CHILDREN'S CONCEPTIONS
OF MASCULINITY:
THE MASK

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts in Media Studies
at Massey University.

Simon Hart

1998

Abstract

Television's potential influence on its viewers is frequently the topic of heated debate, both in academia and wider society. This research uses media representations of masculinity embodied in the cartoon programme "The Mask" as a basis for the study of the social construction of masculinity. The research has two foci. Firstly, the observation of how children's talk about television, in particular, their understandings of masculinity, actively constructs subject positions for them; and secondly, participant use of modality judgements. This thesis holds that modality judgements are a vehicle through which potentially conflicting information (in the form of internal and external modality markers) is actively synthesized. Particular attention is given to how the participants' understandings of masculinity are actively negotiated with the representations of masculinity as depicted by the cartoon. The influential work of Buckingham (1993), Morley (1980) and Hall (1980) provides the theoretical framework in which this thesis is structured. The overall results from the focus group research indicated that participants tended to use traditional understandings of the nature of masculinity to conceptualise how 'most men ought' to be. This research has potential implications for the ongoing societal debates regarding the censorship of children's viewing material.

Acknowledgments

This thesis is dedicated to my late sister (Jackie) and father (Charles) who both have passed away during the time I have been studying for my Masterate degree.

Thanks also to my supervisor, Graeme Bassett for his comments, direction and enthusiasm for this subject; to Maree Fraser for her friendly smile, her laugh and supportive nature; to Graham Slater for the frequent passing corridor chats; to Susan Fountaine for her friendship; and to Patrick Hesp and Richard Heerdegen for their support in terms of computing dramas. And thanks also to Roy Shuker for his involvement during the developmental stages of this thesis.

Thanks also to Rachel Stevens for her involvement in this thesis. The research participants must also be acknowledged. Without their input, this thesis would be less substantial.

Finally, a special thank you to Fleur Francois for being there during the ups and downs that all thesis students experience.

Content

Chapter One - Introduction

Until recently, the focus of gender study has been almost
exclusively on women's experience. Now men too have
begun to realize just how powerfully gender influences
their lives. Wicks (1996: xi)

Masculinity has become an area of topical research, both in social sciences and
other disciplines. This has been promoted to a degree by feminist thought into
the social factors that influence the formation of different expressions of
masculinity. However, the work of socio-biologists (as an example of another
discipline that has an interest in masculinity) does not necessarily derive from
feminist insights. It becomes obvious that attempts to understand masculinity
can be located within a series of differing paradigms. For instance, feminist
literature, which loosely has a sociological base, argues that the gender, but more
specifically, masculinity, is an expression of political power. Maintaining that
gender is a social and political construct, biological influences are seen to carry
little weight in the construction of masculine gender identity. However, feminist
thought on masculinity cannot be reduced to a single strand. It is politically
multifarious, incorporating left-wing thought, 'liberal' and 'radical' branches.
Left-wing feminism tends to view the future for women as involving a change to
the nature of capitalism, but with men still involved. Liberal feminist thought
promotes an amelioration of some sort for women within the current social
order, whilst 'radical' feminist ideologies see "a future determined by women for
women" (Horrocks, 1994:9). Influential writers in this field include Lynne Segal
(1993).

Socio-biology, such as the work of Greenstein (1993) posits an understanding of
human behaviour influenced by genetics. Primarily interested in discovering the
extent to which physiological factors interact with social and cultural influences,
work in this area frequently compares and contrasts human social behaviour to
that of other animals. Greenstein's research focused on brain sexual

differentiation and is a mix of what he calls "speculation and evidence"(1993:2). He notes:

> Initially I was intrigued by the evidence that the brain is intrinsically
> female, and becomes male only through the intervention of the male
> sex hormone testosterone. This prompted the speculation that
> originally there were only females until one started budding off males
> for a specific set of purposes ... [but] From my reading it became
> clear that for most species, and certainly in the case of humans,
> something went terribly wrong and the female lost control of the male.
> He became not a guardian but a biologically programmed tyrant ... I
> discovered that the human male is far more dangerous than I could
> ever have imagined, mainly because he does not know just how
> dangerous he is. (1993:1-2)

From this quote it is possible to observe how difficult it is to separate biological and social influences that shape gender. Greenstein and other authors (Treadwell, 1987) primarily contend that sex differences in the brain are a basis for differing gendered behaviours.

Psychoanalysis also offers an understanding of the construction of masculinity. By far the most influential writer in this area is Freud. Freud contended that the basis of human subjectivity was primarily bio-sexual. But, as Horrocks maintains:

> Freud's thought was imbued with patriarchal and biological
> notions: he was unable or unwilling to see that women's second-
> class status was socially determined. He saw women as castrated
> men, forever mourning their inferiority. He could not relativize
> gender inequality but saw it as eternal and unchanging. (1994:68)

The mirror phase and Oedipal complex were, according to Freud (and later Lacan), instrumental in the construction of subjectivity. The mirror phase occurs

when the child is weaned from its mother and is crucial in the recognition of sexual difference and in the formation of ego boundaries. During the Oedipal trajectory, Freud argued that the male child must at some stage reject his mother as the primary focus of identification, and hence, all that is stereotypically 'feminine' identifying instead with his father as the 'masculine' figure. These two concepts combined are relevant to the construction of masculinity because they enable the gendered factors that influence masculine subjectivity to be observed.

Developing Freudian thought, Jacques Lacan suggested that subjectivity was primarily linguistic, and not as Freud thought, deriving from bio-sexual drives. This aspect of his work is attractive to a branch of feminism because it allows the construction of subjectivity to be analysed in terms of ideological and cultural forces. For Lacan, the Oedipal drama represented the entry of the child into the Symbolic order, or as he elsewhere referred to it, the 'Law of the Father'. Lacan maintained that the child was born with a profound sense of lack, and spends the rest of its life trying to recapture the imagined unity (with its mother) from which it is separated.

The Men's Movement has developed aspects of this, maintaining that certain expressions of masculinity are based in a sense of vulnerability. Contending that as a child, the male receives most of his nurturing from his mother, whilst simultaneously seeing his father as emotionally reticent, the child feels what Biddulph (1995) and Pittman (1993) refer to as "father hunger". A component of this is the male child's perception of what it is to be masculine. Authors such as Wicks (1996), Biddulph (1995) and Pittman (1993) contend that the female child learns 'what' it is to be feminine by observation, and 'how' to be feminine through emotional contact with its mother . In contrast, the male child learns 'what' it is to be masculine through observation, but because of the father's (that is, presuming he is present) emotional autism (Horrocks, 1994:107-125), the child does not learn what it 'feels' like to be a man. Because the basis of the male child's understanding of what it is to be a 'man' is primarily from what it has observed, over-exaggerated displays of hypermasculinity become the way the

child 'acts out' its expression of masculinity. Horrocks contends that the media have an influential, if not somewhat contradictory role in the creation and reflection of such masculine stereotypes:

> If we want to look more closely at the stereotyped images of men in
> our culture, it is very illuminating to examine those found in the media
> and in the arts. Here we find images which provide an insight into the
> expectations of the culture, and also into the unconscious depths of
> masculinity. That is, we find both images that consolidate or reinforce
> the stereotypes of masculinity, and those images that subvert it.
>
> (1994:145)

Reinforced by stereotyped media representations, the tension between what it 'feels' like to be a 'man' and what it 'looks' like to be a 'man' is difficult to resolve. A popular writer in this field is Easthope (1990). Drawing on examples from cultural practices to inform his insights, Easthope maintains that the 'myth of masculinity' is complexly interwoven with aspects of individual psychology.

A numbers of writers have attempted to explain the social construction of masculinity using autobiographical experience. Writers such as Morgan (1992) and Seilder (1989) employ a synthesis of experience and theory to go beyond traditional patriarchal 'rational' uses of language in attempt to explain 'masculine' experiences. Seidler contends that:

> We put a distance between ourselves and our experience and we
> rarely use our language to bring us into closer contact with our
> different parts of ourselves … We can find ourselves trapped
> into a language of externalized systems when we consider, for
> example, the relationship between 'capitalism' and 'patriarchy'.

Similarly:

> Because we develop a sense of self in relation to others in a
> deep-seated competitive relationship, we lose any sense of what
> it could mean to trust other men. We are so used to seeing other
> men as competitors who will not lose any opportunity to put us
> down, that we do not know how to begin in this process. (1989:108)

Horrocks suggests that many authors are now writing 'confessional' books on their experiences of being male. In a similar manner to Seidler, Horrocks agrees that this is an important breakthrough: "it is legitimate to use one's own life, one's own feelings as material for analysis and study" (1994:15). Other authors in this field include Biddulph (1995) and Pittman (1993).

In certain academic postmodern environments, it has become theoretically 'trendy' to distinguish between 'masculinity' and masculinites. Attempting to promote an understanding of masculinity as plural, the adding of 'ies' seeks an acknowledgment of the multiple and differing expressions of masculinity. However, it is a belief of this thesis that the word 'masculinity' is plural in itself. Under the umbrella term 'masculinity', varying expressions or inflections of masculinity exist. The word 'masculinities' is somewhat unnecessary since the term masculinity encapsulates these different conceptions. Throughout this thesis, the word 'masculinity' is used with an awareness of the various inflections of masculinities.

Research involving children, television and its potential influences and uses is an ever topical area of debate. In most 'common sense' understandings, the logic of the 'effects' tradition is employed. This understanding contends that there is a direct and unmediated relationship between what, in this case, children see on television and subsequently, what they do. Research that seeks to prove this stimulus-response theory has primarily been carried out in laboratory situations and has typically "attempted to identify the various ways in which a violent stimulus would produce an aggressive response' (Buckingham, 1993:11). The rhetoric of many 'public' outcries surrounding children and television's effects frequently provokes a wider societal moral panic. This inevitably leads to claims

that television is somehow inherently 'bad' for children. Examples of this include the public concern over the children's programme "Mighty Morphin Power Rangers", or more recently the subversive cartoon "SouthPark".

The research undertaken in this thesis is contextualised by the frequent societal debate regarding the impact that television has on child viewers. The concerns expressed in such debates are often focused on the negative effects of television. Buckingham suggests that

> Whether the emphasis is on children's behaviour, their
> mental development of their attitudes and beliefs, the role of
> television is predominately assumed to be harmful. (1993:9)

Buckingham maintains that these anxieties are informed by wider cultural ideologies about the nature of Childhood. He contends that

> many critics of television would appear to hark back to a vision
> of childhood which has much in common with the Victorian ideal.
> From this perspective, the inadequacies and immaturities of
> children often provide a source of quaint amusement, sometimes
> tempered with a rather patronizing Wordsworthian belief in their
> essential purity and wisdom. Yet ... this view often masks a fear
> of children - and particularly of working class children - as
> potential monsters. The power of media such as television is seen
> to lie in their ability to penetrate the veneer of civilization and
> release the darker forces which lie beneath. Adult intervention is
> therefore needed in order to protect children from temptation and
> the ever-present possibility of corruption. (1993:10)

Expressed in this quote are some of the crucial 'common sense' beliefs that form a basis of moral panics related to the content of children's television programmes and how the viewing of such material can only corrupt the assumed 'morally pure' nature of childhood. Implicit in this understanding of childhood is a

clearly structured power relationship designed to ensure that traditional understandings of 'Adulthood' are not contested or threatened by a less defined relationship between 'adult' and 'child'. The 'Media' are conceptualised as a vehicle for moral corruption, possessing a hypnotic-like power over the defenseless child. This somewhat patronising understanding of childhood implicitly assumes that children have not learnt the adult structures that some would believe 'protect' them. However, one cannot but be concerned about the assumed ideologies that inform this understanding of adulthood. By reverse inference, adulthood here is morally corrupt.

Not only does this represent a simplistic behaviourist 'effects' based model of human cognition, but, as Buckingham again suggests:

> debates about children and television frequently serve as a vehicle
> for much broader concerns. Genuine, often deep-seated anxieties
> about what are perceived as undesirable social or moral changes
> lead to a search for a single, causal explanation. Blaming television
> may serve to deflect attention away from other possible causes of
> change or decline (1993:8).

Such a view fails to acknowledge that children may actively choose to watch television, and that there is a level of enjoyment and pleasure derived from the experience. However, concerns surrounding the moral corruption of 'the young' are not new. Over 2000 years ago Socrates was put to death on the charge of corrupting the minds of the young. Similarly, Plato proposed a ban on dramatic poets, contending that "young people were unable to tell the difference between what was 'allegorical' and what was 'literal', and would be more likely to copy what they saw" (Buckingham, 1993:7). It could be argued that today's moral panic surrounding the influence and nature of children's television programmes is just the latest manifestation of an issue that is deeply a part of the human psyche.

Academic work in this area, such as the research carried out by Hodge and Tripp (1986) and more recently Buckingham (1993) has focused on observations made by children. This is in contrast to public debate which has tended to privilege adult voices, who by default 'know best', and must argue on behalf of the helpless child viewer.

The research of Hodge and Tripp focused on issues of modality judgements. They maintained that children engage in complex and dynamic processes to determine how 'realistic' a programme is. For example, information about the internal world of the cartoon is actively compared and contrasted to knowledge of the external world that participants inhabit. Drawing on this work, Buckingham argued that the act of 'talking' is a inherently social activity where children actively position themselves in relation to the text and others. Consequently, children were viewed in both research environments as 'active viewers', undertaking an active role in the construction of meaning, synthesizing a complex set of variables that include such things as cultural competence and cultural capital (Fiske, 1987:19-20).

Informed by the disciplines of sociology and psychology, the central issue of this thesis is the social construction of masculinity. An episode from the children's cartoon "The Mask" (entitled "Jurassic Mask") was used as the basis for the study, with the programme's differing expressions of masculinity being analysed to provide material for textual analysis and a focus group interview. Insights from sociology, in particular those related to ideology from British Cultural Studies were used to provide a theoretical framework for an explanation of social factors influencing the social construction of masculinity. These understandings of ideology were also used as the basis for textual analysis. Concurrently, material from Freudian and Lacanian psychology, along with aspects of Men's Studies have been drawn on to provide a synergy of differing explanations for the construction of masculine subjectivity.

Chapter two links the thesis to the work of Hall, Morley and Buckingham. This thesis discusses Hall's influential Encoding/Decoding model, Morley's

Nationwide Audience study and Buckingham's 'Children Talking Television'. A critically evaluative commentary of the Encoding/Decoding model is cited. Morley's application of Hall's model is discussed, with specific attention paid to his research methodology and the identification of preferred, negotiated and oppositional readings. The work of Buckingham related to children, their 'talk' and the exercising of modality judgements is focused on, with specific attention paid to his discussion of observations related to masculinity.

Chapter three is a discussion of the theories of representation, specifically, the reflective, intentional and constructionist approaches. Notions of Ideology are raised, with Marxist and Althusserian political thought being discussed. Ideas related to the social construction of masculinity are highlighted, drawing on insights from Freudian and Lacanian psychology, theories from sociology and the Men's movement.

Chapter four details the focus group methodology employed by this research. The 'Funnel' approach to focus group work was used (Morgan, 1997:41), which involves using broad non-directive and open-ended questions. Chapter five is the textual analysis of the chosen episode "Jurassic Mask" from the cartoon programme "The Mask". It is primarily ideological analysis and is the researcher's preferred reading. Chapter six details the research findings whilst chapter seven is the thesis' conclusions.

Primarily, this thesis is interested to observe the understandings of masculinity that a sample of participants (children in this case) express. An episode of a popular children's cartoon programme ('The Mask') will be used as a vehicle to prompt discussions relating to the central concerns of the thesis. Buckingham's (1993) research notions, which point to an understanding of children's talk as being instrumental in the formation of subject positions were employed, while simultaneously observing whether participant's work toward a consensual understanding of 'what the programme means'. Participant's use of modality judgements were observed. It is a tenet of this thesis that such judgements serve as a vehicle through which understandings of masculinity are actively synthesized

into wider 'meanings' of the programme and to more general understandings of 'what it means to be a man'. The methodological approach to the episode of the programme is textual analysis, and is the thesis' 'preferred reading'. It is conceded that this research is based on a small sample. However, the thesis in no way attempts to make grandiose claims about the 'nature of masculinity' for everyone, nor about any kind of 'universal' positivist 'truth'. It is to a model of the interaction between the media and meaning that we now turn.

Chapter Two - Literature Review

2.1 Encoding/Decoding and beyond:

> "There can be no law to ensure that the receiver will take a preferred
> or dominant meaning of an episode ... in precisely the way in which it
> has been encoded by the producer".   Hall (1973:9)

Stuart Hall's 1973 Stencilled Occasional Paper entitled "Encoding and Decoding
in the Televisual Discourse" lead the way in a new era of communication
research. Prior to this article (and his (1980) refined version of it with the same
title), the nature of academic research had moved from the 'Effects' model of
human cognition, onto the 'Uses and Gratifications' model which developed in
part, as a response to the flaws of the effects model. 'Effects' logic (as it was a
commonly recognised) posited a behaviourist understanding of the dynamic
inter-relationship between individuals and the media. One of the central tenets of
the effects tradition is that the viewing of television material has a direct and
measurable influence upon viewers' attitudes and behaviours.   Human
comprehension was understood to be in the form of imitative 'Monkey see
Monkey do'.   A fundamental shortcoming of the effects model is that it
conceptualised the viewing process as a passive activity whilst ignoring the
individual polysemy of media messages.

Consequently, media research began to take divergent paths at the beginning of
the 1960's.   Researchers (Riley and Riley (1959), Katz (1959) and Wright
(1960)) began exploring the general functions of the media in society, equipped
with the realisation that viewers in fact actively assimilate information, rather
than sitting and absorbing visual and aural cues in a manner similar to a 'zombie'.
Thus, the question of 'what does television do to viewers?' commonly employed
in the Effects tradition was modified to 'what do people do with television?' by
the Uses and Gratifications approach.

The 'Uses and Gratifications' model proposed a more viewer oriented

understanding of the communication process: it acknowledged the variety of contributing factors (e.g. race, socio-economic status, religious beliefs, sex, gender) that contribute to the creation of 'meaning'. The model highlighted the fact that different members of a media audience may interpret a programme in ways that differ from what the producer intended. This approach also stressed the role of the audience in the construction of meaning. The model presupposes that a key reason why viewers watch televison is that they (the viewer) come to the media with specific 'needs' to be satisfied (for example, the desire to learn about world events would prompt an individual to view the news). However, this model has its limitations. Morley argued that it is "insufficiently sociological", maintaining that the model relies too heavily "on mental states, needs and processes [that are] abstracted from the social situation of the individuals concerned" (1992:53).

Hall (1980) observed that a common flaw with previous media models was the way communication was conceptualised. The 'effects' tradition understood communication as an unmediated process where the audience passively absorbed the imparted information. The 'uses and gratifications' model dethroned the text as the centre of meaning, instead understanding communication as a neutral medium which allows viewers to interpret the message according to their own individual 'uses' or 'needs'. However, this model essentially removed the viewer from 'society' maintaining that individuals were the autonomous authors of their own private meanings. It was in this academic environment that Hall began to theorise a new model of media communication which ultimately became the 'Encoding/Decoding' model.

In his article, Hall discussed what he understood the nature of the communicative act to be. He argued that the act of mass-communication is a series of "linked, but distinctive moments" (1980:128) characterised by the 'moments' of production, circulation, distribution/consumption and reproduction. These he argued, are mobilised by professional codes, the function of which is the creation of "meanings and messages in the form of sign vehicles" (1980:128). It is

through these 'symbolic sign vehicles' that meaning is established.

Hall described the moments of encoding and decoding as relatively autonomous "determinate moment(s)" (1980:129). Communication in its message form, is a relatively autonomous 'package'. When taken in isolation from the production and viewing context, communication possesses a presence of its own. In contrast the moments of encoding and decoding are 'determinate moments'. It is at this point that the structural features (e.g. socio-economic status, race, sex) of the producer/viewer are mobilised to create meaning. Because there are different structural forces working on each individual viewer, the message can be read in polysemic ways.

Hall had augmented his argument to encompass the possibility that there are many different ways messages can be read. However, he noted that "Polysemy must not ... be confused with pluralism" arguing that any "society/culture tends, with varying degrees of closure, to impose its classifications of the social and cultural and political world" (1980:134). Whilst acknowledging the external social forces that shape meaning, Hall avoided the structuralist notion that meaning is somehow inherent in a word. Instead, he asserted that there is a richness of meaning associated with a symbol, and that there are a variety of meanings which can be 'read into' or 'taken from' it. This position avoids the pluralist notion of being able to read 'anything at all into something'. Aware of the dangers of ignoring the individual structural factors that influence meaning, Hall (1980) is equally wary of the other extreme which dethrones the text as the centre of meaning. This would imply slipping into a completely subjective 'reality'. Turner reiterates this point noting that "Texts can change their meanings [as they are] ... worked on by their audiences" (1996:87).

Hall identified three hypothetical positions through which the viewer could decode the televisual information presented. These were the preferred, negotiated and oppositional readings. For a 'preferred' (or dominant-hegemonic as Hall initially referred to it) reading to take place, the viewer

takes the connoted meaning from, say, a television newscast or
current affairs programme full and straight, and decodes the
message in terms of the reference code in which it has been
encoded, we might say that the viewer is *operating inside
the dominant code.*   (1980:136)

In the preferred reading, there is a direct symmetry and alignment (Hall refers to
this as 'reciprocity') between the encoding and the decoding meanings.   This
symmetry exists in terms of ideological positionings, enabling a "communication
exchange" (1980:136) to occur.   It is insightful to analyse the language that Hall
has used.   For example, the word 'exchange' instead of the word 'process'.
Exchange implies a two sided activity of an interchange of ideas or concepts,
whereas process implies a one-direction flow of information.   This is why Hall
describes communication as 'two distinct moments'.

The second identified position is the 'negotiated reading'.   Hall argued that this is
the position that most viewers take.   A negotiated reading "accord[s] the
privileged position to the dominant definitions of events while reserving the right
to make a more negotiated application to local conditions" (Turner, 1996:86).
The viewer partially inflects the dominant meaning of the message because of
inconsistences created by individual lived social experience.

Hall contended that the 'negotiated' reading is an example of how dominant
definitions become global - because they are in dominance.   However, because
individuals experience 'society' at the local level, hegemonic forces have to
operate in order for the local narrative to be linked to global meta-narratives.
Whilst employing meta-narratives to contextualise an issue on the global level,
the lived local experience of the viewer may not be in alignment with the
encoded messages of the programme, henceforth, creating a gap in
understanding.   This is what the negotiated reading explains.   So, as Hall
succinctly points out:

Decoding within the *negotiated version* contains a mixture of

adaptive and oppositional elements: it acknowledges the

legitimacy of the hegemonic definitions to make grand

significance (abstract)[global], while, at a more restricted,

situational (situated) [local] level, it makes its own ground

rules - it operates with exceptions to the rule ... This version

of the dominant ideology is thus shot through with contradictions,

though these are only on certain occasions brought to full

visibility. (1980:137)

Finally, the third possible reading is the 'oppositional reading'. In this context, the viewer recognises and understands the preferred meaning as being one that is encoded, but actively

detotalizes the message in the preferred code in order to retotalize

the message within some alternative framework of reference.

(Hall, 1980:138)

Therefore, the preferred encoded meaning has been totally inflected due to an individual's oppositional map of meaning. It is clear that an individual's structural features (e.g. race, socio-economic status, sexual preference, religious convictions) and 'lived experience' would be influential in the construction of this meaning. Hall maintained that the "lack of fit between the codes has a great deal to do with the structural differences of relation and position between broadcasters and audiences" (1980:131). It is worth noting that Hall employs the word 'audience' to describe 'viewers'. This word is indicative of his conceptual understanding of the nature of the viewing audience, and of the viewing process. Fiske argued that the use of the word 'audience'

implies that television reaches a homogeneous mass of people

who are all essentially identical, who receive the same messages,

meanings, and ideologies from the same programs and who are

essentially passive. The inability of the term "audience" to account

for social differences and consequent differences of meanings means

that it ascribes great centralizing, homogenizing power to television

and its producers. (1987:16)

The implications that the word 'viewer' infers are different to those surrounding the word 'audience'. In the former, viewing is an active process of 'reading' information, whereas the latter invokes an element of passivity to the act of viewing . The social experience(s) of the viewer are therefore invoked in the 'viewing' experience. Fiske maintained that 'viewer' is specific to televisual texts, but 'reader' is universal to all texts.

"reader" means "the producer of texts, the maker of meanings and

pleasures." This productive ability is the result of social experience or

training, whether formal or informal. It is not an innate gift, but and

acquired ability. It is a social practice, is ideological, and is the means

by which sociocultural experience, the text in question, and its

intertextual relationships, are brought together in a productive moment

of interaction. (1987:17)

A central theme of Hall's in this article is that the 'viewer' is engaged in an active process of 'reading' the meaning(s) encoded into the televisual message. Arising from an understanding of viewing as an active process, Hall insisted that there is nothing 'natural' about the communication act. In fact, it is heavily constructed both for the encoder and the decoder. He noted that there are certain codes of representation, and that these are

learned at so early an age, that they appear not to be constructed ...

(but that) ... this does not mean that no codes have intervened; rather,

that the codes have been profoundly *naturalised*. (1980:132)

Hall provided the example of 'simple visual signs' to demonstrate his point arguing that some have "achieved a 'near-universality' ... though evidence

remains that even apparently 'natural' visual codes are culture-specific"
(1980:132). The ideological effect of this 'near-universality' is to conceal
production codes - for then they are understood as being 'natural'. This
unquestioned 'naturalness' indicated that there is a degree of symmetry between
the messages encoded and those decoded, and this is what Hall calls a 'preferred'
reading. Fiske noted that

> Any one viewer ... may at different times be a different viewing
> subject, as constituted by his or her social determinants, as different
> social alliances may be mobilised for different moments of viewing.
> (1989:57)

There is also the possibility therefore, that the viewer could lose the distinction
between what is 'real' and what is being 're-presented', due to the excessively
'naturalised' and unquestioned codes of representation. It is at this point that
Hall (1980:132) drew upon Eco's notion of iconic signs to argue the distinction
between presentation and representation. Hall referred to Eco as having stated
that "iconic signs look like objects in the real [physical] world because they
reproduce the conditions (that is, the codes) of perception in the viewer"
(1980:132).

One of the problems associated with Hall's model is what Morley considered to
be "the slide towards intentionality" (1992:120). Morley maintained that it is too
easy for the focus of research to change from the examination of textual features
into an attempt to "recover the subjective intentions of the sender or author of a
particular message" (ibid.). He believed that not enough attention is paid to the
fact that the meaning of a message may

> escape the conscious mind of its author, and the model implicitly
> slides towards a confusion of textual meaning with authorial
> intention. (1992:120)

Lewis confirmed this stating "One of the problems I had [with the Encoding/Decoding model] ... involves the assumption that there is a preferred meaning: one which we then negotiate with, agree with, or oppose"(1994:265). No longer can it be assumed that the meaning(s) of the author are the meaning(s) concluded by the viewer. Aware of this, Morley questioned whether it is possible to distinguish textual meanings from 'authorial intent'. This stance, bordering on solipsism, slides toward reader-response theory which understands the viewer as the centre of meaning creation (1992:120). However, the danger of this stance is, as Hall warned, to blur the distinction between polysemy and pluralism (1980:134).

Morley argued that Hall's encoding/decoding model is "unhappily close" to other previous models of communication. This is because the model does not take into account the role of language in the transmission of the message. Instead, it assumed that the message is formed in the author's mind and then simply encoded into language for conveyance. Thus,

> the implicit conception is of language merely as [a] 'tool' or
> mechanism for sending messages, rather than of language
> as the medium in which consciousness takes shape.
> (Morley, 1992:121)

Hall himself (in Nightingale) has criticised this model on many counts, primarily for its linearity, its failure to see communication as anything other than in a functionalist framework, and finally,

> its concentration on the 'level of message exchange', and on its absence
> of a 'structured conception of the different moments [of mass
> communication] as a complex structure of relations'. (1996:27)

In a 1994 interview with various media researchers, Hall suggested that the encoding/decoding model described communication as a circuit, but, as he drew it, it was not. Rather, as it stood, the model was a one-directional flow model

that demonstrated the flow of 'meaningful' discourse from the encoded to the decoded without allowing for the communication circuit to be completed. Illustrating his point with an example (1994:260), Hall asserted "The reporter is [always] picking up on the presignified world in order to signify it in a new way again." His qualification highlights that communication does not occur in a bubble separate from 'reality', but rather that the communication process is a social activity that constantly draws upon presignified concepts which enable the current material to be understood.

The Encoding/Decoding model challenged prior models of communication through its understanding of the communication act as a series of linked but distinctive 'moments'. Resulting from this shift in the way communication was conceptualised, communication was thought of as separate but related moments. This enabled research to focus on each aspect of communication with the model being able to provide an account of specific features (e.g. individual structural factors) of the communication act. This was unlike previous models which saw the viewer either as a passive receptacle for information or as being removed from their social context. Through its identification of three hypothetical 'readings', the encoding/decoding model went some way to explaining the differing readings that viewers could make, whilst still acknowledging the importance of the text as the site of contested meanings. The encoding/decoding model of Hall's is relevant to this project because it of these insights. The model provides an avenue to identify a 'preferred' meaning from a text, whilst also allowing for positions other than the 'preferred' to exist, granting the viewer a level of autonomy in the creation of meaning.

2.2 An initial application: Morley's *NATIONWIDE* Audience

"The television message is treated as a complex sign in which a preferred reading has been inscribed, but which retains the potential, if decoded in a manner different from the way in which it has been encoded, of communicating a different message." (Morley, 1992:86)

David Morley's 1980 study of the British current affairs television programme Nationwide began a new era of cultural studies analysis. Morley's work used the encoding/decoding model to ascertain the influence of viewer socio-demographic features upon the types of meanings that were individually constructed. Nationwide also involved textual analysis employing the discipline of semiotics as a way into textual meanings.

The Nationwide study "hoped to highlight the nature of the interaction through which audiences produce meanings from material (words, images) presented to them in the organised form of the text" (Morley, 1992:90-91). The first stage of the study involved detailed textual analysis of the British television programme "Nationwide". To do this, recurrent themes and presentation formats were sought with a view to analysing them over a period of months, using collective viewing and discussions of the programme. Detailed analysis of the internal structure of one episode was also carried out. Morley does not specify who was involved in the discussion of the programme, nor how they were chosen (1990:90). Ang reiterates this in discussion of the nature of Morley's work.

> Due to his academistic posture Morley has not deemed it necessary
> to reflect upon his own position as a researcher. We [the reader] do
> not get to know how he found and got on with his interviewees, nor
> are we informed about the way in which the interviews themselves
> took place. (1989:110)

Ang calls for a more self-reflexive type of research where the researcher is aware of and acknowledges their own ideological underpinnings.

It was envisaged by Morley that his research would highlight the extent to which the textual meanings (implicit and explicit) were being acknowledged by the viewer. The Nationwide study was fundamentally concerned with the concept of 'Preferred' readings. Specifically, the study of the extent to which the text limited or narrowed down (ideological closure) the range of potential meanings made available to the viewer.

Interested in observing how individuals from different socio-demographic backgrounds interpreted the televisual text, the Nationwide study aimed to investigate the extent (or the limits) to which the 'hegemonic' definitions articulated by the programme were taken up and accepted by its audience. Morley argued "we were concerned with the conditions under which counter-hegemonic, or oppositional, meanings were produced within the communication exchanges initiated by the programme" (1992:91).

The Nationwide study sought to develop the relationship between the analysis of practices of 'decoding' of media material and the theoretical concept of hegemony. "Our concern in the Nationwide research project was to connect the theoretical question of the maintenance of hegemony with the empirical question of how a particular programme acts to 'prefer' one set of meanings or definitions of events" (Morley, 1992:91). Hegemony is relevant because it enables the researcher to observe how implicit power relations are won (largely through language) and actively exercised in a societal context. Turner succinctly argues that

> The idea of hegemony does not suggest that domination is achieved by
> manipulating the worldview of the masses. Rather, it argues that in
> order for cultural leadership to be achieved, the dominant group has to
> engage in negotiations with opposing groups, classes and values - and
> that these negotiations must result in some *genuine* accommodation.
> That is, hegemony is not maintained through the obliteration of the
> opposition but through the *articulation* of opposing interests into
> the political affiliations of the hegemonic group.   (1996:195)

Morley employed a Gramscian understanding of hegemony, arguing that different groups are in competition for the 'power to define' events and values. Bennett notes that Gramsci maintained that there is no one 'dominant' ideology, but rather, a system of competing ideologies standing in positions that could be conflicting (1986:15-16). Hegemony acknowledges that although not all in society are in the same position of power, that power is maintained through

absorbing the ideological positions which are opposed to a dominant one without severely changing it.

Hegemony as a concept allows for the polysemic nature of meaning. The acknowledgement of the existence of competing ideologies allows for readings which are conceived of as being other than 'dominant'. The 'dominant' group is dependent upon the 'subordinate' group for its existence. It is the relationship and tension between the two that becomes the determining factor.

Morley's method involved showing two programmes to two separate groups. The first programme was shown to eighteen groups composed of individuals from different levels within the educational system. All had different social and cultural backgrounds with participants coming from London and Midlands. They were school children, part and full time students from different levels "of further and higher education" (Morley, 1992:91). The second programme was shown to eleven groups, composed of individuals from differing positions in the education system, but drew on individuals from management training centres and trade unions, mainly from London.

It is crucial to note that although Morley claimed to be interested in socio-demographics (age, sex, race and class) he made no mention of the sex/gender of the participants. Instead he drew primarily on class as a signifying characteristic. Similarly, the existence of racial characteristics amongst the grouping was ignored. Age was inferentially highlighted by reference to the relative 'educational levels' of participating individuals. However, the sample, in an essentialist manner, implied that class, along with the (researchers) presumed correlations with each individual's political opinions (a 'preferred' meaning) would be influential in the process of meaning construction.

In an attempt to minimise the 'effects' of the researcher in the process of information gathering, Nationwide researchers gained "entry to a situation where the group already had some existence as a social entity" (Morley, 1992:91). While a benefit of this is that the group is acquainted with each other, group

dynamics such as dominant individuals and patterns of behaviour, can limit not only how the individual speaks, but the types of things that are said. This aspect is something that the researcher will not be familiar with if exposed to the group for the first time.

The groups ranged in size from five and ten individuals, with viewing of a pre-recorded programme of Nationwide being screened within the group viewing context. After the viewing of the videotape, subsequent discussions were recorded and transcribed enabling 'data' to be collected for analysis. A period of approximately thirty minutes of conversation was usually recorded.

The socio-demographic features (e.g. age, sex, race and class) of the participants were observed in order to determine their role and influence in the process of constructing meaning. It can be argued that the closer an individual is to the 'perceived' dominant socio-demographic features, the higher the likelihood of the text being interpreted in a 'preferred' manner.

Morley stated that "the programmes were analysed principally in terms of how they are constructed" (1992:92). Through this textual analysis, the study hoped to elucidate meanings through analysis of elements including

> how topics are articulated; how background and explanatory
> frameworks are mobilised, visually and verbally; how expert
> commentary is integrated; and how discussions and interviews
> are monitored and conducted. (1992:92)

Thus, Morley was interested in the language employed to explain various topics, how the language employed 'mobilises' larger metanarratives and epistemological issues about ways of understanding the world (both through the 'visualness' of the television medium and through the relative discursive environments), how 'expert' commentary is synthesized into the programme, and finally, how interviews and discussions in Nationwide are integrated.

He goes on to argue that the aim of the textual analysis was "not to provide a single, definitive reading of the programmes, but to establish provisional readings of their main communicative and ideological structures" (1992:92) . However, although this might be the 'ideal' of the study, the employment of the 'preferred, negotiated and oppositional' readings positions the viewer in such a manner as to already limit the range of possible meanings made available. There seems to be an unresolved tension between the desire to grant the viewer a level of creative autonomy and the notion of 'fitting' individual 'readings' into some kind of empirically 'coherent' sequence. Nightingale contends that

> Morley prefers to treat [the televisual] message as text only, and to
> conceive of audiences as 'active' only in making decisions about
> what to do with the text ... Creative processes of at least equal
> significance to cultural production [of meaning] are ignored and
> audience performance is limited to a rather narrow range of
> conscious cognitive activities which demonstrate a degree
> of comprehension. (1996:102)

Nightingale's observation signals a significant limitation to Morley's work. Morley sought to observe how viewers understood the previously analysed programmes whilst seeking to observe if there was any correlation between what he called the "structural positions" (1992:93) of the individual subjects; however Morley failed to acknowledge that viewers might use the programme for purposes other than what the research sought to observe. It is assumed that by 'structural positions' Morley is referring to the differing vertical societal positions that individuals inhabit. Morley does not specify how these 'structural positions' were ascertained. However, considering class is a major determinant elsewhere in the Nationwide study, it would be logical to assume that it would act as a criteria here too. These positions are identified to test the application of the 'preferred, negotiated and oppositional readings'.

The focused interview was the key methodological device employed in Nationwide. A major advantage of this method is that the subjective experience

of the viewer can be accessed by the researcher. Initially, the first stages of interviewing were non-directive, enabling the viewer to develop issues that they deem relevant. Later in the interview, Morley directed the discussion(s), beginning to ask specific questions about programme material which had been analysed prior. The questions were shaped so that they did not cut directly across the flow of the conversation "but rather engaged with, and tried to develop, points already raised by the respondents" (Morley, 1992:97).

Morley utilised group interviews rather than individual based interviews on the premise that the latter tend to conceptualise the individual as an atomised isolated being, removed from their discursive environment (Morley, 1992:97). Whilst this can be useful for research where the focus is primarily upon individual responses to certain stimuli, one of Nationwide's aims was to observe how meanings were collectively made from discussions in groups. There are however, shortcomings to this method. Because Morley sought groups that were already in existence, dominant individuals could easily manipulate and colour interactions.

Once research material regarding how the messages were received had been collated, the observations were compared with previous textual analysis carried out by the project to ascertain three main points. Initially the study wanted to observe if the participants drew any messages that their textual analysis did not pick up. Related to this, the 'visibility' of various differing meanings related to respondents socio-economic positions. And thirdly, "to what extent different sections of the audience did interpret the messages in different ways and to what they projected freely on to the message meanings they would want to find there" (1992:93) Consistently, Morley's points reaffirm his belief in the primacy of the text.

Through the observation of participants' use of language, it is possible to ascertain which and/or what type of readings have been made, aligning the 'reading' with the preferred, negotiated or oppositional stances. Again, Morley was only interested in how the meanings that the viewers construct relate to

those that the study developed. Throughout the study, it appeared that the 'respondents' readings only existed in relation to the previously observed 'official' textual readings of the group. As previously mentioned then, Morley was effectively only testing the extent to which he can predict what meanings the viewer will construct. Nightingale refers to this, arguing that

> Clearly what Morley had discovered is that the audience did not read
> the programme in the same way as the researchers, and that his
> research strategy could not accommodate the complexity of the
> research task he had undertaken. (1996:67)

Ideological issues relating to 'presenter styles' and how these actively encourage viewers to align themselves with their perceived 'dominant' ideologies (both verbal and visual) through the use of stereotypes can be thought of in regard to "cultural competence". This involves "the bringing of both textual and social experience to bear upon the program at the moment of reading, and it involves a constant and subtle negotiation and renegotiation of the relationship between the textual and the social", argues Fiske (1987:19). Fiske reinforces this point, maintaining that "Television ...work(s) ideologically to promote and prefer certain meanings of the world, to circulate some meanings rather than others, and to serve some social interests better than others" (1987:20).

In an attempt to discern the relationship between discourse, ideology and the televisual message, the Nationwide audience study sought to develop the relationship between the theoretical concept of hegemony and the textual properties of the British current affairs programme Nationwide. In doing so, Morley employed Stuart Hall's encoding/decoding model to demonstrate the differences that individual social position makes to the interpretation of Nationwide. The Preferred, Negotiated and Oppositional readings were used to seek a practical example of hegemony in action. Because one of the study's foci was the attempt to recover the political ideologies implicit in the programme and how viewers interpreted these, the researchers were able to "theorise a link between the particular comments of audience members, the social formation, and

television as a medium of mass communication" (Nightingale, 1996:68). Nationwide observations with regard to the influence of the socio-demographic features of age, sex, race and class are problematic because of Morley's eagerness to link individual interpretations primarily with individual class position, almost exclusively ignoring the other three stated factors.

Ideas from Morley's Nationwide study will be used to inform this research, drawing upon his observations regarding the use of preferred, negotiated and oppositional readings. However, it should be noted that this will be carried out in retrospect, thereby avoiding a deterministic mindset which would seek to observe whether a correlation exists. Morley's intention of observing a practical application of hegemony in action via the readings set out in the encoding/decoding model will also be employed. This also will be done in a retrospective manner. His methodological approach of gaining access into a pre-existing social group will also be adopted, with the non-directive focus group interview procedure being implemented in the first instance.

2.3 A New Focus For Research: Buckingham and children

> Children are seen ... not as confident adventurers in an age of new
> challenges and responsibilities, but as passive victims of media
> manipulation; and the media not as potential agents of enlightenment
> or of democratic citizenship, but as causes of moral degradation and
> social decline. Children, it would seem, are unable to help themselves;
> and it is our responsibility as adults to prevent them from gaining
> access to that which would harm and corrupt them.
>
> (Buckingham, 1997:32)

David Buckingham has contributed substantially to the shaping of research related to children and television in Media Studies. A central tenet of his research was that children are competent television viewers whose everyday talk about television "may carry a significant social charge" (1993:40). For, as

Buckingham argues "It is ... [through talk that] we may - deliberately or inadvertently - display our moral values, our social and political affiliations, and our perceptions of ourselves and others" (ibid.). Specifically, the central concern of his "Children Talking Television" (1993) research was to observe the ways in which children aged between 7 and 12 years of age *talk* about television. Issues pertaining to the potential neutrality of language are contested, with Buckingham arguing that:

> language cannot be used simply as evidence of what people think or
> know or understand. On the contrary, language is already structured in
> particular ways, which determine what it is possible to think and to
> say. Furthermore ... individuals use language to construct versions of
> social reality and thereby perform specific social functions or
> purposes. Using language is, in this sense, an inherently
> social act. (1993:60)

Rather than attempting to ascertain the nature of what the participants 'say' and how this acts as a direct reflection of what they 'think', Buckingham sought to observe the social function of language. Using discourse analysis, Buckingham argues that issues such as power, group dynamic and degrees of modality (the 'reality' established as judged by the viewer) are played out in the talk about television (1993:53). Maintaining that the main focus of research in this area is not in the end 'product' (that is, the judgements made about content) of discussions, but rather, an understanding of the processes through and by which they were established, Buckingham's research highlights the socially formative functions of language and it's ability to marginalise 'others'.

