

MACHISMO: A CASE STUDY IN REIFICATION

by

JULIO ANGULO

B.A., University of Houston, 1970

M.S.W., University of California, 1972

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCES

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1980

Approved by:



Major Professor

Spec. Coll.
LD
2668
.T4
1980
A575
c.2

DEDICATION

To Sue, my closest friend,
and to my son, Marc.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to express my gratitude to my major professor, Dr. Leon Rappoport. He has provided me with a most rewarding working relationship. His seminal contributions have greatly influenced this study and my professional development. I also wish to thank Dr. Frank E. Saal and Dr. Franz Samelson for their helpful comments and criticisms.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	1
I. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	3
A. The Meaning of Machismo	3
B. The Mexican-American Critique	10
C. The Meaning of Reification	17
D. Reification and Stereotypes	23
II. THE THESIS: MACHISMO AND REIFICATION	25
III. THE STUDY	33
A. General Summary and Statement of Aim	33
IV. METHOD AND DESIGN	37
A. Subjects	38
B. Instrument	40
C. Analysis	41
V. RESULTS	43
A. General Synopsis of Interview Process	43
1. Thematic development	43
2. General impressions of respondents	46
3. General synopsis of interviews	50
B. A Comprehensive Exposition of Machismo Views	54
1. The Hispanic-American interpretation	54
2. The Anglo-American interpretation	61
C. Phenomenological Analyses	68
VI. DISCUSSION	74
A. General Discussion	74
1. The Hispanics	75
2. Non-Hispanics	75
3. The absence of substantive sex differences	78
B. Critical Discussion: Reification	82
C. Conclusions and Implications	88
REFERENCE NOTES	94
REFERENCES	95
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE	99
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SYNOPSES	100

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The present work critically examines the concept of Machismo, a term commonly understood to refer to exaggerated masculinity as exhibited by Latin-American males. In order to fully achieve this purpose, the study has been organized to emphasize three major themes: the critique of existing social science usage of the concept; the discussion of how such usage may be interpreted as illustrating the theory and process of reification; and, a presentation of the socio-cultural, personal meanings that Machismo has taken on in contemporary society, as these meanings may be elicited in depth interviews with Anglos and Chicanos.

This study may be seen as a contribution to social science knowledge on several grounds. It can help clarify the meaning of Machismo. This is important since the concept has been abundantly invoked to explain various complex aspects of Latino life (Montiel, 1973a, 1973b; Padilla and Ruiz, 1973). Further, the usage of the term has been uncritical. The concept, in effect, has become a stereotype yielding inaccurate accounts of the life of Chicanos (Montiel, 1973a, 1973b; Padilla and Ruiz, 1973). As it will be shown, this state of affairs appears to be related to several socio-economic and historical circumstances.

On another relevant dimension of theory, this study also aims at clarifying the process called reification. Developed by the neo-marxist scholars of the Frankfurt school, the theory and process of reification has been an important tool for the analysis of socio-cultural life. With a few exceptions, however, contemporary American social scientists remain largely unaware of its significance.

Finally, by focusing on Machismo as a stereotype and also as a concrete instance of reification, this study should make a clear-cut theoretical contribution toward the relationship between the two terms. The connections between stereotype and reification, it should be noted, have also been ignored in contemporary social scientific work.

CHAPTER 1

Theoretical Background

The Meaning of Machismo

The word Machismo, one adverbial form of the Spanish noun "Macho" (male), is defined by Webster (1972) as strong or assertive masculinity, characterized by virility, courage, and aggressiveness. Latin Americanists are basically in agreement with this definition. Their accounts, however, are more instructive in that they serve to document the qualitative aspects of the phenomenon--which are essentially negative and destructive. Campa (1969), for example, notes that Machismo:

" . . . is an undue emphasis on maleness. . . . It is a means of calling attention to the self, a way of flattering the ego and gaining stature It is not manliness, because it is provocative, and it has the primitiveness of the beast whereby the animalistic tendencies of the male seek to prove to its own satisfaction that he is very Macho. The unfortunate feature of this type of dramatized virility is that, unlike an upsurge of vital energy, it cannot be channeled into useful energy or work. It is an end in itself."

(p. 35).

