mun mame ndak ada, segala keputusan tetap harus lewat keluarga laki-laki. Mertua, paman, kakak.”

(If the father is gone, all decisions must still go through the male family—father-in-law, uncle, older brother.) — Informant P

This fact solidifies the dynastic form of the legitimacy of masculinity. In the case where he may not have a husband or a father authority does not default to the woman, the latter is a horizontal revert to other men. A masculinity is not here personal, but institutional; the blood of authority but not its virtue. The woman is not a presumptive heir-she is a stopgap until the next male can talk. This tells the final truth of this system: masculinity is not a role- it is a right. The given kinship pattern corroborates what Kandiyoti (1988) termed as the patriarchal classic contract: women can only achieve stability and protection by attaching themselves to a man. Once that linkage breaks (widowhood, divorce, and abandonment), they do not acquire their autonomy-they are once more incorporated into manly rule by some new available masculine point. In this way, social capital of the woman is never a free form of capital, but is a conditional, loaned, and reclaimable one.

This elaborated ethnographic picture reveals not an inventory of practices but a regime of symbols, a regime which codes masculinity as natural, proper, and transcendent by usage of space, speech, silence, property, prayer, and praise. This is not toxic masculinity as a temperament rather than by design. Role models or any empowerment slogans cannot undo it because it is not an action, it is an institution. It is here that the discipline has to develop. Gender-sensitive pedagogy is not enough so long as it does not begin to undermine the discursive structure of masculine power, legitimacy, power, and competency, which it seeks to adjudicate in the first place. The graduation of a new school in Sade leaves no difference, as long as the dad is still glorified. A community education session on parenting after divorce is useless when the only one who has a voice publicly at the time of the death is the father praying. What is called upon is not merely redistributive education, but symbolic decolonization, a basic re-narration of those who have the power to name, to interpret, to remember, and to be thanked. Until such a time, masculinity in Sade will keep on donning itself in the garments of hospitality, faith, protection and order- as it'd simultaneously reproduce the hush, authorized exclusion of the feminine.

Masculinity as Cultural Pedagogy and Symbolic Sovereignty

The results of the current study demonstrate that masculinity in Sade community cannot be confined to gender roles or any reductions to norms of behavior. Instead, it is revealed as a cultural pedagogy that sits deep in the social fabric and assumes the form of a symbolic and performative regime that teaches, legitimates, ritualizes, and reproduces male authority across the generations. This masculinity is not weak; it is flexible. It is not deliberately against change, but tactically incorporates the aspects of modernity i.e. tourism, schooling and economic diversification without losing its symbolic essence. In this case therefore, it puts in question an underlying premise that changing gendered behavior necessarily portends progress towards gender equity (Connell, 2005). What is thought by many a passage in Sade, is actually a highly calculated kind of masculine endurance that allows one to reproduce the patriarchy at the pretense of practical accommodations (Fasoli et al., 2023; Mshweshwe, 2020).

This is especially seen in the enactment of masculinity by means of ritual association of women with the exclusion of speaking possibilities of power. The type of gendered power in Sade is not only performed; it is ceremonialized as demonstrated in rituals like merarik, the traditional type of marriage when only men are allowed to talk. According to Bloch, (1989), ritual is not merely a reflection of the social structure but a resurrection of it. This voice suppression in the rituals that define the life of women makes female subjectivity morally invisible and practically non-existent. This concurs with the argument of Mahmood (2005) who criticized the liberal feminist premises that voice becomes agency by presenting cultures that can silence as good and obedience as a sign of moral force. Symbolic violence in this case does not express on a physical dominion, but on moral normalization of which the male power is depicted not only as normal, but equally as righteous (Bourdieu, 2001; Ortner, 2006).