Focussing on 'middle childhood' (ages 7-12), the qualitative observations generated were taken from discussions with groups of children ranging between two and five participants. Containing ninety participants, the sample group was equally split between boys and girls. From here, the group was divided into three sections; the youngest children were aged seven at the commencement of the research; the next group aged nine; and the final group aged eleven. Selected

from four schools, the participants were chosen to provide a "balance of ethnic and social class backgrounds" (1993:34). In each scenario, the British secondary school was linked to a 'feeder' primary school. A preliminary questionnaire was employed to identify children who watched very little television. From this information, a detailed questionnaire was forwarded to the caregivers of the selected participants. It was designed to elicit the following data.

From the two 'inner-city' schools in London (one secondary, one primary) a "high proportion (27 per cent) of the children came from single-parent families, and the majority (82 per cent) could be described as working-class" [Buckingham does not qualify exactly what he means by this] (Buckingham, 1993:35). He points out that the groups were ethnically diverse, with a "comparatively high proportion (62 per cent) of black children of Asian or Afro-Caribbean descent" (ibid.). In contrast, the two 'suburban' schools were located in a 'relatively affluent' area of London. Eighty per cent of these children could be described as 'middle-class', with a much smaller proportion (8 percent) coming from single parent families. Also, the ethnic background was much less diverse, with only thirteen percent of the children being of Asian or Afro-Caribbean descent.

The participants engaged in eight separate activities over a period of fifteen months. Issues covered ranged from discussion of Genre, the construction of 'self' (in terms of gender, age, class and race) and the retelling of stories. In some instances, the groups were divided according to sex, social class or ethnic backgrounds. Other times, the groups were created at random, or along friendship lines. The role of the three researchers (two female, one male) was primarily to 'chair' the discussions, providing relatively open-ended questions when appropriate, but also directing conversation when necessary. The topics for discussions were largely determined by the participants themselves, enabling Buckingham to avoid one of Morley's flaws in 'Nationwide', that of directing possible participant responses by the nature of the questions asked.

In a discussion regarding television advertisements, participants noted the 'unrealistic' nature of particular advertisements. Eager to refute the idea of television exerting any strong influence upon them, many participants exhibited a critical knowledge and awareness of the attempts to persuade them to purchase a product. One participant claimed that 'people' like watching ads, not for knowledge about products, but rather just for the 'catchy jingle'. Instead of watching to attain meaning, viewing according to this participant is "just, like, for watching. Some people love the advert but they never buy it [the product]" (Buckingham, 1993:44)

During discussion about the possible effects of television, Buckingham observed that participants aged 10-11 assumed that violent action cartoons should not be shown to younger children because it would "put hate in their hearts" (1993:43). One participant posited a direct causal relationship between what younger children see and what they do. It is significant that anxiety associated with regulation of such material is projected onto 'other' people, in this case younger children. The participant argued that they felt able to deal with the effects of television. Buckingham contends that the function of the creation of an 'Other' is to enable the psychological removal of the participant concerned from the threat that television might be able to directly influence their attitudes and behaviours (1993:43).

In another component of this research, Buckingham explores notions of 'realism' within television programmes drawing upon Hodge and Tripp's "Children and Television" (1986) study. Hodge and Tripp identify an aspect of viewing which they term 'modality'. Modality is the extent to which a programme can be regarded as 'realistic'. Buckingham elaborates this, arguing that it is possible to distinguish between 'internal' and 'external' modality. 'Internal' modality is the reality constructed by the programme, whilst 'external' modality is how the programme relates to the everyday lived experience of the viewer (1993:219). Buckingham cites Hodge and Tripp who contend that these are:

the formal and contextual 'cues' which increase the transformational distance between the image and its referent, and thereby indicate that it is consciously constructed ... they [Hodge and Tripp] argue that these 'internal' characteristics may not be recognized, and that readers also use 'external' criteria based on the experience or beliefs about the world ... Modality, therefore, is not a fixed property of the message, or, of its relation to reality, but 'a subjective, variable, relative and negotiable judgement' *about* the message.

(Quoted in Buckingham, 1993:219)

Thus, the internal modality of a text intersects with external modality in the form of the viewers' ideological frameworks. External modality is the process of evaluating the 'reality' of the text (internal modality), whilst concurrently comparing this information to the information and ideologies an individual possess' about the 'world'. 'Viewing' is understood as an active process whereby the viewer is established as the 'author' of meaning. However, this is within a framework of viewer subjectivity that acknowledges the pre-existing structural features that individuals possess.

According to Buckingham "talk about television can serve as an arena in which the self and its relation to others are defined. In talking about the programmes we like and dislike, we are inevitably 'positioning' ourselves" (1993:73). Talk about television can be seen as a means of establishing interpersonal social relations and subject positions. This is confirmed by his previous research which observed the creation and projection of anxieties about possible anti-social effects of the media onto the imaginary 'other' (1993:43). Here, not only was the 'other' defined as someone else, but also, was frequently referred to as a person younger, or as someone from a different social class than the viewer concerned. Buckingham's (1993) research places the focus of the research upon what children actually 'say' about their viewing habits. Unlike Morley's (1980) research which began with a 'preferred' reading ascertained by 'researchers', Buckingham's work discusses children's responses in a manner that allows them a degree of autonomy that has been previously overlooked (Edgar, 1977).

In "Boys' talk: television and the policing of masculinity" (1993a), Buckingham argues that 'masculinity' is not something that is fixed or given, but rather "that it is, at least to some extent, actively defined and constructed in social interaction and in discourse" (1993a:92). In a similar manner to the research undertaken in "Children Talking Television" (1993), Buckingham does not understand talk as a transparent way into people's thoughts. Instead he conceives it as a social act, the site where a struggle takes place, the end result of which is the achievement of a 'dominant' form of masculinity. In a similar manner to his other work, this research

> sought to move beyond deterministic accounts of the relationship
> between people's social positions and the ways in which they make
> sense of television - the implication [therefore] that people read
> programmes in a given way *because* they are working class, or male,
> or because of some other single demographic fact about them.
>
> (Buckingham, 1993a:92)

In contrast, Buckingham argues that social identities are both material and discursive. To be biologically male is a 'fact' of nature, but to be 'masculine' involves a series of complex interactions and negotiations with both language, culture and 'society'. Rather than viewing participants as an undifferentiated homogeneous mass, particular attention was paid to the shifting power dynamic between the group and the interviewer. Buckingham maintains that these "relationships will in turn reflect broader relationships of social power, for example in terms of age, class and gender - although they will also *in*flect them in particular ways" (1993a:92).

Citing Jackson (1990) as noting that "masculinity is defined as much in relation to other men as it is in relation to women [and that establishing] masculinity involves exerting power over weaker, more vulnerable men, and entails a ritualistic rejection of deviance, [and] of the 'other' that is feared", Buckingham (1993a:98) observed that one way this was dramatised was through the binary categorisation of cartoon programmes into genders.

Rodney: Have they [the girls] got *My Little Pony* to watch same as us,
we've got =

Interviewer: = No, they're going to watch *Thundercats* as well.

Boys: Oh ... . (...)

Richard: They ain't for girls.   (Buckingham, 1993a:93)

Here, the boys use of gender stereotyping to inform what programmes' were for 'boys' and 'girls' indicated to Buckingham that gender "was a central preoccupation [of the group's] right from the start" (1993a:93).

Buckingham also observed in this instance that the girls were concerned to define themselves against the cartoon, arguing that they are 'for boys', and by implication, somehow 'immature' or 'babyish' (1993a:93-94). In opposition to this, the boys were interested in 'celebrating' their own choice, as if it was somehow a reflection of their 'manliness'. The cartoons' employment of displays of technology, violence and physical power seemed to attract the boys, with subtleties of narrative and relationships being of less interest (Buckingham, 1993a:94). Also, the attributes described act only as a 'display' of the type(s) of masculinity that the boys identify with, and not as a transparent way into their expression of masculinity. Buckingham refutes this idea, maintaining that it is through the 'talk' that boys engage in that masculinity is defined and policed (1993a:92-93). He maintains that "correlation is often mistaken for causality" (1993a:91). It would be easy to assume a simplistic relationship between the attributes of the cartoon that the boys identify with and the types of stereotypical attitudes that 'boys' display as a part of their masculinity. This could be understood as a correlation, but not causality. A causal relationship would imply that it is because of their masculinity that the boys identify with the above attributes, whereas an approach that focuses on correlation might argue that there is a correlation between this type of masculinity and the attributes that it identifies with but that it is not causal.

Masculinity, we might say, is achieved rather than given. It is

something boys *do* rather than something that is simply done to
them - although, equally, it is something that they can attempt
to do to each other. (Buckingham, 1993a:97)

Aspects of this are demonstrated in a discussion as a part of Buckingham's
research involving two eight year old boys. The discussion initially covered
material surrounding what the boys found 'scary' in terms of films they had seen
on video. One of the boys (Allan) commented that he didn't like watching some
of the material that his parents watched and, as a way of coping with this, went
to his room in order to watch another programme. Chris disputes Allan's
interpretation, arguing that in fact the film they were discussing "ain't scary"
(Buckingham, 1993a:99). Buckingham makes the point that despite "Chris's
rejection of the notion that he might be scared by such films, he does in fact
admit to this a little later in the discussion. Significantly, however, this comes at
a point where Allan has briefly left the room" (1993a:100). This would indicate
that there is something to be lost in letting another male know that he (Chris)
was 'scared'. This confirms Buckingham's citing of Jackson's (1990) material
which argued that masculinity is defined as much in relation to other men as to
women.

In another example the exercising of internal and external modality judgements
was observed (Buckingham, 1993a:105-106). The discussion involved opinions
about the US series Baywatch with the group composed of males and females.
Sean was quick to criticise the programme on grounds that it was 'unrealistic'
(external modality) as a result of that the fact that "it's made to look sunny all
the time" (Buckingham, 1993a:105). Buckingham notes that the discussion was
diverted quickly to interlink issues of modality to those of masculinity.
Buckingham highlights Sean's argument that "it's just sort of a bit over-
exaggerated ... the people on it are sort of complete hunks and you know, all the
girls are drooling over them and everything" (1993a:105). Acknowledged in this
comment is a subtext associated with the described character's masculinity and
sexual appeal along with a comment about how Sean sees his own sexual appeal
and masculinity. Clearly Sean is conflating the two and as Buckingham argues

"[w]hat threatens Sean is not so much the physical power of the characters - ... as their sexual appeal, the fact the they make the women in the programme and indeed the girls in their own class 'drool'" (1993a:106). In contrast to this, Buckingham notes also that

> While the girls who discussed these characters acknowledged that
> they were indeed 'hunks', they also complained that they had to act
> 'all macho', and laughed about the way they strutted around with
> their chests out.   (1993a:106).

This would tend to indicate that whilst some of the boys (Sean in this case) were potentially threatened by the hypermasculine displays of masculinity dramatised in Baywatch, a number of the girls were less than impressed by this expression of masculinity.

Buckingham's research focuses on observing how children 'talk' and hence, actively construct understanding(s) of the programme (and sometimes the world); this will be used as a model to observe the active construction and policing of masculinity that stems from both the programme and the interactions that ensue between participants in the research. A practical application for his insights of notions of modality will be sought, with a view to observing the levels to which the participants blur boundaries between 'actual' 'reality' and 'televisual' reality.

Chapter Three - Theory

3.1 <u>Issues Of Representation:</u>

> Representation is the production of the meaning of the concepts in our
> minds through language. It is the link between concepts and language
> which enables us to *refer* to either the 'real' world of objects, people or
> events, or indeed to imaginary worlds of fictional objects, people and
> events. (Hall, 1997:17)

In recent years there has been much debate regarding the complex relationship
between language, meaning and representation. Much attention has been
focused toward the position of the media in the labyrinth of societal meanings
amid a breakdown of the ideologies of the political right. Drawing upon the
semiotic social constructionist views of the Swiss linguist Saussure, ideas from
Foucault regarding discourse, and psychoanalytic film theory, issues surrounding
the complex nature of representation are constantly being re-evaluated and
developed (Hall, 1997).

Working in the area of linguistics, Saussure argued that language, as a system of
signs, is a key component in the creation of meaning. Consisting of two aspects,
the sign combined both the material existence of the object and the cultural
meaning applied to it. These he called the 'Signifier' and the 'Signified'
respectively. The signifier is the form of the object, image or word, and the
signified is the ideological concept associated with the object. Arguing that both
aspects are required to produce meaning, Saussure maintained that it was the
relation between them that fixes the cultural meaning (Hall, 1997:31). He
insisted that there is no 'natural' link between the signifier and the signified, or
that signs do not possess an essential or fixed meaning. Subsequently, he
maintained that the easiest way to affix a relational meaning was through binary
oppositions: for example, male - female, black - white. However, binary
conceptions can be destabilised, with variations existing. For example, grey is a
colour that exists between black and white, made from a little of both, just as a

transvestite employs a little of both maleness and femaleness in their compromised version of a binary.

Hall outlines three broad theoretical approaches to the complex *relation*-ship between language, meaning and representation. These theories attempt to explain how the representation of meaning through language operates (1997:24), and are the reflective, intentional and constructionist approaches.

For the reflective approach, meaning is situated in the object or person. Language merely reflects (like a mirror) the true meaning of an event: the event already exists in the material world. This implies that language somehow has the ability to imitate social experience in an unmediated manner. The model is also know as the mimetic approach. There are obvious problems with this understanding: the approach implies that there is a "real" and empirically provable "truth" 'out there', and that language, as a neutral, unmediated tool, simply reflects this (Hall, 1997:24-25).

In contrast, the intentional approach to meaning and representation posits the opposite understanding. It holds that the author or speaker of language imposes his or her own meaning on the world through language. Since humans use language as the symbolic social system to convey meaning(s), it follows that understandings of the world unique to individual lived experience will be transmitted via this medium. However, each individual cannot be the sole author of private meanings. This would imply that the expression of thoughts and emotions could exist in the form of individual 'private' languages. Hall succinctly points out that

> Our private intended meanings, however personal to us, have to *enter into the rules, codes and conventions of language* to be shared and understood. (1997:25)

Hence, individual 'private' thoughts have to be negotiated via sets of common linguistic systems in order for them to be comprehended by others. Employing notions of authorial intent, the intentional model posits individual human

consciousness as the centre of the cognitive universe. Again, this is negated by the fact that language is a series of common cultural codes, and subsequently, 'private' languages can not exist.

The constructionist approach acknowledges the public, shared social nature of language. Arguing that meaning is not constructed in 'things' (as the reflective approach does), nor that individual 'users' of language fix meaning (as the intentional approach does), the constructionist approach maintains that 'things' do not have an inherent meaning, but rather, that 'we' - language users - actively construct meaning through representational systems and codes.

> According to this approach, we [sic.] must not confuse the
> *material* world, where things and people exist, and the *symbolic*
> practices and processes through which representation, meaning
> and language operate. (Hall, 1997:25).

Language as a part of the symbolic world, enables meanings to be interpreted from the material world, and provides the mechanisms through which understandings can be meaningfully conveyed.

Constructionists (as did Saussure) argue that there is no 'arbitrary' or 'natural' relationship between material things and the symbolic concepts that represent them. Meaning is, in some instances, determined not so much by the symbolic concept affixed to the physical object, but rather by that material objects' relational situation with another object. An example would help clarify the point. There is no arbitrary relationship between colours on traffic lights. The difference between red and green is not so much determined because red somehow automatically means 'stop' and green 'go', but rather the organised 'relational' manner through which both are contextualised and socially defined. Red means 'stop' as much as 'green' means go, but it is the relationship between them that helps determine their relative meanings. This is aided by a routinely organised system. The colours of traffic colours are arranged into a particular sequence which is repeated almost universally.

Thus, meaning is a result of various representational systems and practices that actively construct a meaningful world through language. Meaning does not exist 'somewhere' outside individual consciousness, although there is a material world that the symbolic world of language attempts to represent. Nor is meaning and language inherently an individualistic pursuit, for there is no private language. 'Meaning' has to be conveyed via a shared set of cultural and linguistic codes agreed upon in a relational manner. This does not imply that meaning is static either. Language has nuances and culturally specific subtleties. Consequently, it is a constantly evolving medium, adapting, through lived experience, to an ever changing cognitive terrain that is 'society'. Hall points out that

> If the relationship between a signifier and its signified is the result
> of a system of social conventions specific to each society and specific
> historical moments - then all meanings are produced within history
> and culture. (1997:32)

This is to argue that there can never be a totally fixed or final *relation*-ship between signifiers and signified, but rather that the arbitrary connection between them is the product of a historical context and of a cultural environment.

Saussure contended that language is divided into two parts (Hall, 1997:33). The first Saussure called Langue, and describes the general linguistic rules and codes that all language users must share if there is to be a meaningful communication exchange. Thus, langue is the implicit language system which for example, helps construct grammatically correct sentences. The second aspect of language for Saussure is Parole. This, he argued, is the act of speaking or writing. However, Hall contends that Saussure believed parole lacked those linguistic structural features that langue possessed (1997:33). As such, Saussure regarded parole as being too much a part of the 'surface' of language, with his interest lying in deeper linguistic structures. This differs from Buckingham's approach: language for Buckingham's research has a social function, which amongst other things, serves to position and shape subject positions.

Labelled structuralist, Saussure disputed the common sense assumption (often associated with the intentional model of language) that individuals are the complete authors of their language. As noted, he contended that for meaningful communication to occur, the individual must enter their thoughts into a common cultural symbolic form - language. From this, he (and various other theorists have developed this, for example, the French theorist Althusser) recognised that we, as individuals, are born into a pre-existing language environment, and as Althusser argued are "always already subjects" (1971:172).

Inasmuch as it is important to understand the relationship between language and meaning, meanings can not be conveyed without a receiver. Therefore, whilst acknowledging that for communication to occur, the author of the message must engage with an already existing symbolic order in the form of language, there are factors at the receivers end that can influence the possible meanings interpreted. This is part of what Morley's Nationwide study attempted to elucidate - the extent to which individual structural features (age, race, sex, class) affect the range of possible interpretations made from a message. His study made clear that the 'reader' is as important as the writer in the production of meanings, highlighting that reading a text is an active process.

3.2 Cultural Meaning and Ideology: Marx

> Marx is saying that, in a world where markets exist and market
> exchange dominates economic life, it would be distinctly odd if there
> were no *category* allowing us to think speak and act in relation to it.
> In that sense, all economic categories - bourgeois or marxist - express
> existing social relations. (Hall, 1996:36)

Marx proposed an understanding of society made up of two components - Base and Superstructure. Arguing that the superstructure was the realm of the expressive arts, politics, school and the media, Marx maintained that it was here that the bourgeoisie (the 'ruling class') are situated. It is in the superstructure that ways in which the world are to be interpreted are created. The (economic)

base is industry, and is composed of the proletariat who jointly comprised the dominant mode of production. For Marx, consciousness (and not ideology necessarily) was understood as being directly related to the ideas imparted by the superstructure. These, he argued, reflected the interests of the ruling class. This view is known as materialism (Hall, 1996:29), and explains how an individual's sense of 'self' and 'subjectivity' is constrained by and entirely dependent upon their relationship to their material circumstances. Within orthodox marxism, humans are not complete 'authors' of their own identity, and consequently, all societal relations are reduced to that of the economic.

Marx does not conceptualise 'ideology' as it is now commonly referred to. When he referred to the concept, it was almost exclusively in a negative manner, as a kind of distortion or inversion of 'reality' (Hall, 1996:27). Marx maintained that the founding principle of social relations was production with an individual's subjectivity deriving from one's subjective relationship the mode of production. It follows that the interests of the proletariat will not be the same as the interests of the bourgeoisie. This is as a result of the differing structural positions that individuals inhabit. Thus, ideology became the sense of 'false consciousness' that the bourgeoisie created to 'dupe' the proletariat into actively reproducing the means of their economic subservience. Because it is in the interest of the bourgeois, who occupy the superstructure, to 'falsely' convince the proletariat of the nature of their material existence, strands of orthodox marxism assume that the proletariat is an uncritical, unaware mass. Hall maintained that this theory of ideology could only explain how ideology permeates proletariat consciousness as a result of the success of the ideology of the 'ruling class' in the creation of 'false consciousness' (1996:29). It does not allow for, among other things, a consciousness formed by the proletariat. Thus, the consciousness and ideology of the superstructure inherently goes against the material reality experienced by the proletariat.

However, Larrain argued that it is not the ruling class that necessarily 'dupes' the working class (1996:59-61). This, he argues, is a misunderstanding based on the fact that in his reading of Marx, it is the market and not the ideology of the bourgeois that created a 'false' sense of relations that deceived people. Larrain

contends that Hall, in his writings around the marxist concept of ideology, has conflated two fundamental aspects of marxist thought - that of ideology and the ideas of the ruling class (1996:60). Charging Hall with believing that Marx meant that 'the control over the means of mental production' was the reason why the masses have been duped, Larrain theorised that "it is not true ... that Marx explained their [the ruling ideas] success and penetration within the working class by recourse to false consciousness" (ibid.), but rather that if the ruling class' ideas are in fact the ruling ideas that it was because

> the class which is the ruling *material* force of society is at the same time its ruling *intellectual* force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, consequently also controls the means of mental production, so the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are on the whole subject to it. (From Marx and Engels, 1976:59)

In alignment with this he also noted that

> The concept of ideology was not a device to label a part of the community as stupid or less intelligent ... [and that] According to Marx, capitalists themselves, just as much as the workers, as the bearers and agents of the capitalist system, were deceived by the very operation of the market. (Larrain, 1996:61)

Therefore, although ideology in marxist terms represented a distortion or inversion of 'reality', the claim of ideology as 'false consciousness' ensues from the materialist premise that Marxism embodies. Materialism maintains that

> ideas arise from and reflect the material conditions and circumstances in which they are generated. They express social relations and their contradictions in thought ... (Hall, 1996:29)

Marx's thoughts are also guilty of a determinist relationship between social formations and the economic realm. He implies that "ideas are only the

dependent effects of the ultimately determining level in the social formation - [which is] the economic" (Hall, 1996:29). Thus, if there are changes in the economic sphere, these will eventually result in a direct and unmediated change in the social, for it is the bourgeoisie who control the means of production. Physical life therefore determines consciousness and not the other way around, with the 'ruling' ideas of any given society being the ideas of the 'ruling' class according to this strand of political thought.

Along with denying aspects of human agency, Marxist understandings of ideology as 'false consciousness' imply that it is the subject (the bourgeoisie) that produces ideology. Hall (cited by Larrain, 1996:48) maintains that in fact it is the other way around, that it is ideology that produces the 'subject'. Drawing on Althusser's (1971) notion that individuals are interpellated as subjects in the form of 'always already subjects', Hall engages in a comprehensive reworking of the nature of ideology. Attempting to move past the class reductionism and essentialism that orthodox marxism entails, Hall confirms the thoughts of Larrain echoing Laclau's words stating "that although not every contradiction in society can be reduced to a class contradiction, 'every contradiction is overdetermined by class struggle'" (Laclau, 1977:108 cited in Larrain, 1996:49). From this it is possible to see how Hall avoids the class reductionism of Marxism. For whilst he acknowledges the powerful influence that class position has on the shaping of consciousness, Hall does not give it primacy as Marx does.

The definition of ideology that Hall puts forward is

> those images, concepts and premises which provide the frameworks
> through which we represent, interpret, understand and "make sense"
> of some aspect of social experience. (1981:31)

It is clear from this that Hall is proposing that the nature of the concept is not specifically tied to any one 'material' aspect of society, e.g. class, race, sex. He goes on to highlight three aspects of the concept that he finds crucial. These are that:

> ideologies do not consist of isolated and separate concepts, but in
> the articulation of different elements into a distinctive set or chain of
> meanings. (ibid.)

Ideologies then, are not the disparate ideas of atomised individuals who are isolated and socially fragmented, but rather, are sets of meanings and concepts about the world that come together in an often, though not necessarily, coherent chain of meanings. This definition implicitly denies the conception of ideology as a totalising force, and instead, acknowledges the multifarious nature of human existence. This is both in terms of an economic reality, and one's relationship to it, along with psycho-cultural dimensions such as race, gender, ethnicity, religious beliefs and sexual preference. Hall, again quoted by Larrain, goes on to clarify that:

> ideological statements are made by individuals, but ideologies are not
> the product of individual consciousness. Rather, we formulate out
> intentions *within ideology*. (1996:49)

Born without language skills, human acquire language and all its ideological biases at a young age. Therefore, although individuals talk 'ideologically', they are not the authors of that ideology, because of the external nature of ideology. Humans are assimilated 'into' ideology via the learning process. This clause alludes to Marx's claim that the notion of who 'we' are as individuals is constrained by one's material circumstances, and accordingly, that individuals are not the complete authors of their own identity.

The final clarification that Hall makes regarding ideology is that:

> ideologies "work" by constructing for their subjects (individuals and
> collective) positions of identification and knowledge that allows them
> to "utter" ideological truths as if they were their authentic authors'.
> (1981:32)

This understanding of ideology (and ideological processes) allows a similar process to occur in the construction of a revolutionary ideology. This is opposed to orthodox marxist understandings which make no room for any ideology other than that of the bourgeoisie. Marx's ideas about ideology inform this research through acknowledging the external material components that influence meaning. With Hall's (1981, 1996) reworking of the Marxist notions of subjectivity arguing that it is not the 'subject' that produces ideology, but rather that the 'subject' is constituted in and by ideology, it is these ideas that allow for observations of this process in action.

3.3 Althusser's understandings of Ideology and the State

[A]n ideology always exists in an apparatus, and its practice, or practices. This existence is material. (Althusser, 1971:166)

Writing within the neo-marxist tradition, Althusser, in his widely acclaimed (1971) article (entitled "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses") reinforces marxist notions of the State. Marx argued that the state functioned as a repressive force, which works to ensure that the ruling class maintain their dominance over the working class in order for the capitalist process of 'surplus-value' extraction to continue (Althusser, 1971:137). Further to this, Althusser maintained that marxist conceptions of the functions of the state were too broad. With the multifarious functioning of the 'modern' state, it was necessary to further clarify its function (Althusser, 1971:141-148). Althusser held that the 'modern' state could be distinguished by two fundamental aspects an function: Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA's) and Repressive State Apparatuses (RSA's).

Maintaining that it is vital not to confuse these two aspects of state power, Althusser reiterated that marxist theory conceptualised the state and its apparatus as the government, the administration, the police, the army, the courts and the prisons (1971:137). From this, Althusser qualified the above named institutions as being a part of what he called the Repressive State Apparatus (1971:143). He

suggested that these institutions function solely and exclusively by violence. The RSA's also by their intrinsic nature, exist in the public domain as opposed to the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA's) whose existence is mostly private. However, Althusser argued that it

> is unimportant whether the institutions ... are 'public' or 'private'.
> What matters is how they function. (1971:144)

The Ideological State Apparatus then, function 'by ideology'. Althusser proposes a list of ISA's which include

- the religious ISA (the system of the different Churches),
- the educational ISA (the system of the different public and private 'Schools'),
- the family ISA,
- the legal ISA,
- the political ISA (the political system, including the different Parties),
- the trade-union ISA,
- the communications ISA (press, radio and television, etc.),
- the cultural ISA (Literature, the Arts, sports, etc.). (1971:143)

Both ISA's and RSA's function simultaneously with violence and ideology, but, as Althusser argued, it is how they function that is central. RSA's function with the use of violence, but with the ideological support of the institution(s) that they draw upon. Thus, their secondary function is ideological. The reverse also applies. Ideological State Apparatus function predominantly by ideology, but their secondary function is that of repression. This is what Althusser called "double functioning" (1971:145), and illuminates the subtle interweaving of two, ultimately interdependent sectors of the state. Practical applications of this theory can be observed in cartoon characters from the episode to be used in this research. For example, the roles of the Lieutenant and his partner Doyle. Both characters can be immediately aligned with Repressive State Apparatus because of their active role of enforcing the ideological position of the police. Scene Five shot twenty-one demonstrates the double functioning of the police.

> Police CB: Attention all units, I repeat, attention all units.
>
>   Be on the look out for prehistoric predators
>
>   with an appetite for metal.

Implicit in this dialogue is an understanding of the ideological function of the police as being 'objective' and 'impartial', taking care of what is in the 'public good'. In this case, it is to ensure that the 'prehistoric predators' are caught and controlled. Thus, the police here function both with the support of repressive state power and with its ideological consent. Fiske maintains that the police

> are the agents of a law designed to preserve the interests of those
>
> with property and power and thus to maintain the status quo against
>
> any force of social change. (1990:174)

Echoed in this quote are marxist sentiments: that the bourgeois property owning ruling class are to have their interests 'protected'. Related to this research because of its ability to explain the different ideological roles of the state and how the function, RSA's and ISA's can be observed in action in the chosen episode of 'The Mask'.

3.31 <u>Althusserian notions of Ideology</u>

> In ideology men [sic.] do indeed express, not the relation between
>
> them and their conditions of existence, but *the way* they live the
>
> relation between them and their conditions of existence:
>
> Althusser (1969:233 in Resch, 1992:206)

Developing a strand of Marxism that postulated ideology as 'false consciousness', Althusser contended that ideology is not about some form of 'truth' or 'falsehood' but rather "is a 'Representation' of the Imaginary Relationship of Individuals to their Real Conditions of Existence" (ibid., 1971:162). There is a material world 'out there' and, according to Althusser, that is perceived through ubiquitous

forms of ideology. Ideology then, is about the lived relation of men and women to their world. For Althusser, it was 'in ideology' that individuals expressed not necessarily the relations between them and the conditions of their existence, but the way they lived their relation out. Thus, ideology is both imaginary and lived. Furthermore, even though ideology is 'imaginary' Althusser does not conflate this property with 'false' consciousness, as some marxists have been charged with doing (see Larrain, 1996 in Hall, 1996).

Althusser moves away from the marxist materialist premise which stated that consciousness is a product of the relationship between the individual and their material circumstances. Instead, Althusser insisted that it is through ideology exclusively that humans come to perceive and understand their material 'reality'. Ideology according to Althusser, makes claims about 'reality', and it is through these claims that an 'imaginary' relationship is established.

The primary function of ideology (and ISA's) for Althusser was the reproduction of existing relations of production (1971:154). A key aspect of ideology is its material existence. Building on his claim of humans as 'always' already subjects' (1971:172), and subsequent to that, the notion of 'subjects' being a product of 'culture' as opposed to 'individuals' being a product of 'nature' (cited in Fiske, 1992:117), Althusser claimed that the destination of any ideology is the human subject. He reiterates this further, employing the 'religious' subject as an example, stating that the

> individual in question behaves in such and such a way, adopts such a
> and such a practical attitude, and, what is more, participates in certain
> regular practices which are those of the ideological apparatus on which
> 'depend' the ideas which he [sic.] has in all consciousness freely chosen
> to subject. (Althusser, 1971:167)

In order to explain the processes whereby the individual becomes a 'subject' constituted within ideology, Althusser moves beyond the traditional marxist metaphor of base/superstructure, claiming that it is through Interpellation and Hailing that an individual becomes a "concrete subject" (ibid., 1971:170) in

ideology.   Employing the metaphor of an individual walking along a road, Althusser argued that one of the first functions of ideology in language is to construct a 'subject' position for an individual.   For example "Hey, you there!" enables the 'interpellated' addressee to recognise that it is them that is being 'hailed'. The 'hailed' subject turns around, acknowledging the addresser, and at the same time, responding with a full (although somewhat 'naturalised') recognition of the implicit ideological connotations that are embodied in the language to interpellate them as a 'subject' (ibid., 1971:174).

Althusser understood ideology to be an active process: this enabled him to argue that 'Ideology has no History' (1971:159).   Because the ultimate destiny of ideology is the 'subject' (as a product of culture), and concurrently because "ideology never says, 'I am ideological'" (Althusser, 1971:175), ideology and ideological 'subject' positions are actively reproduced through everyday meetings between 'subjects' of ideology.

A problem with Althusser's understanding of humans as 'always already subjects' is that it implies a sense of totality to the human social and psychological experience. If his thesis is accurate, and all humans are interpellated in a similar manner as 'always already subjects', his theoretical position which is in opposition to the 'dominant' viewpoint cannot, by his own understanding exist.   This is because he does not allow sufficient theoretical space to enable viewpoints other than the 'dominant' to occur. However, this is to presuppose that every 'subject' is interpellated in an identical manner, which is clearly not the case. So, whilst Althusser's notion of humans as 'always already subjects' permits human subjectivity to be understood as being influenced by external pre-existing structural factors, it does not take into account any inflection that may exist between differing subject positions. Therborn developed what he called 'counter-apparatus' to provide a place for contradiction that may arise as a result of for example, class struggle (1980:47 cited in Resch, 1992:222-225).   Noting that Althusser did not provide this space, Therborn is hesitant about relating all ideology to economic class position. Nonetheless, Therborn's main contribution is the acknowledgment of a possible lack of ideological fit between varying influential structural factors.

It is anticipated that Althusser's notions of interpellation and hailing along with 'always already subjects' will be observed in this research through an observation of the ways language actively hails and constitutes subject positions for viewers. The research seeks to provide a practical application of Althusser's thesis that 'ideology has no history' through the observation of how the participants actively produce definitions of the programme between them.

3.4   The Social Construction of Masculinity

> "there is no true essence of masculinity guaranteed by God or nature
> which we could appeal to in analysing men's gender identities. Rather,
> like all identities, masculinities are ... **invented categories**. They are
> the product of the cultural meanings attached to certain attributes,
> capacities, dispositions and forms of conduct at given historical
> moments." Neale (1997:301)

Before and after the advent of feminism there have been 'moments' in human consciousness when issues surrounding maleness, masculinity and the many societal forces that mould it have been brought to the fore. These, and many others have been the beginnings of a Men's movement, or the inception of Men's studies. Although each different area possesses different ideological inflections, there are some concepts which seem central to all. Some of these involve the study of 'masculine' subjectivity, a debunking of the essentailist dualisms that have plagued popular understandings of the sex/gender distinction, and a problematising of 'the myth of masculinity'. Other theorists express an interest in the role of the media in the creation and reinforcing of perceived widespread stereotyped conceptions of 'manliness'.

The French theorist Foucault argued that a key way by which knowledge is created is through an understanding of 'self'. Fiske, drawing on the work of Althusser, reiterated that there is an important difference between the 'individual' and the 'subject'. He argued that the idea of an 'individual' needs to be replaced

with that of the 'subject'.

> The individual is produced by nature, the subject by culture.
> Theories of the individual concentrate on differences between
> people and explain these differences as natural. Theories of the
> subject, on the other hand, concentrate on people's common
> experiences in a society as being the most productive way of
> explaining who (we think) we are. (1992:288)

Therefore, to view men (and masculinity) as 'subjects', rather than 'individuals' is to make available for analysis the ideological influences that act upon how the 'self' as a 'subject'. Saussure (quoted in Hall, 1997:54) and Althusser argued that it is the pre-existing language environment that shapes consciousness. Foucault however, maintained that it is the discursive environment in which the 'self' (as a 'subject') is defined is the most significant in the construction of consciousness (cited in Hall, 1996:55-56). He believed that 'subjects' may produce particular textual readings, but that these readings operate within an episteme (a way of understanding the world), and that this accounts for a privileged (structured) way of knowing. Whilst it is widely acknowledged that conceptions of 'self' are constructed within the language and discursive environment in which one is socialised, a problem with this type of logic is that it denies any level of individual autonomy.

Gender identity, as a socially constructed concept differs from sex: sex is biological whilst gender is psychological and social. Because gender is psychological, it is subject to the cultural and historical ideologies prevalent at the time. Thus, the individual as a gendered 'subject', in terms of both consciousness and body, can be viewed as a site of and for ideological struggle. This is in accord with Althusser's claim that the creation of particular ideological understandings of the self and/or body can be traced to a specific time and place. Foucault argued that the body is at once both a site for personal meaning and political ideologies (Hall, 1997:50). He postulated that

> Different discursive formations and apparatuses divide, classify and
> inscribe the body differently in their respective regimes of power
> and truth. (Hall, 1997:50)

He goes on to argue that

> The body is produced within discourse, according to the different
> discursive formations [that it is subject to]. (Hall, 1997:51).

The body is this site where competing understandings of 'self' are played out, and the site also, where interpretations are made by 'others'. Myths about the 'self' and how it is constructed are one way that ideologies actively constitute individuals as subjects. For example, those myths that combine to create cultural 'myths of masculinity'. Barthes (1972, cited in Strate, 1992:79) maintains that myths are:

> not falsehoods or fairy tales, but uncontested and generally
> unconscious assumptions that are so widely shared within a
> culture that they are considered natural, instead of recognized
> as products of unique historical circumstances. Biology
> determines whether we are male or female; culture determines
> what it *means* to be male or female, and what sorts of behaviors
> and personality attributes are appropriate for each gender role.
> In other words, masculinity is a social construction.

This, as an understanding of subjectivity argues that masculinity as a myth is tied to specific historical ideologies, the development of which can be traced.

Lacan is one writer noted for his theories of construction of subjectivity; his work developed Freud's understandings of processes of identity formation. In his analysis of the Oedipal trajectory, Freud argued that the male child must, at some stage, reject his mother as the primary focus of identification, and hence, all that is stereotypically 'feminine', identifying with his father as the 'masculine'

figure. Garfinkel confirms key aspects of this, arguing that:

> The [Oedipal] complex grows out of the boy's love for his
> mother and his simultaneous identification with his father.
> As the child's sexual urges heighten, he begins to see
> his mother as the object of those urges and, Freud believed,
> his father as a sexual rival and the object of jealous envy.
> This unleashes a new danger for the boy. If he persists
> in feeling sexually attracted to his mother, he fears being
> physically harmed in retaliation by his father. (1992:17)

Lacan postulated that the Freudian understanding of human subjectivity as deriving from bio-sexual drives did not sufficiently explain the construction of human subjectivity (Hayward, 1996:185). Instead, for Lacan, the human child has its identity constructed primarily in the linguistic realm. According to Lacan, the child is born with a profound sense of lack, and spends the rest of its life trying to recapture the imagined unity from which it is separated, that of its mother. There are, therefore, three fundamental stages in the development of a child: "the mirror phase (the acquisition of self), the *fort-da* game (the acquisition of language) and the Oedipus complex (the submission to the laws of society) (Lapsley, 1988:68). Lacan argued in his discussion of the 'mirror phase' that when a child recognises its image in the reflection of the mirror, it perceives its difference from its mother. Although a potentially negative experience, Lapsley notes the beneficial aspects of this experience are that it

> facilitates an awareness of the body as localised and separate from the
> environment, which is a prerequisite for coordinated physical activity;
> and on the basis of this newly acquired awareness of boundaries the
> child is then able to develop a sense of its own separate identity.
> (1988:68)

Developing his notion of the sense of lack that a child experiences, Lacan argued further that the subject can only conceptualise itself when it is mirrored back to itself from the position of another's desire. Obviously then, the child experiences

a sense of division from the moment that it recognises itself as a separate entity.

Like Hegel, Lacan understood the 'word' to be the murderer of things: no representation can ever fully represent what it is claiming to represent (Lapsely, 1988:70). Thus, another aspect to the child's sense of lack is developed. From the pre-linguistic stage where everything was everything in its entirety, the child, after traversing the mirror phase then enters the stage of the *fort-da* game which represents the entry into language. A benefit of this stage is that the child now enters into all the possibilities that communication brings. However, there is still the aspect of lack. For Lacan (as cited by Lapsely, 1988:70), the discrepancy between the satisfaction of need that is achieved through the implementation of language and the level of unsatisfied love that is demanded provides an opening for the creation of desire (another manifestation of lack).

Lapsley argued

> the entry into language is the birth of desire. Because the laws of
> society are inscribed within language, entry into the symbolic order
> entails that the child submits to it's pre-given place and role ... [hence]
> When the child accepts this identity, as it must, its desires and the
> terms in which they are figured are determined by the Other, by
> the laws of society. (ibid.)

It is now clear how the entry into language precipitates the entry into the Oedipal complex. Another component of the Oedipus drama is the recognition of sexual difference. Still desiring to be in union with the mother, the child's desire is now sexualised. Lacan (cited in Lapsley, 1988:72) maintained that the human infant is fundamentally a helpless being. To ameliorate this aspect of its condition, the child takes refuge in the fictitious belief that it is as indispensable to its mother as she is to it. Aware of the father as a threat for the affections from the mother, the male child comes to hate his father for his lawful access to his mother. The child now recognises the mother as representing the threat of metaphorical castration. Lacan argued that the father represents the 'Symbolic' order, as situated by language, whilst the mirror phase represents the entry into the

'Imaginary'. At the moment that the male child becomes aware of his sexual desire for his mother, his father intervenes and imposes the patriarchal law. The father then, representing incest and its social taboo, becomes the third image reflected in the mirror of the mirror phase (quoted in Hayward, 1996:186).