For anthropologist Oscar Lewis (1961), Machismo also refers to the belief in male superiority which, in the lower-class groups of Mexico, is expressed in terms of physical aggressiveness or being the tough guy who lacks in physical fear. As related by Manuel Sanchez (Lewis, 1961):

"I have learned to hide my fear and to show only courage, because from what I have observed a person is treated according to the impression he makes . . . If a guy shows weakness and has tears in his eye and begs for mercy, that is when the others pile on him. In my neighborhood, you are either a picudo, a tough guy, or a pendejo, a fool. Mexicans, and I think everyone in the world, admire the person 'with balls,' as we say . . . The one who has guts to stand up against an older guy is more respected. If someone shouts, you've got to shout louder. If any so-and-so comes to me and says, 'Fuck your mother,' I answer, 'Fuck your mother a thousand times.' In a fight, I would never give up or say, 'Enough,' even if the other was killing me. I would try to go to my death smiling. That is what we mean by being 'Macho,' by being manly" (p. 48).

This concept of Machismo, in its sense of aggressive, destructive, or pseudo masculinity, has been described by many others (Romero, 1970; Reyes, 1970; Stevens, 1973). Additionally, it has also been employed to explain diverse social psychological aspects of Hispanic life. As Montiel (1973a) has asserted, for many American social scientists the concept of Machismo has become a central explanatory concept.

A few cases in point: Gilbert (1959), in a study of sex differences in mental health in a Mexican village, suggested that among the male villagers Machismo was:

" . . . a pronounced tendency to either severely constricted affect or to morbid, depressed, hypochondriacal types of responses . . . may be indicative of increasing impotence and 'castration anxiety,' as the males fail in the life-long struggle to live up to the demands of Machismo . . ." (p. 212).

Similarly, the sociologist Heller (1966) attributed an apparent lack of independence and achievement among Mexican-American youths to their induction into the ways of Machismo:

" . . . a kind of socialization . . . not conducive to the development of the capacities needed for advancement . . . " (p. 34).

More recently, in an article in the Arizona Republic (1978), a political scientist related Machismo to population pressures in Latin America. He is quoted as saying:

"Machismo, the cult of male virility, is the tradition of centuries in Mexico . . . to be a Macho means to beget child after child, one after another, to keep both your wife and girlfriend constantly pregnant" (p. A28).

Although the concept of Machismo has been often invoked to explain affective and motivational, as well as major social states, it has seldom been studied. In fact, the dominant conceptualizations are still those formulated by the Mexican social observers, Ramos (1934), Paz (1961), and Aranomí (1961).

One of the earliest discussions of Machismo came from Ramos (1934). Utilizing an Adlerian framework, he suggested that the Mexican, symbolized by the pelado (a "plucked chicken:" a nobody, the downtrodden), is troubled by an overwhelming sense of inferiority. Psychologically, this sentiment is rooted in the child's realization of his own insignificant strength vis-a-vis that of his parents. Socio-historically, the sense of inferiority

originates in the Spanish Conquest, where the Spaniards persistently dominated first the Indians and later the Mexicans. In this context, Machismo, the boastful exaggeration of virility, is interpreted as an attempt to conceal the feeling of inferiority. Machismo, then, is a psychological defense mechanism.

Paz's formulations are akin to those of Ramos. However, he pays greater attention to the implications of the phenomenon for individual development. For Paz, Machismo involves a defensive philosophy of life. The Macho sees himself as being surrounded by hostility which he must meet with a posture of psychological hermeticism. The Macho is always alert so as to avoid being chingado (translated as "teased," "prickled," "humiliated," "wounded;" being the victim of any act of aggression). When impinged upon, the Macho becomes aggressive and, once committed to this course of action, he must never back down. This style, Paz claims, leaves the Macho unable to establish satisfying supportive relationships with others, and it places him in a "labyrinth of solitude."

Another observer of Machismo is the Mexican psychoanalyst, Aranomi.

Guided by a Frommian framework, Aranomi (1961) also focused on the experience

of the Spanish Conquest. He suggested that this experience, with its imposition of patriarchal domination over women, has had the effect of profoundly dislocating the Latino male-female relationship. To be a Macho is an attempt to impose the values of male dominance. But this insistence is problematic, since Latin males are extremely dependent in their relationship to women as well as submissive toward their mothers. Thus, to be a Macho also constitutes an attempt to deny this vulnerability vis-a-vis women; it is a heroic, although negative, way of coming to terms with one's own fears and inadequacies. Additionally:

" . . . the Machismo response is . . . not to surrender to depression and apathy, but to go to the opposite extreme: to transcend the universally unbearable fear of aloneness and weakness through acting bigger, stronger, more gloriously . . . " (p. 100).