Adding even more strength to this structure is the sexual politics of space between the front and the back yard. Berugak, the traditional raised platform in which men receive and speak and deliberate, stands in a sharp contrast with dapur, the retire domestic space where women work without being seen. This architectural design constitutes a gendered citizenship as a culture grammar. By power and view spaces are always a product of ideological production (Lefebvre, 1991) as articulated by the two authors. In Sade the space of the crowds has been coded as masculine, the personal sphere is associated with femininity, and women hence are logically essential in action, but relegated as elemental. The overall moral geography of the household is a reflection of the gender hierarchy of morality, which supports the view of Connell (1987), that hegemonic masculinity is carried out in terms of privilege and subordination of some masculinities, such as symbolic emasculation of domestic labor as well as devaluation of femininity.

This symbol arrangement is not just ritualised and coined in space but it goes in hand with economic participation and decision-making. Although even Sade experience some men which currently are engaged in household work or seek consultation with wives on money issues, such activities are usually remedial, gestural or utilitarian but not transformational. As it turns out in the findings, women are allowed to air their voices on discussions but the decision is always left to the men. This is what is referred to by Jordan et al. (2022) as complicit masculinity, or a tendency where men seem to adjust to egalitarian standards and create a structure that they continue to dominate. These trends can corroborate the line of thinking of Goetz & Sen Gupta (1996), politics of practical participation without strategic agency, which involves the attraction of women into the work of decision-making and excludes them of their authoritative results. Fraser (1997) emphasizes the criticality of redistribution and recognition in any justice-based system and, in Sade, there might occur some redistribution of tasks, but there is no redistribution of power and no recognition of sovereignty of the feminine.

Symbolic reproduction of the dominance by males is also evident in the practices of discursively directing female accomplishments through male credit. When a girl finishes her university certificate it is done in the name of the father. Such a patriarchal logic of attribution is indicative of a cultural process by which the agency of the female is engulfed into masculine legitimacy (Yuval-Davis, 1997). Even education which has generally been considered a means of empowerment turns out to be a platform where male provision is reinforced. It reconfirms criticism voiced by Nussbaum (2003) and Fraser (1997) that such aspects of development as access to schooling and educational opportunities are frequently exaggerated without consideration of social recognition of achievements of women. Ability to perform does not imply the rights to describe such performance, and in Sade, masculine authority still writes the moral content of female conquests.

Importantly, Sade was not an individual position; in addition, masculinity is currently institutional. Ruling power does not come as a result of individual aptitude but as a birth right. In spite of the desolation of a husband or a father, the transfer of decision-making issues does not fall to the women, but to other male family members- uncles, brother or fathers in law. This dynastic system underlines the idea of the patriarchal bargain introduced by Kandiyoti (1988) according to which women find stability when they are attached to a man. Such systems do not only put a premium on male authority, according to Seravim (2023), but they also bar women and women-in-waiting systematically because of their sex. The outcome is a relational and corporate form of masculinity that is one in which power runs through networks of male kin, and thus sustains itself even when disrupted. The institutional aspect of this quality of masculinity makes it particularly difficult to reform since it does not depend on the actions of people but on the cultural validity of the gender group.

The pedagogy implications of the same are immense. Masculinity in Sade does not only form itself by learning; it is a ritual necessity, a process of indoctrination; early childhood is repeatedly turned in on itself by space. Boys are socialised to talk, pray, make decisions and be the leader. Girls are socialized to serve, accommodate and fade away. It corresponds to what Arnot (2002) argues: that gender does not just form a variable in educational prosperity, but rather it is a designing reasoning of educational openness, desire and completion. In this regard, the school would teach about equality but the community will teach about submission. The textual curriculum of school is superseded by the symbolic one of the home, the ritual and kinship. This serves to reiterate the arguments of Freire (1970) to pedagogy of the oppressed which is not just one that allows marginal voices into the center but which reassembles the meaning and significance of voice, validity and stewardship.