Biddulph (1995:30) and Pittman (1993:115) call the lack of an elder male's involvement in the young child's life "father hunger". As a young child, the male son receives most of his nurturing from his mother, seeing (perhaps, if his father is what Biddulph calls a 'Victorian father' who is "alienated, remote, often violent, [and] sexually disturbed in a variety of ways" (1995:30)) his father as emotionally distant. At the stage when the male child rejects the mother and her associated femininity, he then identifies with 'what' it is to be masculine, but learns not 'how' to be, because of the lack of emotional closeness. The example of the female child makes the point clearer. As a young female, a child learns from her mother 'what' it is to be feminine by observing actions and behaviours, and 'how' to be feminine because of the associated symbolic commonality (they are both biologically female). Wicks confirms this suggesting:

> Children of both sexes begin life with a close bond to their mother.
> As a child mature, self-confidence and self-sufficiency slowly
> supplant the mother's constant, life-sustaining care. For a girl, this
> journey is a relatively unbroken progression. She need on detach
> from her mother to find a suitable model for her gender identity. The
> young boy, on the other hand, faces a more complicated ordeal ...
> Girls learn that they are like their mothers sexually. The formation
> of their identity is based on attachment. Boys cannot say that they
> are like their fathers without first realizing that the are what their
> mother are not. (1996:16)

Horrocks reiterates this arguing:

> there is a fundamental identity between daughter and mother:
> the girl is able to become what her mother is; but the boy must

become that which she is not. Thus he must turn to his father
for an image of maleness, in order to find out what he must
become. (1994:75)

But if the male child has had no active emotional fathering from his father, he learns 'what' it is to be 'masculine' from the outward actions and perceived attitudes of his father, but not 'how'. Thus, 'father-hunger' comes about because of the unquestioned repetition of behavioural patterns passed down from generation to generation of stoical emotionally repressed men. Horrocks maintains that the cultural reasons why these expressions of masculinity are prevalent is that:

Masculinity has been demanded of men in many cultures in
order to economically preserve ... the family. (1994:60)

Prior to this he noted that:

it's not men who create harsh and conflict torn cultures, but
those cultures which create the cult of masculinity, and propel
men, *whether they like it or not*, into the traditional male roles.
(1994:59)

Expressions of masculinity of this sort it would seem are made and not born. This is in alignment with the theories of subjectivity that maintain that the subject is a product of culture and not a product of nature.

However, this argument implies a degree of biological determinism toward 'traditional' gender roles. As Freud contended, the gender (and sexual) identity of a child comes directly from the mother/father dichotomy. This however, fails to sufficiently allow the involvement peers have in the development of identity. But more importantly, Freud draws upon binary categorisations of personality traits attributing them (stereotypically) to one sex or the other. Rather than viewing the development of gender identity as a complex set of polymorphous possibilities (child's disposition, language environment, socio-economic position,

religious beliefs), Freud reduces it to biological sex identification (Hayward, 1996:185).

Many theorists argue (Seidler (1989), Easthope (1990)) that male sexuality is the sexuality of performance, power and conquest. Acknowledging the pre-existing language environment that 'we' as humans are born into, Seidler (1989:23) highlights that sex is the way that heterosexual males 'prove' their masculinity. Arguing that Judeo-Christian influences on the construction of sexuality have left masculinity with a confused sense of itself resulting from the contradictory messages received about desire, sex, sin and shame, he notes that men have been socialised into conceptualising women (and children) as possessions.

Masculinity then, has been stereotypically associated with a number of personality characteristics. Issues surrounding biological maleness and cultural ideologies of masculinity have been conflated onto the biological reality of the binary opposition of male/female. As a result, characteristics such as being physically active, assertive and somewhat dominant, competitive and rational have been imposed upon cultural myths of what it means to be a 'real man'. Horrocks contends that this expression of masculinity seems to be concerned, if not somewhat fixated, with proving itself to other men. He goes on to suggest that such inflections might stem from feelings of inadequacy, and of not feeling man enough (1994:139). The fact that a male may not 'feel' how they perceive a man should, indicates that the role of fathering in the development of a male child's sense of self is crucial. This is in accord to issues raised earlier in this section.

A psychoanalytic approach to this expression of masculinity (ensuring that the everyone sees one as being overtly 'manly') might argue that such a fixation indicates that the overcompensation of 'masculine' traits is, in fact, latent or repressed homo-erotic desire that has been denied, coming out in fierce (and in certain cultural environments, socially sanctioned) displays of masculine gender identity. Although not explicitly concerned about love between men, many inflections of 'traditional' notions of masculinity have a strongly homophobic content to them. Horrocks explains that

For many heterosexual men, love for other men remains a
sore area, one that they either avoid totally, or express in
symbolic ways, for example, in physical contact sports, or
heavy drinking with the boys. (1994:73)

Often interlinked and promoted by sporting ideologies associated with
competition, stoic unemotional masculinity that refuses to acknowledge physical
pain (a form of self denial) and socially approved displays of masculine
aggression, this form of masculinity promotes an understanding of self that seeks
to deny and consequently obliterate, all that is traditionally associated with
femininity. Instead, this expression of masculinity is concerned with acting out
one's understanding of what it is to be a 'man' - and subsequently is literally a
display. Horrocks has this to say about this component of masculinity:

This is an essential attribute of masculinity: the ability to
suffer and remain cut off from human feeling. Male
hegemony has a very dark shadow side, self-destruction,
self-denial. (1994:42)

Male sport is therefore a very public display of one's masculinity, and at once,
recapitulating a number of cultural ideologies surrounding what social
expectations of masculinity are. However, this expression of masculine identity
is plagued by its very nature: display. In attempting to convey through the
display of actions the quintessential characteristics of 'being male', issues
surrounding what Biddulph (1995), Pittman (1993) and Horrocks (1994)
maintain as contributing to a boy's understanding of what it is to be a man ring
true. As mentioned earlier in this section, the male child, learns 'what' it is to be
a man through observation of male role models (often his father) but not 'how' it
feels to be a man. Dominant sporting images of males fulfil this role, teaching a
boy what it looks like to be a male, but not conveying how it feels. A possible
exception to this via the spectator's subjective interpretations of the sportman's
legitimated emotional displays.

These notions confirm Lacanian psychoanalytic beliefs that masculine identity is based on a sense of profound vulnerability. Because the male child lacks the symbolic association that a female child experiences with her mother (in terms of their ability to learn 'what' and 'how' to develop a female identity), it can be argued that the acting out of 'hypermasculine' traits expresses a desire to 'prove' oneself resulting from this sense of vulnerablility.

These notions of masculine subjectivity and its construction will be applied in the analysis of the different forms of masculinity as represented in the episode "Jurrasic Mask" of the cartoon "The Mask". Ideas relating to the hegemonic policing of gender as discussed in chapter two relating to Buckingham's observations will be observed. Issues surrounding the different displays of what is it to be 'masculine' will be deconstructed in chapter five with a view to observing how a 'preferred' meaning of masculinity is created and concurrently: to what extent the participants accept or the degree to which they inflect these messages.

Chapter Four - Research Methodology

4.1   Research design and procedures:

The central issue of this thesis is the social construction of masculinity.   In particular, how participants 'talk' about the different expressions of masculinity within the cartoon programme "The Mask".   This chapter describes the procedures used during the research, from obtaining information relating to viewer demographics to the nature of focus group research.

The episode of "The Mask" used in this research (entitled "Jurassic Mask") was selected from a series of programmes recorded during late summer 1996.   The programme aired between 4.30 and 5pm on week afternoons on TVNZ's Channel Two. In order to determine the viewer demographics of those watching "Jurassic Mask", data was obtained from AC Nielsen Limited.   This was to elucidate information relating to two primary interests: the percentage of people within the chosen demographic who watched the programme (for instance, 4% of all people aged 5 years and over watched "The Mask" on 'X'/'X'/199X) and the percentage of people watching TV within the demographic who watched the programme (for instance, of those people aged 5 years and over who were watching TV, 51% watched "The Mask" on 'X'/'X'/199X) (see Appendices). Identifying those most likely to be watching 'The Mask' as being between the ages of eight and ten years, this information was used to formulate the age range of participants for the focus group research.   As a result of the participants' age, a method of obtaining their informed consent needed to be given careful consideration.   It was decided that an information sheet and consent form would be sent to participants, written in language tailored to their expected level of ability.   Another facet of the research of ethical concern was the collection of data for later analysis.   Both video and audio equipment would be used in order to ensure the maximum level of both aural and visual information was captured on tape.

Access to participants was gained via an opportunity sample. Because the age of those most likely to be watching 'The Mask' was between eight and ten, it was decided that the research would take place in a school environment. Information sheets were sent to the school Board of Trustee Principal, the class teacher, parent/guardians and participants explaining the nature of study. The information sheet(s) clearly explained the rights of the participant and parents/guardians. These included the right to withdraw from the research at any stage, the right to ask questions at any time throughout the research, the right to request that the recording devices be turned off at any stage during the research, and that participant confidentiality would be ensured and kept through the changing of names and any special characteristics that might lead to the identification of those involved in the research. A consent form was also enclosed with the information sheet. This required signatures from both the participants and their parent(s)/guardian(s). This form restated the rights of those involved: a key component of the form was that both the parent(s)/guardian(s) and the participant had to sign. Thus, informed consent was attained through the explanation of the nature of the research via three avenues: an in-class explanation by the participating teacher, an information sheet addressed to the participants written in language tailored to their perceived level of comprehension and via the explanation of the research by parents/guardians. Further to this, the researcher explained the nature of the project to the participants when they met prior to the research being carried out.

Upon the receipt of completed consent forms, another letter was forwarded to the parents/guardians proposing a time to meet the researcher. The purpose of this was to enable the participants' parents/guardians to meet with the researcher (myself). This provided an opportunity for any further questions they had to be asked, whilst also making an avenue available to express any final anxieties they had regarding the research. At the meeting, the researcher set time aside for a screening of the episode 'Jurassic Mask'. It was reiterated by the researcher to the parents/guardians that the participants' regular classroom teacher will be present during the research. The researcher also organised with the class teacher a time to meet the participants. The purpose of this meeting was to allow the

participants to become familiar with the researcher. Another motivation for this meeting was to diminish any initial hesitancy that participants might have to provide information in the research setting.

The focus group interview as a method of gaining information was employed because of its potential to empower participants: participants have the freedom to explain what they've said within this research method. The focus group method also allows a researcher access to detailed information regarding participant attitudes. Using the funnel approach (as described by Morgan, 1997:41, and described in more detail below), this research began with a relatively unstructured opening, working toward closer analysis of participant ideas as the study progressed. This method of focus group design was employed by both Morley's Nationwide research (1980) and in Buckingham's Children Talking Television project (1993). During the development of discussion topics for the focus group interview, the researcher worked closely with the participants' classroom teacher. This was to gain an informed insight into the perceived level of comprehension of the participants. In addition to Morley and Buckingham's methodological procedures, this research utilised sentence completion as an exercise to encourage participation. Participants worked in pairs, completing a sentence that was provided by the researcher. An opportunity was then made available for participants to read aloud their ideas. This was done in order to prompt ideas for further discussion. A list of the characters in the episode was written on a white board in order to aid participants in the accurate recalling of character names. The participants were also given the opportunity to re-watch any segments of the episode to help prompt discussions. It was anticipated by the researcher that the participants would talk first of what interested them most. This allowed the researcher to draw conclusions about what types of things interested participants the most.

4.2   Focus Group research:

> The focus group emphasizes the social nature of communication
> and does not reduce social scientific research to the study of the
> individual.   Lunt (1996:90)

> [T]he focus group method involves bringing together a group,
> or, more often, a series of groups, of subjects to discuss an
> issue in the presence of a moderator. Lunt (1996:80)

Focus groups have been utilised for most of the twentieth century with Bogardu's (1926) description being one of the earliest published documents detailing the method (Morgan, 1997:4). Indeed, it was Lazarsfeld in 1941 who employed the focus group interview to any great degree. Lazarsfeld's initial application arose from research requiring participants to press buttons indicating a positive or negative emotional response to a particular radio programme. Focus groups were subsequently employed, allowing researchers the opportunity to ask participants the reasons for their responses, both individually and collectively (Lunt, 1996:80). Resulting from this, it is possible to observe the different academic applications of focus groups. Lazarsfeld's work was primarily quantitative research, inquiring not what people were doing with the information from the radio broadcast, but rather how many people responded to it in particular ways. It was not until the subsequent qualitative section of the research that participants were given the opportunity to provide reasons for their responses. The focus group as a method of research has been evaluated for its ongoing usefulness by commentators from both qualitative and quantitative disciplines (Morgan (ed.) 1993, Krueger, 1994).

Focus groups as a self-contained method of study provide an avenue for the gathering of information (Morgan, 1997:2). Used in this manner, the focus group is a basis for study that allows a researcher access to a group whose primary reason for existence is to engage in discussions designed to inform the

research topic(s). In addition to this, Morgan contends that the "key distinguishing feature of a self contained focus group is that the results of the research can stand on their own", maintaining that one of the fundamental goals of the self contained focus group "is to learn about participants' attitudes and opinions" (1997:18-20). A key benefit of the type of research methodology exercised in focus groups is in allowing the researcher "to observe a large amount of interaction on a topic in a limited period of time" (Morgan, 1997:8). Because of these advantages, the focus group as a method of social inquiry, provided the most appropriate way of observing participant attitudes regarding masculinity.

Morgan contends that the two principal means of collecting data in social science research are participant observation and open-ended interviews (1997:7). Through the use of focus groups, a researcher can achieve a synergy of research methods through the meeting of methodological techniques employed in participant observation and open-ended interviews. For instance, participant observation attempts to observe participant behaviours in their 'natural' context. This mode of research is particularly useful if an objective of the study is to observe in-depth behaviours over a period of time (Morgan, 1997:10). However, issues arise pertaining to how the presence of the researcher alters 'natural' group communication. Consequently, there are ethical implications for the validity of the observations generated from the study. A substantial limitation of this approach is the tendency to conceptualise participants as being divorced from their socio-demographic environment. In comparison, the open-ended individual interview provides a researcher with an opportunity to exercise greater control over the direction of discussion, whilst also empowering participants, giving increased opportunities for detailed responses. These factors combine to aid closer communication between researcher and participant (Morgan, 1997:10). The self-contained focus group as a symbiosis of participant observation and open-ended interviews provides avenues for obtaining information that cannot easily be gained from these other methods. For example, in the case of this research, the observation of both participant attitudes regarding the representation of masculinity in a cartoon programme, whilst

simultaneously observing a group dynamic was a key factor in designing the study. Again, the focus group interview provided the most appropriate avenue for this.

A hotly contested issue in literature relating to the design and implementation of focus groups is whether it is beneficial for participants to be familiar with each other prior to the research taking place (Lunt, 1990: Morgan, 1997). Lunt contends that researchers "must consider whether to use groups who know each other or those who are relative strangers" (1990:82). Morgan (citing Jarrett, 1993) theorises that "working with prior acquaintances can help the researcher deal with issues of self-disclosure" (1997:38). Because a goal of this research was to observe individuals in their 'natural' setting, a group with a pre-existing entity was desirable due to the presumed familiarity of its members.

It is widely acknowledged (Krueger, 1994: Lunt, 1990: Morgan, 1997) that the role of the moderator is of pivotal importance in assuring the maximum effectiveness of a focus group. The moderator facilitates many issues surrounding the implementation of the focus group. Stewart and Shamdasani maintain that some of these issues include the possible initiation and direction of discussion, ensuring the discussion is kept to the goals of the research and dealing with individuals who dominant conversation (1990:69-86). However, the role that the moderator has potentially conflicts with the goals of the research. Lunt holds that:

> It is central to the focus group interview that researchers do not
> predetermine responses, and that they allow the opportunity for
> unanticipated issues to arise. (1990:84)

The role that the moderator is to have must be carefully considered. Depending upon the ideological focus of the research, it may be beneficial for the moderator to act as a symbolic authority figure. If the research group is comprised of individuals who are familiar with each other (as in this research), a moderator who acts as a figure of authority can redirect discussion if it has transgressed

from issues that are to be discussed. As noted in the discussion of Morley's Nationwide study in chapter two, the Nationwide research involved gaining access to groups that were already in existence. Because a central tenet of his study was to observe how groups of viewers with different social positions interpret a particular programme, it was of fundamental importance to the research design that the members of the groups were familiar with each other prior to the inception of the study. Morley notes:

> The choice to work with groups [who were familiar with each
> other] rather than [unfamiliar] individuals ... was made on the grounds
> that much individually based interview research is flawed by a focus
> on individuals as social atoms divorced from their social
> context. (1992:97)

Further to the points made in chapter two regarding the methodology employed by Morley in the Nationwide study, the specific design of questions he used in his focus group work was the 'funnel' strategy. The funnel approach to focus group research involves the discussion beginning with broad questions with a gradual progression toward narrow tightly regulated questions. This approach emphasizes free discussion with a focus toward a more tightly controlled ending.

> "This [method]... makes it possible to hear the participants' own
> perspectives in the early part of each discussion as well as their
> responses to the researcher's specific interests in the later part
> of the discussion". (Morgan, 1997:41).

Morley reiterates these notions, and in relation to the Nationwide research maintains that:

> The initial stages of the discussions enabled the respondents to
> elaborate ... their reconstructions of the programme, while the
> later stages made possible a more direct check on the impact

of what, in the programme analysis, had taken to be the
significant points. In short, the strategy was to begin with the
most naturalistic responses, and to move progressively towards
a more structured probing of hypotheses." (1992:97)

Because of these aspects, this method was chosen for this study. The final points
made by Morley interlink with a number of Buckingham's (1993) research
experiences with children. Buckingham cites what Hodge and Tripp (1986) call
'non-television meanings' as having an influence on how the group interacts:

the existing social relationships between members of a group, and
the ways in which these relationships are negotiated are redefined
in the process of discussion will significantly determine the
meanings which are produced. (1993:45-6)

Buckingham is critical of the methodology Morley employed in Nationwide,
maintaining that this approach would not be relevant to research with children.
Buckingham argues that trying

to filter out ... social relationships in order to arrive at an
account of what children really think may be a futile and
indeed misguided activity. (1993: 46)

Citing the work of Jordin and Brunt (1988) who critique Morley's Nationwide
study, Buckingham highlights that the emphasis in focus group research should
be on what the groups do and not what they represent:

All too often, potential debates and differences within groups
are suppressed and groups are taken to be representative
of unified social or ideological positions ... While broad social
structural factors such as class are bound to influence the ways
in which individuals make sense of television, it is important to

regard these not as *external* constraints, but as social
relationships which are actualized or brought into play in the
specific context of the discussion itself. 'Decoding' television
is itself a social process, [and] not merely an effect of other social
processes. (1993:46)

The moderator's role in a research situation is pivotal because the act of decoding is an active process. Because a key aspect of this thesis (similar to Buckingham's) was to observe participant interactions, the moderator's presence was potentially stifling to a group dynamic. To reduce the chance of this, the moderator carefully monitored the verbal and non verbal cues that were being sent. This is in accord with what Stewart and Shamdasani argue: that in situations similar to this "the moderator's role [is one of] being relegated to that of being one of the disscussants (with occasional clarifying or [the employment of] directional questions)"(1990:77). The effect of this is to encourage participants to speak as freely as possible. Similarly, Hansen maintains:

It is in the nature of focus group discussion that the role of the
moderator or facilitator is essentially to 'facilitate', 'moderate'
and 'stimulate' discussion among the participants, not to 'dominate',
'govern', or unduly 'lead' such discussion. (1998:272)

In this research, the moderator initially employed primary questions as a method of introducing new topic areas. These tended to be open-ended and were followed up by secondary questions, which were designed to probe in greater detail the answers given to the Primary questions (Stewart and Shamdasani, 1990:75). For example:

Int: Think back to the beginning of the programme where Stanley
         is on the floor in his pyjamas with his fluffy slippers on.

         ...

         Can anybody tell me how you think he got to be on the floor?

Follow up:

> Do you think a real man would let his dog push him around?
>
> Does that mean Stanley is less manly?
>
> What do you mean?

The moderator allowed participants to develop their own points as they arose from discussion. In these instances, the moderator only intervened to clarify any issues that were unclear. For example, prior to the example below, participants were discussing issues surrounding their understandings of masculinity.

Emily:	Some men can be funny / some men can be boring / some can be dumb.
George:	Some can be lazy.
James:	Some can be strong.
Mark:	Some can be weak.
Andrew:	Some could be criminals.
Mark:	Some could have pippies / some could have muscles.
Interviewer:	Sorry Emily?
Emily:	Some have a decent job, some don't / Some are married, some aren't.
John:	Some have only got … some are spare / some of them haven't got any girls.
Interviewer:	So what kinds of men are positive to you? / Go on Emily.

The use of what Stewart and Shamdasani call 'Leading questions' was also considered. They maintain that

> [l]eading questions may be valuable when the intent is to probe
> into sensitive topic … or where there is a need to push
> respondents beyond simple or surface responses. Although such
> questions are sometimes necessary, excessive use tends to place
> respondents into a reactive mode in which they simply respond to

the interviewer's questions rather than generate their own free-wheeling ideas in response to one another. (1990:75)

Although the research was interested to learn of participant opinions beyond a superficial level, the researcher felt that using leading questions would not be dissimilar to a questionnaire like approach; in this situation participants respond to prescribed material. Thus primary questions, rather than leading questions were employed.

This research used focus group interviews to observe a group of participants' talk about their understandings of the cartoon programme "The Mask". More specifically, this research was interested to learn what their understandings of masculinity are. The 'funnel' approach to focus group research was used: this method offers strong benefits to research of this type because it allows participants to discuss topics of their own choice, whilst allowing the researcher, in response to issues raised, to direct conversation towards areas that relate to the research. This also allowed participants to talk in a relatively unstructured manner which is in accord with one of the research objectives; to observe children's talk about television. The focus group interview, combined with an analysis of the ideological implications of participants' talk, aims to overcome any tendency to focus on the text at the expense of the context.

Chapter Five - Textual Analysis

5.1   The Programme:

> television, like the postmodern subject, must be conceived
> as a *site* - an intersection of multiple, conflicting cultural
> messages. (Collins, 1992:338).

Television, it has been argued, is inherently postmodern (Collins, 1992:327-353). Attempting to "destablize the relationship between high art and mass culture", postmodernism (in this instance, television) seeks to reconnect the viewer with "everyday life", as opposed to the artistic elitism that much of modern art typified (Collins, 1992:328-329). Arguing that one of the "key preconditions of the postmodern condition is the proliferation of signs ... [with] their endless circulations", Collins maintains that the televisual universe, with its dependence on and circulation of signs, has taken the place of the 'Real' (1992:331). 'Reality' is mediated by a ubiquitous television through a series of self-referential intertextual allusions.

Collins maintained that there are a number of characteristics that are indicative of postmodern televisual consciousness. One of these is Eco's concept of the 'already said'. Eco argued (cited by Collins, 1992:333) that a lover can no longer claim 'I love you madly', contending that such a declaration would "very probably only produce a laugh". Eco claimed " ... if he [the lover] [sic.] wants to make such a declaration of love, he [sic.]could say, "As Barbara Cartland would put it, 'I love you madly.'"" (1992:333). Another sign of postmodern consciousness is ironic manipulation. This changes 'I love you madly' from a genuine expression of emotions into a remark tinged with an awareness of its potentially cliched nature. The potential change in meaning has occurred not in the nature of the remark, but in the subjects' recognition, and awareness of the remarks' position and status in an environment saturated with media representations. This form of the rearticulation of meaning via dependent referents is similar to that employed by many language systems. However, in this situation, television has become

the medium through which 'reality' is both mediated and reinforced. Collins cites Hutcheon reiterating her claim that "what distinguishes postmodern rearticulations is their ambivalent relationship to the[ir] antecedent text" (1992:333). This leads directly to notions of Intertextuality.

"Intertextuality is a relation between two or more texts which influences the reading of the intertext" (Hayward, 1996:190). Consequently, if the relationship in a postmodern environment between the text and the intertext, or the text and its antecedent, is ambivalent as Hutcheon (quoted in Collins) contended, intertextuality though present, can never predetermine meaning in a universal sense. Collins points out that

> These intertextual references are emblematic of the
> *hyperconsciousness* of postmodern popular culture: a
> hyperawareness on the part of the text itself of its cultural
> status, function, and history, as well as of the conditions
> of its circulation and reception. (1992:335)

The cartoon programme "*The Mask*" embodies such postmodern notions. Based very loosely on the successful Hollywood film "The Mask" which starred Jim Carrey, the cartoon programme "The Mask" draws upon the viewers' prior intertextual knowledge of the film to aid comprehension of the cartoon. However, this is by no means a mutually exclusive quality. It is not necessary for the viewer to have seen the movie to understand the cartoon programme. The central thesis of the movie is the discovery of an ancient Indian 'mask' by the character of Stanley Ipkiss. Ipkiss works in a bank in a menial employment environment. His life is uneventful and methodical. He comes across 'the mask' and puts it on. A transformation occurs. He now has a green face, a yellow suit and an outgoing personality. The movie follows preformulated Hollywood narrative conventions, achieving ideological closure of both narrative and romantic components of the movie. Ipkiss gets the girl.

The cartoon programme focuses on the exploits of Stanley Ipkiss and his dog Milo. In the chosen episode entitled "Jurassic Mask", Ipkiss is woken one morning by the local trashman collecting rubbish. At his bedroom window, Ipkiss engages in dialogue with the trashman requesting the trash be collected 'at a later hour'. The reason for this is that Ipkiss worked late at the bank the night before 'counting all the money'. The trashman seemingly agrees. Ipkiss turns away from the window self assured and confident in his skills of negotiation. However, the trashman dumps the contents of the trash vehicle through Ipkiss' bedroom window on the floor, entrapping Ipkiss below the rubbish.

Ipkiss' expression of masculinity as a fluid and multifarious identity is continually invalidated both symbolically (visually) and textually. Masculinity in a modernist 'traditional' understanding, is in part defined through its binary opposition to what is perceived as feminine. The idea of binary opposites will be developed in more detail later but for now it is important to note that masculinity as an unquestioned universal concept has typically been associated with action rather than inaction, physical prowess and presence rather than physical passivity, and rationality rather than the expression of emotions (Easthope, 1990, Horrocks, 1994). In this example, Ipkiss embodies a rather 'wimpish male', personified as having a desk job. A part of Ipkiss' sense of self can be understood as deriving from his 'action' in terms of his daily activities, but these actions are cerebral rather than physical. He works at a bank rather than, as in this example, a trashman. He pushes a pen and counts money rather than employing his physicality. Although it is important to acknowledge Ipkiss' job as conforming to the masculine pursuit and mastery of cerebral knowledge (Easthope, 1990:42-44), Ipkiss does not posses this, for he is not the author of his destiny within his employment (as a 'masculine' leader) environment, but rather a worker, who by definition is bound to follow.

An example of how the programme symbolically invalidates Ipkiss' masculinity occurs in the first scene of the episode. In close up, the scene begins with a figure making shapes under the bedcovers. The viewer is led to believe that the shape is human. However, the next shot reveals Ipkiss lying on the floor in his

pyjamas with fluffy slippers on. Ipkiss has been pushed out of his bed by his dog. This example demonstrates how conventional ideas of masculinity are challenged through Ipkiss' lack of mastery over his dog Milo. As the scene progresses, Ipkiss is woken by the sound of the trash truck reversing. He wakes with a fright, gets up suddenly only to crash his head on an open drawer above him. This all occurs before there is any dialogue in the scene. Depicted as clumsy, where even his dog can push him around, the viewer is informed symbolically through visual inference of Ipkiss' uncertain sense of himself.

Immediately upon his introduction, the trashman's masculine identity is shown to derive from control over his physical body. Foucault contended that the body is a site where personal meanings in the form of gender identity and ideological struggle are dramatised and contested (Hall, 1997:50). In this example, the trashman is represented as a muscular man with a beard, dressed in a singlet, track pants and work boots (in comparison to Ipkiss' masculine identity, clean shaven, blue pyjamas with yellow fish on them and fluffy slippers). The trashman illustrates his 'modernist' masculine physical prowess explicitly by crushing trash cans against his forehead. This conforms, as Easthope argued, to ideals associated with mastery over nature, and subsequently, one's body: "The masculine ego must try to master everything other than itself: physical reality both as nature in the outside and the body on the inside; other people in society [and] its own unconscious and femininity" (1990:46). In order to demonstrate superiority, the trashman uses intimidation to ensure that his dominance can and will be maintained. This is over an already unsure Ipkiss.

Correspondingly, Morgan maintained that:

> there are intimate connections between issues of men's bodies
> and issues of men's power ... The domination of men over other
> men, over women and over children (and indeed over animals and
> nature) are expressed in bodily terms, directly and indirectly. (1993:74)

Here, Morgan alludes to the claim that 'the personal is the political'. This statement argues that personal attributes can be understood as having political and social implications. Horrocks suggested that "Sociology ... [has] argued that 'private' issues are actually individuals manifestations of political issues" (1994:36): in this example, it is the trashman's body or his physicality that embodies and signifies the oppression of other men, woman and children (along with animals and nature). Gender and cultural power are conflated to converge on the trashman's body as a physical manifestation of the socially constructed nature of masculine power.

Similarly, in the discussion that Ipkiss and the trashman have, it is the trashman who is subtly ironic towards Ipkiss' genuine request. The tone of the trashman's response (scene one, shot fifteen) is patronising and belittling. This is an example of inconsistent messages: here the literal meaning of the trashman's dialogue would have the viewer believe that he is being helpful, but his sarcastic tone is indicative of his hostile intolerance held toward other forms of masculinity and can be seen as an attempt to reconstitute his position of power through the use of sarcasm.

Ipkiss' personality changes when he turns into The Mask. The issue of multiple identities is symbolically hinted at early in the programme. In scene one, shot twenty seven, the mask is on a stand on Ipkiss' dresser with a mirror in the background. As Lacan argued (Williamson, 1978:61), the mirror is symbolic of the process whereby a child begins to develop ego boundaries. In this example, the mirror symbolically conveys the 'Jekyll and Hyde' persona that Stanley Ipkiss and The Mask embody. Placed with the mask, the mirror explicitly introduces the idea that the two personalities of The Mask and Stanley are two split components of one.

It is noticeable that the character of The Mask is motivated primarily by revenge. From the dominated Ipkiss comes a self assured Mask, who uses overcompensation as a personality mechanism to motivate behaviour(s). The Mask overcompensates Ipkiss' vulnerable masculine character traits, turning

them into hyper-exaggerated displays of masculine identity. This revenge is to set straight, at least in the character's mind, the injustices that have been dealt to Ipkiss. Essentially in the first scene, Ipkiss is humiliated by the physically robust trashman. Ipkiss attempts to engage in "civilised verbal communication" (scene one, shot thirty) with the trashman, asking him to collect the trash later in the morning. Responding to this in a hostile and sarcastic manner, the trashman, in an act of aggression, dumps trash in Ipkiss' room. As a result, Ipkiss puts the mask on and seeks out the trashman for what he understands as justice, which is retributive rather than restorative. This again is consistent with The Mask's version of masculinity, based on revenge rather than correction.

It is a belief of this thesis that this episode of 'The Mask' is structured around a series of deep binary oppositions. These are dramatised in various ways throughout the programme and are ideological in nature. The ideological dimension of binary oppositions is, according to Fiske, a way that deep cultural tensions and contradictions are expressed (1987:132). Adding to this, Hall argued that "though binary oppositions ... have the great value of capturing the diversity of the world with the either/or extremes, they are also a rather crude and reductionist way of establishing meaning" (1997:235). In this example, not only do statements have an ideological dimension, but bodies, physical things and actions also have ideological implications. For example, the guard's uniform symbolises law and order; his words and actions indicate that he has assimilated ideologies similar to those of a repressive state apparatus (the police for instance) into his character and is prepared to act them out. This thesis maintains that there are certain key binary oppositions that the programme is structured around. These are:

good	:	evil
order	:	disorder
passive	:	aggressive
masculine	:	feminine

These become transformed into physical realities as embodied in the following:

(aggressive)	:	(passive)
Hyper-masculinity	:	'Wimpish'-masculinity
The Trashman	:	Stanley

(order)	:	(disorder)
Stanley	:	The MASK
Police/Guard	:	The MASK/The dinosaurs
Adult	:	Child

(masculine)	:	(feminine)
The Mask	:	Stanley
The Trashman	:	Stanley

(high culture)	:	(low culture)
The Museum	:	The city street/The rubbish dump
Scientists	:	Citizen
		(The audience at a conference
		for the "folliculary challenged")
White collar worker	:	Blue collar worker

The City is also an economic symbol emboding the ethics of hard work and competitive masculinity. For instance, Ipkiss occasionally refers to the overpowering influence that work has in his life. During scene three shots twelve through fifteen, Milo the dog has dragged Ipkiss around the city whilst still in his pyjamas. Ipkiss shouts at Milo "Oh Milo, I'm going to be late for work". This demonstrates that at the forefront of Ipkiss's concerns is his punctuality for work and not for example the fact that he is in his pyjamas.

The episode represents an implicit oxymoron (where contradictory terms are used in conjunction with each other) in the form of the contradiction symbolised by the Science conference and the Museum. Ideologically, Science can be understood as symbolising evolution, technology and progress, intellectual pursuits and humanity in control of nature and the future. Alternatively, the Museum symbolises the insignificance of human scientific endeavours in the context of the evolution of the planet, the past, nature as awe inspiring and as a force to be reckoned with dwarfing humanity. Thus it is a juxtaposition for the 'World Conference of Really Smart Scientists' (scene four, shot one) to be held in a space that symbolises ideologies that are in part in opposition to those embodied by Science.

The second scene of the episode dramatises the interaction, with the trashman being shown at work at the city dump. The trashman's masculine vulnerability is exposed in this scene. As he empties the trash from the truck, a small box falls to his feet. His response, in conjunction with previous contextual information that the programme has conveyed, is demonstrative of the contradiction and tension embodied in his performance oriented masculinity.

> "Well, well, what do you know, haven't seen one
> of these since my last birthday party."
>
> Scene two, shot four.

As he inspects the box he realises it is a 'Jack in the Box'. There is potential ambiguity amid these lines. It is unclear whether the trashman is referring to a birthday party that he had last year, or whether he has a particularly vivid memory of his 'last birthday party' from his childhood. Either way, it is no mistake that he is represented as being childlike in his desire to play with a toy conventionally associated with childhood. His tone in the delivery of his lines reinforces this. This is in contrast to the form of masculinity that he displayed earlier at Ipkiss' bedroom window, employing tactics such as intimidation, motivated to reinforce his traditional sense of masculine identity.

This reinforces and illustrates notions of masculinity as performance. In this expression of masculinity, men seem more interested in proving their masculinity to each other, and subsequently themselves, rather than to women (Horrocks, 1994:90). Examples from the script demonstrate this notion. The trashman utilises an overexaggerated masculine persona when he interacts with Ipkiss. His is a performance of hypermasculinity, where the characteristics and attributes of maleness are exaggerated in order to ward off what he construes as a potential threat. Various theorists have argued that it is unsure whether or not the enemy is on the outside or whether it is the 'enemy within', namely, the feminine side of the personality (Easthope, 1990:104). There is however, a notable change in the trashman's version of masculinity when he is on his own. Physically represented as an 'adult' male, the trashman's inward sense of masculinity is depicted as childlike and vulnerable, typified by an interest in childlike toys.

Various expressions of masculinity are represented in this episode. Law enforcement officers are represented in the form of the guard at the museum, and as a lieutenant and his assistant Doyle. The guard at the museum is introduced in scene three. Milo in scene two, has accidentally ended up with the Mask on his face. After running through city streets Milo eventually runs into the local museum with Ipkiss following in pursuit. The programme then invokes what humans perceive to be stereotyped interests of a dog: Milo heads straight for the exhibition of ancient bones. With one in his mouth, he runs toward the centre of the museum with Ipkiss again following, but not before attracting the attention of a guard. Dressed in a blue uniform with a hat, a badge on his shirt sleeve indicating authority, the guard symbolises what Althusser defined as Repressive State Apparatus (1971:145) as discussed in chapter three.

Through the personalities of the lieutenant and Doyle, differing understandings of what it is to be 'masculine' can be observed. The lieutenant's version of masculinity is stoic in nature. With dialogue including: "Let's take him Doyle" and "Don't be a cry-baby Doyle" (scene five, shots 24 -30), the lieutenant demonstrates his conquering intolerant mentality. Combined with a dark overcoat, brooding eyebrows and a husky voice, the lieutenant's masculinity is

aggressive, confrontational, and generally invasive. However, his over exaggerated display of masculinity is but an example of a boy still trying desperately to act like a 'man'. Horrocks maintained that:

> The macho image is always an anxious one, since it is not
> inherently in the male - one is always liable to find oneself doing
> or saying something that doesn't fit.

And similarly:

> hypermasculinity in men is 'unnatural' and has to be forced. Both
> men and women contain both masculine and feminine elements: but
> [this expression of masculinity seems to need to be] ... constantly
> vigilant and repressive toward their own femininity. (1994:91)

The lieutenant's expression of masculinity as hypermasculinity (i.e. a performance) is based amid a number of externally motivated characteristics: the function of his 'performance' of masculinity is to prove his masculine identity to other men (and probably more importantly, himself) through what he perceives to be 'manly' traits; and also, the use of intimidation. Intimidation serves as a mechanism to belittle another in order to prop up his inwardly vulnerable masculine persona.

Doyle's masculinity, as typified through his soup spilling incident, is somewhat dichotomous to the form of masculinity that the lieutenant embodies. In comparison to the lieutenant, Doyle is portrayed as a weak masculine character. The mere fact that he is the passenger in the vehicle is symbolic of the power relationship between the two. Doyle is represented, both textually and via the character he interacts with, as less than smart. He illustrates this during shot thirty two of scene five, where he announces over the loudspeaker radio attached to the car:

Doyle: Attention rampaging dinosaur, pull over to the kerb.

                I repeat some more, pull over.

Lieutenant: And they say dinosaurs have small brains.

In this instance, it is the lieutenant's retort that contextualises Doyle's comment. Within the boundaries of 'normality', it is commonly understood that dinosaurs do not have, nor understand the language of humans. Thus, the request made by Doyle to the rampaging dinosaur to "pull over" is ludicrous in this context. The lieutenant's response, which is delivered to camera rather than to Doyle himself, illustrates the political tactics that the lieutenant employs to assert his position of power, and concurrently, his masculinity as the personal is at once the political. Not only is his comment intended as intimidation, but the fact that it is delivered to the viewer and not the character positions the audience as privileged viewers. In delivering the line directly to camera, the viewer is encouraged not only to identify with Doyle, but also to align their judgement with that of the lieutenant, clearly the preferred reading. This is a demonstration of what Fiske contends:

> The reader and the text together produce the preferred meaning, and
> in this collaboration the reader is constituted as someone with a
> particular set of relationships to the dominant value system and to the
> rest of society. This is ideology at work. (1990:165)

Fiske acknowledges that ideology works at the level of the subject constituting subjectivity in and by ideology. Later he maintains that in "using signs we [sic.] maintain and give life to ideology, but we are also formed by that ideology" (1990:171). This further highlights the double role of ideology in its power to constitute subjectivity, and at once re-constitute it. Subjectivity, argues Woodward

> includes our sense of self. It involves the conscious and unconscious
> thoughts and emotions which constitute our sense of 'who we are'
> and the feelings which are brought to different positions within

culture. (1997:39)

She goes on to suggest that

> we experience our subjectivity in a social context where language and
> culture give meaning to our experience of ourselves and where we
> adopt and identity. (ibid.)

Subjectivity can be actively constructed through the technical aspects of a programme. In this instance, subject positioning is the ideological work of a 'preferred reading'. The programme on multiple occasions actively encourages the viewer to decode a preferred reading. An example of this occurs during scene six, shots thirty nine through to forty-eight. A television reporter reads a news bulletin explaining that Edge city is in a state of siege as a result of three rampaging dinosaurs. Shot thirty nine is a long shot outside a shop window looking into a television set that is turned on. Shot forty moves to a mid shot of a passer-by incorporating the passer-by's stomach in the shot. Shots forty-one through forty-seven are shots without any contextualising reference point: it is as if the viewer had become one of the passerbys standing outside the shop window looking in. This thesis maintains that the ideological effect of the passerbys is to 'stitch' the audience into the cartoon.

Throughout the episode multiple male characters display similar patterns of body language. Both the guard at the museum, the trashman, the boy and The Mask fold their arms during situations of potential conflict. Often they have made an accusation toward another character or have betrayed the confidence of a character. An example of this is the boy who antagonised Milo with his water pistol in the street. He demonstrates this behaviour during Scene three shot thirty-one where Ipkiss is looking for Milo in the museum. Ipkiss stumbles across a roaring green dinosaur and is frightened by it. The boy from the street arrives on the scene and, in an example of a pointed castigation, sarcastically remarks to Ipkiss

Hey Mr. PJ - what are you - a scared?

Not only is this comment loaded with potential invalidations of Ipkiss' manliness in the form of the innuendos surrounding what it is to be a 'real man', but the boy, in an example of closed body language, folds his arms upon the delivery of the line "a scared?". Rich with inferences regarding Ipkiss' masculinity as not being allowed to show fear, the boy draws upon ideologies that construct what is 'acceptable' clothing for 'adults' to wear in public. Ipkiss is still in his pyjamas. This is because they were the last items of clothing that he was wearing before he put the mask on. Nonetheless, the boy uses the fact that Ipkiss is wearing pyjamas to further exploit his power over Ipkiss in this scene. Accusing Ipkiss of being inappropriately 'scared' at the animatronic robotic dinosaurs, the boy symbolically undermines Ipkiss' manliness via the belief that it is not 'masculine' to be scared. Psychologically, the boy is projecting his fear of Ipkiss' version of masculinity onto Ipkiss in the form of aggressive behaviours. Because Ipkiss' masculine identity is not in alignment with the ideologies of masculinity the boy has, and because it is dissimilar to his own, the boy perceives this external influence as a threat to his own sense of his masculine identity. This is an example of denial on the boys' part. Through the inner denial of his un-masculine side, the boy deals with the potential threat of what is perceived to be a threat by marginalising it, ridiculing it in an attempt to reinforce a sense of self that is based in external comparisons that can only further entrench both inner and outward projected antagonism. The boy folds his arms in a display of childlike defiance.