In sum, the concept of Machismo was originally employed as a conceptual tool to elucidate complex aspects of Hispanic life. However, as noted earlier, the meaning of the term has apparently evolved in such a way that its usage is simply to designate an extreme form of defensive masculinity. Moreover, while the concept continues to be widely used in a variety of contexts, little

or no attention has been directed to either theoretical or empirical investigation of its meaning. In effect, present formulations of Machismo differ little from those first articulated in 1934. Contemporary views are perhaps more limited in their analytic scope.

The Mexican-American Critique

A clear reaction among Chicano social scientists (Montiel, 1973; Padilla and Ruiz, 1973) is that the concept of Machismo has not only been used too often, but also employed uncritically or stereotypically. While the existence of Machismo is not questioned, they argue that its behavioral referents are vague, unclear, and in desperate need of empirical validation. Thus, to rely on the concept as an explanatory tool amounts to scientific irresponsibility and may serve no purpose other than maintaining stereotypical accounts of Hispanic life. Further, phenomena such as family patterns or sex differences are decidedly too complex to be analyzed in the light of a single explanatory concept.

Chicano critics have also objected to the preferred dominant conceptualizations noting that they stress psychopathology and depict Mexican-American males as sick (Montiel, 1973). Such formulations are insensitive to the more positive aspects of the phenomenon. Ruiz (1978), for example, states:

" . . . certainly, Chicano men are Macho, but this term does not denote compulsive promiscuity, explosive violence, or chronic drunkenness. When I think of the Machismo of my father and uncles,

the emotional responses elicited are in terms of a strong sense of personal honor, family loyalty, love for children, and respect for the aged" (p. 243).

In a similar vein, Rendon (1971) believes that, in its modern meaning, Machismo goes beyond its sex-role connotation and that it may constitute political behavior. Baca-Zin (1974) agrees with this possibility, adding that Machismo, for Chicano males, may actually be:

" . . . an affirmation of Mexican cultural heritage identity and an expression of the conscious rejection of the dominant society's definition of Mexicans as passive, lazy, and indifferent" (p. 23).

In accord with these criticisms, Mexican-Americans have called for research efforts aimed at clarifying the behavioral referents of Machismo. Baca-Zin (1974), for example, has recommended an examination of the ways in which Machismo is perceived by the Chicanos themselves, rather than relying on social science categories for definition. Such investigations, she believes, would undoubtedly yield some indicators of the positive dimensions of the phenomenon. Montiel (1973), on the other hand, has called for studies in which the concept is carefully operationalized. Similarly, Padilla and

Ruiz (1973) suggest work to establish the validity of the construct

" . . . according to the traditional methods of experimental test."

A critique of the Machismo concept cannot end at this point, however, for the one important question arises of whether the negative, stereotypical portrayal of Mexican-Americans is simply to be understood as a matter of faulty methodology or indicative of something more significant. Most Mexican-Americans believe that the distortions and stereotypes associated with Machismo are a function of the misunderstanding of, and lack of interest in, the Chicano socio-historical world by majority social scientists. This state of affairs, in turn, is attributed to the social, cultural, and political subordination of Mexican-Americans in the United States (Alvarez, 1970; Limon, 1973; Roco, 1970; Romano, 1968; and Vaca, 1970a, 1970b). The present discussion, therefore, must include an examination of the socio-historical distortions of Chicano life which are found to bias their portrayal in the social science literature.

Yale sociologist Alvarez (1971) states that, much too often, Chicanos are viewed and believed to behave as other groups of immigrants. This is erroneous, he asserts. Mexican-Americans, as a group, were abruptly and reluctantly created because Mexico suffered a military defeat by the United

States. In the eyes of Mexican-Americans, this meant betrayal by both Mexicans and Americans, coupled with a lack of acceptance by the latter. Psychohistorically, Alvarez believes Mexican-Americans must respond to dynamics differently from those experienced by immigrant groups, and it is a mistake to understand them in the light of acculturation hypotheses, an error not altogether uncommon. Furthermore, a lack of historical perspective among social observers of Chicano life is a serious matter, because data can be interpreted either out of context or in a false context, and analyses run the risk of being misused by both public and private policy makers.