These results also question the optimism of the educational interventions that dwell only on inclusion of females. Just like Chant & Sweetman (2012) have tried to indicate, inclusion without power in most occasions causes women to be overworked with additional workloads applied and continued male domination. In Sade, women are becoming more productive economically, at least in the fields of tourism, weaving, etc. but their capital movement, economic independence, and right to make choices are still controlled by acts of male consent. This is a very dynamic dynamic as highlighted by Tabassum (2011), whom she refers to as the extent of access based empowerment whereby participation is only permitted on patriarchal conditions. Equality is therefore presented in a superficial manner.

In addition, transitional masculinity in Sade can even be disguised by symbolic acts or notoriety and not by reconfiguration of morals. Men who sometimes assist in childcare, bring water or discuss matters with wives are modern or nice. Such acts are however carried out erratically and most of the time only when outsiders are around or only in case of crisis. Such masculinity is according to Arisukwu et al. (2021) frequently audience dependent and only manifested when in front of audiences or being assessed but is seldom maintained in solitude. It is not constructive masculinity of an interiorized belief of egalitarianism, but masculinity of impression.

The results also support the second purpose of ridicule and gossip in a community to support gender roles. The men who break the masculine ideals of doing the chores at home or becoming the subordinate to their wives are ridiculed or scorned. This is in tandem with the theory put forward by Kimmel (2010) about homosocial policing in the sense that the men were no longer acting on behalf of women, but acting in front of other men. Sade is at once concerned, then, with masculinity as about authority but also as about respectability, produced

through community recognition and maintained by poorly and informally enforced norms of social discipline.

More specifically, on the theoretical level this case drives reconsideration of the essence of masculinity and its performance. It is not a gender status, a composition of features but rather a structure of culture and a symbolic economy, which determines who can talk, who can possess, rule and be grateful to. The given interpretation is supported within the works of Connell & Messerschmidt (2005), Bourdieu (2001) and who consider, together, that gendered power should be perceived as the symbolic regime incorporated in the institutions, rituals, and discourses. Masculinity in Sade cannot be divorced of custom, religion, kinship and space. In order to destabilize it, it is not enough to teach men to assist more or speak less but to question the whole structure of narration, which makes the male power look inherited, godlike, and ethical.

Lastly, the research also adds value to the sociology of education since it holds that cultural pedagogies, or pedagogies that are outside of the classroom, are as strong as curricula. Unless it comes hand in hand with critical community involvement, schools tend to recreate instead of criticize the existing dominant ideologies. What is at stake in Sade is that without such engagement education becomes a place of symbolic reinforcement; girls learn to do well but not to rule and boys learn how to tolerate criticism without yielding authority. In the Sade society, masculinity is a construction of pedagogy, control through symbols, and maintenance is related to rituals. It is flexible and thus permanent and it is intertwined with morality, custom and kinship so that it seems untouchable. Any action toward the establishment of gender justice in these situations cannot remain at the level of labor redistribution or increased access to something. It has to tend to break the cultural mythologies establishing masculinity, as sovereignty, and femininity, as support. It is only then that the gender should be reimagined not as a list of chores, but as a space of mutual authorship, moral acknowledgment, and power of transformation.

Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated that masculinity among Sade does not only represent a role-based gender difference but a complete institutionalized and pedagogically conveyed system of symbolic power. Dominance among men does not happen in a vacuum; it is taught, moralized, and naturalized using cultural practices, kinship structures, building space and the ordinary language. Although new trends towards gradual masculinity, in which men sometimes engage in housework or talk about economy, are observed, these changes still constitute more of a symbolic gesture, carefully organized in a way that does not seek to put an end on patriarchal authority, but respects it to a certain degree. This drive towards masculine authority in Sade therefore does not linger based on active opposition to the process of change, but based on the selective form of adaptation, which does not critical internalize the process of modernization values, but takes upon the onus of the moral or structural infrastructure of the male claim to authority.