There are other examples of masculine gendered behaviour in this episode. Scheflen maintains that "People may also exchange behaviors of an aggressive, dominating, or antagonistic nature. They may clash about territorial violations or a transgression of right, threaten each other, or even come to blows" (1972:23). When executing his position of authority, the museum guard puts his hands on his hips. After accusing Ipkiss of being a 'bone thief', the female organiser of the conference defends Ipkiss' credibility. However the guard wants more:

Guard: If you're really a hot shot scientist, then prove it.

This is again consistent with the guard's conception of masculinity. For him, being 'masculine' involves somehow 'proving' it. This is in accord with comments made previously in the chapter alluding to the belief that certain expressions of masculinity are involved in the proving of oneself. For the guard in this example, proving ones masculinity is intimately tied to one's work or career. It is not sufficient for the scientist to be 'average', he must be a 'hot shot'. This is consistent with a version of masculinity driven by mastery, mastery of not only the 'other', but of knowledge (Easthope, 1990). These examples demonstrate the forms of body language that symbolically convey messages about power that are interwoven with issues of masculinity.

In contrast to this, the males at the "World Conference Of Really Smart Scientists" (Scene four, shots one-five) display body language that is less confrontational. Standing around in groups discussing topics that are presumably related to the conference, some of the men stand with their arms behind their backs, whilst others stand with their hands in their pockets. Although the scene utilised other cultural stereotypes regarding the nature of scientists (they all wear white coats, have eccentric hair styles and wear glasses resembling Albert Einstein), it is significant that nearly all the scientists in the room are male. The programme here assumed a preferred reading for the viewer - that most scientists are male and eccentric.

The phallus is symbolically represented in this episode of the programme. An example is the museum guard. During scene four, the guard chases Ipkiss into a room where a conference of scientists is being held. Still thinking that Ipkiss is a bone thief, the guard pushes Ipkiss along a table. The reverse shot is a close up of the guard looking as Ipkiss travels along the table (shot eighteen). In this shot, the size of the guard's nose is enormous. It could be argued that psychologically, this is a socially sanctioned way of incorporating a reference to the patriarchal power embodied in and by the phallus.

> The phallus, according to Lacan, is not the penis. Possessed by
> neither men nor women belonging to the symbolic order and not
> nature, taking its value like all signifiers from its relation to other
> signifiers, the phallus signifies the lack indissociable from
> entry into culture. (Lapsley, 1988:97)

Other examples also demonstrate similar points. During scene two, Ipkiss has a plunger thrown at him, and in an attempt to remove it, accidentally pulls the Mask off his face. The mask is thrown into the air with it landing on Milo's face. Upon turning into the dog form of the Mask, the length of Milo's tongue is exaggerated (scene two, shot twenty seven). Again a symbolic allusion to the cultural power of the phallus within patriarchy.

Through an analysis of the lyrics in the introduction of the programme, the general nature of the Mask's disposition is symbolically conveyed to the viewer. The initial lyrics indicate that the character of the Mask is narcissistic. With lines like:

> I've got you with my winning smile ...
> Just can help but stare at my savoir-faire ...
> Pretty baridian pleasure like mine ...

it is made clear to the viewer early on that his is a self centred world. Easthope contends that, in terms of psychoanalysis, narcissism originates from the libido.

> Flowing out of a single reservoir of energy, or libido, the two main
> [human] drives take the form of love for oneself (narcissism) or
> love of another (sexual desire). (1990:15).

Self love, or narcissism is continually repeated thematically throughout the episode. Initially, the topic is introduced with the symbolism of the mirror on Ipkiss' dresser. Upon turning into the Mask, Ipkiss becomes an exhibitionist. This is demonstrated by his wearing of a yellow suit. Exhibitionism, is in a sense

self love reflected externally in an attempt to attract attention from the other in order to gratify an ego hungry for love. This is typified by the line "I stand out in a crowd".

Dramatising masculine identity in many ways, the episode utilises common thematic representations of masculinity: in this example, displays of hyper-masculinity. Hypermasculinity as a 'performance' is an extreme version of the masculine/feminine binary opposition, with this thesis maintaining that this expression of masculinity is based primarily in attempting to 'prove' oneself to other men. Utilising certain 'Western' cultural stereotypes about what it is to be a 'man'. Hall maintained that there are political and social dimensions to the use of stereotypes:

> Stereotyping ... is part of the maintenance of [the] social and
> symbolic order. It sets up a symbolic frontier between the 'normal'
> and the 'deviant' ... the 'acceptable' and the 'unacceptable', what
> 'belongs' and what does not or is 'Other'... It facilitates the 'binding'
> or bonding together of all of Us who are 'normal' into one 'imagined
> community'; and it sends into symbolic exile all of Them - 'the Others'-
> who are in some way different. (1997:258)

Examples of these cultural stereotypes are illustrated in the characters of the Mask, the boy on the street, the museum guard and the lieutenant. In these instances, it has been argued that the characters' primary ideological motivation is revenge. The work of Foucault, who suggested that body is a primary site where the personal struggle for meaning is contested has been used, with an example of this being the trashman's expression of masculinity. Here, the claim that 'the personal is the political' has been drawn on to demonstrate how individual traits are manifestations of political issues. The creation of a 'preferred' reading in the form of the delivery of lines direct to camera, along with issues surrounding the potential 'Jeckyl and Hyde' persona embodied in the characters of the Stanley Ipkiss and The Mask have been developed. The programme's symbolic use of mirrors has been foregrounded as a vehicle

through which these points are conveyed. These issues surrounding the differing representations of masculinity have been critically evaluated to provide material for observation in focus group research.

Chapter Six - Focus Group Observations

6.1   The Participants and the Programme

> Rather than regarding meaning as something contained within the text,
> it [the 'active reader' approach] draws attention to the possibility
> of ambiguity and contradiction. While the text might 'prefer' or
> 'invite' a particular reading, and thus prevent or restrict others,
> it might also invite multiple readings - although limitations and
> the ideological consequences of that diversity cannot be guaranteed
> or determined in advance. At the same time, readers are not
> simple free-floating individuals, able to make meanings of their
> own choosing. Reading will inevitably rely upon established strategies
> for making meaning, and on orientations and expectations about texts,
> which are socially shared. The discourses - or ways of defining
> and making sense of the world - which are available to readers,
> and which are brought into play by the text, are not infinite, nor are
> they equally available to all. Readers do indeed make meanings,
> but they do so under conditions which we not of their own
> choosing. (Buckingham, 1993b:14)

In drawing on the work of Buckingham (1993), Morley (1980) and Hall (1980), this research endeavoured to observe the ways varying expressions of masculinity as a social construct are contested and potentially established. A number of Buckingham's research observations were initially confirmed: these relate to how participants perceived the research setting. Buckingham maintained that

> any adult asking questions about television in a school context
> inevitably invites certain kinds of responses. While the interviewers
> here were at pains to present the aims of the project as neutrally as
> possible - we [sic.] were simply 'interested in finding out what
> children think about television' - the children were bound to speculate

about our [sic.] motives, and to adjust their responses accordingly.
(1993:63)

Participants acted in ways that indicated they understood the interviewer to be a substitute teacher. Initially participants raised their hands seeking permission to speak. In accordance with the general intent of the research, the interviewer sought to establish a research environment that was open and trusting. Consequently, participants were encouraged to speak their ideas freely.

The research design specified that the participant's regular classroom teacher be present whilst the focus group took place. Having their teacher present had ideological implications: it was hoped that this would aid in diminishing participant anxieties regarding their openness to discussion. The research was carried out in the school's library, with both video and audio recording equipment being used to record the interview. An aspect of importance to the focus group experience was the body language exhibited by the interviewer. Care was taken to offer body language that mirrored the participants' while concurrently being as impartial as possible. Similarly, the level of language employed by the interviewer was given careful attention. Whilst planning the focus group procedure, the researcher consulted closely with the participants' classroom teacher. This was to obtain an insight into the level of language that participants were likely to be familiar with. During initial stages of the focus group interview, the interviewer sought to observe participants' language competency. From this perceived level, the interviewer adjusted the language used in discussions to the participants' language ability.

The researcher initially sought to establish whether participants made an intertextual link to the movie 'The Mask'. As mentioned in chapter four, intertextuality "is a relation between two or more texts which influences the reading of an intertext" (Hayward, 1996:160). All participants made intertextual connections between the film and the cartoon, acknowledging that the character of 'the Mask' in the cartoon was the same as in the film as illustrated by this example.

Extract 1:

Interviewer: So how can you tell that it is the same character?

Andrew: The way he talks.

John: The green face.

[…]

James: Their names are both the same.

However, later in the discussion participant's confused intertextual information from the cartoon and the movie. Members of the group were unsure whether Stanley had a girlfriend in the cartoon. In the following extract, the topic of conversation was Stanley and what kind of man participants thought he was. Emily had just stated that Stanley wasn't married.

Extract 2:

Interviewer: He wasn't married / okay.

George: But he's got a girlfriend.

Interviewer: Has he got a girlfriend?

Group: Yeah / no.

Interviewer: In the cartoon.

James: In the movie.

Interviewer: In what you've just seen?

Emily: Nah.

Chris: No.

Sarah: In a different one.

Interviewer: What's the different one Sarah?

Sarah: The movie.

Interviewer: Okay / so he's got a girlfriend in the movie.

Sarah: Yeah 'cos he dances with her / and

Interviewer: Ah.

Sarah: And turns into a dog and his eyes pop out.

Mark: (laugh). He turns into a dog and goes 'arrrgough'
            (imitation dog howl).

Eventually the group arrives at an accurate account of Stanley's marital status: he had a girlfriend in the movie but not in the cartoon. As members of the group begin to retell aspects of the movie, Mark contributes a comment invested with ideological meanings ('He turns into a dog and goes 'arrrgough'). In a section of the movie, Stanley dances with his girlfriend during which time, his head turns into that of a dog. Stanley's eyes then pop out, he drools and begins to howl. Clearly this is a coded, but nonetheless overt expression of Stanley's sexuality. In this instance, Stanley's biological maleness and his personality are conflated, enabling this act to be understood as an expression of a particular inflection of male sexuality. Stanley's drooling, howling and the fact that his eyes pop out of his head are ways of symbolically conveying Stanley's overtly sexual response to his girlfriend's physical appearance in the film. Furthermore, this example is symbolic of wider ideological issues regarding the (in this instance male) objectification of Women in terms of physical appearance. The point here is that Mark's comment could be understood as seeking to perpetuate the (typically) male objectification of the female body. For this 'read', Mark's biological maleness and his personality as two separate components of his being would have to be conflated. This example as demonstrative of the phrase "the personal is the political" (as discussed in chapter three) is framed by Mark's personal physical characteristics: white heterosexual (presumably) male turning them into a political weapon.

From the above extracts, there is a sense that participants were engaged in a retelling of the cartoon. Buckingham refers to this as 'collective remembering'. This describes how the act of recounting a story is "generally a collaborative activity" (1993:159). Here, each participant shared their opinion with other group members, with group discussion moving toward what participants deemed a satisfactory account of the issue at hand. It is significant that a proportion of the discussion occurred as if the interviewer was not present. This would indicate that individual interpretation in this context is "a social process in which

individual judgments are validated or disputed as the discussion proceeds" (Buckingham, 1993:160). At the same time, participants interjected during discussions, adding what they considered to be vital information. This confirms Buckingham's observations: on many occasions during his research the majority of retellings

> were collective, with one main speaker taking the burden
>
> of the narrative and others contributing details. There was often
>
> some strong competition for talk space, with the speaker
>
> being repeatedly corrected, as if getting the details exactly right
>
> was very important - although correction also served to remind
>
> the speaker that the right to speak was only granted provisionally,
>
> and could be lost at any time. (1993:67)

A component of the retelling was the raising of alternative or oppositional readings. This substantiates issues discussed in chapter two relating to Morley's Nationwide research. Morley observed the existence of viewpoints other than the 'dominant-hegemonic'. In this research, participants contributed individual interpretations to the 'collective' version of events. These can potentially be understood as having negotiated and oppositional aspects, but because the viewpoints are actively synthesized into the collective retelling, the oppositional or negotiated aspects are incorporated.

Early in the focus group experience, participants' personalities shone through. Emily for example, came across as being perceptive and intelligent. This was confirmed throughout the research by her comments which often opened up new areas of discussion. George was talkative also. He could be described as the 'jester' of the group, offering comments that were phrased somewhat rhetorically, as if he were testing the boundaries of what was able to be said. Mark was forthcoming with his opinions regarding differing expressions of masculinity. At one stage when discussing what it was about the trashman that Stanley was threatened by, Mark claimed that it was because "Stanley's got pippies" (a colloquialism referring to someone with small muscles). Mark made

this comment on more than one occasion. This would perhaps indicate that for him, the male body, and in particular, muscular bulk was the key signifier in determining how much of a 'man' someone is.

Peter got lost to a certain extent in the act of discussion. He sat to the right of the interviewer, and was often blocked from the interviewer's vision by the talkative George. Sarah offered a number of valuable contributions but spoke very softly and was asked on occasions by the interviewer to 'speak up because her opinions were important'. As the focus group progressed, participants became increasingly restless. The research lasted approximately and hour and a half and the group's restlessness would indicate that this period of time was too long for them to maintain this level of concentration. This time was not solely discussion however. The group viewed the episode at the beginning with this taking approximately twenty-five minutes. The programme was also used as a reference point for discussion starters, with the interviewer having prepared excerpts to prompt discussion.

As mentioned, on occasions participants spoke to each other as if the interviewer was not present. When this occurred, the interviewer attempted to let the conversation take its own course, developing a momentum of its own with the issues raised by the participants. This did not happen naturally. As previously mentioned, participants raised their hands seeking permission to speak. In the main, conversation was dominated by three of four members of the group. They were: Emily, Mark, George and to a lesser extent Andrew, James and Sarah. Chris, John and Peter were encouraged by the interviewer to contribute. This was done by asking them questions directly.

An excerpt was shown to participants in which the central character Stanley Ipkiss (his un'masked' persona) was awoken by the trashman collecting trash outside Stanley's apartment building. This programme establishes that this was inconvenient for Stanley: the previous night he had worked late at the bank. Stanley confronts the trashman from his open window a floor or two above, requesting that he (the trashman) come back at a later hour to collect the trash.

The participants were asked, as a part of a more general discussion regarding the trashman's expression of masculinity what they thought Stanley was asking the trashman.

Extract 3:

Interviewer: Okay / what is Stanley asking the trashman for?

George: Some rest.

Interviewer: Some rest / yes George / John?

John: Um / to come back later.

Interviewer: Okay / Emily?

Emily: Come round at a different time and pick up his garbage.

[...]

Interviewer: Do you think his request is okay?

Group: Yeah / No.

Interviewer: Did someone say 'no'?

Emily: 'Cos he shouldn't be out late at night.

Interviewer: ... sorry?

Emily: He shouldn't be out late at night and he should get to bed earlier.

Mark: Yeah but he can't help it 'cos he counting the money.

Interviewer: Sarah?

Sarah: Then he should quit / his job.

Interviewer: (shocked) He should quit?

Group: Yes. No.

Chris: What type of job can he get?

George: Laugh.

Interviewer: Why should he quit?

George: So he can go to sleep and then the trashman can come early in the morning.

Interviewer: Oh.

Sarah: But then he won't have anything to do through the day.

Interviewer: That's right.

George: Yes he will / he'll be the Mask.

James: Play with the dog.

George: Laugh.

Throughout the interchange of ideas occurring in this extract, a struggle to establish a 'preferred' meaning is taking place. Participants initially sought to establish a consensual 'version' of events (whether Stanley's request was okay), but as discussion progressed, differing opinions of the course of action characters ought to take were postulated. Emily argued that Stanley 'shouldn't be out late a night' and that 'he should get to bed earlier'. Mark reinforced Emily's thoughts but maintained that there was, by inference, a valid reason for Stanley being out - he was 'counting the money'. Sarah however argued in response to this, that Stanley should quit his job so that the trashman could collect the trash at a 'reasonable' hour. Here again, a member of the group (George) reinforced this posited viewpoint. George thought that Stanley should quit his job 'so he can go to sleep and then the trashman can come early in the morning'. It is clear here that the participants are conflating external and internal modality judgments, projecting and applying their own standards of what they thought was 'acceptable' onto the cartoon characters. Hodge and Tripp maintain that:

> Meaning is constantly negotiated. Interpretation and re-interpretation are apart of a continual process. (1986:10)

Similarly, the degree to which the modality judgements are regarded as 'realistic' is what Hodge and Tripp refer to as 'modal fit' (1986:116). The higher the 'external modality' judgement (i.e. the more the internal modality of the programme is in accord with the external modality as perceived by the viewer) the higher the modal fit. Participants in the research constantly engaged in a dynamic process of modality judgements, transposing their understanding of external modality onto and into their internal modality judgements.

Also significant here is the attempt to create a sense of what is 'normal'. It is Emily who states that "He [Stanley] shouldn't be out late at night". This in itself is an attempt to impose a moral judgment on Stanley's actions. As mentioned, the group agreed with this judgment; no-one voiced an oppositional viewpoint. However, one cannot help but wonder if this statement is more an expression of Emily's childlike understanding of what is an 'acceptable' time for people, irrespective of age, to go to bed. Later in the discussion, another member of the group (John) argued that "it [was] weird" for men to play with toys. Similarly, no-one argued with this ideological construction of 'masculine' 'normality'. During this segment of the discussion a consensus was not established.

As a result of being constructed in terms of subject positioning as 'viewers', participants actively engaged in modality judgements. As discussed in chapter two, modality is the extent to which a programme can be regarded as 'realistic'. Buckingham noted that modality can be clarified into 'internal' and 'external' modality. 'Internal' modality is the reality constructed by the programme, whilst 'external' modality is how the programme relates to the everyday lived experiences of the viewer (Buckingham, 1993:219). The ability to make modality judgments is a function of the constructed subject position of viewer. In the following extract Mark exercises an internal modality judgment whilst James seeks to link the example to an external modality marker.

Extract 4:

Interviewer: Okay / Mark who do you like the most?

Mark: The Mask.

Interviewer: You like the (interrupting)

Mark: 'Cos he's / um crazy and he can open just about every
             part in his body.

Interviewer: Open just about every part in his body?

Mark: Like when he was / 'cos he opens his brain. (laughs).

Interviewer: Oh / do you think that's real?

Group: No.

Interviewer: No.

James: Only in an operation.

Here Mark indicates that he takes pleasure from the improbability (external modality) of the described act. This is reinforced by the fact that he laughed after his explanation. James, perhaps in an attempt to appear knowledgeable, employs an external modality judgment invoking the discourses of science and health to provide a possible explanation for the act. This is similar to Buckingham's observations where:

> In [the] applying [of] 'internal' criteria, the children [sic.]
> recognized that the programme is a fictional text, which
> obeys certain rules and conventions, and which is scripted
> and acted out in front of cameras in a studio. To this
> extent, they acknowledged that the programme will never be
> completely 'realistic'. (1993:47)

Elsewhere in relation to this Buckingham argues that:

> the modality discourse is a very powerful one. It entails a claim
> to knowledge, whether of the real world or of the ways in which
> television itself is produced. In condemning television as 'unrealistic'
> or indeed in praising it on the grounds that it '*looks* realistic' - we are
> simultaneously distancing ourselves from the 'other people' who know
> less than we do, and who therefore implicitly believe it to be 'real'.
> (1993:235)

The participants' awareness of the tension between internal and external modality issues was explicitly demonstrated in another section of discussion. Here the interviewer asked if there was any difference between the movie 'The Mask' and the cartoon.

Extract 5:

Interviewer: What do you mean Andrew - 'except it's a cartoon'? / Is
                there a difference between the cartoon and the movie?

Andrew: Not really.

Interviewer: Not really.

George: 'Cos they're dressed up in costumes and the other ones aren't.

Interviewer: Which one's that?

George: The cartoon is dressed up in a studio thing.

George demonstrates his awareness of the constructed nature of the 'cartoon' in his last comment inferring that modality judgements surrounding a 'cartoon' are different from those applied to a 'movie'. Here, the cartoon is "dressed up in a studio thing" (strong internal modality but weak external modality) implying a 'fantasy' aspect implicit in the cartoon. This is in contrast to the movie of 'The Mask' where the characters are played by Real people. Hence, the appearance of the movie is more 'realistic', implying high external modality. Buckingham suggests that the exercising of modality judgements such as those herein act to undermine the power of the text whilst concurrently asserting the power of the viewer. More specifically, he contends that modality judgements:

> enable readers to place the text and their responses to it at arm's
> length, to question the motivations of its producers and to challenge
> its claim to provide an accurate representation of the world. (1993:239)

By illustrating an awareness of the fictitious nature of the cartoon, George implicitly depicts himself as knowledgeable. The tension between differing criteria of internal and external modality that he alludes to demonstrates his desire to suggest the implausible nature of the cartoon. Andrew however appears to shy away from the issue. Initially he suggested that there was a difference between the cartoon and the movie ('except it's a cartoon'). When asked to if he could explain the difference he said "not really".

Later, the group were shown an extract in which two scientists refer to Stanley as a 'nutcase'. Stanley in this instance is wearing his pyjamas.

Extract 6:

Interviewer: Why do you think that / they describe Stanley as a
'nutcase'?

Emily: 'Cos he's wearing pyjamas.

[...]

Interviewer: ... do you think there's anything unusual about
wearing pyjamas down the street?

Group: Yes!

George: You feel stupid. [spoken together].

Andrew: You'll look strange. [spoken together].

John: You'll be strange. [spoken together].

James: People will look at you all the time. [spoken together].

In an attempt to justify the claim that Stanley was a 'nutcase', whilst correspondingly confirming a sense of what is 'normal', it is significant that both Andrew and James employed external motivations in the formulation of their sense of 'normality'. Andrew argued that 'You'll look strange' and James seemed to confirm this stating 'People will look at you all the time", both drawing on their own suppositions of what they perceived 'other' people might be thinking. In contrast to this, George and John drew on inward criteria of what 'normality' felt like. George argued that 'You [would] feel strange' whilst John seemed to promote a sense of just 'being' strange. Notable here is the projection of the feelings onto an 'Other' demonstrated by the word 'you' or 'people'. Buckingham, in a slightly different context notes that:

Debates about the negative effects of the media are almost always
debates about *other* people. (1997: 32)

Nonetheless, Buckingham's points are relevant here. The creation of the category of 'other' enables viewers to project potentially conflicting anxieties onto someone or something else. Binary oppositions are a key aspect in the creation of the 'Other'. Typically, projections utilise binary extremes in order to signify, amongst other things, points of difference (Hall, 1997:229-230). This point is further confirmed when, nearing the end of the discussion the interviewer asked the group if they thought the programme they had just seen should be shown to younger children.

Extract 7:

Interviewer: Do you think that this programme should be shown
to young children?

Group: Yes.

George: Some of the bad stuff should be taken out of it. [spoken together]

Emily: No. [spoken together]

Interviewer: Okay.

George: If he looks out the window babies might look out the window and fall down.

Interviewer: What do you think Emily?

Emily: No / it's showing kids bad things to do and say bad things.

Interviewer: And what about / do you think people your age should see it?

Emily: Yes.

Group: Yes.

Emily: 'Cos we've already learnt what's right and what's wrong and what's wrong to say.

[…]

Sarah: When my sister watched a programme / um / these kids rolled their eyes and then she started doing it.

Interviewer: Oh / Andrew?

Andrew: Um / little kids shouldn't watch it under three / because it
            might be a bad influence.

John: Under five.

Andrew: Under two.

In this instance, the 'Other' is children younger than the participants. Multiple viewpoints are vocalised in this extract, but it is interesting to note that participants expressed a loose understanding of the logic of the "effects" tradition. One participant (Sarah) goes as far as providing an anecdotal example to demonstrate her knowledge. But far more telling is the discussion which takes place regarding the construction of themselves as viewers who 'know what's right and what's wrong' (Emily), and the corresponding construction of the 'Other' that takes the form of 'little kids ... under three [who shouldn't watch it [the programme] because it might be a bad influence' (Andrew). This too is in accord with Buckingham's observations which maintain that children tended to displace their anxieties onto children much younger than themselves (1993:43).

As in Buckingham's research, it is the act of speaking that is fundamental in the formation of subject positions: "talk about television can serve as an arena in which the self and its relation to others are defined. In talking about the programmes we like and dislike, we are inevitably 'positioning' ourselves" (1993:75). The act of talking about individual likes and dislikes involves a certain amount of risk: the risk of being rejected by peers on the basis that 'others' did not agree. As a group, the participants did not always reach a consensual interpretation of issues discussed, nor did they engage in a complete rejection of 'other' participants.

The programme creates a 'preferred' subject position for the viewer through its positioning of the camera. In this instance, the technique of an over the shoulder shot/reverse shot is employed. The ideological effect of this is to encourage the viewer to identify vicariously with the central character, in this case Stanley Ipkiss. Hayward confirms this, maintaining that the shot/reverse shot "represents

another series of shots that stitch us [the viewer] into the narrative and also into character identification" (1996:376). At the simplest of levels, the viewer (in this case the participants) is positioned as a voyeur, being given access to privileged information as viewers of the cartoon that characters are not. For example, when Stanley and Milo are in the back of the trashman's truck (Scene five, shot forty-five), the viewer is shown a shot of the truck from the dinosaur's point of view using the shot/reverse shot technique. The truck then turns into a steak on wheels, and then back into a truck. Through the 'invisible' presence of the camera, the viewer is given information that the character of Stanley does not have, and thus is positioned as a 'viewer' removed from the programme, but with privileged knowledge of events.

The chosen episode of 'The Mask' contains many different expressions of masculinity, but perhaps none more central than that expressed by Stanley Ipkiss. As argued in chapter four, Stanley's expression of masculinity is continually invalidated both visually and textually. In one section of the focus group research, the participants were asked to describe Stanley.

Extract 8:

Interviewer: ... so / what kind of man do you think Stanley is?

                    [Silence.]

Emily: A normal man.

Interviewer: So he's a normal man / what does / can you tell me what a
                    normal man is though?

Emily: Just does his job and ...

[...]

Andrew: He's a bit lazy.

Interviewer: ... tell me what you mean?

Andrew: Um / he doesn't / um, get dressed in the morning.

[...]

George: He lied to those people.

Interviewer: Which people are you talking about?

George: Those / doctors.

[…]

Interviewer: Do you / can you tell me what he lied?

[…]

Emily: 'Cos he didn't want the cop to know that he hum / stole
the bone.

[…]

George: He was funny.

Interviewer: … can you give me an example of when he was funny?

[…]

Sarah: When he was lying on the floor moving around and trying
to get the blankets.

[…]

Chris: Every / he lets everyone push him around.

Interviewer: Oh.

Chris: He said / (mimicking) "I'm not going to let anyone push me
around".

[…]

Mark: Um / he's a good person.

Interviewer: He's a good person / why do you say that Mark?

Mark: Um / because / he puts the mask on just so that he can save
the city.

[…]

Emily: Most men are funny or / um / they're ordinary but Stanley's
just boring.

Interviewer: So what's the difference between being ordinary and being
boring? …

John: Um / an ordinary man / works.

[…]

Interviewer: Does Stanley have a job though?

Group: Yes.

John: At the bank.

[...]

Interviewer: ... Stanley is on the floor and George said here that he thinks
                Milo pushed the dog / Milo pushed Stanley out of bed / does
                that make Stanley less of a man?

Group: Yes.

Interviewer: Do you think so? ... can you tell me

[...]

Emily: An ordinary man would've just got the dog and then / um
             put it outside.

Interviewer: Okay.

Emily: Or put the dog on the floor and he get in the bed.

[...]

Emily: It said at the start that Stanley let's everyone push him
             around / and he even let's his dog push him around.

Andrew: Yep.

Mark: It's not the dog that owns the man.

Vocalised here are differing conceptions of masculinity. Participants' conflated
moral judgements about the character of Stanley with opinions regarding
differing expressions of masculinity. For example, Stanley was not described as
passive or considerate of others, he was "lazy" (Andrew), a "good" person
(Mark) and "ordinary" (Emily). It is curious to note that Emily's descriptions of
Stanley are ambiguous. Initially, Stanley was a "normal" man, and later in the
discussion (quoted) he was an "ordinary" man. However, in the middle section
of the quoted material, Emily claims that "Most men are funny or / um / they're
ordinary but Stanley's just boring". Emily here is engaged in an active process of
defining Stanley. But this does not happen in isolation. Her comments seem to
be influenced by the general tone of groups' conversation with her opinions of
Stanley differing according to the wider group dynamic. Not only that, but she
seeks to make a moral judgement about the nature of "most men". Here, she
uses the category of 'most men' as 'Other' to justify her opinion that Stanley is
"boring". As discussed earlier in this chapter, it is significant that although not

necessarily engaged in contested meaning, the group attempted to establish a 'dominant' understanding of masculinity whilst working toward establishing a consensual working definition. In contrast to this, the interviewer at a later stage in the discussion asked if the participants thought it possible for more than 'one type of man' to exist. Here the group responded unanimously that it was indeed possible.

Morality judgments are a central theme in the above descriptions of Stanley. Stanley is lazy, a liar, funny, a 'good' person, a 'boring' man and by reverse implication somehow less of a man because he let's his dog push him around. To add credence to her comment that Stanley lets everyone push him around, Emily sites the programme as having stated this 'at the start'. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, the hegemonic struggle for a preferred reading is something that Morley's Nationwide study sought to observe. Here, phrases such as 'an ordinary man works' and 'an ordinary man would've just got the dog and then / um put it outside' indicate the linking together of a sense of 'normality' with certain kinds of behaviours, in this case, work, assertiveness and power over one's pets. Also being conflated here are notions of acceptable forms of 'masculinity'. It is a part of one's expression of masculine identity to 'work' according to John. Mark argued that Stanley was a 'good' man because 'he puts the mask on just so that he can save the city'. This statement could indicate one of two possible understandings on Mark's behalf. Either Mark is somehow intertextually transposing the ideological motivation of the character of the Mask from the movie, or that the comment is an indication of a component of Mark's understanding of masculinity. His comment seems to imply that it is important for the character to have a sense of 'what is good for the community' as an integral component in particular articulations of masculinity. Emily states later that Stanley "wasn't married". This might indicate that the discourse of heterosexuality underpins her reasoning and that it is 'unusual' for a man of Stanley's age not to be married.

In contrast to this, when asked to describe the Mask, the group provided confirmation that in their view, the characters of Stanley and the Mask are binary

opposites. The Mask was described as funny, exciting, silly, crazy, having 'gone completely wacko' and 'magic'. The last description of the Mask as magic is somewhat intriguing. It is John who describes the Mask in this way with the Mask being described like this on more than one occasion. Initially, the interviewer asked "can anybody tell me how Stanley changes when he puts the mask on?" and it was at this stage that John mentioned 'magic'. This perplexing statement was not explored at this point. However, later in the discussion when a similar question was asked John answered in the same manner.

Extract 9:

John: Um / magic.

Interviewer: The Mask is magic / okay / can you tell me what you mean?

John: When he changes into other things.

This illuminated the quest to discover what John meant by 'magic'. His qualifying statement indicated that he interpreted the question 'how the Mask changes' as an opportunity to explain literally 'how' the Mask changes i.e. it is through magic that the Mask can change from one person to another. However, the intention of the question was to establish if the participants were able to identify the differences in personality between Stanley and the Mask. This is a practical example of how the underlying assumptions and agenda of the researcher was in fact not decoded by the participant.

Value judgments were made by the group during discussions regarding the nature of the Lieutenant's and Doyle's expressions of masculinity. The participants were shown an extract where Doyle accidentally spills soup over himself. The lieutenant then accuses Doyle of being a 'cry-baby'. Again there were alternative and oppositonal readings of what the extract meant, but the discussion around Doyle's masculinity proved particularly insightful.

Extract 10:

Interviewer: How would you describe the way the Lieutenant treats
Doyle?

[...]

Chris: He treats him right because Doyle wasn't doing what he's
supposed to.

Interviewer: What do you mean?

Chris: Like / he's drinking coffee and he should be telling him

Mark: (interrupting) get a move on.

Chris: Get in the car and that.

Interviewer: Emily?

Emily: He shouldn't be um / that um / Doyle shouldn't be drinking
in the car.

Interviewer: Ah / Andrew?

Andrew: Like / he's trying to toughen him up / to not be weak.

Interviewer: What do you mean?

Andrew: Like he's being a sook.

Interviewer: So is Doyle a man? / would you describe Doyle as a man?

Group: No / sort of.

Interviewer: Sort of / what does sort of mean?

Mark: Like a woman.

Andrew: Half.

Group: Laughter.

Interviewer: Can you be half man though?

Group: No. Laughter.

Mark: Half man / half wo-man.

Here again the group engages in an attempt to 'normalise' behaviour as
demonstrated by Emily's comment that 'Doyle shouldn't be drinking in the car'.
Further to this, Andrew provided a comment laden with value judgments
involving values he associated with what it meant to be a 'man'. The lieutenant,
according to Andrew, was 'trying to toughen him [Doyle] up / not to be weak

[... because] like he's being a sook'. Embedded in this comment are many cultural and ideological assumptions about what it means to be a 'man'. It seems for Andrew, being a 'man' means rejecting all that is potentially feminine, and in this case, this meant weakness or being a 'sook'. Horrocks argues with strong conviction that "Men seem to have to constantly reassure themselves that they are men, [and] not women" (1994:90). Here also, the group creates the category of 'woman' as 'Other' in the form of Mark's comment 'Like a woman'. In contrast to this, Chris (at the beginning of the extract) identifies with the lieutenant arguing that the lieutenant "treats him right because Doyle wasn't doing what he supposed to". Implicit in this comment is a strong sense of appropriate 'normality' for what the police are ought to do. Chris sympathises with the lieutenant's symbolic authority, identifying Doyle as a deviation from the police are "supposed to" do.

Toward the end of the extract Mark and Andrew grapple (unsuccessfully) with the distinction between maleness and masculinity. The participants conflate biology and gender identity (Andrew: Like a woman. - Mark: Half man / half wo-man). The distinction is the difference between biologically male (maleness) and the gender that one identifies with (masculinity). In terms of child development, it can be inferred from the participant's conflation of biological sex and gender identity that in the development of a conception of masculinity, the distinction between biology and gender does not appear to have occurred at this level. Horrocks maintains that

> One thing is clear - maleness and masculinity must be distinguished.
> Maleness is nearly always incontrovertible. One can be the most
> camp queen on the block, but one is still male. (1994:91)

The interviewer purposefully did not provide the group with the distinction in an attempt to observe if the two aspects would be conflated.

The trashman is another example of a character from the programme where issues surrounding maleness and masculinity are conflated. As mentioned in

chapter four, the trashman's sense of masculinity can be seen to signified by his physical being. His is a body of excessive muscular bulk, his voice deep and husky and his presence overpowering - clearly a 'macho' man. Horrocks however maintains

> the macho man protests too much. He has to go around telling
> and showing everyone what a man he is, because there is such a
> strong internal pressure the other way, towards the feminine. (1994:90)

The participants identified that Stanley was intimidated by the trashman's display of masculinity, noting that it was the trashman's physical presence and his tone of voice that threatened Stanley the most.

Extract 11:

Interviewer: So why do you think Stanley changes the tone in his voice?

John: Because he's scared?

[…]

Interviewer: So what is it about the trashman that makes Stanley scared?

Mark: Um / how he / how many muscles he's got.

Interviewer: Okay / Sarah?

Sarah: The way he talks / like he yells at him.

Interviewer: The trashman yells.

Emily: He sounds all grumpy.

[…]

Interviewer: So which one of the two is more manly?

              Silence.

Interviewer: Emily?

Emily: The trashman … because he's got muscles.

In contrast to this, the group, in a later section of discussion, argued that they thought the way the trashman treated Stanley was 'mean' and 'cruel' when the trashman treated Stanley like 'garbage'. The latter example demonstrated a level

of word play in the form of a pun that the group took pleasure in (they laughed). The group maintained that they would, under no circumstances want to be treated that way and that the way the trashman treated Stanley was not 'the way most men should behave'. Emily explicitly stated "I don't get the part where Stanley said can you come back at a different time to collect my rubbish and then he just went and dumped it in there" demonstrating that she did not understand the motivations for the trashman's behaviour. Similarly, no-one could provide a reason for the trashman's actions and the group all agreed that no-one liked the trashman's expression of masculinity. Again, it was Emily's comments that were informative in terms of her understanding of what masculinity was about: "I don't like it when he shows off and he um / he gets the tin and crashes it against his head". Emily here is objecting to the trashman's hypermasculine displays of aggression and his attention seeking behaviour.

The group were also somewhat perplexed at the trashman's fascination with a Jack in the Box that he comes across whilst emptying his truck.

Extract 12:

Emily: He said 'I haven't seen it since my last birthday party' and he was old so he must've got a baby thing for his birthday.

Interviewer: Ah / Chris?

Laughter.

Interviewer: Chris / what do you think about that?

Chris: He must have not much family 'cos he got that for his last birthday party and that must've been ages ago.

Interviewer: Ah / Emily?

Emily: It's a bit babyish to get one of those when you're old.

Interviewer: Ah / what do you mean by that? Do you think men can play with toys?

Group: Yeah / no.

George: Yeah some of them can.

James: They can play with computers and that.

John: They can but it's weird.

George: If they had children they can play with their toys when they're
           getting bored and they're at home sick.

[...]

Interviewer: So / so its' alright for dad's to play with toys but not men?

George: No / not really.

Chris: Nah.

Andrew: But they are men!

Interviewer: Sorry Andrew?

Andrew: Some dad's are men.

Interviewer: Some?

Mark: No they all are.

Andrew: All are.

As discussion developed, the topic of conversation widened including viewpoints about what was deemed acceptable behaviour for 'men' to engage it. Initially, conflicting (alternative and oppositional readings) viewpoints were expressed in an attempt to explain the ambiguity in the trashman's phrase 'I haven't seen one of these since my last birthday party'. The ambivalence arises when one tries to determine when the trashman had his 'last birthday party'. If, as Emily suggested, his last birthday party was last year , 'he was old' and he was still receiving 'baby thing[s]', then this fact is a comment on an aspect of his rather 'boyish' masculine identity. In contrast to this, Chris argued that the trashman's last birthday party 'must've been ages ago' and 'he must not have much family'. As discussed in chapter four, this comment leaves a range of meanings open to interpretation that hint at two potentially conflicting understandings of the trashman's expression of masculinity. His outward display of hypermasculinity is an overcompensation for the fact that he is still a 'little boy' inwardly, with this being demonstrated by his fascination with the Jack in the Box.

It is significant that a number of the male participants engage in a struggle which attempts to narrowly define a sense of masculinity that permits an interest in toys. To begin with, the group argued 'yes' and 'no' as to whether 'men can play with toys'. George clarifies this by saying 'some of them can'. Here, George is projecting a concept of 'manliness' onto the category of 'Other' as indicated by the use of the objective pronoun 'them'. From this point it is 'which men' can play with toys that is debated. John argued that 'they can but it's weird' in an attempt to reconfirm an 'adult' masculinity that is in opposition to a 'childlike' expression that is interested in toys. George maintained that it's okay for men to play with toys 'if they had children'. Ideologically, George is arguing that it is only through having children that men can legitimately play with toys, and even then it is only the children's toys that the men can play with. Further to this, he adds that this type of behaviour is only acceptable when 'they're at home sick' while 'they're getting bored' as if having an interest in toys was somehow a sign of being less 'manly'. In an attempt to establish whether 'men' and 'dad's' were mutually inclusive categories, the interviewer questioned the group; 'so it's alright for dad's to play with toys but not men'. There was some confusion here, but eventually Mark trumpeted that all dads are men conflating fatherhood and malenss in this context.

Similarily, members of the group (mostly males) reacted to the idea of Stanley kissing his girlfriend (in the movie) in a negative manner. Wicks, in a discussion of the path a boy takes in rejecting his mother and all things associated with femininity, whilst simultaneously seeking feminine approval maintains that:

> A life long conflict begins that will compel a man to seek the
> acceptance of women, whom he depends upon to validate his
> manhood, while fearing and avoiding intimacy. Consider the
> young boy's reaction to a girl's kiss. His melodramatic show
> of disgust and indignation, which adults often find charmingly
> comic, is largely a protest against the affectionate contact that
> he associates with his mother. (1996:16-17)

The second part of the quote is particularly poignant to this research. The boys laughed as if embarrassed at the topic of kissing, with George maintaining, in a manner frighteningly similar to Wicks', that kissing was 'disgusting'. In contrast, the females in the group did not react in this way, with Emily disagreeing with the claim that kissing was disgusting. Once Emily had challenged this claim , two males (George and Mark) sided with her suggestion. George here has had a complete change of opinion. This would appear to confirm the points made earlier in the chapter relating to Emily's change in attitude: that to a certain extent, participants opinions were influenced by the level of group approval to their proposed ideas.

The group tended to confirm traditional notions of masculinity: Easthope contends that

> The masculine ego must try to master everything other than itself: physical reality both on the outside and the body on the inside; other people in society; its own unconscious and femininity. (1990:46)

Implicit within this quote are assumptions about the gendered nature of activity; it is masculine to be active, and through a binary opposition, femininity is associated with inactivity. This came through strongly in the research, specifically in relation to the differences between Stanley Ipkiss and the Mask. Categorising the Mask and Stanley in accordance with traditional understandings of the masculine/feminine binary, participants associated the Mask's expression of masculinity as active, and Stanley's masculinity, by inference, as passive and somewhat feminine. At one stage during discussion, participants were asked to state which of the two characters that they liked the most providing a reason why they thought this. The following extract is a sample of responses.

Extract 13:

John: Um / the Mask because um / he can / I mean he can do heaps
               of things.

Interviewer: Okay / Andrew?

Andrew: The Mask.

Interviewer: And why do you like the Mask more than Stanley?