Romano (1968) has made similar charges. He argues that majority social scientists have insisted on viewing Mexican-Americans as unchanging, passive retainers of culture, seldom involved in the making of their own history and social norms. Citing evidence demonstrating the fallacious nature of these notions, Romano speculates that they are rooted in the history of political subordination of Chicanos in the United States and are maintained through social scientific concepts such as "acculturation" or "traditional culture." These concepts, Romano notes, are eminently ahistorical because they are static. The one grants the Chicano the ability to act in the world but only

under the auspices of the host culture. The other depicts him as committed to the ways of his ancestors and, therefore, unwilling or unable to act upon his own life. Both concepts successfully ignore the Mexican-American self-view.

From this standpoint, it appears that the inaccurate and stereotypical portrayal of the Mexican-American should not be treated simply as a methodological problem. Instead, researchers need to become attentive to the socio-historical reality of this group. Thus, Romano (1973) advocates the adoption of an historical perspective and a paradigm by which it could be articulated. The purpose would be to redefine the Mexican-American in the social sciences via the inclusion of his culture, history, and self-image. It is this self-image that should be taken as the unit of analysis, since it contains the experiences of an individual and group in a context that is socio-historical and ever-changing. Some of the guidelines toward the construction of the historical paradigm assert that:

. . . Chicanos do not view themselves as traditionally unchanging social vegetables . . . but rather as creators of systems in their own right . . .

. . . Chicanos view themselves as participants in the historical process, for they are inseparable from history.

. . . Chicanos see in their historical existence a continuous engaging in social issues, the spurious concepts of "resignation" and "fatalism" notwithstanding . . . (p. 39).

Furthermore, Romano believes that adoption of this paradigm could change the Mexican-American self-view, for the literature would then contradict negative stereotypes now assimilated by many Chicanos. The suggested paradigm would also benefit social scientists in the conduct of their work, sensitizing them to a reality they now exclude.

The Mexican-American critique may now be summarized as follows: the concept of Machismo has been used much too often and much too uncritically. This practice has resulted in unfair and simple-minded analyses of complex aspects of Chicano life, and also reflects negatively on the conduct of the social sciences. Furthermore, conceptualizations of Machismo stressing inferiority have yielded pathological accounts of Mexican-American males, thus contributing to the negative image that Chicanos may develop about themselves. These distortions, it was argued, could be corrected by research aimed at evaluating Machismo behavior according to the traditional scientific criteria. Other sources advocated research on the meaning that Machismo has

for Chicanos themselves. It was also noted that distortions could be traced to the historical misunderstanding of Chicanos by majority social scientists who have been insensitive to the long-term effects of social and political oppression. A later section will elaborate upon the Mexican-American critique, showing that it demonstrates the dialectical concept of reification. A more immediate concern is an explanation of the notion of reification itself.

The Meaning of Reification

Chaplin's Dictionary of Psychology defines reification as "treating an abstraction as if it were real." This definition, however, says nothing about how reification occurs. Luckacs' (1971) essay on the reifying function of facts in bourgeois society is more instructive. This work is an elaboration of Marxist analyses of industrial production and exchange of commodities under capitalism. In such systems, the Marxian thesis claims, products appear as objects divorced from the workers who produced them: commodities take on a reified form. For Luckacs, this particular arrangement becomes the prototype not only for production and exchange but also for the structure of consciousness, giving rise to a bourgeois ideology and mode of thinking.

Thus, Luckacs claims that the philosophical argument concerning the separation of subject and object had, as its blueprint, the alienation between producer and product. In the theoretical realm, the (reified) notion of the object as a given, something cut off from the socio-historical process to which it owes its existence, mimics commodities which are also cut off from the social processes of their production. It is by virtue of the process of reification that scientific practice under capitalism involves a "fetishization

of facts." As it relates to human behavior, this becomes a collection of isolated data, facts that take a character of their own. Such facts also then come to resemble commodities in the marketplace.

To restate the above, the dialectical concept of reification can be interpreted to be both a process and an end result, a phenomenon and resulting phenomena (Luckacs, 1970). Further, and in reference to reification as an end result, the concept possesses an objective and a subjective dimension such that from the vantage point of the former, reification refers to a world that is ahistorical, a second nature of pseudothings, while from the subjective point of view, reification refers to the alienation and victimization of individuals who are forced to live with this second nature in the ahistorical world.

Luckacs' theoretical work on reified consciousness has had a profound impact on the critical (dialectical) theorists of the Frankfurt school. For these social critics, the theory of reification has become an important tool for analysis of the ideology underlying modern industrial societies which are seen as reified systems impeding human liberation (Marcuse, 1968; Horkheimer and Adorno, 1972; Horkheimer, 1972; Adorno, 1967, 1968, 1973).