The particular findings necessitate a drastic adjustment of the manner in which education researchers, policy-makers, and educators put into perspective gender equity, especially in culturally natural environments. Empowerment cannot be equated to access or inclusion and education cannot be equated to schooling. In other places, such as Sade, education has already occurred--in ritual arenas, during symbolic silences and through the negotiation of transgression and command within households, and through inter-generational exchange of what constitutes authority, respect and virtue. As long as education is designed so that girls can learn to accomplish but not to talk and boys to accommodate however to make decisions,

the schooling will just imitate and enforce strongly established hierarchies. This explains why critical, community-responsive pedagogies, an education that does not simply teach the concept of gender equality but attempts to unsettle the cultural discourses that construct masculine dominance and feminine submission as natural and good respectively, are needed.

Sociologically speaking, the present study helps to remind us all that gender is always more than structural, it is cultural, symbolic, pedagogical. Transformative education should consequently go beyond distribution of roles or skills. It has to question, who gets to talk, who gets to lead, who gets to decide, and on whose voices that determine success get voiced.. It must question how rituals teach obedience, how space encodes power, and how masculinity continues to govern through discourses of tradition, protection, and respectability. Without disrupting these layers of gendered pedagogy, efforts at inclusion risk becoming nothing more than aesthetic equality—visible participation without structural transformation.

ORCID

Imam Malik  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5667-1266>

References

- Andriana, M., Solihin, M., & Basuki, U. (2023). Toxic Masculinity in the Extra Joss Advertisement “Laki Berani Beda.” *Massive Journal of Communication Science*, 3 (1), 66. <https://doi.org/10.35842/massive.v3i1.86>
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Arisukwu, O., Igbolekwu, C., Adebisi, T., & Akindele, F.A. (2021). Perception of Domestic Violence Among Rural Women in Kuje. *Heliyon*, 7 (2), e06303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06303>
- Arnot, M. (2002). *Reproducing gender: Critical essays on educational theory and feminist politics*. Routledge.
- Bahardur, I. (2024). Masculinity of Minangkabau Men in AR Rizal's Novel Perempuan Batih: A Review by Rewyn Connel. *Humanika*, 30 (2), 177–197. <https://doi.org/10.14710/humanika.v30i2.59788>
- Bili, DL (2022). The Influence of Father's Parenting on the Social Emotional Development of Early Childhood in Southwest Sumba Regency. *Jiip - Scientific Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5 (12), 5338–5343. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v5i12.1191>
- Binasdevi, M. (2021). Gender Inequality in the 2013 Thematic Book Pierce's Semiotic Perspective. *Equalita Journal of Gender and Child Studies*, 3 (1), 132. <https://doi.org/10.24235/equalita.v3i1.8738>
- Bloch, E. (1989). *The utopian function of art and literature: Selected essays*. MIT Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination* (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1998)
- Chant, S., & Sweetman, C. (2012). Fixing women or fixing the world? ‘Smart economics’, efficiency approaches, and gender equality in development. *Gender & Development*, 20(3), 517-529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2012.731812>
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Stanford University Press

- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & society*, 19(6), 829-859.
- Creswell, W. J., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Issue 5). Los Angeles : SAGE.
- Elvira, M., & Santoso, STP (2022). Childcare Education Through Father Involvement at Al Maarif Islamic Kindergarten, Singosari. *Indonesian Community Service Journal* , 2 (3), 455–461. <https://doi.org/10.53769/jai.v2i3.334>
- Ernawati, A., & Marta, RF (2020). Masculine Identity Wrapping in Tattoo Users from Levinas Phenomenology Perspective. *Mudra Journal of Arts and Culture* , 35 (3), 296–307. <https://doi.org/10.31091/mudra.v35i3.1039>
- Faadihilah, AN, Pangestu, DH, & Shidiq, KA (2021). Representation of Masculinity and the Ideal Male Body in Cristiano Ronaldo's Clear Man Shampoo Advertisement. *Audiens Journal* , 3 (2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jas.v3i2.11822>
- Fasoli, F., Frost, D. M., & Serdet, H. (2023). How Voice Transition and Gender Identity Disclosure Shape Perceptions of Trans Men in the Hiring Process. *Gender Work and Organization*, 31 (1), 36–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.13053>
- Felix, F., & Pandrianto, N. (2023). The Image of Patriarchal Culture in the Horror Movie. *Connection*, 7 (2), 446–457. <https://doi.org/10.24912/kn.v7i2.21512>
- Fraser, M. W. (1997). *Risk and resilience in childhood: An ecological perspective*. Washington, DC: NASW press.
- Freire, P. (1970). The adult literacy process as cultural action for freedom. *Harvard educational review*, 40(2), 205-225.
- Goetz, A. M., & Gupta, R. S. (1996). Who takes the credit? Gender, power, and control over loan use in rural credit programs in Bangladesh. *World development*, 24(1), 45-63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(95\)00124-U](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(95)00124-U)
- Handaningtias, UR (2022). Masculinity: Society's Fantasy About the Body (A Study of Signs in Cigarette Advertisements in Indonesia). *Ijd-Demos*, 4 (1). <https://doi.org/10.37950/ijd.v4i1.178>
- Haq, NU (2023). Survival Strategies of Farm Labor Families Due to Gender Inequality. *Journal of Social Cultural Dynamics*, 25 (1), 108. <https://doi.org/10.26623/jdsb.v25i2.4205>
- Hidayat, A., & Suharto, AWB (2022). Philosophical Basis of Establishment and Character Education of Independence of Orphans in Child Welfare Institutions. *Edukatif Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4 (3), 3979–3989. <https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v4i3.2716>
- Hodges-Simeon, C.R., Grail, G.P.O., Albert, G., Groll, M.D., Stepp, C.E., Carré, J.M., & Arnocky, S. (2021). Testosterone Therapy Masculinizes Speech and Gender Presentation in Transgender Men. *Scientific Reports*, 11 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-82134-2>
- Holmes, E. K., Petts, R. J., Thomas, C. R., Robbins, N. L., & Henry, T. (2020). Do Workplace Characteristics Moderate the Effects of Attitudes on Father Warmth and Engagement? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 34 (7), 867–878. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000672>

- Hulaipah, A., Pana, A., Rizaldi, I., Thamrin, IR, Malik, A., Hadi, S., & Hidayati, VR (2024). Gender Inequality Towards Education Within the Framework of Awig-Awig in Sade Hamlet, Rembitan Village, Central Lombok Regency. *Scientific Journal of Educational Professions*, 9 (1), 300–303. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jipp.v9i1.2060>
- Jackman, M. (2022). *The Effect of Tourism on Gender Equality in the Labor Market: Helpmate or Hindrance?* <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/a5dxy>
- Jannah, F. (2022). The Urgency of Understanding Gender Equality for Elementary School Teachers. *Muadalah*, 10 (1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.18592/muadalah.v10i1.8127>
- Jordan, A., Anitha, S., Jameson, J., & Davy, Z. (2022). Hierarchies of Masculinity and Lad Culture on Campus: “Bad Guys”, “Good Guys”, and Complicit Men. *Men and Masculinities*, 25 (5), 698–720. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184x211064321>
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Women and rural development policies: the changing agenda.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2010). *Misframing men: The politics of contemporary masculinities*. Rutgers University Press.
- Kusuma, IBA, & Zulkifli, Z. (2023). Equal Inheritance (Case Study of Bumi Mulya Village, Logas Tanah Darat District, Kuantan Singingi Regency, Riau Province). *Jisrah Journal of Integration of Sharia Science*, 4 (1), 175. <https://doi.org/10.31958/jisrah.v4i1.10315>
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). of Everyday Life. *Foundations for a Sociology of the Everyday*, 2.
- Mahmood, S. (2005). *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton University Press.
- Miles, MB, & Huberman, AM (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Universitas Indonesia Press.
- Mshweshwe, L. (2020). Understanding Domestic Violence: Masculinity, Culture, Traditions. *Heliyon*, 6 (10), e05334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e05334>
- Nurritzka, A. F. (2016). Peran Media Sosial di Era Globalisasi pada Remaja di Surakarta (suatu Kajian Teoritis dan Praktis terhadap Remaja dalam Perspektif Perubahan Sosial). *Jurnal Analisa Sosiologi*, 5(1).
- Nursaptini, N., Sobri, M., Sutisna, D., Syazali, M., & Widodo, A. (2020). Patriarchal Culture and Women's Access to Education. *Al-Maiyyah Media Gender Transformation in the Socio-Religious Paradigm*, 12 (2), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.35905/almaiyyah.v12i2.698>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2003). Cultivating humanity in legal education. *U. Chi. L. Rev.*, 70, 265.
- Ortner, S. B. (2006). *Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject*. Duke University Press.
- Pandusaputri, N.A., Hendrawan, J., & Mokodompit, R.B.R. (2024). Stereotypes of the Role of Men as Cooks (Gender Communication Study). *Syntax Literate Indonesian Scientific Journal*, 9 (6), 3686–3694. <https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v9i6.16222>
- Prayoga, AD, Hendrawan, A., & Eswanda, Y. (2021). Ideal Male Masculinity in Garnier Men Power White Television Advertisement. *Audience Journal*, 3 (2), 33–42. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jas.v3i2.11930>