Andrew: Just what James said / that he can change into things.

Interviewer: Ah / okay / Sarah who do you like the most?

Sarah: The Mask.

Interviewer: You like the Mask too.

Sarah: He's exciting and he does lots of things.

[…]

Interviewer: Um / which of the two characters do you like the most? /
               Emily?

Emily: The Mask.

Interviewer: … why do you like the Mask more than Stanley?

Emily: 'Cos he's funny and Stanley's not funny.

The descriptions of the trashman in the above extract all have a verb in them, attributing an action to them: 'he can *do* heaps of things' (John), 'he can change *into* things' (Andrew), and he '*does* lots of things' (Sarah). Emily's comment that the Mask is 'funny' confirms another aspect of 'traditional' masculinity, that of being assertive. Emily reiterated this in another section of the research arguing that "The Mask doesn't let him / anyone push him around". In fact, this is explicitly stated by the programme, with the character of Stanley Ipkiss stating:

> "All right, all right that is it! Stanley Ipkiss lets no one push
> him around. Well actually, Stanley Ipkiss lets everyone push
> him around. But I know someone who doesn't." (Scene two)

Immediately after delivering this line, Stanley looks toward the mask, and later turns into the character the Mask. Participant observation are in accord with this: the Mask is active and masculine, and Stanley inactive and feminine.

Participants' noted that Stanley's feminine masculinity is conveyed in a coded manner in the programme. At the beginning of the programme, Stanley is lying on the floor in blue pyjamas that have a yellow fish pattern and is wearing matching fluffy slippers. At one stage during the research George asked "How come he sleeps with his slippers on?" inferring that it is not masculine to do so. Participants were asked if they could explain how Stanley ended up on the floor: they agreed that Stanley's dog Milo has pushed him out. The programme shows Stanley on the floor and Milo on Stanley's bed. The following extract details some of the participants' responses.

Extract 14:

Interviewer: ... but Stanley is on the floor and George said here that
                 he thinks Milo ... pushed Stanley out of bed / does that
                 make Stanley less of a man?

Group: Yes.

Interviewer: Do you think so?

Group: Yes.

Interviewer: And why is that / can you tell me?

[...]

Emily: 'Cos um / an ordinary man would've just got the dog and
                 then / um put it outside.

Participants thought that this incident showed Stanley as being 'less of a man'. Emily confirmed this, contending that accepted notions of masculinity ("an ordinary man would ...") are typically associated in this example with assertiveness and mastery over one's pets. Prior to this extract, Emily stated that "the man's the owner and the dog's just the pet". The is similar the general (traditional) conception of masculinity that she expresses.

Participants demonstrated their conceptions of masculinity by attempting to make claims about how, for example 'most men' or 'an ordinary man' would act. As mentioned, a portion of the research was devoted to discussion of what participant's thoughts were regarding the character of Stanley Ipkiss. A number of participants thought Stanley was a 'boring man', with one comment from Mark being particularly insightful.

Mark: Um / it's sort of like / oh (changing thought) / ... ah like
         most men would probably go out fishing if they had the
         chance.

Mark is not so much conveying his understanding of Stanley and his expression of masculinity, but more what 'most men would probably' do. It is significant that Mark describes an activity and associates this with 'most' men's masculinity. Here, activities signaling independent and sporting type action are drawn on to convey a sense of masculinity that is a derivative of traditional understandings. Other attributes that participant's associated with traditional expressions of masculinity were; possessing a job and tone of voice.

Observations arising from the focus group research have confirmed a number of Buckingham's research findings. Participants initially conceptualised the researcher as a pseudo-teacher but this diminished as the focus group discussion progressed. All participants made an intertextual link between the cartoon and the movie, recognising Stanley Ipkiss as the central character. There was however, some confusion over the distinguishing of similar aspects the movie and the cartoon. In discussions surrounding issues of masculinity and potential regulation of viewing, the participants created and projected anxieties onto an imaginary 'Other'. To a certain extent, this enabled them to engage in moral judgments regarding 'other' types of people while detaching themselves. Potential hegemonic process' were observed in the attempt to construct consensual 'preferred' meanings of issues surrounding 'normality', 'masculinity' and 'Other'. Participants identified differing expressions of masculinity in the cartoon, but used traditional notions commonly associated with masculinity to

justify their comments. The group also acknowledged that there could be more than one version of masculinity yet these were often in conflict. It is significant to note that the female participants objected to the hypermasculine displays of masculinity depicted by the trashman while the males paid this little attention. This would indicate that differing ideological understandings of what it is to be 'masculine' underpin their comments indicating that a universal understanding of 'masculinity' is a fallacy.

Chapter Seven - Conclusions:

This thesis contributes to a growing body of literature on the nature of masculinity. This research sought to observe the social construction of masculinity as displayed among a group of the identified target audience for the cartoon programme 'The Mask'. Drawing primarily on the work of David Buckingham ("Children Talking Television" (1993)), this thesis observed much evidence that is in accord with his observations. Children's talk about television (and masculinity) is a complex process that is not easily reducible to a series of identifiable variables. In a manner similar to Buckingham's research, talk in this study functioned in a number of different ways. The nature of participants' talk indicated that the act of talking was primarily a social activity. Through 'talk', speaker subject positions were established. Talk was instrumental in the formation and construction of a sense of identity, both personally and as a mechanism to situate the individual as a member of a larger group. In the case of this research, talk was specifically related to attitudes about masculinity. One participant defined masculinity in terms of male physical characteristics, i.e. muscle size. This was indicated through what he said, and signalled that muscularity was a key signifier of masculinity for him.

The work of David Morley in his 1980 Nationwide Audience study was used as a theoretical framework for the identification of preferred, negotiated and oppositional readings. The textual analysis undertaken by this thesis effectively created a preferred reading of the cartoon programme. Material from this analysis was not used in a deterministic manner as if to seek whether participant's confirmed the readings of the researcher. Rather, the material was employed as a guiding framework for a number of the topic areas that were discussed during the focus group.

Stuart Hall's 1980 Encoding/Decoding model, which provided a basis for an understanding of the communication process was critically evaluated. Located within the field of British Cultural Studies, this thesis drew on understandings of the nature of Ideology from Marx through to Althusser. However, the influential

work of Stuart Hall in this area has been adopted as it provides a synthesis of Marxist, Althusserian and Gramscian political thought. This has enabled the researcher to engage in an ideological analysis of the implications of what participants said.

This thesis observed that participants employed traditional notions of 'what it means to be a man' to inform their discussions of the nature of masculinity. Characteristics that were identified as being a part of this understanding were: possessing a voice with a low tone, having muscles, being employed, assertiveness, being associated with activity and displaying characteristics in opposition to what is conventionally considered 'feminine'. Participants displayed an understanding of masculinity that had a sense of universality to it. This would indicate that individuals drew on a dominant, culturally specific understanding of what masculinity is. However, at one stage during discussion, participants acknowledged that there could be more than one 'type' of man. Significantly however, there was a level of ambivalence associated with the groups' understanding of what it meant to be a 'man'. This was expressed in the first instance, primarily by female members of the group: a number of the male participants' subsequently modified their views as they perceived the mood of the discussion changing.

This is similar to Edley and Wetherell who maintain that

> while a culture may contain multiple theories or discourses of
> masculinity, this does not necessarily mean that they happily
> coexist. Indeed, it is often more useful to see the thoughtful
> intellectual, the active hard man, the chivalrous romantic and so
> on as competing arguments about how a man should be.
> Manliness, in other words, is a contested territory; it is an
> ideological battlefield. (1996:106)

In stating this, it is noticeable that the male members of the group initially sought to establish a narrow sense of what was an acceptable expression of masculinity

for them. This is in contrast to the female members, who acknowledged the existence of more than one inflection of masculinity. It would seem (and can be concluded), from this research at least, that the boys had more at stake in establishing a definition of manliness than the girls did. This is in accord with arguments from psychology, sociology and the men's movement where it is maintained that masculinity (both biologically and as a particular expression of a gender identity) has its roots in the male-female (and in certain cases, the feminine-masculine) binary opposition. Furthermore, it can be concluded from this study, that the particular inflection of masculinity that draws on conventional ideologies in an attempt to define itself has much at stake in seeking to perpetuate the male/female binary. This is similar to Buckingham's observations which point out that boys in his research attempted to disclaim their preferences for anything that was associated with traditional understandings of femininity; "For some reason, the naming of female characters appears too risky" (1993a:103). This would lead one to conclude that the argument which maintains that this expression of masculinity is based on a sense of vulnerability (or differences in developmental experiences) has a degree of credence.

Drawing on an analysis of the social construction of masculinity informed by a number of the insights from Freudian and Lacanian psychology, this study observed a tension that a number of the male participants exhibited. Many participants sought to affirm their understanding of masculinity through a rejection of all that was associated with traditional understandings of femininity. Freud in his analysis of the Oedipal trajectory, argued that after the male child has identified with his mother as a primary care giver, must seek to reject her femininity in favour of what he perceives his fathers' masculinity to be. This argument, as a basis for masculine subjectivity contends that it is primarily through bio-sexual drives that subjectivity is constructed. Lacan argued however that human subjectivity was primarily linguistic. For him, a child does not gain a comprehensive understanding of itself until it enters the symbolic order, which is the realm of language, and in his understanding, patriarchal order. Lacan's understanding of subjectivity thus allows for ideological and cultural factors to be deconstructed. In a similar manner, Althusser replaced the idea of the

individual with the idea of the subject. For him, an 'individual' was a product of nature, whereas a 'subject' was a product of culture. This distinction allowed for the ideological factors that contribute to a sense of one's subjectivity to be observed. A good deal of evidence in this study supported this social constructionist theory, and reinforced prevailing ideological notions about masculinity.

This thesis draws on Horrock's (1994) analysis of masculine gender identity. A practising psychotherapist, Horrocks loosely employs the work of Freud and Lacan (among others) to argue that "Masculinity [is] in Crisis". In a combination of insights from feminism, sociology and psychology, Horrocks contends that "patriarchal masculinity cripples men" maintaining that

> Manhood as we [sic.] know it in our [sic.] society requires such a
> self-destructive identity, a deeply masochistic self-denial, a shrinkage
> of the self, a turning away from whole areas of life, that the man who
> obeys these demands of masculinity has become only half-human.

> (1994:25)

There seems to be an implicit tension in this which expresses a desire to be rid of the deterministic implications that the word 'masculinity' implies, primarily because of it's tendency to be understood as a 'singular' universal concept. Yet on the other hand, there appears to be a failure to acknowledge the conflating of masculine gender identity and one's (individual) personality. In his analysis, Horrocks employs the phrase 'the personal is the political' in an attempt to explain this. In this instance, 'private' issues are understood as manifestations of political issues and can for example, be seen as the way stereotypes are reproduced. This was observed in an analysis of comments made by one participant who, in one particular comment, repeated a comment made by the character Stanley Ipkiss (from the movie 'The Mask' and not the cartoon) in which a woman is objectified.

The act of speaking is an inherently social activity, composed of complex aspects that cannot, and should not always be taken on face value. This idea was confirmed in this research. One participant seemed to be on occasions 'testing' or pushing the boundaries of what could be said. While this could be interpreted as a dysfunctional expression of masculinity, in which the individual displayed an anti-social nature, it is an attempt to establish the 'acceptable' limits of the discourse in this context. It depends on, among other things, whether one chooses to believe 'the personal is the political', or whether, as Horrocks suggests, 'the political is the personal' (1994:36). The second approach maintains that the outer world is an expression of personal political issues and this notion was at times confirmed by an analysis of participants' talk.

Participants did not exhibit an awareness of the distinction between being biologically male and psychologically masculine. Subsequently, maleness and masculinity were conflated by all participants. This was demonstrated explicitly when a male participant claimed that the character of Stanley Ipkiss, who had previously been established by the group as being rather 'feminine', was "Half man half wo-man". It can be concluded, in a manner similar to Hodge and Tripp (1986), that the ability to distinguish between biological characteristics and psychological attributes has not been established in individuals at this developmental stage.

This thesis sought to observe factors which influence childrens' social construction of masculinity. A crucial component of the work was 'critical analysis', employing insights from different academic disciplines to aid in the process of understanding participants' comments. The nature of critical analysis has been evaluated by Buckingham who maintains that:

> To privilege 'critical analysis' is to run the risk of adopting
> a rationalistic position, which fails to engage with students'
> complex subjective investments in the media, and sanctions a
> dismissive superiority towards the vulgarity of popular

culture and those who enjoy it. (1993a:112)

Buckingham's point is that a purely academic investigation into children's understandings of television misses a significant aspect of their viewing: the 'complex subjective investments' that viewers have in watching, or, to put it another way, the pleasure derived from the viewing experience. The attempt to discern, from an intellectual perspective, what viewers interpret from a programme, runs the risk of drawing on an implicit power dynamic in the attempt to explain the interests of 'popular culture'. He also maintains that the opposite approach is not a viable alternative either:

> On the other hand, it seems equally problematic to suggest that
> 'saying how we really feel' is necessarily the path to political
> change, or to realising our 'true human potential' - as if 'true feelings'
> could somehow be expressed irrespective of the context and the
> language in which we might do so. This approach ... offers an
> individualistic, psychotherapeutic response to what is ultimately a
> social and political problem. (ibid: 112-113)

This research, similar to Buckingham's, draws on both participant's thoughts (and talk) as signifiers of their attitudes and what their comments represent in terms of social patterns as a synergy of intellectual factors and social pressures.

This research has potential implications for the ongoing societal debates regarding the censorship of children's viewing material. What underpins a number of societal moral panics about children's television is the presumed 'meaning' of a programme (which is often an adult interpretation), and how this meaning is 'magically' transmitted to the 'helpless' child viewer. This research has clearly demonstrated that children actively exercise and engage in judgements surrounding issues of modality. Implicit in such an activity is a synthesis of an individual's personal criteria associated with internal and external modality markers. Hodge and Tripp's (1986) research also observed this phenomenon. However, this is not to imply that determining meaning is an

individual activity. Hall's insights (as discussed in chapter three), suggest that individuals must enter their personal meanings into a common cultural code. This is to aid others in the comprehension of ideas and confirms that private languages do not exist. It is clear then, that an attempt to discern the 'meaning' of a programme is not a simple cause and effect process: rather, in this study, complex variables impacted on the nature of meanings which the children interpreted. For example, this research observed that ideas participants expressed, were motivated as much by how the children wanted to be perceived by other group members as it was by individual attempts to ascertain what the programme meant. This was demonstrated through the observation of subject positions that participants identified for themselves through their language. It can be concluded that the process of determining what something 'means' is inherently social, influenced and mediated by context and how others interpret an individuals' comments. Other factors include issues associated with an individuals' feelings and sense of self, together with non-verbal cues which help the individual moderate how what they have said has been interpreted. Similarly, cartoons contribute to viewers' developing ideas (and experience) of the world. This research has shown that there is a constant process of negotiation and re-negotiation of subjective information that participants held tempered by complex internal and external modality judgements.

In accord with Buckingham's observations, when asked if children younger than themselves should be allowed to watch this programme, participants projected anxieties onto the category of the 'Other'. A number of these anxieties are associated with whether the programme was potentially harmful to viewers less sophisticated than themselves. It is worth noting that the process of projecting anxieties onto 'other' less sophisticated viewers is a strategy not uncommon to other media debates surrounding violence and pornography for example. Buckingham noted that

> Just as adults frequently displace their concerns onto children, so
> children will often claim that it is those much younger than themselves

who are most at risk - while they themselves, by implication, are more 'adult' and thus much less vulnerable. In this context, therefore, the children had a good deal to gain from presenting themselves as selective, critical viewers. (1993:292)

The technique of projecting onto an imaginary 'other' was a recurring pattern throughout this research.   Participants in this instance, argued that the programme should not be shown to others younger than themselves: they were (in their minds at least) 'mature' enough to view the programme because they had learnt the difference between what was right and what was wrong.   One participant argued that if "little kids" saw a character looking out a window, they would do the same and would inevitably fall. Participants displayed a loose understanding of the logic derived from the 'effects' tradition, simultaneously siding with a morally conservative argument regarding the detrimental nature of television.   These observations are in accord with Buckingham's: "Children are very aware that adults ... often disapprove of them watching television, and believe it has a harmful influence upon them" (1993:291).   It can be concluded therefore, that contrary to many 'common sense' understandings of childrens' viewing competency, children are aware of a number of complex social pressures that inform debates about whether the programmes' they watch are 'suitable' for them.   This was demonstrated in this research through participants, in some cases, quite sophisticated comments.

The area of children and television is plagued by complex ideological and political issues.   Various groups in society, who have their own ideological agendas, engage in a search for what children 'interpret' or take from television programmes.   From the morally conservative view of childhood and television through to liberal attitudes, research has, until relatively recently, focused primarily on adult understandings of both what programmes 'mean', and what the child viewer 'really means' when they discuss their viewing preferences. Until the influential studies of Hodge and Tripp (1986) and Buckingham (1993) this was the dominant research paradigm. This thesis has drawn on insights from these newer studies to contribute to the literature on *children's* understandings

of television. This study concludes that children's viewing competency is a complex phenomena, not easily reducible to a number of variables that can be frequently isolated. Finally, as Buckingham maintains on the subject of children and television:

> Children's 'understandings' about television are almost inevitably embedded and expressed in language, and language itself is bound to serve social functions and purposes. 'Viewing skills' are not exercised in the abstract, and they cannot be separated from the social and affective dimensions of children's relationship with television. (1993:284)

ACNIELSEN DATALINE SERVICE
Top Programmes Analysis

Time Period : The Mask Sep96-Jun97
Prog. Group : the mask
Results in Percentages

	Programme		All 5+	13-16	5-12	5-16	F 13-16	F 5-12	F 5-16	M 13-16	M 5-12	M 5-16
29	The Mask	TV2 Sat 07/09/96 8:07 28	4	5	20	14	8	15	12	2	25	16
30	The Mask	TV2 Sat 14/09/96 8:05 28	3	2	16	11	-	12	7	4	21	15
31	The Mask	TV2 Mon 24/02/97 16:31 27	3	10	5	7	10	5	7	9	5	7
32	The Mask	TV2 Tue 25/02/97 16:32 26	3	6	13	10	6	11	9	7	15	12
33	The Mask	TV2 Thu 27/02/97 16:30 27	2	8	6	7	6	7	7	9	5	7
34	The Mask	TV2 Fri 28/02/97 16:33 27	3	3	11	8	2	9	6	3	12	9
35	The Mask	TV2 Mon 03/03/97 16:34 26	4	7	11	9	4	13	9	11	9	10
36	The Mask	TV2 Wed 05/03/97 16:34 27	3	1	14	9	*	16	10	2	12	8
37	The Mask	TV2 Thu 06/03/97 16:32 27	4	11	13	12	13	10	11	9	15	13
38	The Mask	TV2 Fri 07/03/97 16:31 27	3	6	11	9	4	14	10	9	8	8
39	The Mask	TV2 Mon 10/03/97 16:31 27	4	7	13	11	7	15	12	8	11	10
40	The Mask	TV2 Tue 11/03/97 16:33 26	5	8	14	11	11	17	15	4	11	8
41	The Mask	TV2 Wed 12/03/97 16:30 28	4	6	16	12	3	18	12	9	13	12
42	The Mask	TV2 Thu 13/03/97 16:31 27	3	5	10	8	7	10	9	4	9	7
43	The Mask	TV2 Fri 14/03/97 16:33 27	3	11	9	10	14	13	13	7	6	6
44	The Mask	TV2 Mon 17/03/97 16:33 27	4	10	7	8	7	7	7	13	7	9
45	The Mask	TV2 Tue 18/03/97 16:34 26	4	8	9	9	7	9	8	9	9	9
46	The Mask	TV2 Wed 19/03/97 16:32 27	4	8	11	9	1	10	7	14	11	12
47	The Mask	TV2 Thu 20/03/97 16:31 28	3	6	8	7	6	6	6	5	9	8
48	The Mask	TV2 Fri 21/03/97 16:32 26	4	4	15	11	7.	13	11	2	17	11
49	The Mask	TV2 Mon 24/03/97 16:32 27	3	11	13	12	12	15	13	9	11	10
50	The Mask	TV2 Wed 26/03/97 16:33 26	3	7	13	11	11	12	12	3	13	9
51	The Mask	TV2 Fri 28/03/97 16:49 23	3	1	14	9	1	16	10	1	11	7
52	The Mask	TV2 Mon 31/03/97 16:32 27	3	5	8	7	5	5	5	5	11	9
53	The Mask	TV2 Tue 01/04/97 16:33 26	4	13	16	15	17	21	20	8	11	10
54	The Mask	TV2 Wed 02/04/97 16:30 28	4	8	15	13	6	19	14	11	11	11

ACNIELSEN DATALINE SERVICE
Programme Share Analysis

Time Period : The Mask Sep96-Jun97
Prog. Group : the mask
Results in Percentages

	Programme		All 5+	13-16	5-12	5-16	F 13-16	F 5-12	F 5-16	M 13-16	M 5-12	M 5-16
1	The Mask	TV2 Sat 07/09/96 8:07 28	51	53	67	65	99	59	65	20	73	65
2	The Mask	TV2 Sat 14/09/96 8:05 28	54	48	62	61	-	49	44	90	73	74
3	The Mask	TV2 Mon 24/02/97 16:31 27	38	71	52	61	98	48	67	55	56	55
4	The Mask	TV2 Tue 25/02/97 16:32 26	41	60	62	62	98	56	64	44	67	60
5	The Mask	TV2 Thu 27/02/97 16:30 27	33	43	51	47	66	56	59	34	45	39
6	The Mask	TV2 Fri 28/02/97 16:33 27	38	34	75	65	95	85	86	26	69	56
7	The Mask	TV2 Mon 03/03/97 16:34 26	42	54	68	63	64	77	74	50	58	55
8	The Mask	TV2 Wed 05/03/97 16:34 27	37	13	72	59	100	79	79	13	64	45
9	The Mask	TV2 Thu 06/03/97 16:32 27	39	54	55	54	74	54	61	39	55	50
10	The Mask	TV2 Fri 07/03/97 16:31 27	21	30	58	46	30	66	55	30	49	39
11	The Mask	TV2 Mon 10/03/97 16:31 27	23	31	71	53	49	72	65	24	70	44
12	The Mask	TV2 Tue 11/03/97 16:33 26	43	60	64	63	75	68	70	38	59	53
13	The Mask	TV2 Wed 12/03/97 16:30 28	37	45	71	64	58	82	78	41	60	53
14	The Mask	TV2 Thu 13/03/97 16:31 27	38	33	62	50	49	55	53	20	74	48
15	The Mask	TV2 Fri 14/03/97 16:33 27	21	61	65	63	93	71	79	35	55	45
16	The Mask	TV2 Mon 17/03/97 16:33 27	27	43	49	46	59	87	73	38	35	36
17	The Mask	TV2 Tue 18/03/97 16:34 26	43	39	59	50	57	63	61	31	55	42
18	The Mask	TV2 Wed 19/03/97 16:32 27	38	49	56	53	9	63	47	70	51	57
19	The Mask	TV2 Thu 20/03/97 16:31 28	33	39	57	50	42	51	47	36	62	52
20	The Mask	TV2 Fri 21/03/97 16:32 26	32	54	55	55	55	61	59	52	52	52
21	The Mask	TV2 Mon 24/03/97 16:32 27	34	66	57	60	73	66	68	60	49	52
22	The Mask	TV2 Wed 26/03/97 16:33 26	39	44	63	56	52	65	59	27	61	53
23	The Mask	TV2 Fri 28/03/97 16:49 23	29	11	74	60	18	74	64	5	75	56
24	The Mask	TV2 Mon 31/03/97 16:32 27	19	34	57	48	33	36	35	36	76	61
25	The Mask	TV2 Tue 01/04/97 16:33 26	41	61	70	67	64	67	66	54	77	69
26	The Mask	TV2 Wed 02/04/97 16:30 28	39	52	62	59	39	67	60	66	55	58

Appendix B - Focus Group Correspondence

07 July 1998

REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINITY
IN THE CARTOON PROGRAMME
'THE MASK'

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Dear Principal,

My name is Simon Hart and I am a postgraduate student at the School of English and Media Studies at Massey University. I am contacting you regarding research that I am currently carrying out for the thesis component of my Masterate degree. I would like to request the participation of ten to twelve children in Miss. Rachel Steven's class in this research. The research aims to discover children's views of the television cartoon programme *The Mask*, particularly, how the programme portrays its male characters.

The purpose of this research is twofold;

+ to examine the images of masculinity in the chosen episode of 'The Mask' called "Jurassic Mask".

+ to observe participant discussions regarding the messages of 'what' it is to be 'masculine' that are portrayed in the programme.

At present very little research has been undertaken examining how masculinity as a social construct is influenced by television. This study is designed to go some way toward investigating these issues.

The research will involve the participants in *one* taped interview which will take approximately *one* hour and will be carried out in conjunction with Miss. Stevens in school time. This interview will consist of a viewing of the chosen episode, followed by open-ended discussion. The topics raised for this discussion will in the first instance come from the participants. Direction will be given by the researcher (myself) only in order to discover specific information if it does not seem to be forthcoming from the nature of the discussion. Discussions will be held in mixed small groups of about 5 or 6 participants, with Ms. Stevens being present in the room at the time of discussion.

This project has been approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee. It is a ethical and legal necessity to gain the informed consent of all those involved and affected by this research. As a result the parent's/guardian's,

participant's, teacher's and your consent need to be gained. If you approve and agree that this research can be carried out, the following procedures will be followed. That:

1.   The Parent/Guardian of the participant will tell Simon Hart, the researcher, that they allow .... (participant's name) to participate in the above described research.

2.   The Parent/Guardian and .... (participant's name) confidentiality will be kept through the following measures:

    +   All names and any special characteristics that would lead to identification will be changed.

    +   Interview tapes will only be viewed by Simon Hart and an assistant who will transcribe them. The assistant will sign an agreement that s/he will treat the tapes as confidential and will not discuss them with anyone other than Simon Hart.

    +   The interview tapes will not be released to anyone.

3.   The Parent/Guardian has the right to ask any questions that they or .... (participant's name) might have at any stage of the research. Their child also has the right to request that the recording device(s) be switched off at any stage of the research.

4.   With the approval of the Parent/Guardian, the information recorded onto video-tape will be placed in storage in a research archive situated at the School of English and Media Studies. If this is not to your satisfaction, the list of participant's who partook in the research can be destroyed, or alternatively, you will be provided with a copy of the material for your own purposes.

5.   If the Parent/Guardian request access to a summary of the research this will be supplied.

6.   The Parent/Guardian and their child .... (participant's name) are free to withdraw from the research project at any time.

Dr. Graeme Bassett of the School of English and Media Studies has approved this research and is supervising the project. He and the researcher (Simon Hart) are the only two people who will have access to material arising from this research.

Upon receiving the completed approval form from the peoples concerned, another brief letter will be forwarded proposing a time and place to meet. This will enable discussion of any matters that you, the parents/guardians or teacher might have regarding the nature of the with me, and will also provide a time for

the parents of the participants to view the episode that will be used.

If there are any matters arising from this letter that you wish to discuss with me, I can be contacted at either of the numbers provided below. I hope that you will consider allowing the children from Miss. Stevens class to participate in this research, and I look forward to meeting you over the coming weeks.

Simon Hart.
Postgraduate Student.
School of English and Media Studies.
Massey University.
Palmerston North.
6-3569099 Ext.7316 (Office).
6-3505522 (Secretary DDI).

07 July 1998

REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINITY IN THE CARTOON PROGRAMME 'THE MASK'

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Dear Miss. Stevens,

My name is Simon Hart and I am a postgraduate student at the School of English and Media Studies at Massey University. I am contacting you regarding research that I am currently carrying out for the thesis component of my Masterate degree. I would like to request the participation of the children in your class(es) aged nine and ten in this research. The research aims to discover children's views of the television cartoon programme *The Mask*, particularly, how the programme portrays its male characters.

The purpose of this research is twofold;

+ to examine the images of masculinity in the chosen episode of 'The Mask' called "Jurassic Mask".

+ to observe participant discussions regarding the messages of 'what' it is to be 'masculine' that are portrayed in the programme.

At present very little research has been undertaken examining how masculinity as a social construct is influenced by television. This study is designed to go some way toward investigating these issues.

The research will involve you and the participant's in *one* taped interview which will take approximately *one* hour and will be carried out in school time. This interview will consist of a viewing of the chosen episode, followed by open-ended discussion. The topics raised for this discussion will in the first instance come from the participants. Direction will be given by the researcher (myself) only in order to discover specific information if it does not seem to be forthcoming from the nature of the discussion. Discussions will be held in mixed small groups of about 5 or 6 participants, with yourself being present in the room at the time of discussion.

This project has been approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee. If you agree that the research can take place, the procedures for research involving human subjects as recommended by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee will be followed. These are designed to ensure and protect the confidentiality of those involved with the research, and will be explained both in letter form to the participant and their guardians, and verbally upon meeting with them.

Dr. Graeme Bassett of the School of English and Media Studies has approved this research and is supervising the project. He and the researcher (Simon Hart) are the only two people who will have access to material arising from this research.

Upon receiving the completed approval form from the peoples concerned, another brief letter will be forwarded proposing a time and place to meet. This will enable you to discuss any matters that you might have regarding the nature of the with me, and will also provide a time for the parents of the participants to view the episode that will be used.

If there are any matters arising from this letter that you wish to discuss with me, I can be contacted at either of the numbers provided below. I hope that you will consider allowing the children in your class(es) to participate in this research, and I look forward to meeting with you over the coming weeks.

Simon Hart.
Postgraduate Student.
School of English and Media Studies.
Massey University.
Palmerston North.
6-3569099 Ext. 7316 (Office).
6-3505522 (Secretary DDI).

29 July 1998

REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINITY
IN THE CARTOON PROGRAMME
'THE MASK'

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Dear Parent/Guardian,

My name is Simon Hart and I am a postgraduate student at the School of English and Media Studies at Massey University. I am contacting you regarding research that I am currently carrying out for the thesis component of my Masterate degree. I would like to request the participation of your child in this research. The research aims to discover children's views of the television cartoon programme *The Mask*, particularly how the programme portrays its male characters.

The purpose of this research is twofold;

+ to examine the images of masculinity in the chosen episode of 'The Mask' called "Jurassic Mask".

+ to observe participant discussions regarding the messages of 'what' it is to be 'masculine' that are portrayed in the programme.

At present very little research has been undertaken examining how masculinity as a social construct is influenced by television. This study is designed to go some way toward investigating these issues.

The research will involve .... in *one* taped interview which will take approximately *one* hour and will be carried out in conjunction with your child's teacher Rachel Stevens in school time. This interview will consist of a viewing of the chosen episode followed by open-ended discussion. The topics raised for this discussion will in the first instance come from the participants. Direction will be given by the researcher (myself) only in order to discover specific information if it does not seem to be forthcoming from the nature of the discussion. Discussions will be held in mixed small groups of about 5 or 6 participants, with Rachel Stevens being present in the room at the time of discussion.

This project has been approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee. It is a ethical and legal necessity to gain the informed consent of all those involved and affected by this research. As a result the parent's/guardian's, participant's, teacher's and your consent need to be gained. If you approve and agree that .... is able to participate in the study, the following procedures will be followed. That:

1.   You will tell Simon Hart, the researcher, that you allow your child the participant to participate in the above described research.

2.   Yours and the participant's confidentiality will be kept through the following measures:

  +   All names and any special characteristics that would lead to identification will be changed.

  +   Interview tapes will only be viewed by Simon Hart and an assistant who will transcribe them. The assistant will sign an agreement that s/he will treat the tapes as confidential and will not discuss them with anyone other than Simon Hart.

  +   The interview tapes will not be released to anyone.

3.   You have the right to ask any questions that you or the participant might have at any stage of the research. Your child also has the right to request that the recording device(s) be switched off at any stage of the research.

4.   With your approval, the information recorded onto video-tape will be placed in storage in a research archive situated at the School of English and Media Studies. If this is not to your satisfaction, the list of participant's who partook in the research can be destroyed, or alternatively, you will be provided with a copy of the material for your own purposes.

5.   If the Parent/Guardian request access to a summary of the research this will be supplied.

6.   You and your child are free to withdraw from the research project at any time.

Dr. Graeme Bassett of the School of English and Media Studies has approved this research and is supervising the project. He and the researcher (Simon Hart) are the only two people who will have access to material arising from this research.

Enclosed is a consent form which both you and the participant need to read and sign. Please return this in the envelope provided to Miss Stevens at school by Friday the 7th of August. Upon receiving the completed approval form from the peoples concerned, another brief letter will be forwarded proposing a time and place to meet. This will enable discussion of any matters that you, the parents/guardians or teacher might have regarding the nature of the with me, and will also provide a time for the parents of the participants to view the episode that will be used.

I hope that you will consider allowing your child to participate in this research,

and I look forward to meeting you over the coming weeks.

Simon Hart.
Postgraduate Student.
School of English and Media Studies.
Massey University.
Palmerston North.

REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINITY
IN THE CARTOON PROGRAMME
'THE MASK'

CONSENT FORM

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I or .... (participant's name) may ask further questions at any time. I have also explained to my child the nature of the research and s/he is comfortable with it.

I understand that both I and my child (the participant) have the right to withdraw from the study at any time and to decline to answer any particular questions.

I agree and have explained to the participant that the information provided to the researcher by the participant's will be used on the understanding that all names will not be used.

It is my preference that the video-taped material that will arise from this research be: *(please tick one or more of the following)*

Be placed in storage in a research archive at the School of English and Media Studies at Massey University ....( )

That yours and the participant's confidentiality be kept through the destroying of the list of participant's at the completion of research .... ( )

I and the participant also understand that the participant has the right to ask for the video tape to be turned off at any time during the research.

I understand that the only people who will view the tapes and have access to results are Dr. Graeme Bassett (supervisor), Simon Hart (researcher) and a transcriber who will sign a confidentiality document to ensure privacy is maintained.

I hereby allow ....(participant's name) to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

Signed:.. (Parent/Guardian.)

Signed: ....(Student.)

Name: .... (Student)

Date: ....

Please find enclosed a self-addressed envelope to be sent back to Miss Stevens at school by Friday the 7th of August confirming your and your child's involvement.

29 July 1998

REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINITY IN THE CARTOON PROGRAMME 'THE MASK'

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Dear Participant,

My name is Simon Hart and I am a student at the School of English and Media Studies at Massey University. At the moment I am doing some research observing how children watch tv, and I would like you to be involved in my study.

The study would be done at school, and will involve you and some of your classmates watching an episode of the cartoon programme *The Mask*. Your teacher and I will be in the room watching the tv with you. Once the programme is finished I hope that we (you, your classmates and I) will be able to talk to each other about what you have seen. Don't worry, this is not a test. There will be a video camera in the room video taping all of us as we watch the programme and talk to each other. The reason for this is so that when I am back at university I can sit down and play the tape back to help me remember what you've said. Please try not to be nervous just because the camera is there. The total amount of time that we will spend together will be about one (1) hour, and this will be in class time. After we meet, I will be writing a small book about the types of things that we have talked about, and may want to use what you have said as examples. In this book your real names will be changed. This is to make sure that no-one will be able to find out who you are.

Before we watch the tv together, I think it is a good idea that we meet each other. After you have read this letter, there is another piece of paper which your parent or guardian has that I need you to write your name on. By putting your name there, it means that you have read this letter and understood what my study is all about. If there is anything you don't understand here, or some words that you couldn't work out, please ask your parents or guardians to help you with it. It

is very important that you understand everything here.

You also need to know that if, for any reason you don't want to keep going with watching the tv, or talking together afterwards, you can say so, and you will be able to stop your involvement with the study. You can also ask at any time to have the video camera turned off. If there is anything you don't understand during the time of this study please just ask me and I will do my best to explain it to you.

Now please go to one of your parents or guardians and say that you have read this letter. Ask them to help you re-read it and explain it if you have any problems. If you want to meet me and take part in this study, and you feel that you know all about what we will be doing together, write your name on the piece of paper. Then ask one of your parents'/guardians' to do the same. Please ask them to put the piece of paper back in the envelope that I have provided for you and take it back to school, giving it to Miss Stevens by Friday the 7th of August.

Once I receive this, I will send you both another letter with a time and place that we can meet each other. This time might be one day at school just before you have your lunch. I will also organise another time with mum or dad, or your guardians so that they can meet me too.

I hope that you are interested in being a part of my study, and I look forward to meeting you soon.

Simon Hart.
School of English and Media Studies.
Massey University.
Palmerston North.

05 August 1998

REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINITY
IN THE CARTOON PROGRAMME
'THE MASK'

Dear Parent/Guardian,

Thank you for your quick response to the letter that I sent to you last week. I am now in receipt of the completed consent forms and am writing to advise you of the proposed time line from today until the time of research. As I explained in the Information Sheet, it is necessary that we meet in order to provide you with the opportunity to view the episode that will be used in the research and at the same time, provide you with the avenue to discuss any further issues that you might have regarding the research with me. Please find below a proposed outline of the next three weeks.

+ Friday the 7th of August: Please have the tear off sheet below returned to Miss. Stevens at school in the envelope provided.

+ Monday the 10th of August: I will come to the school just prior to the end of the school day to meet with the participants. This is so that they will be semi-familiar with me, and is designed to foster mutual respect. At this time, the participants are free to discuss with me any issues or concerns that they might have regarding the research.

+ Thursday the 13th of August: I will again come to school just prior to the end of the school day. This is the opportunity for those parents and guardians who wish to meet with me can do so. I will make myself available between 2.40pm and 3.30pm on this day. It is not compulsory that you attend. However this is the time that I propose we meet. It is then that the episode will be screened and any associated questions are welcome. The episode is approximately 22 minutes long. It has been suggested by Miss. Stevens that the participants can either spend time in their classroom or amuse themselves in the form of a outdoor game.

+ Friday the 21st of August: (Morning). This is the day that I propose the research will be carried out on. Miss. Stevens has approved this and it is anticipated that the research will be conducted in the school library. Again, I reiterate to you that Miss. Stevens will be present at all times during the research.

Please find below a tear off section to be sent back to me via Miss. Stevens at school indicating whether you would like to meet with me to view and discuss

this research.

I can be contacted at the university at 356-9099 Ext. 7316 (office) or alternatively if there is no response at the above number at 350-5522 (secretary).

Again I thank you for your agreement to let your child partake in this research and I look forward to meeting you over the coming weeks.

Simon Hart.
Postgraduate Student.
School of English and Media Studies.
Massey University.
Palmerston North.

A) Yes I would like to take the opportunity to meet with you to view and   ( )
   discuss any issues that I have regarding the research. Thursday the 13th
   of August between 2.40 and 3.30pm is convenient for me and I will be there.

B) Yes I would like to take the opportunity to meet with you to view and   ( )
   discuss any issues that I have regarding the research. However the time that
   you propose is not convenient with me. I would like to alternatively phone
   you and discuss my concerns with you.

C) I am comfortable with the nature of your research as you have   ( )
   described it to me. As such, I am happy for the research to go ahead
   without meeting you.

Appendix C - List

Shot description:

ECU: Extreme Close Up.
CU: Close Up.
MS: Mid Shot.
LS: Long Shot.
ELS: Extreme Long Shot.
HA: High Angle.
LA: Low Angle.

Characters:

The Mask.
Stanley Ipkiss.
Milo (Stanley's dog).
Trashman.
Boy (On the street).
Museum Guard.
Woman Scientist.
Man 1.
Man 2.
Dinosaurs (x3).
Lieutenant.
Doyle.
Salesman.
Male Audience Member.
Woman at promotion.
Female TV Reporter.

Appendix D - Cartoon Transcript

<u>Introduction:</u>

<u>Dialogue:</u>		<u>Accompanying Visuals:</u>
		(Music)
	1: MS:	Stanley in pyjamas looking.
	2: CS:	Mask on shelf.
	3: MS:	Stanley with arms outstretched about to put Mask on.
	4: CU:	Flash of lightning. Milo under bed covers, with a scared look in his eyes, puts paws over eyes attempting to hide from glare.
I've got you with my winning smile,	5: MS:	Stanley turns into the Mask, with paper flying out of tornado-like whirlwind.
	6: CU:	The Mask in yellow suit smiling, with green face. Pulling Milo's jaw apart to expose teeth for smile.
I'm living less in this flair and style,	7: LS:	In a tornado, the Mask comes along floor by banister with landlady looking out her door disapprovingly with her face screwed up. Her hair is in rollers. The Mask stops outside her door with cigarette lighter in his hand, lighting it.
Just can help but stare at my savoir-faire.	8: CU:	The Mask with arm around landlady. She now has a mouth full of cigarettes.
	9: LS:	The Mask jumps onto banister rail, watches landlady who is standing

			in doorway explode, whilst he swings a microphone. The Mask now slides down banister continuing to swing microphone.
I do bo jecko, Roman Grecco.	10:	CU:	The Mask with eyes popping out of head.
	11:	MS:	The Mask in confined space in robotic outfit.
	12:	LS:	The Mask dressed as roman figure. Standing in chariot with whip in front of city wall. Milo is positioned so that he will be pulling the chariot.
Rococo, boroco,	13:	LS:	The Mask dressed as a girl in pink dress with bow in hair with her hands behind her back. She is situated by city wall with a motorbike on her left. She pulls both hands out, and has in them multiple automatic machine guns.
	14:	LS:	(In bedroom). The Mask in knights tin suit romancing female.
	15:	MS:	(On bridge). The Mask in yellow suit does a twirl points to his right.
Bee bop, hip hop, flip flop,	16:	LS:	(In corridor). Metal shoe in CU. The Mask somersaults towards shoe with a non descript person at the end of the corridor.
Somebody stop me!!			During the final somersault, the Mask turns into a ninja.
Pretty baridian pleasures like mine	17:	MS:	The Mask, who is swinging his hips, dodges a person in a balaclava who is attempting to punch him from behind.
	18:	MS:	Of lieutenant: The Mask is behind him.