The concept has also been employed by dialectically inclined social psychologists. Israel (1977), for example, finds the notion of reification useful in the understanding of the separation of persons from their social context. It is this process and its institutional counterpart called bureaucracy which account for isolation and alienation of individuals from the very social institutions they have created. For social psychological theory, according to Israel, reification has meant that, to a large extent, theory became the ". . . psychology of the 'social' and not the sociological explanation of subjectively experienced or objectively observed psychological phenomenon" (p. 31). A consequence of this position, Israel adds, is that social phenomena have come to be explained in terms of psychological conditions. Thus, motivation continues to be a central theme in modern social psychology. It is the behavior of individuals that is viewed as problematic and, therefore, in need of explanation. Society, on the other hand, continues to be considered a given and relatively unproblematic. Consequently, there is resistance against theorizing on a macro-social level and an emphasis on research at the micro-social level. This development is in agreement with a basic positivist orientation: the empiricist/reductionist notion of studying phenomena by means of fragmentation, observation, and quantification.

This positivist stand, Israel notes,

". . . in turn presupposes that the phenomena to be studied would be well delimited, that they would occur now and here, that they could be studied by isolating them. The desire by the researcher to manipulate, if possible, causal, i.e., independent variables, in order to have full control over the situation and to be able to carry out a causal analysis becomes a consequence of this approach. These values, ideals, and requirements, based upon a "value free," atomistic as opposed to wholistic, approach favored psychological reductionism as well, contributing to the reifying tendencies already strong in the social system; this type of social psychological research transformed man into objects, manipulated and observed him as an object, but failed to understand that he is a subject as well as an object (p. 31-32)."

Positivistic social science, therefore, involves neglect of the contexts wherein theorizing takes place. In this connection, Israel (1977) cites such theories as levels of aspiration, social comparison, and cognitive dissonance. The facts that concern these theories are never critically examined. Instead, the theories are taken as universal principles of individuals' survival.

According to Israel, the most immediate neglected context for these theories is academia itself, for these theories do not state anything about man in general but only in the optimal case, something about middle-class American men involved in the intensively competitive academic system. Thus, where assumptions are made about human nature, they are based upon the values of possessive individualism.

Comparable to Israel's thesis is that of Gadlin (1978). Focusing on the American family, he notes that much work in this area begins with an account of the way social forces impinge upon the family and its members but soon succumbs to psychopathological explanation of the phenomenon. He calls this form of analysis "psychologistic misunderstanding," because it involves removal of the phenomenon from its social context and an exaggeration of its psychological nature. The effort is not free of consequences for the individuals observed, for in:

. . . looking for the effects of societal circumstances in the dispositions of persons, there is a tendency for the presumed victims of oppressive conditions to come to be blamed for the very characteristics that are allegedly the stigmata of their

oppression. Consequently, the problem comes to be redefined in terms of the need to change the characteristic of those who are victimized (p. 314).

And, such psychologizing may also lead to naive prescriptions for social change, as when psychotherapy is singled out as the primary means to that end.

An equally cogent illustration of reification is Kvale's (1977) analysis of memory research. Briefly stated, Kvale's charge is that remembering, as a relationship between a human subject and the world, has been dichotomized into an inner memory apparatus and its external behavioral manifestations. Thus, the temporal and social aspects of remembering as a dialectical interaction with the world, when recognized at all, have generally been relegated to either a naive, artistic, or philosophically speculative sphere. Moreover, the dominant paradigms of memory research have been modeled on the division of labor, i.e., assembly lines or bureaucratic characteristics of industry.

Reification and Stereotypes

Reification, it was noted, is the process of detaching a phenomenon from its context, turning it into an abstraction, and then coming to treat this abstraction as if it were real. Reification, then, is a process and an end result. An excellent example of this is the development and application of intelligence measures. Widely used IQ scores are reifications long ago detached from the context whence they originated and from the intention of the researchers who constructed them.

Stereotypes, however, do not relate directly so much to the processes underlying the construction of an historical world. Instead, they refer to the kinds of descriptions or generalizations that individuals come to have in such worlds about an object, animal, individual, or group which, according to Chaplin's Dictionary of Psychology (1968), are both rigid and biased. IQ scores, then, are reifications but not stereotypes. They set the stage, however, for stereotypical (i.e., rigid, biased) perceptions. An individual, therefore, may come to be judged and responded to (whether favorably or unfavorably) largely on the basis of the reified attribute, his I.Q. A stereotype, then, invariably reflects one type of reification and can be

seen as an instance of it, but a reification is not always a stereotype.