- Puteri, IAW, & Rudi, R. (2021). The Role of Father's Parenting on Early Childhood Adaptation Skills. *Pelita Paud Journal*, 6 (1), 7–14. <https://doi.org/10.33222/pelitapaud.v6i1.1501>
- Rahmasari, B., Umami, A., & Gautama, T. (2023). The Influence of Customary Law in Village Government Regulation: Normative Perspective. *Muhammadiyah Law Review*, 7 (2), 60. <https://doi.org/10.24127/mlr.v7i2.2770>
- Risfiana, A., & Imelda, JD (2023). Strategy Change Cycle as Organizational Strategic Planning to Implement Gender Mainstreaming in Women in Indonesian Tourism. *International Journal of Social Health*, 2 (8), 511–524. <https://doi.org/10.58860/ijsh.v2i8.79>
- Sairah, S., & Chandra, A. (2022). Daycare and Father Involvement in Child Care. *Obsesi Journal Early Childhood Education Journal*, 6 (5), 4181–4188. <https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v6i5.2498>
- Seravim, O. (2023). The Impact of Patriarchal Culture on Toxic Masculinity in Generation Z in East Nusa Tenggara. *Journal of Health and Behavioral Sciences*, 5 (2), 277–296. <https://doi.org/10.35508/jhbs.v5i2.10583>
- Seyfi, S., Hall, C. M., & Vo-Thanh, T. (2020). The Gendered Effects of Statecraft on Women in Tourism: Economic Sanctions, Women's Disempowerment and Sustainability? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30 (7), 1736–1753. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1850749>
- Sugiarti, S. (2021). Patriarchal Culture in East Javanese Folklore. *Satwika Study of Cultural Sciences and Social Change*, 7 (2), 424–437. <https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v7i2.17888>
- Tabassum, N. (2011). *Towards unlocking patriarchy: women's participation in local politics in Pakistan* (Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University (Turkey)).
- Udzma, NS, Hamid, A., & Herwati, H. (2023). Analysis of Gender Injustice in Patriarchal Culture According to Karin Van Nieuwkerk in the Book Women Embracing Islam. *Jiip - Scientific Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6 (3), 1709–1716. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v6i3.1438>
- Yulianti, Y., & Syahriyah, UU (2023). Fighting Social and Cultural Construction Against Women: Realizing Gender Justice in Households. *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences (Jisi)*, 4 (2). <https://doi.org/10.15408/jisi.v4i2.37129>
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). Women, citizenship and difference. *Feminist review*, 57(1), 4-27.