			He grabs the lieutenants' underwear, pulls them up over his head, to 'wedgie' him.
	19:	CU:	The Mask with playful look on his face.
	20:	LS:	(On bridge). The Mask rushing of screen right. His hat is left up in the air to indicate this speed of his movement. The Mask reaches back to get it.
Don't come a dime a dozen.			
I stand out in a crowd.	21:	LS:	(In city). The Mask stands outside a cafe and inflates his buttocks, cushioning the impact of a car, stopping a car from crashing into the cafe.
Fate when they made me,	22:	LA LS:	Dressed in a Western outfit with an excessively large hat, the Mask is in the centre of the screen. He pulls the hat down over himself, and when the hat comes up again, he is now in a jester outfit. There are two large 'thugs' on the floor looking up at him.
they broke the mould,	23:	MS:	The Mask is in the grip of a creature made of rock. The Mask with a large hammer in his hand, hits the creature over the head.
	24:	CS:	The Mask falls out of the grip of the creature, who is now disintegrating as a result of being hit by the Mask.
	25:	CS:	Creature with a delirious look on its face.
Awesome and kind,	26:	LA LS:	The Mask with foot out intending to trip a robotic creature in hallway.
stately refined,	27:	MS:	A 'fat' Mask sitting on a couch eating

		popcorn, with a long food roll on the table in front of him, and a beer hat.
Totally out of my mind.	28: LA LS:	A door opens, the Mask tornados into the room. He then pops his eyes out, showing them to the camera.
Arch villains and ne'r do wells,	29: CU:	Black figures' eyes/ eyebrows. The figure is wearing glasses, with a nonsensical image in their reflection.
	30: LS:	In a room with three men standing poised for action. A purple octopus-like tentacle comes from camera right and ensnares the men, taking them off the screen.
They'd never let me decorate prison cells.	31: LS:	A masked creature in silhouette stands in the middle of an opening door. He has his hands on his hips and his legs are apart.
Green goes with anything they add, see!	32: MS:	Lurch standing in front of a building. The Mask, dressed in a purple beret, with a large yellow bowtie paints Lurch green.
	33: LS:	The Mask throwing away paint brush.
	34: LS:	The Mask drives a motorbike up the wall of a building.
Well there's one last thing I got	35: MS:	The Mask reclined over a to sing about, broken grand piano, and casually pushes a key down.
Open up wide and really shout,	36: CS:	The Mask with his jaw dropping.
	37: CS:	The Mask on a motorbike high up in the air. Suddenly, gravity

		takes its natural effect, and the motorbike falls away from the Mask. The weight of the bike pulls the Mask's body out of shape, with his eyes nearly popping out of his head.
Woah - Lookout!!	38: MS:	The Mask falling out of a car that he, or so it is presumed, has just driven down the side of a building. He has red Elvis-like hair.
This is The Mask.	39: MS:	The Mask in a tornado-like movement moves into a black background, with THE MASK emblem coming into focus. The MASK disappears.
Smokkin!!!!!!	40: CS:	The Mask.

Scene One:		Shot:
	1: LS:	Of street with name of episode midscreen. Pan right - zoom MS to trash cans then up to window with curtain blowing out it in the wind.
	2: CU:	Of window. Credit. Zoom in to window.
	3: CU:	Inside bedroom. Zoom out to LS. Body under green cover making shapes.
	4: HA LS:	Of bed and side table. Camera tilt to show Stanley lying on floor in pyjamas. He has slippers on and is snoring.
	(sound bridge)	
	5: CU:	Stanley sleeping. The beeping noise of a truck reversing wakes him.
	6: CU:	Stanley getting up.

		He hits his head on an open draw above him.
Stanley: Ooouch.	7: CU:	Of creature under sheets. Pops head out - it is Milo.
Stanley: I hate trash day.	8: CU:	Stanley rubbing head. Moves out of shot right. Milo enters camera left, jumping over bed.
Hey buddy, I want to talk to you.	9: MS:	Of Stanley walking into window. Camera behind Stanley.
	10: LS:	Looking over Stanley's shoulder. Trashman with two cans over his shoulder walks toward the back of the truck. He empties the cans and throws them to his right.
Trashman: Oh yeah? And what might be the nature of this discussion?	11: LS:	Of trashman's shoulders/ head. Crushes one can against head.
Stanley: Well, um, you see sir, Thursday night we have to count all the money down at the bank where I work and I don't get home until really late. So I was	12: MS:	Stanley at his window. Swallows in an anxious manner. Milo joins him.
	13: MS:	Trashman throws can over right shoulder. Angry look on face.
wondering if you could hold the noise down a little tinsy bit on a-a Friday morning?	14: MS:	Stanley at window.
Trashman: Ohhh, or perhaps you'd prefer me to retrieve your trash at a later hour. Would say 9 or 10 be more convenient?	15: MS:	Seen through Stanley's window. Trashman puts left hand on his heart. Pointing finger up.
Stanley: Well sure. I mean 10, gosh, that would be just great. Thanks. Ooouch.	16: MS:	Stanley at window. Moves back into room. Hits head in window.
Milo, you've just witnessed	17: LS:	Of Stanley standing up rubbing his head walking away from window.
the process that separates		Turns to face bed. Milo runs away from window and jumps on the bed.
man from the beasts -	18: MS:	From behind Stanley's left hand side. Sees Milo jump on bed. Milo sits

		down and immediately looks at Stanley.
whoops - no offence. Sure, we could've used	19: MS:	Of Stanley's face.
coarse language and duked it out,	20: CU:	Milo whimpers. Moves to one side to see behind Stanley. Hydraulic sounds. Milo starts to growl and show his teeth.
but civilised verbal communication - that's so much more effective -	21: MS:	Over Milo's shoulder, looking out window to see the dumptruck tipper coming up to window level.
	22: LS:	Of truck. Camera tilts up to Stanley's window. Trashman looking out his drivers' window.
in fact ...	23: LA MS:	Camera looking up to encompass the ceiling. Stanley bends down on one knee to pat Milo. See trash about to be dropped into room.

(sound bridge)

Trashman: I'll be back to pick up your trash at 10 o'clock sharp.	24: CU:	Of trashman looking up. He drives off.
Stanley: All right, all right that is it! Stanley Ipkiss lets no one push him around. Well actually, Stanley Ipkiss lets everyone push him around.	25: MS:	Of the pile of rubbish.
But I know someone who doesn't.	26: LS:	Stanley stands up out of rubbish. Milo is on Stanley's bed.
	27: MS:	Of mask on a stand on a dresser. A mirror is in the background.
	28: LS:	Stanley gets out of the rubbish. Moves across camera left. Camera pans left following his movement. Milo jumps off bed.
Don't, just stop it Milo.	29: CU:	Of Stanley's legs from his knee down. He is walking. With his

			teeth, Milo grabs Stanley's ankle.
	Civilised verbal communication has its place - that's fine. That garbage man needs to get his can kicked.	30: MS:	From beside the mask. Stanley is strutting up to the dresser. He looks down at Milo and then at the mask, reaching for it.
Milo:	Grrrr.	31: CU:	Of Milo. He changes his weight balance, placing his weight on his hind legs. He then puts his front paws over his eyes.
Mask:	Ssssnaking!!	32: MS:	Stanley puts the Mask on. A tornado like action occurs. He spins and appears in a yellow suit as he stops spinning.

Scene Two:

		1: LS:	Of rubbish dump. Cars piled high. City in background. Camera pans right. Trashman standing beside dump truck. Truck starts to dump trash.
		2: MS:	Trashman watching trash as it falls out of truck. Look of surprise.
		3: CU:	Of box with handle on its left side. Gloved hand reaches into shot from above right and picks up box.
Trashman:	Well, well, what d'ya know, haven't seen one of these since my last birthday party.	4: MS:	(*side on*). Of trashman talking to himself as he looks at box. Starts to wind it up.
		5: CU:	Camera looking at him. With a childlike curiously innocent look on his face, he continues to wind it. Start to see Jack in the Box jump out.

		6: CU:	Of Jack in the Box jumping out with a sign in his hands that reads "LOOK BEHIND YOU".
	Look behind you?	7: CU:	Trashman reads the sign aloud in a bemused tone. He turns to look behind him to see a giant face in the shape of the Mask's with a jester hat on its head. Zoom out to see the overpowering height of the Mask-like Jack in the Box.
	Yow!!!	8: ECU:	Trashman hollows.
		9: MS:	Trashman turns to face the Mask whilst throwing small Jack in the Box away.
Mask:	Careful now, watch your step.	10: MS:	From behind trashman. He starts to back away from Mask. The Mask has an angry look on his face.

(sound bridge)

		11: CU:	Of banana peel on ground. Trashman is about to step back onto it.
Trashman:	Huh, I'm not falling for that old banana peel gag.	12: MS:	Trashman looks left and then turns to the Mask. Camera pans right to show trashman in inferior position spatially.
Mask:	Well actually, this is a new one -	13: MS:	Of Mask bouncing up and down as he delivers the line.
		14: CU:	Of trashman. Shot of comprehension.

(sound bridge)

		15: LS:	Of trashman looking up anxiously. Shadow
	and it's falling for you!		draws over him just before a giant banana peel lands on him.
	And that takes care of the weasel.	16: LS:	Of Mask in yellow suit with Milo walking in camera right.
	Ugh!!!		Plunger from camera left

with green liquid
hits him the face.
He falls back.

Trashman: Chew on that freak face.

17: HA LS: Of Mask on his back
with trashman walking
in camera left. With his
has on his hips, he
delivers his line. The
Mask lifts his legs in the
air and attempts to
remove plunger.

18: MS: Of Mask attempting to
remove plunger. Is
pulling his face out of
shape as he tries.

Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha

19: LS: From behind the Mask.
Milo is between the
trashman and the Mask.
Trashman is standing with
his hands in his hips.

20: L/MS: Of the mask coming off,
flying up into the air.
The Mask turns back
into Stanley wearing his
pyjamas.

Stanley: Ugh!!, reminds me of
kissing Mrs. Beanman.

21: MS: Stanley leans back.

22: CU: Of Milo's face.

23: LS: Of Mask flying down
down from the sky.

24: LS: Of Milo looking as Mask
falls onto his face. Flash
of light.

Trashman: You!!!

25: MS: Of trashman next to truck.
Leans forward as if to
grab Stanley.

Arrrrgh!

Looking at Milo.

26: MS: As trashman gets back
upright, turns left with
anxious look on his
face.

27: MS: Of Milo in Mask with
exaggerated facial
features Milo has an
enormous tongue
hanging out.

28: LA MS: Of Milo growling/
snorting. Trashman
bends down to look

		at Milo, screams and jumps into pile of trash as dog turns to watch.
Stanley: Hee, hee, hee, nice going Milo.	29: LS:	From behind Milo looking at Stanley. Milo has mouth open wide. Stanley gets up. Delivers line as he walks toward dog. He stops walking at hip height.
Now be a good boy and give me back the mask.		Camera tilts up to deliver rest of lines. Milo jumps up and licks Stanley's left ear. He then starts to run away from Stanley (towards camera)
Milo: Grrrrrrr.		
Stanley: Oh Milo, I don't want to play this game.	30: LA LS:	From beside a trash can. Milo runs off with Stanley chasing him.

Scene Three:

	1: CU:	Of fire hydrant with water being sprayed at the top of it from off camera right. Pan right to view boy sitting on steps with water pistol shooting water. He has his chin resting on his left hand and he looks bored. The background is composed of innercity streets. He turns to look at camera as his expression changes.
	2: LS:	*(side on)*. Boy stands to face Milo as he runs into the shot from camera right. Boy points pistol at dog's head.
Boy: Hey mutt, you make a great moving	3: LA MS:	From behind Milo's head looking up at boy pointing pistol.
target. Ha, ha, ha.	4: MS:	Milo blinks eyes with mouth open. Keeps running past the boy.

	5: LS:	Of kid moving arm and spraying Milo again.
Milo: Grrrrrrr.	6: CU:	Of Milo looking disapprovingly. He spins around and turns into a "fireperson" with a red hat on his head. He runs towards camera right.
	7: CU:	*(side on)*. Of boys' head. His expression is changing.
	8: MS:	Of Milo running up to fire hydrant. He pulls the cap off it. As a result, high pressure water gushes out, hitting the boy.
Boy: Whoa!!	9: MS:	Water hits boy in the stomach, with the pressure projecting him back into the doorway.
Milo: Laughs.	10: CU:	Milo beside fire hydrant. Camera pans left across the road and zooms in to the front of the museum. A banner with the words "BONES OF THE WORLD" hangs above the door.
	11: CU:	Of Milo blinking. He runs out of the shot across the road toward the museum.
	12: MS:	Of museum stairs. Milo runs up them and through the door.
Stanley: Milo, I'm going to be late for work.	13: LS:	Looking out from the museum. Stanley runs into the shot camera left. Camera zooms out. He runs up the steps.
	14: LS:	From inside the museum. Stanley opens front door and looks around for Milo. He is still in his pyjamas.
	15: CU:	Of Stanley's face with

				mouth open looking around anxiously. Door closes. Zoom in to shocked expression.
Milo:	Grrrrrrr.	16:	LS:	Looking down hallway. Milo is about to take a bone off a stand in his mouth.
		17:	CU:	Milo takes bone. Still in red hat. Turns around to look at camera with "happy" look on his face.
Stanley:	Milo, that's not our bone, put it down.	18:	LS:	From behind Milo. Stanley is running toward Milo. Milo is standing on the raised level of the stand. Milo swings his head left to right and then throws the bone. Stanley jumps in the air to catch it.
	Goodboy.	19:	CU:	Relieved look in his face.
		20:	LS:	Of Milo running to elephant tusk. This is on an even larger stand than the last bone. He takes it and runs.
	Oh Milo!	21:	MS:	Of Stanley with first bone in hand. Whistle blows. Stanley cringes. Then looks right.
	(sound bridge)			
Guard:	All right poochy, hold it right there.	22:	LS:	Guard running from camera right to left toward Stanley.
Stanley:	Oh, oh. I've got to find Milo and get him out of here before -	23:	MS:	Of Stanley. Starts to run off camera left.
		24:	LA LS:	Of Stanley running down another hallway away from the guard.
	arrgh!!	25:	MS:	Stanley turns another corner into a stuffed green dinosaur positioned by the corner. He steps into the grip of the dinosaur. It roars. Camera zooms and tilts up.

		26: CU:	Of a scared Stanley. He shrugs down.
		27: LS:	Of Stanley running away from dinosaur to camera right.
		28: LS:	Of Stanley running into shot from stage right and into another dinosaur. Still has original bone from Milo in hand. Dinosaur roars.
		29: HA MS:	From dinosaur's point of view. Roaring in Stanley's face. Stanley starts to move back.
		30: LA MS:	Leg of Stanley as he's moving back into tail of red dinosaur. He falls over its tail. Red dinosaur turns.
Boy:	Hey Mr. PJ - what are you - a scared?	31: MS:	Stanley on the ground. Voice off camera. Camera tilt up to see boy from the street ... comes in and folds his arms. Green dinosaur next to boy roaring.
	These are just animatronics robots.		He turns around to turn the animal off.
	See?	32: CU:	Of dinosaur eye.
Stanley:	Huh? Oh yeah, yeah, sure - I mean I - I, animatronics, I knew that. Good stuff eh?	33: MS:	From over boy's shoulder. Stanley gets up. Clears throat, delivers lines with his hand on chin. He still has the bone in his hand.
Boy:	Hey, did you steal that bone?		
Stanley:	The, the bone? Well, well no. You see actually what happened was ...		Camera pans to CU of boys' face with hands up to mouth ... yelling
Boy:	Hey guards - bone thief.	34: LS:	Stanley runs off camera left. Boy looks in direction that Stanley goes.

Scene Four:

| | 1: CU: | Camera rotation right 45 degrees. Poster reads "WORLD CONFERENCE OF REALLY SMART SCIENTISTS". Pan right to a room full of individuals chatting. Some have white coats on. |

Woman: Now please, we must be patient. I'm sure the doctor will be here momentarily.

2: MS: Pan right to female in blue suit delivering lines. She is waving her arms as she speaks.

After all, what scientist would miss out on receiving the

3: LA LS: Of the hallway leading into the room. runs in as woman speaks.

prestigious Kelp award?

4: CU: Of Stanley with a bemused look on his face.

5: LS: Of the room. People are looking at him blankly.

Stanley: Oh hi, sorry I'm late. I've got to find my ...

6: CU: Of Stanley still with bone in his hand.

7: CU: Of scientist with red hair and a coffee cup. Another man has a disgruntled look on his face.

Woman: Oh, pish pash Dr. Proctor - no apologies necessary.

8: MS: Stanley standing camera left. Female moves toward him from camera right. She takes him by the arm and walks off camera right.

Man 1: He's wearing pyjamas.

9: MS: Man with eccentric hair and mirrored glasses with hands up to mouth whispering to man in white coat.

Man 2: I told you he was a nut case.

Stanley: I, you know, I-I-I think you have the wrong person.

10: LS: From other end of table. Female and Stanley walk toward the two men.

Woman: On nonsense my humble colleague. No one deserves the Kelp award more than you.

11: MS: Of female talking to Stanley.

(sound bridge)

Both turn to look camera right.

Guard: I've got you now

12: LA LS: Guard in doorway.

bone thief.

		He is pointing and running toward Stanley who still has bone in his hand.
	13: LA MS:	Guard runs into shot. Stanley is standing by the table with the other men behind him. Guard hits Stanley with an open hand on his chest, sending him backwards onto the table. The bone goes up into the air. Camera tilts to see bone flying.
	14: LS:	Of Stanley sliding along the table knocking glasses and plates into the air.
	15: MS:	From above Stanley looking down on him as sporadic bits land on top of him.
	16: MS:	Of bone flipping in the air.
Woman: Oh you fool, this happens to be Dr. Horace T. Proctor, the worlds' leading researcher on nuclear powered laser re-generation.	17: LA MS:	From behind guard looking at female as the bone lands in her hand. Camera swivels onto 'normal' vertical angle. She delivers her lines and moves bone from hand to hand. She waves it in the guard's face.
Guard: Him - but he's wearing pyjamas.	18: CU:	Of guard with an exaggerated nose.
	19: LS:	Of Stanley sitting on table with the knocked over glasses everywhere. Standing up. He clears his throat and puts his hands on his hips.
Stanley: Ah yes, yes well we famous scientist types don't like wasting time getting dressed in the morning.		
	20: CU:	Of food falling to the floor showing Stanley's blue fluffy slippers.
So, now if you'll excuse me.	21: LA LS:	Of Stanley, two scientists and female. Stanley starts to walk

		away (toward guard), but guard comes to meet him, stopping Stanley from going out of room.
Guard: If you're really a hot shot scientist then prove it.	22: MS:	From behind Stanley. Guard is standing with his hands on his hips.
Woman: He was planning on doing just that - weren't you Doctor?	23: LA MS:	Of female about to pull of white sheet covering an invention.
Stanley: Er, well, I, er.	24: MS:	Shocked look on Stanley's face as he turns around. All the people in the room also look shocked.
Woman: Dr. Proctor will now demonstrate his greatest invention.	25: LA LS:	Pulls off sheet as she delivers lines. At the same time, a pot plant falls to the floor.
	26: CU:	Of plant.
Stanley: I invented droopy house plants?	27: MS:	Of Stanley with finger to face with a puzzled look. He then stands more upright.
Woman: No - this is your nuclear powered laser re-generator. Ha, ha, ha - what a sense of humour!	28: LA LS:	Female pointing at invention with both hands laughing.
Stanley: Yes, yes, just a little joke - you know, to break the ice.	29: MS:	Stanley laughing agreeably. Zip pan to guard watching Stanley.
Now, the key to nuclear	30: MS:	Of Stanley looking nervously around. Raising finger when starts to talk. He starts to move forward and out of shot camera left.
powered - is it laser re-generation? Yar. Is to re-generate using, of course a,	31: HA LS:	Stanley walking from camera right to left moving toward and standing next to invention.
um, a - laser, which is powered nuclearly. Okay, tell me if I'm going to fast	32: MS:	Raises hand in a knowing manner. Facial gestures however give a contradictory message.

		33: MS:	Of guard. Looking disgruntled.
	for you now.	34: CU:	Of Stanley about to push buttons. There is an anxious look on his face.
		35: CU:	Camera tilt down as he pushes the buttons.
		36: LA MS:	Of the tip of the gun which is a lime green colour. Camera zooms out and tilts down to include Stanley's reaction.
		37: CU:	Stanley smiles.
		38: MS:	Of guard standing by the door with arms folded as if still keeping Stanley there. Milo appears camera left
Milo:	Grrrrrr.		with tusk in his mouth. Camera pans and zooms to follow Milo as he walks away up the hall.
Stanley:	Milo? Where's that mask fella?	39: MS:	Delivers lines with hands by his mouth as he calls the dog. As he takes his hands away from his mouth, he knocks the angle control level of the laser re- generator.
		40: CU:	Of the tip of the gun pulsating. The gun now tilts downward.
		41: CU:	Laser beam shot into the hallway with a sign above it reading "ANIMATRONIC DINOSAUR EXHIBITION". There is a green blast of light.
	Milo!!	42: MS:	Stanley calls out. He then returns the lever to top position.
Milo:	Growling and barking.	43: CU:	Milo.
		44: MS:	Of Stanley running camera left to right.
		45: CU:	Of Milo barking.

	46: LS:	Stanley arrives from behind Milo. Animatronic dinosaurs alive and roaring.
Stanley: Ha, ha, it's okay boy.	47: LS	From behind dinosaurs. Woman and two scientists come running as Stanley delivers lines. The three of them stand with their legs apart an arms poised. Stanley moves off camera right in an attempt
You see they're just animatronic robots.	48: MS:	to turn animatronic off. He is standing next to the green dinosaur. The dinosaur turns and roars at him. He jumps.
Dinosaurs: Roaring. Woman: No they're not - they're alive.	49: LA MS:	Of the three. Delivers lines. Milo pops his head up into the centre of the camera shot.
	50: LS:	From behind Stanley. As he moves back, the dinosaurs come forward.
	51: HA MS:	Dinosaurs walking.
	52: LA MS:	Running after the woman and two men down hallway.
	53: LA MS:	Of doorway. Stanley has Milo in his hand. He runs through the door with the scientists following him.
Oh, your re-generation ray has apparently bought the animatronic dinosaurs to life Doctor.	54: MS:	In room. Stanley comes in and closes the door. All look shocked. Pan left as female delivers her lines
Stanley: Yes, well, I'm sure we'll be safe in here.	55: CU:	Of Stanley.
Oh, then again?!	CU:	Of green claw breaking through the door.
	56: LS:	All running in different directions. Dinosaurs knock over the door and run through.
	57: LA MS:	Of five scientists

		screaming. Dinosaurs running.
	58: LS:	From behind them running. They run through the broken doors, down the hallway they've just come through.
	59: LS:	Of dinosaurs eating through concrete walls.
	60: LS:	Milo runs through open door. Stanley follows him through.
	61: LS:	Other side of door. Entered into a room that has a banner on the wall that reads "ANTIQUES OF THE BRONZE AND IRON AGE". Stanley and Milo stop at the door. Camera pan left to see the Mask on a heap of iron.
Oh great, so that's where you hid it. Are you sure you're not part squirrel?	62: MS:	Stanley talking to Milo.
	63: HA CU:	Of Milo wagging his tail.
Dinosaurs: Roaring, chewing.	64: MS:	Stanley moves right to left to get the Mask. The dinosaurs roar. He turns right in shock.
	65: LA LS:	Of dinosaurs breaking through a wall.
	66: MS:	Stanley's reaction shot. runs camera right.
	67: LS:	Dinosaurs running left, Stanley running right.
	68: MS:	Stanley jumps to floor. Looking back toward dinosaurs.
	69: LS:	Dinosaurs start eating.
	70: MS:	Camera pan right to left showing dinosaurs eating. Stanley and Milo are on floor in the distance.
Stanley: I thought you had some disgusting table manners.	71: MS:	Of Stanley talking to Milo on the floor.
	72: LS:	From the centre of the

			room. Dinosaurs crash through the exterior wall of the museum.
		73: MS:	Of concrete falling over the pile that the Mask is on.
		74: LS:	From the street. Dinosaurs running toward camera exposing the hole in the wall.
	Ha, ha, that's okay - don't say excuse me, let's just toss two million years of civilisation out the window. What do you say?	75: MS:	Stanley gets up to deliver lines. Starts to walk toward camera.
	Okay, let's go get the mask and ...	76: LS MA:	Stanley walking right. Milo follows him. Gets the Mask.

(sound bridge)

Guard:	All right you bone thief and artefact demolisher,	77: LA LS:	From behind the guard showing the hole in the wall. Only see the legs of guard. He has his hands on his hips.
	I'm putting you under museum arrest.	78: MS:	Of guard starting to walk toward them. The size of his nose is exaggerated. He moves from camera right to left.
		79: MS:	Stanley and Milo now run out the hole in the wall. Guard runs to rubble. Stops and looks out.
		80: MS:	From outside the museum looking in. The guard has his hands on his hips as he looks out.

Scene Five:

		1: LS:	Of museum entrance. Camera pan left to guard standing with arms folded next to trashman who picks up a can.
		2: MS:	Camera zoom in. From inside the trash truck. See the trashman raise a can above his head

Dialogue	Shot	Description
		and start to empty it into the truck.
	3: CU:	Of trash falling out. See the mask come out of the can.
	4: LS:	Trashman returns can to the sidewalk. Picks up another can.
Trashman: Sorry I missed the party.	5: MS:	With the can above his head, shaking it into the truck.
Guard: Some low life practically destroyed the whole museum.	6: LS:	Of guard next to standing next to the trashman. He leans forward and starts to shake his fists as he delivers his lines. Trashman moves back into the frame from camera left.
Trashman: Couldn't be worse than the joker I ran into this morning. If I could get my hands on him again I'll ...	7: MS: 8: MS:	Of Trashman. From behind the trashman. His arm muscles are hugely exaggerated. The guard has his arms folded. Camera zip pans right to show Stanley and Milo behind a distant tree listening to the conversation.
Stanley: The Mask - it's gotta be in with all that trash.	9: MS:	Of Stanley and Milo behind the tree looking out.
	10: LA MS:	Of the trash truck rumbling. It moves off camera left to expose the guard waving.
	11: MS:	Of the truck moving from camera right to left. Stanley and Milo enter the shot right running after the truck. The camera pans to follow them running.
I know I've told you never to chase moving vehicles Milo, but come on ...	12: LA MS:	Of Stanley and Milo running.
	13: LS:	From inside the trash truck. Both catch up

			to the truck and jump in.
There's nothing but junk in here .	14: MS:	Stanley and Milo as they've just got into the truck.
	15: MS:	Stanley starting to go through the trash.
	16: MS:	From position of rear view mirror in trucks' cab. The trashman is in close focus as he drives. Stanley delivers his line.
Trashman: Well, what d'ya know.		Trashman looks in rear view mirror and sees Stanley. He starts to swerve the truck as he delivers his lines.
	17: MS:	Of the trash truck swerving from camera left to right across the street.
Stanley: Whoa!!	18: CU:	Of Stanley being thrown around the back of the trash truck.
	19: LS:	From the front of the truck. The truck continues to swerve.
Trashman: Laughing.	20: CU:	In the cab of the truck. Crazed vindictive trashman laughing.
Police CB: Attention all units, I repeat, attention all units. Be on the look out for prehistoric predators with an appetite for metal.	21: MS:	Contextualising shot. City street. Shop window, and pole in shot. The bonnet of a car comes into frame camera left. The two front seats of the car are visible. Car is moving to camera right. Zip pan right to parallel the movement of the car. Zoom in to CU. Two men are in the car. The red headed man looks shocked at the news, whilst the driver's expression is unchanged.
	23: LA LS:	Green dinosaur moves out from a street toward

		a "t" junction. There are traffic lights in the shot.
Lieutenant: There's one now. Let's take him Doyle.	24: LA MS:	From passenger's knee. The interior of the car. Red headed Doyle has a 'dopie' look on his face. He is pouring soup. The lieutenant's (driver) face is aggressive.
Doyle: Oh, but I just poured my soup Lieutenant.	25: LS:	Of an empty city street. The car comes from the rear left of the camera shot, heading camera right along the street. He car travels out of shot.

(sound bridge)

Ouch, it's burning my lap.	26: LA MS:	From Doyle's knee. Doyle spills soup as a result of the speed of the car.
	27: LS:	Police car camera left moving toward dinosaur.
	28: HA LS:	Dinosaur camera right sees police car. It then runs off camera right with the car following it.
Lieutenant: Don't be a cry-baby Doyle, at least it's not coffee.	29: CU:	From behind the steering wheel of the car.
All right you prehistoric creep - you're going down!	30: MS:	Of car moving right. As he finished his lines, the car moves out of shot.
Doyle: I read you Lieutenant.	31: LA MA:	From Doyle's right knee as he reaches for the CB radio.
Attention rampaging dinosaur, pull over to the kerb,	32: LS:	Of dinosaur running toward camera. The dinosaur is running down the left hand side of the road with the car on the right.
I repeat some more, pull over.	33: CU:	Across the lieutenant's arms looking toward Doyle.
Lieutenant: And they say dinosaurs have small brains.		Pull focus to MS:

	34: LS:	From behind the dinosaur. It is running away. Suddenly, it stop and turns.
Dinosaur: Growls and roars.	35: LA CU:	Of dinosaur roaring.
	36: LS:	From beside the dinosaur. Car heading towards camera right. The dinosaur starts to jump.
	37: LS:	Of dinosaur jumping.
	38: LS:	From behind the dinosaur. It is about to land.
	39: LS:	Dinosaur coming down on the bonnet of the car. The camera is beside the drivers' door. The viewer can see the lieutenant's facial expressions in the wing mirror of the car. He has an angry confrontational expression on has face. The dinosaur is roaring.
Doyle: Well well, its a good thing she's made of metal isn't it?	40: MS:	From the front of the bonnet of the car looking into the interior of the car. Can see the left claw of the dinosaur on the bonnet. Doyle is intimidated. He looks at the lieutenant as he delivers his lines. The dinosaur scratches a hole in the bonnet.
Dinosaurs: Roaring.	41: MS:	Of car moving camera left to right with the dinosaur jumping on its roof.
	42: MS:	From the front of the car. Can see from the front windshield up only. The lieutenant and Doyle are looking up at the dinosaur on the roof of the car. The dinosaur starts to rip the roof off.
	43: LS:	Of trash truck swerving from right to left along the road. The camera

		crosses the 180 degree line to give a sense of the two vehicles moving toward each other.
	44: MS:	Of dinosaur with metal in its mouth. It is using its claws to hold the metal there.
	45: HA MS:	From dinosaur's point of view. Of the trash truck moving. The truck dissolves into a steak on wheels and then back to a truck.
	46: LS:	Of truck coming toward camera left. Car with dinosaur on it travelling away camera right. Dinosaur sees truck. The truck then comes into shot.
	47:	Brief black out.
	48: LS:	See the underside of the truck with the dinosaur jumping off it and running toward camera.
Lieutenant: Close call Doyle. I tell you, having a metal plate in your head is not all it's cracked up to be.	49: HA MS:	Of ravaged car with the roof ripped up.
Doyle: Did you ever try hanging fridgerator magnets off it? You know, to hold memos or ...		Disgruntled look from lieutenant.
Stanley: Whoa, whoa, whoa, oh!!	50: LS:	Of truck swerving left to right. Dinosaur running after the truck.
	51: LS:	Of truck coming toward camera with dinosaur now next to the driver's door of the truck. The dinosaur jumps on the side of the truck and puts its head in the driver's window. The truck makes a hard right hand turn.
	52: CU:	Of trashman driving. Stanley and Milo are still

		in the back. The dinosaur's nose is in the cab. The trashman puts his hand on the dinosaur's nose.
Dinosaurs: Roaring.	53: CU:	Side angle from left. The dinosaur roars and grabs the arm.
	54: MS:	Of dinosaur pulling its head away with the trashman's watch in its mouth.
	55: MS:	From drivers left. Brown dinosaur jumps on the vehicle. The trashman turns to look in anguish. The dinosaur starts to bite into the door. Camera zooms in and rotates 45 degrees right.
	56: HA LS:	Of an empty street. The truck comes into shot camera left. Zoom out to see the red dinosaur on the roof of a building. As the truck comes by, the dinosaur jumps off the roof and onto the bonnet of the truck.
	57: LS:	Looking up at the underside of the dinosaur coming down.
	58: LS:	From in front of the truck as the dinosaur lands on it.
Trashman: Get off my windshield you big ugly butt.	59: MS:	From left of red dinosaur on the bonnet looking into the cab of truck. As the trashman delivers his lines, he turns on the window wipers. The dinosaur gets its head stuck.
	60: MS:	From the front of the truck. The dinosaur is moving from left to right in time with the wipers.
	61: MS:	Inside the cab looking out the driver's window. The

		green dinosaur reaches in and bites off the steering wheel.
	62: LS:	From behind the truck. It is swerving from side to side.
	63: LS:	From in front of the truck inside a shop window. The truck is heading toward it. Dinosaurs fly over truck.
	64: LS:	From the left of the truck. The truck crashes into the building generating a huge cloud of dust. This dust blocks out the screen. When the dust clears, there is a dinosaur either side of the truck, with Stanley and Milo in the back still. Milo moves.
Stanley: Uh, uh.		
	65: CU:	Of inside the trash truck. The mask is in ECU.
Dinosaurs: Roaring.	66: MS:	Stanley reaches for the mask. Is about to put it on when the dinosaurs roar. This frightens him. The brown dinosaur bites the back of the truck. Stanley and Milo look left and right in a scared manner.
	67: CU:	Of the mask.
	68: MS:	Stanley puts the mask on.
Mask: Me smokinnnn!!!	69: LA MS:	Outside the truck. There is a flash of light. Camera tilts up to see tornado like mask transformation. He stands on the truck in a prehistoric animal skin outfit. Delivers line.
And fire's not even discovered yet.	70: CU:	From behind mask's head. He turns around to deliver line, looking at camera. He puts his hand up to the side of his mouth as

		he speaks. He runs out of the shot.
	71: LS:	Jumps down onto the concrete and runs off camera left.
	72: CU:	Is now pulling a huge ice formation. Zoom out to MS:
Back dinosaurs, ice age coming	73: LS:	From down the street behind all the activity. The Mask is pulling the ice toward the dinosaurs.
and make you all extinct.	74: LA MS:	Dinosaurs roaring.
	75: LA LS:	From camera left. Dinosaurs run off down the street camera right.
Um, me should go finish them off - but first ...	76: CU:	Of Mask with hands folded. Voice change to more effeminate tone.
	77: LS:	Of the Mask facing away. He turns toward the camera. Runs toward the camera as it pans right, following him into the shop that the truck crashed into.
	78: LS:	Of the trashman in the middle of the shop, standing next to a female mannequin. The mannequin is to the right of the trashman. The Mask runs around the back of him repeatedly. There is another tornado.
Oh girlfriend, you really should do something about	79: MS:	The Mask looking back at his creation. He folds his hands, placing one hand near his mouth.
those hips.	80: LS:	Of trashman in red dress with his cap on and his beard still there.
	81: CU:	Of trashman shocked face. Zoom out and dissolve into black.

Scene Six:

Salesman: The amazing Growth Formula Spray.	1: HA LS:	In a television studio. Camera pans right to show salesman delivering promotion.
As you know, this incredible formula was developed by a world famous scientist -	2: LA MS:	Salesman bring a can of formula into shot.
seems he wanted to enlarge the world's food supply.	3: LA MS:	From behind the podium. Behind is a pile of promotional can. There is a tomato on a stool in front of him. He sprays the tomato with the substance. Tomato grows massive.
But folks - who really needs six foot tomatoes?	4: LA LS:	From behind the salesman. He turns right toward the audience as the tomato falls off the podium camera left.
What do we want?	5: MS:	Salesman with hand up to his face calling.
Crowd: Hair, hair, hair, hair.	6: MS:	Shot of audience comprised of balding men yelling.
Salesman: Did I hear someone say hair?	7: LS:	Salesman walking off stage right.
	8: MS:	Salesman grabs a completely bald man.
	9: MS:	From the audiences' perspective. Of a chair on the stage. The man is catapulted into the chair.
Of course, seeing is believing, so I'll just spray a small amount of the amazing growth formula on this folliculary challenged gentleman - then mama get the lawn-mower!	10: CU:	Of man. Camera tilts up to show salesman as he sprays the substance onto the man's head. There is an immediate reaction, with stalks of green hair growing.
Crowd: Yeah, yeah, ha, ha, all right.		Crowd cheers at seeing the result.
Salesman: A little moose'll do you fine.		The salesman whispers

		in his ear. There is a boom in the background. Both salesman and audience member turn to look camera left.
		(sound bridge)
	11: LA LS:	From stage left looking at the wall. The red and green dinosaur's break through.
	12: LS:	Of stage. The man in the chair runs off leaving the salesperson with the can in his hand. He looks shocked. Then a crowd of people run camera left to right, running over him.
	13: MS:	Salesman getting up. His hair is now untidy. He corrects his hair and runs camera right.
Mask: How dreadfully horrible. No etiquette whatsoever.	14: CU:	Of green dinosaur eating the camera equipment. Camera zooms out to show other dinosaurs destroying the property. Now see the Mask leaning against the wall where the dinosaurs burst through. He has on a red bowtie and a blue jersey.
Everyone knows one must always lift the left pinky in the air when devouring TV equipment.	15: CU:	Of the Mask with his arms folded. He is raising his left little finger up and down. He moves his face toward the camera.
Hey, I've seen this stuff on TV.	16: MS:	In a feminine voice with his hands clasped together.
Mask: Wonder if it works?		As he picks up a can. A females' head comes into shot down camera right.
	17: HA MS:	Shot from behind the Mask incorporating

			the two.
		18: CU:	Of his face. An idea comes into his head. His facial expression changes.
		19: MS:	Side profile of both. The Mask moves into the shot camera left. He sprays the substance onto the female's chin.
		20: MS:	From behind the Mask. Camera zooms out and tilts up. The woman stands as hair instantly grows on her chin.
Lady:	Aargh!!		
Mask:	Don't worry lady, the circus is hiring.	21: LS:	From behind the woman looking at the two on the stage. She screams, turns and runs toward the camera. The Mask stands and yells with his hands to his mouth.
Dinosaurs: Groaning:		22: LS:	From next to the tower of can looking out toward the audience. The green and red dinosaur's roar and start to move toward the Mask.
		23: HA LS:	From the dinosaur's presumed height. They tower above the Mask.
Mask:	Here you go boys, this ought to give you a	24: MS:	The Mask starts to throw cans of the substance at the dinosaurs.
	good sized hair ball.	25: LA MS:	Of dinosaur's mouths open swallowing cans.
		26: CU:	Of green dinosaur swallowing can.
		27: LA LS:	Of the dinosaurs heads growing through the roof.
Milo:	Barking.	28: HA CU:	Of Milo barking. He looks up and then

Mask:	Whoopsee, guess I made a teensy miscalculation.		starts to whimper.
		29: MS:	Of the Mask looking up with a finger pointing to his mouth.
		30: LS;	From behind the TV equipment. The dinosaurs run through another wall.
	He, he, them boys gotten too big for their breeches. I reckon something's gotta be done.	31: LS:	From outside the building looking back across the rubble. The Mask is now dresses as a hill-billy rubbing his head.
Mask:	Well kick the dog and spit in the fire -	32: LA LS:	From next to the spray section of a can. Milo is on the left of the Mask as he reaches down for a can.
	I got me an idea. If this here stuffs made them big, there must be an opposite type formula to make them teeny, tiny, small.	33: MS:	The Mask brings the can to eye height. The top of his hat opens and a light bulb pops out. He throws the light bulb away, takes the hat off and camera zooms in.
	But I reckon my brain just ain't big enough to think of such a formula.	34: HA CU:	To a flip top head. Inside is a small green brain surrounded by a blue interior of his head.
Milo:	Barking.	35: LS:	Of Milo barking at the can in the Mask's hand. Only see the Mask from chest down.
Mask:	Hey, good thinking Rover. You get back on in there you, go get in there.	36: MS:	The Mask sprays the substance into his head. His brain grows massive. He puts the excess brain back in his head.
Mask:	Now to get to work on the antidote formula.	37: LS:	From an imagined audience position. The Mask is now in a white coat. He has 'big' hair but is still in his yellow trousers. He is next to a blackboard writing wearing an eye glass.
	Don't you just hate it	38: MS:	Of the Mask turning

when this happens?		to look past the camera with chalk in has.
Reporter: Edge City remains	39: LS:	Outside a shop window. Passers-by stop to watch a TV in the window as a news bulletin begins.
in a state of siege as the three prehistoric bohemers continue their destructive rampage.	40: MS:	At belly height of one of the passers-by. A female newsreader with glasses delivers the news. There is an insert of a green dinosaur in the top right hand corner of the TV screen.
Earlier today they destroyed the Thomas Jefferson bridge,	41: LS:	Of the bridge.
prompting Mayor Tilden to rename it	42: CU:	Of the brown dinosaur eating some of the metal of the bridge.
the Thomas Jefferson Really Big Piece of Sunken Concrete.	43: LS:	Brown dinosaur in the background. The bridge crashes down. The dinosaur walks away.
But there was more devastation to come -	44: LA ELS:	Looking up the length of a sky scraper to the green dinosaur pulling off the radio antenna and eating it.
the dinosaurs destroyed the Edge City Radio Tower	45: MS:	Of green dinosaur on the roof eating the metal from the antenna,
as well as scratching the paint off a mailbox - which is a federal offence.	46: MS:	Of a blue mail box in the street. A foot of the green dinosaur comes into the shot from above and squashes the mailbox.
Time is running out for Edge City - is there no hero who can save us?	47: MS:	A repeat of shot 40.
Mask: Yee har, yes, bingo!! I've finally done it. It is ready -	48: CU:	Zoom out to the Mask in a science lab. He is working at a desk. He raises his arms in the air in excitement.
ah, the perfect cup of cappuccino.	49: CU:	Pouring a brown coloured mixture out of a vile into what looks like a beaker.

			In fact, it is a coffee cup. He turns to look at the camera.
	Watch out Seattle!		
	Now to work on the anti-growth formula.	50: MS:	The Mask gulping down the coffee. He throws the cup over his left shoulder. He disappears down behind the table and reappears in his yellow suit with a box of cereal in his left hand.
	This ought to do the trick.	51: CU:	Of the cereal box with a bearded Mask like face on it.
	Grandpa Masks' freeze dried reverse growth formula flakes.		The face on the box starts talking.
	So simple, so quick, and all you do is add water.	52: MS:	As he pours the flakes out of the box into a glass. He starts to sweat. He then pulls a white handkerchief out, wipes his head and his underarms with it.
		53: CU:	Of squeezing handkerchief out into the vessel.
	Now let's see if it works.	54: LA MS:	The Mask puts the lid on the vessel. Exits camera right.
Reporter:	Here at Edge City airport the dinosaurs continue their terrifying feeding frenzy. Let's hope they don't notice the air traffic control tower.	55: CU:	Of female reporter talking to the camera. The shot is framed by an aeroplane wing. The dinosaurs are eating a plane. As she mentions the tower, the dinosaurs see it and start to move toward it.
		56: CU:	Of dinosaurs moving toward the tower to eat it.
	With that tower destroyed, there's no telling what disaster could befall the many flights due to land.	57: LA MS:	Framed by the wing and 'record' frame in the camera.
	Oh, the humanity.		Hand to bowed head.
Mask:	All right you vermins,	58: LS:	The Mask steps over camera as to put legs around frame. Dinosaurs

		in the background. Dressed in a cowboy outfit, The Mask starts to move toward the dinosaur.
reckon it's time to send you for the last round-up.	59: HA LS:	With a huge hat on, the Mask pulls out the container with the mixture in it.
Dinosaurs: Roaring.	60: LS:	Camera adjacent to the dinosaur, with the Mask backing the control tower.
	61: LS:	*(side on)*. The Mask is camera left. The green dinosaur jumps in the air camera right. Lands and sends the Mask into the air.
	62: LS:	Up in the air. The Mask loses the container.
	63: CU:	Of container. The lid comes off with the liquid falling out onto the Mask.
	64: LS:	Of the Mask shrinking as he is falling.
	65: LS:	Mask shrinking.
	66: LA LS:	The dinosaurs gathered around looking down.
Mask: Oh, oh,	67: CU:	Of hat. The Mask lifts the hat as a yellow paw squashes him.
note to self, never step on a bug again - it is very painful.	68: CU:	The Mask flat on the ground.
	69: MS:	*(side on)*. Picking up a can of spinach.
	70: CU:	Of spinach can.
	71: MS:	Squeezes can contents up into the air and into his mouth.
Oh, da,da, da, da. Ah, what am I doing? I hate spinach.	72: MS:	He gets up. Spits out the spinach. Delivers lines in a 'small' voice.
It's time to pump me up.	73: MS:	Still in a 'small' voice, he gets up. Puts his thumb in his mouth and starts blowing. He gets

		bigger.
	74: LS:	Of a small Mask getting bigger. As he gets bigger, he breaks out of his yellow suit into red briefs.
Yo, the dinosaurs - gaze upon my countenance and dispare, run and hide from the magnificence of my pectorals.	75: LA MS:	In an 'Arnold Schwarzenegger' tone. He has a huge chest and a green face.
	76: LS:	Of the dinosaurs standing by the tower. They turn right.
	77: LS:	The Mask now in an old plane.
	78: LS:	Of the dinosaurs running toward the camera. The plane follows them.
	79: LS:	*(side on)*. The dinosaurs runs from right to left. The plane flies over the top of them and drops a liquid substance on them.
	80: LS:	The plane flies off as the dinosaurs shrink.
	81: MS:	Small dinosaurs on the runway. The Mask walks into shot camera right. The dinosaurs turn to look at him. They are bleating, not roaring.
Hey, these are better than sea monkeys and I know just what to do with these critters.	82: LA MS:	Dinosaurs looking up at the Mask in his yellow suit. He is rubbing his hands together. He then look right.

Scene Seven:

	1: LS:	Suburbia. Trash van pulls up outside building.
	2: MS:	*(side on)*. Of trashman about to lift up lids of trash cans.
Trashman: Huh?!	3: CU:	From inside trash can looking up at trashman.

		4: HA MS:	From over the shoulder of trashman looking down.
Mask:	Hi, anyone ever tell you you've got a magnetic personality?	5: MS:	Mask comes up out of second can next to trashman. Put a huge U-shaped magnet in the back of trashman's trousers. A tin lid is attracted to it.
		6: LS:	Looking down sidewalk. Knife and fork come out of window hovering in mid air. Come toward trashman.
		7: MS:	Objects hit magnet. A lunch box is there also.
		8: CU:	Of trashman's face. He has an anxious expression on it. He turns to look along street.
		9: LS:	Along street. Parking meter and an iron are coming toward him as a result of the magnetic force of the magnet.
		10: CU:	Of trash can. Dinosaurs are jumping up to get the metal. Camera tilts up to an anxious looking trashman.
Trashman:	Get out, get away, shoo.	11: LS:	Trashman running down the street screaming.
Mask:	Go get'em boys, peddle to the metal.	12: MS:	*(side on).* The Mask has a trash can lid on his head. Delivers lines.
	Somebody stop me!! Ha, ha, ha, ha.		Turns to face camera. Blackness comes in around him in the shape of a circle. Total blackout

Appendix E - Focus group questions

Have any of you ever seen The Mask before?

A couple of years ago there was a movie also called 'The Mask'. Did anybody see the movie?

Can you tell me anything about it?
Follow up: Anyone else?

Is this the same character as in the film?
Follow up: How can you tell?

Can somebody tell me anything about what has happened in the programme we have just seen?
Follow up: Do you all agree?
                Why do you think he did that?
                How would you feel if that happened to you?

I'm really interested in learning about what you think the programme tells us about what it means to be a boy or a man.

Sentence completion 1:

The most important character in the programme was ...
Follow up: What is it about him/her that you like?
                Is there anything else that you can tell me about him/her?

Stanley Ipkiss:

How would you describe Stanley?
Follow up: What kind of man this that?

What kind of person do you think he is?
Follow up: Why do you think that?

When Stanley puts on the mask he changes. Let's have a look at an example of this.

excerpt one

Can you tell me how Stanley changes when he puts the mask on?
Follow up: Clothes: What about his personality?
                Does he do things differently than Stanley does?

Which of the two characters do you like the most?
Follow up: What do you like about them?
                What does he say or do that you like?

What kind of man do you think Stanley is?
Follow up: Well what does it mean to be a man?
                Are there any qualities that you think are more manly
                than others?

When Stanley turns into the mask he is a different kind of man. Can anyone describe what kind of man the mask is?
Follow up: How? Tell me what you mean.

Think back to the beginning of the programme where Stanley is on the floor in his pyjamas with his fluffy slippers on.
excerpt two

Can anybody tell me how you think he got to be on the floor?
Follow up: Do you think a real man would let his dog push
                him around?
                Does this mean that Stanley less manly?
                What do you mean?

When Stanley is talking to the trashman the way he talks changes. Let's watch an example of this.
excerpt three

What is Stanley asking for? Do you think his request is okay?

Why do you think Stanley changes his tone of his voice?

Can you tell me what is happening here between the two men?
Follow up: Which one is more manly?
                Why?

Is there more than one type of man?
Follow up: What kinds of men are more positive to you? (qualities)
                What do you mean?

The Trashman:

Now I want you to think about the trashman. I have an episode to show you and we can talk about it afterwards.
excerpt three (A)

What do you make of how the trashman treats Stanley?
Follow up: Would you like to be treated this way?
                Why/why not?

Is this the way most men should behave?
Follow up: Why/why not?

How do you think most men should behave?
Follow up: Why do you think that?
                  Does anyone agree?

Do you like the character of the trashman?
Follow up: What does he do that you like or dislike?
                  What kind of person do you think he is?

When the trashman is at the rubbish dump he comes across a jack in the box.

excerpt five

Follow up: Do you all know what a jack in the box is? Can anyone tell us?

Can anyone explain why he is so interested in it?

What do you think of men that play with toys?
Follow up:

Milo/The street kid:

Before Stanley and Milo get to the museum, Milo meets a boy on the street. Let's watch what happens.

excerpt six

Why do you think the boy squirted Milo with his water pistol?
Follow up: Because he was bored!
                  Why do you think he was bored?

Let's watch some more to see what Milo does.

excerpt seven

Why do you think Milo does this?

Would you do the same as Milo if someone squirted you?
Follow up: Can you explain why?

Do you think it was right of the street kid to squirt Milo?
Follow up: Why/why not?

Milo now runs into the museum with Stanley chasing him. Stanley accidentally walks into the wrong room where there is a meeting going on. Let's watch this scene and see what happens.

excerpt eight

What kind of meeting is it?

What kind of work do you think these people do?

Do you know anyone like this?

Follow up: YES: Do they look and act like these people do?
                 NO: move on with discussion.

Is this how all scientists look?
Follow up: What is it about them that tells you that theses are scientists?

Two scientists have a talk when they see Stanley. Let's watch this.
excerpt nine

Why do you think they say that Stanley is a 'nutcase' for wearing his pyjamas?

Do you agree with the way they describe Stanley?
Follow up: Why/ why not?

Do you think there is anything unusual with wearing pyjamas down the street?
Follow up: Why/why not?
Later in the scene a guard comes in. Do you know any other kind of person in society that wear a uniform who look like the guards?

That's right - police wear uniforms like the guards. There are police in this programme too. Let's watch an example of two police officers.
excerpt ten

How would you describe the way the lieutenant treated his partner?

Would you like to be treated in that way?
Follow up: Why/why not?

Do you think the lieutenant is a nice man?
Follow up: What is a nice man?
                 How is that different from a horrible man?
                 Are there any nice men in this programme?
                 What about horrible men? Are there any?

In the car with the lieutenant was another man. His last name is Doyle. Doyle accidentally spills his soup as they are driving along and the lieutenant is mean to him - calling him a 'cry-baby'. Do you know why he might have said those things?

Do you think this is fair to Doyle? After all, he didn't spill any soup on the lieutenant.

What do you think the purpose of the police is in this programme?

sentence completion 2:

Do you think the 'The Mask' is about real people?

Follow up: YES: What kind of people are they?

NO: How are they different from you or I?
PROBE: Do you know any people like those in 'The Mask'?

sentence completion 3:

I liked/disliked the programme because ...

Follow up: Now why was that?

Do you think this is a programme that all children should watch?
Follow up: Why/ why not?

What other kinds of programmes shouldn't children watch?
Follow up: Why/why not?

Do you think that this programme should be shown to young children?
Follow up: Why do you think this?

Appendix F - Focus Group Transcript

Interviewer:	Have you ever seen 'The Mask' before?
Group:	Yes. Yep. Yeah.
Interviewer:	What was that Chris?
Chris:	I've seen that one (referring to the viewed episode).
Interviewer:	You've seen that one. So you remember it?
Chris:	Yep.
Interviewer:	Okay / do you remember a couple of years ago there was a movie called 'The Mask' as well - did anybody see the movie?
Group:	Yep.
Interviewer:	Okay / and can anybody tell me anything about the movie from what you remember?
Mark:	Ah / he jumped in that river to get the mask out of the trash.
James:	/ and that cop saw him.
Mark:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	And that cop saw him James - is that right?
James:	Yes.
Mark:	He thought / um / he thought that the trash um / was a person drowning in the water.
Interviewer:	Oh okay / what about the cop seeing him James? why do you think ?
James:	He thought he was drowning.
Interviewer:	Oh did he? / does everybody remember that?
Emily:	He thought he was a person in the river who was drowning.
Interviewer:	The cop thought it was a person drowning in the river Emily?
Emily:	(Shakes her head indicating 'no').
Interviewer:	No? / what do you mean?
Emily:	Um ... Stanley he was going past the river and he saw the mask in the river
Peter:	Car broke down
Emily:	And he thought it was a person so he went and got it.
Peter:	And he jumped in and got it.
George:	And his girlfriend said no.
Interviewer:	Ah / okay.
George:	And then they kissed at the end.
Interviewer:	They kissed at the end?
	Laughter from the group.
Interviewer:	Did you like it when they kissed?
	Laughter from the group, but mostly from the males.
George:	Disgusting.
Interviewer:	Disgusting was it George? Why was that?
	Group still laughing.
George:	Because ...
Interviewer:	Does anybody have any thoughts on that? Why is it disgusting to see people kiss?
Emily:	'Cos its not.
	Group still laughing.

Interviewer:	Emily reckons its not.
	Laughter.
George:	It isn't.
Interviewer:	Okay.
Mark:	It's a form of life?
	Mostly male laughter.
Interviewer:	Now is this the same character in the programme that we've just seen- as the movie?
Group:	Yes / no (group disagreeing).
Andrew:	It's a cartoon.
Interviewer:	It's a cartoon / okay / so everybody thinks that the mask in the programme is the same as the mask in the movie?
Group:	Yep.
Interviewer:	What do you mean Andrew - 'except it's a cartoon'? / Is there a difference between the cartoon and the movie?
Andrew:	Not really.
Interviewer:	Not really.
George:	'Cos they're dressed up in costumes and the other ones aren't.
Interviewer:	Which one's that?
George:	The cartoon is dressed up in a studio thing.
Interviewer:	Oh, okay / Alright / does everybody agree with that? / Is there any differing opinions?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	Okay / um / so how can you tell that it is the same character? / Is there anything …
Andrew:	The way he talks.
John:	The green face.
Interviewer:	What was that John?
John:	The green face.
Interviewer:	It was the green face / yes James?
James:	Their names are both the same.
Interviewer:	Okay / that's good - thank you / Emily?
Emily:	He does silly things.
Interviewer:	He does silly things / can you give me any examples of silly things that he does?
Emily:	Talks funny.
Interviewer:	Talks funny / can anybody else give me examples of silly things? Sarah?
Sarah:	He put that magnet in that trashman's pants and those magnifying things on his prong.
	… [Interviewer asking participant to speak up]
Interviewer:	Okay / thank-you / did everybody / what did people think of when the Mask put the magnet in the trashman's pants?
Group:	[General noise].
Emily:	Funny.
Interviewer:	It was funny.
Group:	Laughter.
Interviewer:	What made it funny / do you know? can you tell me why it was funny? Andrew?

Andrew:	'Cos there were forks / and knives came out the window /(laugh) / flew out the window.
Interviewer:	Okay.
Mark:	Yeah / and there was a lunchbox
Peter:	…
Interviewer:	Hang on / sorry - one at a time / I need to hear one at a time,
Mark:	There was um …
Interviewer:	Peter can you talk first and then Mark in a minute.
Peter:	'Cos the dinosaurs were trying to get the meat and off - the metal …and and …
Interviewer:	Do you think there's anything strange about that? Do you think dinosaurs would eat metal naturally?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	No? / do you know what they might eat naturally?
John:	Meat.
Peter:	Meat and plants.
Interviewer:	Okay / so / do you have any idea why in this programme dinosaurs are eating metal?
Group:	Oh? (thinking).
Interviewer:	Okay / one at a time / just talk / you don't have to put your hands up / one of you just talk / okay John you talk first.
John:	Um / 'cos it / oh
Interviewer:	Okay Sarah do you know why?
Sarah:	They're machines.
Interviewer:	They are machines that's right / they were machines to start with weren't they? / does everybody remember that?
Mark:	Laughing.
Group:	Yes.
George:	And then they / that thing went / sssssh
John:	Turn them off …
George:	That machine made them come true.
Interviewer:	That's right / okay Mark sorry … (inviting discussion).
Mark:	Um / it / because um nuclear things eat metal.
Interviewer:	Ah … (inquiringly)
Mark:	I think.
Interviewer:	Nuclear things eat metal / okay / go on John.
John:	… I forget
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	Its not true / it's just made up so / they make them eat metal. Agreement from the group.
Interviewer:	What's made up?
Emily:	Um / the cartoon.
Interviewer:	The cartoon is made up / so / do you think the movie is made up as well?
Group:	Yes / yep.
Interviewer:	So / yes the movie is made up and yes the cartoon is made up.
Group:	Yes.
George:	'Cos they made the cartoon before the movie.
Interviewer:	Do you / is there any / they made the cartoon before the movie

	did you say George? Okay / well we can talk about that later / um / What I'm really interested in today is to hear from you about what you think the programme tells us about what it is to be a man. Okay? On the white board over here I've got a little exercise that I want you to do / so you can decide / James and Chris, are you going to work together in two?
J and C:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Okay / and Sarah and Emily / are you going to work together in two?
S and E:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	And Mark / are you going to work in a two or a three?
Mark:	Three.
Interviewer:	Three / okay / So that's going to be John, Andrew and Mark in a group of three / Does that mean that Peter and George are together?
P and G:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Do you want to turn around and behind you and there should be a clipboard each so this clipboard will have to go here / That's right / And Mark you'll have to go with the three boys. [Interviewer moving around the room]. What I've got here is a question for you / I want one of you in the group to write down what you think the finish of the sentence is … or to complete the sentence.
Sarah:	Yep.
Interviewer:	So Chris / can you read what I've got on the whiteboard for me please and for everybody?
Chris:	The most important character in the programme was …
Interviewer:	Okay / so what I want you to do now please is amongst the two or you or three of you have a little chat and decide who the most important characters in the programme is and then write that down.
Emily:	Do we just write
Interviewer:	Just your answer / yes, that's right.
Group:	[General chatter as they decide what to write].
Interviewer:	And if you want you can refer to the list if you can't remember the name / okay / it's not a secret and there's no right or wrong answer / just want to know what you think / Are you writing out the whole question Andrew?
Andrew:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Okay / but you didn't have to do that but you can if you want / Okay, we'll just wait for Andrew to finish …
Mark:	Snigger.
Interviewer:	And then we can talk / okay now do you want to go round a group at a time and talk to each other and / so the question is / and tell each other your response / and the question is / the most important character in the programme was … We'll start with Peter and George / Do you want to read out your answer?
P and G:	Yeah.

P and G:	The Mask and Stanley.
Interviewer:	Okay / thank you / Andrew, John and Mark - does one of you want to read out / okay.
A, J and M:	The Mask.
Interviewer:	Okay / thank you. (looking toward Sarah and Emily).
S and E:	The Mask.
Interviewer:	The Mask. (looking toward Chris and James).
C and J:	Stanley Ipkiss - The Mask.
Interviewer:	Stanley Ipkiss - The Mask. Now why do you think James and Chris - why do you think Stanley was the most important character? Can you tell me?
James:	Because he put the mask on.
Interviewer:	Okay / does everybody agree? Why do you think he's the most important person / character in the programme?
Peter:	Because he is The Mask.
George:	And he was the most important person that was on there.
Interviewer:	He was on the programme the most?
George:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Andrew, John and Mark / can you tell me why you think he was the most important character in the programme? / and who did you say again?
Andrew:	Mask
Interviewer:	The Mask.
John:	Mask.
Interviewer:	Why do you think the Mask is the most important character in the programme?
John:	'Cos he ...
Andrew:	'Cos you saw him the most.
John:	'Cos he saves ...
Mark:	'Cos he was in the most scenes.
Interviewer:	Okay / and what were you going to say John?
John:	He um / destroyed them so they made them little / The Mask made them little.
Interviewer:	Okay / thank you / and Emily and Sarah / who was the most important character for you please again?
Emily:	Stanley and The Mask.
Interviewer:	So you've got two people / Stanley and The Mask / would you say that one of them is more important than the other / or are they both the same?
Sarah:	Hmmmm.
Emily:	Hmmmm.
Emily:	Stanley. [at the same time] (laugh).
Sarah:	The Mask. [at the same time] (laugh).
Interviewer:	Okay so tell me why do you think the Mask is the most important Sarah?
Sarah:	Because / the title is The Mask.
Interviewer:	Okay because the programme is The Mask.
Sarah:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Do you / can you tell me why you think Stanley is the most

	important person Emily?
Emily:	'Cos he put it on and um / he was The Mask.
Interviewer:	Okay. Do you have something to say James? Did one of you have your hand up? (Visual cue no) / okay. Is there anything else that you can tell me about the character of The Mask or Stanley that you want to say as to why he might he the most important?
Group:	Hmmm / Nah.
Interviewer:	No / okay / he's the most important because / or he / wears the mask and Stanley is / Stanley so there are / it is because he's named after the programme then because Stanley puts the mask on / that's right is it?
Group:	Yep / yeah.
Interviewer:	Okay / um / I want to also talk to you about Stanley could you / anybody describe to me what you think / can anybody describe to me about Stanley.
	[Arms go up].
	Okay John you start.
John:	He was / he um / he lives / in the building.
Interviewer:	He lived in a building / that's right / Andrew?
Andrew:	He's a bit lazy.
Interviewer:	He's a bit lazy / tell me what you mean?
Andrew:	Um / he doesn't / um, get dressed in the morning.
Interviewer:	Oh okay / and that's because he's/
John:	He's teasing him?
Interviewer:	He's wearing his pyjamas isn't he around town? / okay / now George.
George:	He lied to those people.
Interviewer:	Which people are you talking about?
George:	Those / doctors.
Group:	[General inaudible discussion about whether the term 'doctors' is correct].
Emily:	Scientists.
Chris:	He said that he was the ...
George:	Scientists.
Interviewer:	Okay.
George:	And he was doing the machine.
Interviewer:	Do you / could you tell me why he lied? Can you tell me about what happened in the scene as to why you think he might have lied?
George:	Because they thought he was the fella.
Interviewer:	Okay / does anybody else have any ideas as to why Stanley might have lied? Emily /do you have an idea?
Emily:	'Cos he didn't want the cop to know that he um / stole the bone.
Interviewer:	Ah? / but was it Stanley that stole the bone?
Emily:	Nah.
Group:	No / nah.
Interviewer:	Who stole the bone then?

James:	Milo.
Mark:	The dog.
Sarah:	Milo.
Interviewer:	Oh / so why would Stanley not want the cop to think / go on Emily.
Emily:	'Cos he would get in trouble and he would go to jail.
Interviewer:	Okay / John did you have something to say?
Emily:	I've said it.
Interviewer:	Peter did you put your hand up?
Peter:	Uh uh.
Interviewer:	No / okay / so we were describing Stanley does anybody else have anything to say about Stanley? / how would you describe Stanley me?
	[Silence].
Interviewer:	Go on George.
George:	He was funny.
Interviewer:	He was funny / can you give me an example of when he was funny?
George:	Yep / when he was / in the mask.
Interviewer:	When he put the mask on / okay / and Sarah / can you tell me another thing?
Sarah:	When he was lying on the floor moving around and trying to get the blankets.
Interviewer:	When he was lying on the floor moving around and trying to get the blankets / was that funny?
Sarah:	Because / he looked funny.
Interviewer:	He looked funny / okay / Chris.
Chris:	Every / he lets everyone push him around.
Interviewer:	Oh.
Chris:	He said / (mimicking) "I'm not going to let anyone push me around".
Interviewer:	Okay / thank you / John do you have something else to say about Stanley?
John:	Um / when he went up to that window and yelled at the man.
Interviewer:	Oh yeah / tell me about that / what happened there / what was happening there? / do you remember?
John:	He was making a noise.
Interviewer:	Who was making a noise?
John:	That um / the trashman.
Interviewer:	The trashman / that's right.
Mark:	He was going 'pssh pssh' (punching sounds).
Interviewer:	And why do you think Stanley yelled at the man / the trashman?
John:	He didn't want much (cough) / want / he didn't like the noise.
Interviewer:	He didn't want the noise / okay Emily / do you have another idea?
Emily:	He's fussy.
Interviewer:	Who's fussy?
Emily:	Stanley.
Interviewer:	Stanley's fussy / can you give me an example of what you

	remember?
Emily:	'Cos he wanted the garbage man to come and put up his / rubbish at 10.
Interviewer:	At 10 / okay / anybody tell me anything / or why he wanted the trashman to come back at 10? So Emily thinks he was fussy / do you all agree?
Group:	Hmmmm / no / yeah.
Interviewer:	As to / that was the reason he asked the trashman to come back at 10. Chris?
Chris:	He wanted the trashman to come at 10 so that he could get some sleep.
Interviewer:	Oh / he wanted some sleep? Oh, can you tell me / do you remember anything from the programme that said that? [Silence. Hands go up].
Interviewer:	Emily / do you remember anything?
Emily:	He said / um, "I was late out last night and I need some more sleep".
Interviewer:	That's right. Does everybody agree with that / do you remember that?
Group:	Yep / yeah.
Interviewer:	Okay / any other comments about Stanley that you'd like to tell me?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	Okay - we can move on then / so / what kind of person do you think he is?
Group:	Hmmmm.
Mark:	Funny.
Chris:	Funny.
Interviewer:	So he's funny / yes?
Mark:	Um / he's a good person.
Interviewer:	He's a good person / why do you say that Mark?
Mark:	Um / because / he puts the mask on just so that he can save the city.
Interviewer:	Ah / okay / Sarah?
Sarah:	He's fussy? (unsure)
Interviewer:	He's fussy / okay.
Group:	Murmur.
Interviewer:	And he's funny as well / thank you / any other comments about what kind of person Stanley is?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	Okay / so / um / when Stanley puts on / sorry Sarah.
Sarah:	He's a liar.
Interviewer:	He's a liar? / Oh / tell me what you mean/ can you? / can you give me an example?
Mark:	Laugh.
Sarah:	He's um / said to those scientists that he really was a / um / a scientist.
Interviewer:	Okay / that's great.

... [asking Sarah to remember to speak a loudly as possible]

Interviewer:	I am going to show you an example / You all know that when Stanley puts on the mask he changes / doesn't he?
Group:	Yeah / yes.
Interviewer:	Okay / So let's have a look at this example and then we can talk about that as well.

Excerpt One:

Mark:	like it when he said that.
Interviewer:	Okay /so can anybody tell me how Stanley changes when he puts the ask on? / okay John / seeing as you had your hand up.
John:	Magic?
Interviewer:	Magic is how he changes / okay / can you / go on Emily.
Emily:	He says stupid words.
Interviewer:	He says stupid words / can you think of any stupid words?
Emily:	Smokkin'
Interviewer:	Smokkin'? / okay / George.
George:	Um / when he was spinning around.
Interviewer:	Okay / Andrew.
Andrew:	When he sticks it on lightning comes out of his face.
Interviewer:	Okay Chris / did you have something to say?
Chris:	I was just going to say what George said.
Interviewer:	Thank you / okay James.
James:	He has no hair.
Interviewer:	He has no hair?! / oh that's interesting / I hadn't noticed that / did anybody else notice that?
Group:	Yep / yeah.
Interviewer:	Okay / and Mark?
Mark:	Um / um.
Interviewer:	How does Stanley change when he puts the mask on?
Mark:	He spins around in yellow in lightning / yellow lightning goes out.
Interviewer:	Okay / Emily?
Emily:	He goes all silly.
Interviewer:	He goes all silly? / what do you mean?
Emily:	Hmmm / how he moves his body / he goes all different / he goes all …
Interviewer:	Okay / Sarah?
Sarah:	Every time he changes he goes 'Smokkin' or 'Stinkin' or something.
Interviewer:	Yes he does / yes.
Mark:	'Smokkin'.
Andrew:	'Snakin'.
Interviewer:	Okay / but what about his personality? When / when Stanley is Stanley he has a personality / when he puts the mask on you could say that perhaps his personality changes. Did you notice that?
Group:	Yes / yep.
Interviewer:	Okay / could you / um does he do things differently? / does the Mask do things differently than Stanley does?

Group:	Yes / yep
Interviewer:	Okay / Andrew can you tell me how / do you know?
Andrew:	He goes all crazy.
Interviewer:	He goes all crazy? / can you give me an example or / what do you mean?
Andrew:	Like when he says 'stinkin' or something /
Mark:	(imitation) Somebody 'smokkin'.
Interviewer:	Sarah?
Sarah:	Oh when he found that little box /
Mark:	(interrupting) 'somebody stop me'
Sarah:	And he turned it and it said 'look behind you' / and he was that big /
George:	(imitation) 'Look behind you'
Group:	(interrupting to finish her sentence) jack in the box.
Sarah:	… jumping jack and that big banana fell on him.
Interviewer:	Okay / so who what the Mask in there?
Mark:	Laughing.
Interviewer:	Was the Mask the big jack in the box?
Group:	Yep.
Interviewer:	Is that what you're saying? / okay / does anybody notice any other changes in Stanley when he becomes the Mask? / Andrew?
Andrew:	What he's wearing changes.
Interviewer:	Okay / can you / can you tell me what you mean? / I mean / what does the Mask wear and then what does Stanley not wear?
Andrew:	Like / if Stanley 's wearing his pyjamas and he sticks the mask on he will have a yellow suit on.
Interviewer:	Okay / yes Sarah?
Sarah:	He wears a green face instead of a white face.
Interviewer:	He wears a green face instead of a white face / yes / Emily?
Emily:	He can change to who he is / not just the Mask. He can / um change himself to like / a firefighter or a boxer or something?
Interviewer:	Ah?! / okay / Mark.
Mark:	Um / he always wears yellow.
Interviewer:	He always wears yellow /
Mark:	And Stanley usually wears a blue suit / a blue suit.
Interviewer:	Okay / James?
James:	The Mask always 'wedgies' people.
Interviewer:	Oh.
Mark:	Laugh/snigger.
Interviewer:	Tell me what / did you see some / an example? / or what do you mean?
James:	Um …
Interviewer:	I mean / I know what a 'wedgie' is
Group:	[Knowing snigger].
James:	When he put his undies over his head.
Interviewer:	Oh / okay / why do you think the Mask would do that?
James:	So they can't see.
Interviewer:	Oh!?

Andrew:	So they can burn.
Mark:	So … 'cos
Interviewer:	Oh sorry / Sarah's got her hand up Mark.
Sarah:	'Cos he think / 'cos he thinks that it's funny.
Interviewer:	He thinks that it's funny / would you like to have that done to you?
Group:	No!
Mark:	Laughter.
Interviewer:	So why would it be funny do you think?
Group:	[Laughter].
Sarah:	I don't know / 'cos he put the mask on and goes all stupid.
Interviewer:	Oh?
Mark:	He's crazy?
James:	To annoy the cops.
Interviewer:	To annoy the cops? Okay so
John:	'Cos they're always after him.
Interviewer:	So was it the Mask who 'wedgied' one of the policemen? Is that what you saw?
Group:	Yeah / yep.
Interviewer:	Okay, so he's doing it to annoy the cops? Chris?
Chris:	He always does it to the same person / he does it to that lieutenant.
Interviewer:	Oh / so do you think there might be something between the lieutenant and the Mask?
Mark:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Maybe they don't like each other?
Chris:	The lieutenant always thinks he's a criminal but he isn't.
James:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Say that again sorry?
Chris:	The lieutenant always thinks' he the criminal but he isn't.
Interviewer:	Oh / are you talking about the Mask?
Chris:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Oh okay. Do you know why that might be?
James:	No.
Interviewer:	Is there
Chris:	He always / 'cos he works at the bank and he's always in there when the lieutenant drives past.
Interviewer:	Oh / okay / John?
John:	Um / he always annoys him.
Interviewer:	Who always annoys who?
John:	Um / the / um / Stanley annoys the cop.
Interviewer:	Oh okay / so you're saying the Mask annoys the lieutenant or the lieutenant annoys the Mask?
John:	The lieutenant annoys the Mask.
Interviewer:	Oh / so / so you're saying that / all of you are saying that the Mask 'wedgies' the lieutenant because the lieutenant annoys the Mask? Is that what / is that what you are saying?
Group:	Yeah / yep.
Interviewer:	No? / you don't know? / okay Mark.

Mark:	The um / he 'wedgies' the lieutenant / the lieutenant gets angry and um he's starts chasing after him in the cop car.
Interviewer:	Oh / why do you think he might chase after him?
Mark:	To um / try and arrest him.
Interviewer:	Okay / so 'wedging' somebody is wrong?
Group:	Yeah / yes.
Interviewer:	Yes?
Sarah:	It's cruel.
Interviewer:	It's cruel? / okay George.
George:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	But / but didn't you say before that it was funny as well?
Group:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	So it's funny but it's wrong?
Group:	[Laughter at pointed out inconsistency].
Interviewer:	Hmmmmm / do you think that makes sense?
Group:	No / Not really.
Interviewer:	Uhh? / so what do you think? / do you think the Mask is being fair?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	No / and you wouldn't like to have it done to you either would you?
Group:	No / no way. [Laughter].
Interviewer:	Sorry Andrew?
Andrew:	I'd be stressing if he done it to me.
Mark:	Laugh.
Interviewer:	Yeah / it wouldn't be very nice would it?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	Um / which of the two characters do you like the most? / Emily?
Emily:	The Mask.
Interviewer:	You like the Mask / do you want to tell me why? / maybe we can get each of you to tell me why? / so you talk Emily / why do you like the Mask more than Stanley?
Emily:	'Cos he's funny and Stanley's not funny.
Interviewer:	Okay because the Mask is funny and Stanley is not funny / thank you. Chris who do you like the most?
Chris:	Milo.
Interviewer:	You like Milo.
Chris:	When he puts on the Mask.
Interviewer:	Okay / sorry I was just asking out of Stanley of the Mask which you like the most?
Chris:	The Mask.
Interviewer:	You like the Mask / can you tell me why?
Chris:	'Cos Stanley is just plain and boring and the Mask is funny.
Interviewer:	Ah / okay / James who do you like the most out of Stanley or the Mask?
James:	The Mask because he can turn into other people.
Interviewer:	Ah / John?
John:	Um/ the Mask because um / he can / I mean he can do heaps of things.

Interviewer:	Okay / Andrew?
Andrew:	The Mask.
Interviewer:	And why do you like the Mask more than Stanley?
Andrew:	Just what James said / that he can change into things.
Interviewer:	Ah / okay / Sarah who do you like the most?
Sarah:	The Mask.
Interviewer:	You like the Mask too.
Sarah:	He's exciting and he does lots of things.
Interviewer:	What do you mean by exciting? / can you tell me? / can you give me an example?
Sarah:	He's funny / he's silly / he's naughty / he's bad.
Interviewer:	He's naughty / and bad did you say? Oh?! Can you / is there / can you tell me an example of when he might be naughty / or is it?
Sarah:	No.
Interviewer:	Okay / Mark who do you like the most?
Mark:	The Mask.
Interviewer:	You like the (interrupting)
Mark:	'Cos he's/ um crazy and he can open just about every part in his body.
Interviewer:	Open just about every part in his body?
Mark:	Like when he was / 'cos he opens his brain. (laughs).
Interviewer:	Oh / do you think that's real?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	No.
James:	Only in an operation.
Mark:	And he can make his eyes pop out too. (laughs).
Interviewer:	What was that James?
James:	Only in an operation.
Interviewer:	Ah / okay / Peter do you like either Stanley or the Mask more?
Peter:	Ah / um / both the same.
Interviewer:	You like them both the same / okay / thank you / do you have any comments as to why / you like them both?
Peter:	Yeah / I just like them both.
Interviewer:	Okay / thank you.
Mark:	The Mask is funny when he says 'Smokkin' (imitation).
Group:	Laughter.
Interviewer:	Is that funny? / can you tell me why that is funny or is it just funny?
Group:	It is just funny.
Interviewer:	Okay / Sarah?
Sarah:	He says it in a funny way.
Interviewer:	He says it in a funny way.
John:	He uses a different voice.
Interviewer:	Voice is it John? / Emily?
Emily:	They're unusual words that you don't usually hear of.
Interviewer:	Ah / okay / Go on Mark.
Mark:	He sort of / like has a different saying for a different occasion.
Interviewer:	Emily?

Emily:	I like it when he says 'Somebody stop me'.
Mark:	Chuckle.
Interviewer:	Can you tell me why you like that? / why is that funny?
Group:	Laugh.
Interviewer:	Can anybody tell me why that might be funny? / John?
John:	He sounds funny.
Interviewer:	He sounds funny / yes Emily?
Emily:	He says that nobody can stop him no matter what he does.
Interviewer:	Oh / Sarah do you agree? / do you have another comment sorry?
Sarah:	I like / its funny because the way he says it.
Interviewer:	It's the way he says it.
John:	When he / when he says it / he goes / he acts funny.
Interviewer:	He acts funny too.
Mark:	When he says it he's got funny facial expressions.
Interviewer:	Oh / and can you describe any of can you tell me what you mean?
Mark:	He screws his face up.
Interviewer:	Oh / why / um / why is that funny? Is there a way that people should normally look?
Group:	No.
	[Silence].
Interviewer:	No / okay / um / what / so / what kind of man do you think Stanley is?
	[Silence].
Emily:	A normal man.
Interviewer:	So he's a normal man / what does / can you tell me what a normal man is though?
Emily:	Just does his job and ...
	[Silence].
Interviewer:	Okay / go on Andrew.
Andrew:	A boring man.
Interviewer:	He's a / Stanley's a boring man.
Andrew:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Okay / can you tell me why Stanley's a boring man?
Andrew:	He doesn't really do nothing / he doesn't really do much.
Interviewer:	What do you mean by that?
Andrew:	He just sits in his room and watches TV / sleeps.
Emily:	Sleeps.
Mark:	He doesn't really / there a whole sort of world around him and he doesn't really use it.
Interviewer:	What was that Mark?
Mark:	There's a whole world around him but he doesn't use it.
Interviewer:	So ...
Mark:	He doesn't really go out into the wilderness that much.
Interviewer:	So you think Stanley's boring as well.
Mark:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Okay / anybody else have any comments about what kind of man Stanley is?

Group:	No.
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	He wasn't married.
Interviewer:	He wasn't married / okay.
George:	But he's got a girlfriend.
Interviewer:	Has he got a girlfriend?
Group:	Yeah / no.
Interviewer:	In the cartoon.
James:	In the movie.
Interviewer:	In what you've just seen?
Emily:	Nah.
Chris:	No.
Sarah:	In a different one.
Interviewer:	What's the different one Sarah?
Sarah:	The movie.
Interviewer:	Okay / so he's got a girlfriend in the movie.
Sarah:	Yeah 'cos he dances with her / and
Interviewer:	Ah.
Sarah:	And turns into a dog and his eyes pop out.
Mark:	Laugh. He turns into a dog and goes 'arrgh'.
Interviewer:	Okay.
Peter:	I like it because he's the girl dog.
Interviewer:	What do you think it means to be a man then if Stanley's a boring man? What do you think it means to be a man? John?
John:	Um / work.
Interviewer:	Work / that's what it means to be a man.
Group:	Laughter.
Interviewer:	Okay / Mark.
Mark:	Um / it's sort of like / oh / he sort of like/ acting like / ah like most men would probably go out fishing if they had the chance or something.
Interviewer:	Okay / but he lives in a city though doesn't he.
Mark:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Okay Emily.
Emily:	Most men are funny or / um / they're ordinary but Stanley's just boring.
Interviewer:	So what's the difference between being ordinary and being boring / can anybody tell me? / John / can you tell me what you think?
John:	Um / an ordinary man / works.
Interviewer:	An ordinary man works / yes?
John:	And has a job.
Interviewer:	Does Stanley have a job though?
Group:	Yes.
John:	At the bank.
George:	He works at the bank.
Interviewer:	He's at the bank / does anybody know what he does at the bank from what you've just been told?
Peter:	Accounts.

Interviewer:	From what you've just been told?
Group:	He counts all the money.
Interviewer:	He counts all the money did you say Mark?
Mark:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Yes that's right / he counts all the money / okay / so what type of qualities do you think Stanley as a man has?
Mark:	Um / good.
Sarah:	[talking but inaudible].
Interviewer:	Sorry?
Interviewer:	Good qualities / can you tell me what a 'good' quality is?
Mark:	Um / sort of like / he's a person that will work for money and won't sort of cheat off lotto and things like that.
Interviewer:	Okay / anybody else have any comments about what qualities Stanley has as a man?
Mark:	(talking over Interviewer) because he's boring he doesn't do much / he has time to / he just has the time to sit down to count all the money all the time.
Interviewer:	Ah?! / okay / can anybody tell me then what type of man the Mask is?
Sarah:	Um ...
	[Silence].
Sarah:	Um / funny?
Interviewer:	The Mask is funny? / huh? / okay Emily.
Emily:	Exciting.
Interviewer:	The Mask / so Stanley is boring and the Mask is exciting?
Emily:	Yes.
Interviewer:	Is that right? / does everybody agree or disagree?
Group:	Agree.
Interviewer:	Agree / do you have any comments Chris about what type of man the Mask is?
Chris:	No.
Interviewer:	Okay / John?
John:	Um / magic.
	[Silence].
Interviewer:	The Mask is magic / okay / can you tell me what you mean?
John:	When he changes into other things.
Interviewer:	Okay / Sarah?
Sarah:	He's a silly person.
Interviewer:	The Mask is a silly man or silly person.
Sarah:	Silly man.
Interviewer:	Silly man / okay / James / do you have any comments about what type of man the Mask is?
James:	No.
Interviewer:	Okay / Mark?
Mark:	He's crazy.
Interviewer:	He's crazy / can you tell me what you mean?
Mark:	Like / he's gone completely wacko. (Laughs).
Interviewer:	And that / how do you learn that? / I mean / what does he do to
	...

Mark:	Um / he sort of like / does the thing where he changes into Albert Einstein and tries to find the antidote to that thing and then he um / he um makes that cappuccino and then he um takes / it takes him about five minutes to make the cappucino and / ten seconds to make the antidote.
Interviewer:	Ah / what do you think James? / do you agree with the Mark said?
James:	Yes.
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	The Mask doesn't let him / anyone push him around.
Interviewer:	Okay / so
Emily:	And Stanley does.
Interviewer:	So how would that he? / how would you describe that as a man? Is the Mask somehow more of a man?
Group:	Yeah / yes.
Interviewer:	Do you think / can you tell me anymore about that? / or is there anything else to say? [Silence].
Interviewer:	Okay / think back to the beginning of the programme when Stanley is on the floor / right at the very beginning of the programme / and he's in his pyjamas with his fluffy slippers on / okay.
George:	How come he sleeps with his slippers on?
Interviewer:	I don't know, what do you think?
John:	'Cos it probably keeps his feet warm.
Interviewer:	Oh / okay.
George:	Probably doesn't have any socks to wear.
Interviewer:	Ah / Mark?
Mark:	Every time he puts / tries to put the mask on Milo tries to stop him.
Interviewer:	Oh / why do you think that might be? Does anybody have any ideas? [Hands go up] Somebody talk … John?
John:	Um, he doesn't like the face 'cos he always goes like that (alluding to Milo putting paws over his eyes when Stanley puts Mask on).
Mark:	'Cos he doesn't like the noise / goes like this
Emily:	'Cos Milo might think / " Or no, now he's going to be a lunatic!".
Interviewer:	This is Milo / 'cos Milo doesn't like the face and Milo doesn't like the noise / Emily again?
Mark:	Laugh.
Interviewer:	Oh / James?
James:	He messes up everything.
Interviewer:	Stanley? / um / the Mask messes up everything?
James:	Yeah.
John:	Um / he forgets to feed Milo.
Interviewer:	Oh really? / okay / I didn't think about that / Sarah?

Sarah:	Um / the Mask / when he puts it on he scares the dog.
Interviewer:	Oh / and how do you know that?
Sarah:	Because he puts his paws over his eyes.
Interviewer:	Puts his paws over his eyes / Mark?
Mark:	Um / the / the / maybe the um / when he whirls around in the bolts of lightning come out / it frightens Milo.
Interviewer:	Um / might be / okay / well let's watch this example that we've got here and we can talk again some more.

Excerpt Two:
[While snippet is playing]:

| John: | Looks like a dick. |

[End of snippet]:

Interviewer:	Emily / you talk.
Emily:	The dog sleeps in the bed and not Stanley.
Interviewer:	Oh.
	Laugh.
Mark:	The dog's like a ghost.
	[Inaudible chatter].
Interviewer:	Okay / so how do you think Stanley got to be on the floor?
Mark:	'Cos the dog might of pushed him out and gone (change of tone) "ha - ha".
Interviewer:	Emily / do you have a
Emily:	He might've just fell out.
Interviewer:	He might've fallen out / what do you think Andrew?
Andrew:	The dog would've taken all the blankets up and he would've fallen out.
Interviewer:	Ah / James / do you have a comment as to why Stanley might've ended up on the floor?
James:	He / someone could've rolled him off.
Interviewer:	Someone?
Mark:	Someone could've jumped through the window.
Interviewer:	Who / who? someone jumped through the window?
Group:	Laughter.
Interviewer:	Okay / so / sorry Sarah?
Sarah:	His window was open.
Interviewer:	His window was open / yes you're right / Chris / how do you
Chris:	The dog's greedy.
Interviewer:	The dog's greedy / okay / so do you think a real man would let his dog push him around?
Group:	No!
Interviewer:	Why not?
James:	If my dog ...
Andrew:	Because ...
Interviewer:	Can you tell me why? / what / Emily?
Emily:	'Cos the man's the owner and the dog's just the pet.
Interviewer:	Okay / that might be and interesting point.
	[Multiple inaudible chatter].

Interviewer:	Is this / but Stanley is on the floor and George said here that he thinks Milo pushed the dog / Milo pushed Stanley out of bed / does that make Stanley less of a man?
Group:	Yes.
Interviewer:	Do you think so?
Group:	Yes.
Interviewer:	And why is that/ can you tell me? Go on Andrew.
Andrew:	Um / he would've been able to a stay upon the bed.
Interviewer:	Ah okay / Emily?
Emily:	'Cos um / an ordinary man would've just got the dog and then/ um put it outside.
Interviewer:	Okay.
Emily:	Or put the dog on the floor and he get in the bed.
Interviewer:	Do you think it's unusual for a dog to sleep on the bed? / do you
Group:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	You say no?
Emily:	Yep.
Interviewer:	Does your dog sleep on your bed?
Emily:	Yes.
Interviewer:	(supportive laugh) Okay.
Peter:	a dog usually
Interviewer:	Sarah?
Sarah:	I don't think it's unusual 'cos my dog sleeps on my bed.
Interviewer:	Your dog sleeps on your bed too.
Mark:	My dog sleeps in it's kennel.
Interviewer:	So what do we think here? / is Stanley less of a man because he's been / he's on the floor and the dog's on the bed.
Mark:	Yep.
Interviewer:	Andrew?
Andrew:	Um / laugh.
Interviewer:	Go on Emily.
Emily:	It said at the start that Stanley let's everyone push him around / and he even let's his dog push him around.
Interviewer:	Oh okay / so a real man owns his dog and therefore doesn't let the dog push him around.
Andrew:	Yep.
Mark:	It's not the dog that owns the man
John:	Huh?
Interviewer:	So when Stanley is talking to the trashman / the way Stanley talks changes / do you remember that?
Group:	Yeah / yep.
Interviewer:	Okay / I've got another example here so let's watch that and see what you think.

Excerpt Three:

Interviewer:	Why / oh Emily you talk.
Emily:	Stanley / um yelled at the man and then he got scared of the man 'cos the trashman crushed the / (pause)

Chris:	Can.
Mark:	On his head.
Emily:	Against his / head.
Interviewer:	Okay / does everybody agree?
Group:	Yeah / yep.
Interviewer:	What do you think James?
James:	Um / Stanley knocks his head.
Interviewer:	Ah.
Mark:	He goes 'oouch'.
Interviewer:	Okay / Sarah?
Sarah:	Um/ when he gets out of bed and he hears the truck / he st / he sits up and he dongs his head and …
Interviewer:	He dongs his head?
Sarah:	He might blame it on the trashman.
Interviewer:	Ah / Mark?
Mark:	He's um / quite forgetful 'cos everytime he um sticks his / 'cos he woke up and he donged his head and them he wakes up / he's quite forgetful 'cos he donged his head when he first got up and them he stuck his head out the window and tried to bring his head up and donged his head them (laughing).
Interviewer:	What do you think it is about the trashman that Stanley is afraid of? / Emily?
Emily:	'Cos he's got muscles and he's tough.
Interviewer:	Okay / and does Stanley have those muscles?
Group:	No way!
Boys:	He's got 'pippies' [repeatedly]. Laughter.
Interviewer:	Sarah?
Sarah:	[Shakes her head indicating 'no'].
Interviewer:	So what was the reason / so the reason Stanley is afraid of the trashman is / because the trashman's big and Stanley is not / is that right?
Sarah:	Strong
Mark:	(over Sarah) Stanley's got 'pippies'
Interviewer:	(laugh) Andrew?
Andrew:	Um / that the / trashman he's got real / he's got real strong.
Interviewer:	He's real strong.
Andrew:	And like / um
Mark:	Um
Sarah:	He's not a weakling.
Mark:	Stanley's got 'pippies'!
Interviewer:	Okay / what is Stanley asking the trashman for?
George:	Some rest.
Interviewer:	Some rest / yes George / John?
John:	Um / to come back later.
Interviewer:	Okay / Emily?
Emily:	Come round at a different time and pick up his garbage.
Interviewer:	Do you
Mark:	(interrupting) He's like / snapping.
Interviewer:	Do you think his request is okay?

Group:	Yeah / no.
Interviewer:	Did someone say 'no'?
Emily:	'Cos he shouldn't be out late at night.
Interviewer:	James? / so / he shouldn't / sorry?
Emily:	He shouldn't be out late at night and he should get to bed earlier.
Mark:	Yeah but he can't help it 'cos he's counting the money.
Interviewer:	Sarah?
Sarah:	Then he should quit / his job.
Interviewer:	(shocked) He should quit?
Group:	Yes. No.
Chris:	What type of job can he get?
George:	Laugh.
Interviewer:	Why should he quit?
George:	So he can go to sleep and then the trashman can come early in the morning.
Interviewer:	Oh.
Sarah:	But then he won't have anything to do through the day.
Interviewer:	That's right.
George:	Yes he will / he'll be the Mask.
James:	Play with the dog.
George:	(Laugh).
Interviewer:	Sarah?
Sarah:	He could / if the trashman didn't come he would've had peace and quiet.
Interviewer:	If the trashman hadn't come then he would've had peace and quiet? / Do you agree with that?
Group:	Yep / yeah. (boys more vocal.)
Interviewer:	So / so what do you think? / Stanley's request is / okay? / But who is / is Stanley wrong or is the trashman wrong?
George:	Trashman's wrong!
John:	Trashman's wrong.
Interviewer:	Why is the trashman wrong though?
James:	Because he's big and strong and he's / Stanley's only a weakling.
Interviewer:	Oh? John?
	[Laughter].
John:	When he threw them things around
Interviewer:	Okay.
Emily:	It's the trashman's job to go and pick up everyone's rubbish at that time.
Interviewer:	Okay / that's right / okay / why do you think / so why do you think Stanley changes the tone in his voice?
John:	Because he's scared?
Interviewer:	John / because he's scared? Emily?
Emily:	He um / when the trashman goes "Oh yeah" (imitating) he goes "gulp".
John:	Laugh.
Interviewer:	Okay / Mark?

Mark:	Um / first he starts off angry 'cos he um / doesn't know who the rubbish man is and then when he sees him he goes ' uh uh' (laugh) and then he's scared.
Interviewer:	Okay / so what is it about the trashman that makes Stanley scared?
Mark:	Um / how he / how many muscles he's got.
Interviewer:	Okay / Sarah?
Sarah:	The way he talks / like he yells at him.
Interviewer:	The trashman yells.
Emily:	He sounds all grumpy.
	[Group becoming increasingly restless].
Interviewer:	Ah / so / so what's happening here between the two men? / can you tell me what's happening?
Andrew:	They're starting a war.
Mark:	Ba pa ba pa ba pa ba pa.
Interviewer:	Do you think? / what do you think Emily?
Emily:	They're not agreeing with each other.
Interviewer:	Okay / what do you think might be a way to come to an agreement?
	Silence.
Interviewer:	Is Stanley's request okay?
Group:	Yeah.
Peter:	Come back at a later hour.
Interviewer:	Why might the trashman see that as being wrong?
	[all talking at once]
James:	Um
George:	Because
Andrew:	He's / 'cos he's
George:	He won't get paid and all that.
Mark:	That's his ...
Interviewer:	Sorry / one at a time.
Mark:	That's his job and he's got to come round and collect the rubbish.
Interviewer:	Do you agree Chris?
Chris:	Yep / that's what he gets paid for.
Mark:	And he might / if he comes / and his boss
Chris:	and goes around (both at same time)
Mark:	might be driving his car all the time and he might go past and see / he's not doing his job.
Interviewer:	Oh.
Emily:	He might have other things to do during the day.
Interviewer:	Okay / sure / so which one of the two is more manly?
	Silence.
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	The trashman.
Mark:	Snigger.
Interviewer:	The trashman is more manly / what else does everybody else think?
	Silence.

Interviewer:	Between the trashman and Stanley which one is more manly?
Boys:	Trashman.
Interviewer:	The trashman.
Mark:	The trashman.
Interviewer:	Why?
Emily:	Because he's got muscles.
Interviewer:	Okay.
Peter:	He doesn't / he doesn't have as good a job.
Interviewer:	Um / okay so do you think that there can be more than one type of man?
Emily:	Yes.
Group:	Yeah.
James:	The Mask.
Interviewer:	Okay / go on Emily.
	Laughter.
Emily:	Some men can be funny / some men can be boring / some can be dumb.
George	Some can be lazy.
James:	Some can be strong.
Mark:	Some can be weak.
Andrew:	Some could be criminals.
Mark:	Some could have pippies / some could have muscles.
Interviewer:	Sorry Emily?
Emily:	Some have a job, some don't. Some are married, some aren't.
John:	Some have only got ... some of spare / some of them have got girls.
Interviewer:	So what kinds of men are positive to you? / Go on Emily.
Emily:	My dad.
Interviewer:	Okay / what qualities / what qualities or / about a man / what kind of like personality? / John?
John:	Voice.
Interviewer:	Sorry?
John:	Voice.
Interviewer:	Voice did you say?
Emily:	Most men have decent jobs.
Interviewer:	What's a decent job Emily?
Emily:	Truck driver or
Interviewer:	Okay / what else does it mean to be a man?
	Silence.
Interviewer:	Sorry Andrew were you going to say something else?
Andrew:	(laughing) Truck drivers get fat sometimes / and they smoke.
Mark:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Oh? / Okay James do you have any comments about what kinds of men are positive to you?
	Silence.
Interviewer:	Sarah?
Sarah:	Most trashmen are white and not black.
Interviewer:	Oh?
George:	And fat.

Mark:	And some of them have got / about 40 kgs of / or something like that.
Interviewer:	Oh? / Emily?
Emily:	Um / that's not true that most men / um most trashmen are white and not black.
Interviewer:	Oh?
James:	But / that man was black on there.
John:	Yeah.
George:	No he was brown / he was like cocoa.
Group:	Laughter.
Mark:	Looks like milo?
Interviewer:	Um / we haven't got much longer to go. I know you're getting … sort of bored / there's a couple more things. When / um / I want you to think about the trashman now. I've got an episode to show you and we can talk in a minute.

Excerpt Three (A):
[While snippet is playing]:

George:	He looks like Milo there (said during snippet).

[End of snippet]:

Interviewer:	What do you make of the way the trashman treats Stanley?
Emily:	Mean.
Interviewer:	Mean / John?
John:	Cruel.
Sarah:	He treats him like / like
Mark:	Garbage.
Sarah:	Trash.
Interviewer:	Trash (laugh).
Group:	All laugh.
Emily:	Like he's nothing.
George:	Like he's a piece of little garbage.
Interviewer:	Okay. Emily?
Emily:	Stanley doesn't take any notice of the dog / 'cos it started barking when the man put the rubbish in and he didn't even turn around.
Mark:	He didn't go 'holy mackrel'.
Interviewer:	Okay / would you like to be treated the way the trashman treated Stanley?
Group:	No!
Interviewer:	Why not?
Chris:	'Cos …
Emily:	'Cos I wouldn't want garbage dumped in my house.
Mark:	(smacking sound).
John:	Or dumped on him.
Andrew:	I wouldn't want to clean it up either.
Interviewer:	Wouldn't want to clean it up?
	Laughter.

Interviewer:	Is this the way most men should behave?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	So the trashman is what type of man?
Emily:	Mean.
John:	Mean.
Interviewer:	Mean.
Andrew:	Naughty.
Interviewer:	Andrew thinks he's naughty / okay / can you tell me anything about naughty?
Andrew:	'Cos he made his truck / the carriage at the back lift up and put all the rubbish in his house / in the apartment.
Interviewer:	Do you think it was fair of the trashman to dump the rubbish?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	What would be fair? / how would you describe fair? / why do you think the trashman put the rubbish in Stanley's room? / Emily?
Emily:	'Cos he asked to come back at a different time?
Interviewer:	Stanley asked?
Sarah:	No.
Emily:	Yeah / the trashman.
Interviewer:	But Stanley asked the trashman to come back at a different time.
Emily:	Yes.
Mark:	Laughing.
Interviewer:	James?
James:	Um / Stanley was arguing with him / and the trashman / probably doesn't like people arguing with him.
Interviewer:	So if you were arguing with somebody would you like them to dump their trash in your room?
Emily:	No.
	Laughter.
Interviewer:	No / do you think that's the right way to respond to people? / Emily?
Emily:	I don't get the part where / um
	[Group becoming restless].
Interviewer:	Hang on / can we just listen a little bit longer so we can talk to each other?
Emily:	I don't get the part where Stanley said can you come back at a different time to collect my rubbish and then he just went and dumped it in there.
Mark:	He should've just left it outside.
Emily:	He / he / should've just waited until a different time.
Interviewer:	Can anybody / does anybody understand why the trashman dumped
Mark:	Yeah.
James:	Not really.
Mark:	He / he said come back so he dumped his trash so he gotda do and put it back out so he can pick it up at another time.
Interviewer:	Is that the

Mark:	At another time.
Interviewer:	Is that the reason why the trashman put the rubbish in Stanley's room?
Mark:	No / but probably just so that he can / um
George:	Behind the truck.
Mark:	Be mean to Stanley.
Interviewer:	Do you think the trashman likes Stanley?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	Why?
Emily:	'Cos Stanley's fussy.
Sarah:	'Cos he ugly.
Interviewer:	'Cos Stanley was fussy / do you think the trashman doesn't like fussy people?
Group:	No way.
Interviewer:	Why? / what can
Emily:	'Cos he was doing his job then and there and he didn't want to do it later.
Interviewer:	Okay / what do you think / um / do you like the character of the trashman?
Group:	No.
Mark:	Nah / not really.
Emily:	No.
Interviewer:	What
George:	'Cos he changes character.
Interviewer:	What does he do that you like or don't like?
Mark:	His muscles.
Interviewer:	Go on / sorry James first.
James:	He's mean.
Interviewer:	He's mean.
Emily:	I don't like it when he shows off and he um / he gets the tin and crashes it against his head.
Interviewer:	Why don't you like that? / can you tell me why you don't like that?
Emily:	'Cos he showing off.
Interviewer:	'Cos he showing off / okay.
Sarah:	He's trying to make him scared.
Interviewer:	He's trying to make him scared / who? / the trashman is trying to make Stanley scared?
Group:	Yeah.
Sarah:	'Cos when he crushed it he had a lower voice / and
Interviewer:	Okay / Andrew.
Andrew:	His laugh.
Interviewer:	Whose laugh?
Andrew:	The trashman's / when he's driving along
James:	The man / when he laughs he goes 'ha ha ha' (imitating).
Interviewer:	George?
George:	Um / he's ugly.
Interviewer:	Whose ugly?
George:	The trashman.

Laughter.

Interviewer:	What's good looking though?
Emily:	Trashmen aren't meant to be pretty.
Interviewer:	Sorry / say that again?
George:	No their not.
Emily:	Trashmen aren't meant to be pretty 'cos they do a stinky job.
Mark:	'Pippies'
George:	Yeah.
James:	They're filthy.
George:	He might sleep in the trash.
Mark:	Laugh.
Interviewer:	An
Emily:	That's why he's
	Laughter.
Interviewer:	Okay / when the trashman goes to the rubbish dump he comes across a Jack in the Box. Let's watch what happens.

Excerpt Four:

Interviewer:	Just before we start / do you all know what a Jack in the Box is?
Group:	Yeah.
Mark:	A thing that pops up.
Emily:	You push a button or you wind the thing around and it pops up.
Mark:	(Tick tick.)
Interviewer:	Okay / Andrew did you have something to say?
Andrew:	Um / that the trashman's got bits of dirt on him.
Interviewer:	Okay / Emily?
Emily:	He said ' I haven't seen it since my last birthday party' and he was old so he must've got a baby thing for his birthday.
Interviewer:	Ah. Chris?
	Laughter.
Interviewer:	Chris / what do you think about that?
Chris:	He must not have much family 'cos he got that for his last birthday party and that must've been ages ago.
Interviewer:	Ah. Emily?
Emily:	It's a bit babyish to get one of those when you're old.
Interviewer:	Ah / what do you mean by that? Do you think men can play with toys?
Group:	Yeah / no.
George:	Yeah some of them can.
James:	They could play with computers and that.
John:	They can but it's weird.
George:	If they had children they can play with their toys when they're getting bored and they're at home sick.
Interviewer:	Okay.
Andrew:	And they can sit down and play with cars.
	Laughter.
Interviewer:	So / so its' alright for dad's to play with toys but not men?
George:	No / not really.
Chris:	Nah.

Andrew:	But they are men!
Interviewer:	Sorry Andrew?
Andrew:	Some dads are men.
Interviewer:	Some?
Mark:	No they all are.
Andrew:	All are. [at the same time].
Andrew:	They all are. [at the same time].
Mark:	(Laugh).
Interviewer:	So / what do you think? / can men play with toys?
Group:	Yes.
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	It's a bit weird for a man that's not married or something to go out and just buy toys like Teletubbies to play with.
Males:	Laughter.
Interviewer:	But why?
George:	But they might be buying them for birthday presents.
Mark:	Smellygrubbies!
Group:	Laughter.
George:	And then he goes home and says 'time for tele / hello'.
Interviewer:	Why do you think the trashman is so interested in toys?
George:	'Cos he loves toys.
Emily:	'Cos he hasn't seen one in ages.
Interviewer:	Sorry?
Emily:	He hasn't seen one in ages.
Mark:	He loves them / - must do.
Interviewer:	But didn't he just say he hadn't seen one of those since his last birthday party? / when
Andrew:	His last birthday party. [at the same time].
George:	Might've been yesterday. [at the same time].
John:	Yeah.
Mark:	Might've been when he was nine or something.
Andrew:	Yeah. [at the same time].
Chris:	Yeah. [at the same time].
Andrew:	He might [at the same time].
James:	Oh yeah / 'cos his last birthday party [at the same time].
Chris:	He might've not had a birthday for about / eighteen years. Laughter.
Interviewer:	Now also / I want to show you a clip about when ...
Mark:	(Machine gun noises).
Interviewer:	Before Stanley and Milo go to the museum / Milo has the mask on and he's running down the street and he comes across a street / a boy in the street standing on some stairs / let's watch that and see what happens here too.

Excerpt Five:

Mark:	I'd go and bite him.
Interviewer:	Why do you think the boy squirted Milo with his water pistol? / James?
James:	'Cos he was bored.

Interviewer:	What do you think Emily?
Emily:	He wanted the dog to react at him.
Interviewer:	What do you mean?
Mark:	He never knew that
John:	To try and bite him.
Emily:	So / so the dog could go back to him and do something.
Interviewer:	Okay does anybody else have any ideas why /
George:	'Cos he was bored and he wanted to shoot him.
Interviewer:	Okay / Andrew?
Andrew:	Silence.
George:	With his water pistol.
Interviewer:	So let's watch some more of what Milo does then.

Excerpt Six:

[While snippet is playing].

George:	Imagine if his mum came out and saw he was at the door.
Mark:	(Punching noises).

[End of snippet].

Interviewer:	Why do you think Milo does that? / Andrew?
Andrew:	He / oh / he was like a fire dog so he wet him / he thought he was like a fire dog
Mark:	putting out a fire.
Interviewer:	Okay / Sarah why do you think / did you have you hand up?
Sarah:	No.
Interviewer:	Okay / Emily?
Emily:	He wanted to pay the boy back a lesson.
Interviewer:	Oh.
Emily:	Since the boy squirted him he'll squirt him even harder.
Interviewer:	But would you like to be treated like that?
Group:	No.
James:	Nah / I wouldn't want to dong my head on the door.
Interviewer:	Emily again?
Emily:	The boy shouldn't of / um / shot him in the first place.
Interviewer:	But / James said the boy was bored.
	Silence.
Emily:	He could've just squirted the ground.
Interviewer:	Oh.
	Laughter.
Interviewer:	Mark?
Mark:	Um / the um / the boy was mean so um / and he squirted Milo and so Milo wanted to just teach him 'if I do it to you do you like it?' / how do you like it if I do it to you so / he um / got a stronger hose.
Interviewer:	Okay / just one or two more clips / um Milo runs into the museum / and Stanley is chasing him / Stanley accidentally walks into the wrong room and there's a meeting going in there / let's watch and have a look.

Excerpt Seven:

Interviewer:	What kind of meeting do you think that is? / James?
James:	A scientist's meeting.
Interviewer:	Okay / what's that you're going to say Emily? / does everybody agree that that was a scientist's meeting.
Group:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	What is it about those people that tell you that they were scientists?
George:	They're wearing white coats.
Interviewer:	Sorry / who was that speaking down the back?
Andrew:	They were all wearing lab coats.
Interviewer:	Lab coats / Emily?
Emily:	It's a special occasion 'cos they're all dressed up.
Interviewer:	Okay.
George:	They're in white tops and they had buttons down here (demonstrating).
Interviewer:	Do you know anybody that looks like that?
Group:	Yeah / no.
Mark:	Scientists.
Emily:	My mum dresses like that in the morning.
Interviewer:	Does she?
Andrew:	Like Frankenstein.
Interviewer:	So / two scientists have a talk when they meet Stanley / let's watch and see what happens then.

Excerpt Eight:

Interviewer:	Why do you think that / they describe Stanley as a 'nutcase'? Silence.
Emily:	'Cos he's wearing pyjamas.
George:	And he's nutty.
Emily:	With fishes.
Interviewer:	Sarah?
Sarah:	'Cos he's wearing pyjamas at a meeting to show / the other scientists what he done.
Interviewer:	But how did Stanley get to the meeting?
Sarah:	He went to the wrong room / he was trying to find the dog.
Interviewer:	So / do you think Stanley was meant to go to that meeting?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	No.
George:	He was running away from that cop.
Interviewer:	Do you agree with the way they describe Stanley?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	Why not?
Sarah:	They just
Emily:	'Cos he's not a nutcase.
Interviewer:	'Cos he's not a nutcase / do you think there's anything unusual about wearing pyjamas down the street.
Group:	Yes!
George:	You feel stupid. [at the same time].

Andrew:	You'll look strange. [at the same time].
John:	You'll be strange. [at the same time].
James:	People will look at you all the time. [at the same time].
George:	They'll go ' he's wearing pyjamas, he must be a dickwad' [at the same time].
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	As soon as he walks into that room they all jump to conclusions that he was the scientist.
Interviewer:	Oh / Sarah?
Sarah:	At least he was wearing some clothes.
Group:	Laughter.
Interviewer:	So there's something unusual about wearing nothing as well.
Group:	Laughter.
George:	Imagine if he was wearing undies down town.
Mark:	Laugh.
Interviewer:	Okay / later in the scene the guard comes in / do you know anybody else that wears that kind of uniform?
Emily:	Yes.
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	A policeman.
Interviewer:	That's right / the policemen wear uniforms and there are policemen in this programme as well / we'll just watch one more example.

Excerpt Nine:

Interviewer:	Okay / how would you describe the way the Lieutenant treats Doyle?
James:	Like a slave.
Interviewer:	James?
James:	Like a slave.
Interviewer:	Chris?
Chris:	He treats him right because Doyle wasn't doing what he's supposed to.
Interviewer:	What do you mean?
Chris:	Like / he's drinking coffee and he should be telling him
Mark:	(interrupting) get a move on.
Chris:	Get in the car and that.
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	He shouldn't be um / that um / Doyle shouldn't be drinking in the car.
Interviewer:	Ah / Andrew?
Andrew:	Like / he's trying to toughen him up / to be not weak.
Interviewer:	What do you mean?
Andrew:	Like he's being a sook.
Interviewer:	So is Doyle a man? / would you describe Doyle as a man?
Group:	No / sort of.
Interviewer:	Sort of / what does sort of mean?
Mark:	Like a woman.
Andrew:	Half.

Group:	Laughter.
Interviewer:	Can you be half man though?
Group:	No. Laughter.
Mark:	Half man / half wo-man.
Group:	Laughter.
Interviewer:	Emily / did you have something else to say?
Emily:	He goes / when I was drinking / oh / he was drinking soup and the other man goes 'well at least it wasn't coffee'.
Interviewer:	What does that mean?
Emily:	That he's not wasting any coffee.
Interviewer:	Oh.
Emily:	When he spills it / 'cos that man might like coffee.
Interviewer:	Okay / do you think the Lieutenant is a nice man?
Group:	No / yes.
Interviewer:	What is a nice man then?
Group:	Ummm.
James:	Oh / yes he is 'cos cops are nice.
Interviewer:	Cops are nice.
George:	No they're not 'cos
Mark:	Laugh.
George:	they put people in jail.
Emily:	They put bad people in jail.
Interviewer:	Okay / so was the Lieutenant a nice man or not?
Group:	No.
Interviewer:	What is a nice man then?
Group:	Um / Stanley?
Emily:	One that um / doesn't lose his patience straight away.
George:	Like if it was running around at the back of the line I'd be going
Interviewer:	What's happening down the back there Mark? / do you have anything to say about whether the Lieutenant is a nice man or not?
Mark:	Um / yes.
Interviewer:	He is a nice man? Okay / how do you think he differs / what is a horrible man then?
	Silence.
James:	The man that um / a man that tells you what to do and that.
Chris:	The trashman.
Interviewer:	The trashman is a horrible man / Emily?
Emily:	A man that loses his patience straight away and
Interviewer:	Okay Andrew.
Andrew:	A man that beats someone up / that bullies him.
Interviewer:	And Mark?
Mark:	A man that's sort of um / in a gang and um / keeps on bullying people around.
Interviewer:	Okay / in the car the Lieutenant was with another man - you remember and you said he was Doyle.
Group:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Okay / as they're driving along the road Doyle accidentally spills

	/its actually soup and he spills his soup/ and the Lieutenant is mean to Doyle calling him a 'cry-baby' / why do / do you have any idea why the Lieutenant might've said those things to Doyle?
George:	'Cos he split his hot / um / hot thingie and he was saying good.
Peter:	It's burnt me.
George:	It's burnt me.
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	He goes / when he was drinking his soup / and he spilt it / he goes "oowl / something" / and the man thought he was a 'cry-baby'.
Interviewer:	John?
John:	The Lieutenant is trying to toughen Doyle up?
Interviewer:	So the Lieutenant is trying to toughen Doyle up?
Group:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	And it's not acceptable for Doyle to feel pain?
Mark:	Yeah.
Emily:	It is.
James:	Nah.
Mark:	But um / but he's not meant to be drinking in the car.
Interviewer:	Do you think it's fair to Doyle? I mean / Doyle didn't spill any soup on the Lieutenant? Do you think it's fair of the Lieutenant to say 'don't be a cry-baby'?
Emily:	No.
James:	Yeah - oh, no.
Group:	Laughter.
James:	If the Lieutenant spilt some on him / that guy / or Doyle
Mark:	Will go 'ha ha what a cry-baby'.
Interviewer:	What do you think the purpose of the police in the programme is?
James:	You need them?
John:	Catch that dinosaur.
Interviewer:	Emily?
Emily:	To catch the Mask.
Interviewer:	To catch the Mask and the dinosaur / okay / just a couple more things. Do you think "The Mask" is about real people?
Group:	No / nah.
George:	'Cos the Mask is a jerk.
Mark:	All it is is a piece of wood.
Emily:	Yeah / but he's trying to show us that / um he's saving his town.
Interviewer:	And if "The Mask" is not about real people / how do they differ from you and I?
George:	You're not a drawing.
John:	He's cartoon and we're not.
Interviewer:	Okay / Emily?
Emily:	He's silly and we're not.
Interviewer:	Andrew?
Andrew:	He's got a green face.
Mark:	And we don't / we got Pakeha and Maori faces.

Interviewer:	And if you were to say / did you like the programme?
Group:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Or not / did anyone not like the programme?
Mark:	No / it was funny.
Interviewer:	Can we all go around and tell me why you liked the programme? James? / so what I want you to say or tell me whether you liked or disliked the programme and then if you can give a reason or something you liked or didn't like about it.
James:	It was funny / because / oh I liked it because it was funny.
Interviewer:	Chris?
Chris:	Same as James.
Interviewer:	Emily / did you like the programme?
Emily:	I liked it 'cos it was funny and he was showing up that he could save his town.
Interviewer:	Thank you / Sarah?
Sarah:	I liked it because it was about a lot of things.
Interviewer:	Okay / John?
John:	I liked it when that um / that Mask put that magnet on that man's pants.
Interviewer:	Okay / Andrew.
Andrew:	Same as what James and Chris said.
Interviewer:	Okay / Mark do you have any comments? Did you like or dislike the programme?
Mark:	I liked it 'cos um / the Mask goes wacko all the time and he plays tricks on people all the time.
Interviewer:	Peter / do you have any comments about whether you liked or disliked the programme?
Peter:	Ah / I liked it 'cos I haven't seen that one before.
Interviewer:	Okay / and George?
George:	I liked it 'cos / um the Mask is so funny.
Interviewer:	Okay / one last question / Do you think that this programme should be shown to young children?
Group:	Yes.
George:	Some of the bad stuff should be taken of it.
Emily:	No.
Interviewer:	Okay.
George:	If he looks out the window babies might look out the window and fall down.
Interviewer:	What do you think Emily?
Emily:	No / it's showing kids bad things to do and say bad things.
Interviewer:	And what about / do you think people your age should see it?
Emily:	Yes.
Group:	Yes.
Emily:	'Cos we know what's right and what's wrong.
Interviewer:	Okay / what did you say Emily?
Emily:	'Cos we've already learnt what's right and what's wrong and what's wrong to say.
Mark:	And some little kids could go up to you and say 'ha ha'.
Interviewer:	Sarah?

Sarah:	When my sister watched a programme / um / these kids rolled their eyes and then she started doing it.
Interviewer:	Oh / Andrew?
Andrew:	Um / little kids shouldn't watch it under three / because it might be a bad influence.
John:	Under five.
Andrew:	Under two.
Interviewer:	Okay / thank you for your participation / I hope you've enjoyed it.
Group:	Yes / yep.

Bibliography

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes towards an Investigation. In *Lenin and Philosophy and other essays by Louis Althusser.* (pp 127 - 186). London and New York: Monthly Review Press.

Ang, I. (1989). Wanted: Audiences. On the politics of empirical audience studies. In Seiter, Borchers, Kreutzner and Wartton (Eds.). *Remote Control - TV, Audience and Cultural Power.* (pp 116 - 129). London and New York: Routledge.

Belsey, C. (1980). Addressing The Subject. In *Critical Practice.* (pp 56 - 84). London and New York: Routledge.

Bennett, T. Mercer, C. & Woollacott, J. (Eds.). (1986). *Popular Culture and Social Relations.* Milton Keynes. U.K.: Open University Press.

Biddulph, S. (1995). *Manhood. An action plan for changing men's lives.* NSW, Australia: Finch Publications.

Buckingham, D. (1997). Electronic child abuse? Rethinking the media's effects on children. U.K. In Barker, M and Petley, J (Eds.). *Ill Effects - The Media/Violence Debate.* (pp 32 - 47). London and New York: Routledge.

Buckingham, D. (1993). *Children Talking Television. The Making of Television Literacy.* London & Washington D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Buckingham, D. (Ed.). (1993a). Boy's talk: television and the policing of masculinity. In *Reading Audiences: Young People and the Media.* (pp 89 - 115). U.K.: Manchester University Press.

Buckingham, D. (Ed.). (1993b). Introduction: young people and the media. In *Reading Audiences: Young People and the Media.* (pp 1 - 23). U.K.: Manchester University Press.

Collins. J. (1992). Television and Postmodernism. In Allen. R.C. (Ed.) *Channels of Discourse Re-assembled.* (pp 327 - 353). London and New York: Routledge.

Cruz, J. & Lewis. J. (Eds.). (1994). Reflection upon the Encoding/ Decoding Model: An Interview with Stuart Hall. In *Viewing, Reading, Listening - Audiences and Cultural Reception.* (pp 253 - 275). San Fransisco and Oxford: Westview Press.

Doty, W. (1993). *Myths of Masculinity.* New York: Crossroads Publishing Co.

Easthope, A. (1990). *What a Man's Gotta Do. The Masculine Myth in Popular Culture.* London and New York: Routledge.

Edgar, P. (1977). *Children & Screen Violence.* St. Luica, Australia: University of Queensland Press.

Edley, N. & Wetherell. M. (1996). Masculinity, Power and Identity. In Ghaill, M (Ed.). *Understanding Masculinities.* (pp 97 - 113). Philadelphia., U.S.A.: Open University Press.

Fink, B. (1995). *The Lacanian Subject. Between Language and Jouissance.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Fiske, J. (1992). British Cultural Studies and Television. In Allen, R.C. (Ed.). *Channels of Discourse Re-assembled.*(pp 284 - 326). London and New York: Routledge.

Fiske, J. (1990). Ideology and Meaning. In *Introduction to Communication Studies*. Second Edition. (pp 164 - 188). London and New York: Routledge.

Fiske, J. (1989). Moments of Television: Neither the text nor the audience. In Seiter, Borches, Krutzner and Warth (Eds.). *Remote Control - TV, Audiences and Cultural Power*. (pp 56 -79). London and New York: Routledge.

Fiske, J. (1987). *Television Culture*. London: Routledge.

Garfinkel, P. (1992). *In A Man's World: Father, Son, Brother, Friend, and Other Roles Men Play*. Berkeley, California. U.S.A.: Ten Speed Press.

Greenstein, B. (1993). *The Fragile Male: The Decline of a Redundant Species*. Carol Publishing Group, U.K: A Birch Lane Press Book.

Hall, S. (1973). *Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse*. A Stencilled Occasional Paper. Centre for Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham. England.

Hall, S. (et. al.).(1980). Encoding/Decoding. In *Culture, Media, Language*. (pp 128- 138). London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1996). The problem of ideology: Marxism without guarantees". In Morley, D. and Chen, K-H. (Eds.). *Stuart Hall - Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. (pp 25 - 46). London and New York: Routledge.

Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). The Spectacle of the 'Other'. In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. (pp 225 - 279).

London, California, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). The Work of Representation. In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices.* (pp 15 - 74). London, California, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Hansen, A. (1998). Media Audiences: Focus Group Interviewing. In Cottle, S., Negrine R., Newbold, C. and Hansen, A. (Eds.). *Mass Communication Research Methods.* (pp 257 - 287). London: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Hayward, S. (1996). *Key Concepts in Cinema Studies.* London and New York: Routledge.

Hodge, R. & Tripp, D. (1986). *Children and Television: A Semiotic Approach.* Cambridge & Oxford, U.K.: Polity.

Horrocks, R. (1994). *Masculinity in Crisis.* London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.

Krueger, R. (1993). When to Use Focus Groups and Why. In Morgan.D. (Ed.). *Successful Focus Groups.* London: Sage Publications.

Lacan, J. (1993). The mirror stage as formative of the function of the I. In Easthope. A. (Ed.). *Contemporary Film Theory.* (pp 35 - 39). London and New York: Longman.

Lapsley, R. & Westlake, R. (1988). Psychoanalysis. In *Film Theory: An Introduction.* (pp 67 - 104). Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press.

Larrain, J. (1996). Stuart Hall and the marxist concept of ideology. In

Morley, D. and Chen, K-H (Eds.). *Stuart Hall - Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies.* (pp 47 - 70). London and New York: Routledge.

Lunt. P. (1996). Rethinking the Focus Group in Media and Communications Research. *Journal of Communication.* Annenberg School Press: Philadelphia.

Masterman, L. (1985). *Teaching the Media.* London: Comedia.

Morgan, D. (1997). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research.* Second Edition. London, New York, New Dehli: Sage Publications.

Morgan, D. (1993). You Too Can Have a Body Like Mine: Reflections on the Male Body and Masculinities. In Scott, S and Morgan, D. (Eds.). *Body Matters: Essays on the Sociology of the Body.* (pp 69 - 88). London and Washington D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Morley, D. (1992). *Television, Audiences and Cultural Studies.* London: Routledge.

Neale, S. (1996). Representation, subjectivity and spectatorship. In *Hard Looks. Masculinities, spectatorship and contemporary consumption.* (pp 11 -19). London: UCL Press.

Nightingale, V. (1996). *Studying the Audience -The Shock of the Real.* London: Routledge.

Nixon, S. (1997). Exhibiting Masculinity. In Hall, S. (Ed.). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices.* (pp 291 - 330). London, New Delhi, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Pittman, F. (1993). *Man Enough. Fathers, Sons, and the Search for Masculinity*. Berkeley Publishing Co. New York, Perigee Book..

Resch, R.P. (1992). Ideology and Social Subjectivity. In *Althusser and the Renewal of Marxist Social Theory*. (pp205-259). Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1994). Althusser's Theory of Ideology. In Elliot, G. (Ed.). *Althusser: A Critical Reader*. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishing.

Saco, D. (1992). Masculinity as Signs. In Craig, S. (Ed.). *Men, Masculinity, and the Media*. (pp 23 - 39). London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Scheflen, A. (1972). *Body Language and Social Order. Communication as Behavioral Control*. U.S.A.: Spectrum Books.

Seidler, V.J. (1989). *Rediscovering Masculinity. Reason, Language and Sexuality*. London and New York: Routledge.

Seilder, V.J. (1994). *Unreasonable Men. Masculinity and Social Theory*. London and New York: Routledge.

Stewart, D.W. & Shamdasani, P.N. (1990). *Focus Groups: Theory and Practice*. California, London, New Dehli: Sage Publications.

Strate, L. (1992). Beer Commercials: A Manual on Masculinity. In Craig, S. (Ed.). *Men, Masculinity and the Media*. (pp 78 - 92). London, New York, New Dehli: Sage Publications.

Treadwell, P. (1987). Biologic Influence On Masculinity. In Brod, H.

(Ed.). *The Making Of Masculinities: The New Men's Movement.* (pp 259 - 285). Boston, London, Sydney, Wellington: Allen and UnWin.

Turner, G. (1996). *British Cultural Studies - An Introduction.* Second Edition. London: Routledge.

Vance, C. (1995). Social Construction Theory And Sexuality. In Berger, M, Willis, B, Watson, S, (Eds.). *Constructing Masculinity.* (pp 37 - 48). London and New York: Routledge.

Wicks, S. (1996). *Warriors And Wildmen: Men, Masculinity and Gender.* Westport, Connecticut and London: Bergin and Garvey.

Williams, R. (1991). Base and Superstructure in Marxist Critical Theory. In Mukerji, C and Schudson, M (Eds.). *Rethinking Popular Culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies.* (pp407 - 423). U.S.A. University of California Press.

Williamson, J. (1978). *Decoding Advertisements.* Marion Boyer.

Woodward, K. (Ed.) (1997). Concepts of Identity and Difference. In *Identity and Difference.* (pp 1 - 50). London, New York and New Dehli: Sage Publications.