To summarize, reification is a phenomenon and resulting phenomena.

It can be understood as a form of consciousness, a mode of thinking, or a process whereby products, facts, or data are separated and treated as objects in isolation from the context where they occur. These products or data, it was noted, come to be understood as having a life of their own (i.e., become reified) and are viewed as possessing exchange value just as if they were commodities in the marketplace. It was shown that the notion of reification has been adopted by critical theorists of society and some social psychologists, and that it has proven useful in identifying the source of one-sided, usually personalistic or pathological accounts of complex human interactions. Finally, one difference between stereotypes and reification was noted, namely as one where the former is an instance of the latter which sets its stage. The section that follows concerns the relationship between the theory of reification and the Mexican-American critique of Machismo.

CHAPTER 2

The Thesis: Machismo and Reification

Taken as a whole, the Mexican-American position addresses the question of its misrepresentation in mainstream social science. This presumably occurs as a result of uncritically accepted generalizations or stereotypes reflecting the lack of historical perspective that majority social scientists have toward Chicanos. This, in turn, is a function of the socio-political subordination of the latter group by the former.

This critique cannot be dismissed as an anti-scientific effort by Mexican-Americans to mix science and politics. On the contrary, convergent interpretations already presented and others to be noted below indicate that the critique is valid, for science and social structure are intimately intertwined. In fact, Comte, the founder of positivist philosophy, formulated a sociocratic blueprint which was based precisely on this connection (Samelson, 1974). He explicitly advocated positivism as a mode of thought for a hierarchical society ruled by industrialists and bankers, with a positivist scientist priesthood in charge of ideology and seeing to it that workers be kept in their place. Samelson notes:

. . . we discover another Comte, for whom positivism was not just a methodology, who did not take the stance of a value-free, politically-neutral, pure and objective scientist, pursuing knowledge for its own sake or for the use of others as they saw fit (p. 225).

Furthermore, the Mexican-American position cannot be dismissed by treating it as an isolated event. On the contrary, other ethnic minorities have engaged in similar critiques. Moreover, within social psychology itself, dialectical psychologists have developed general critiques that closely resemble those of the Mexican-American scholars. Let us briefly examine the dialectical perspective.

Central to the dialectical view are the connected notions of historicity and change. Thus, Riegel (1975) asserts that dialectical psychology focuses on the changing individual in a changing socio-historical world. More specifically, there is a dynamic interdependence between changes in individuals and changes in their socio-historical environment. Individuals actively create their world as much as they are created by it. The same principle is also seen to govern the relationship between scientists/researchers and their society. Science creates and is created by the social structure. In this

context, Rappoport (1975) notes that the praxis of research is a form of changing reality, while Gergen (1973) similarly states that the dissemination of psychological knowledge modifies the pattern upon which that knowledge is based. Further, Gergen (1973) asserts that:

In essence, the study of social psychology is primarily an historical undertaking . . . Theories of social behavior are primarily reflections of contemporary history . . . We are essentially engaged in a systematic account of contemporary affairs . . . In this light, it is a mistake to consider the processes in social psychology as basic in the natural science sense. Rather, they may largely be considered the psychological counterpart of cultural norms (p. 309, 316, 318).

For the practice of social psychology, therefore, historical awareness signifies epistemological awareness. Historical understanding is required in order to clarify the sources, limits, and limitations of our preferred ways of theorizing and conducting research.

The similarities between the Mexican-American perspective and the dialectical view are substantial and noteworthy. Both approaches call for a dynamic, historically-conscious analysis of human behavior. Man is not

static. He is in a constant, ever-changing relationship with his socio-historical world. It is this dynamic that changes the world and, in turn, acts upon the individual to further change him. Both perspectives also articulate the connection between science and society, and agree on the consequences that the praxis of psychology has for science and the world it describes.

However, there is one important difference between the two views. The dialectical critique, unlike the Mexican-American, is sensitive to epistemology, especially the prevailing positivistic type, as a source of constraint upon the study of human behavior. It is in this light, it will be recalled, that the theory of reification has become an important tool to identify the consequences of the positivistic research in psychology, i.e., the isolation of facts from their socio-historical context.

An important theoretical contention of this study is that the Mexican-American perspective would benefit by employing the concept of reification to show that its critique concerns the foundations of current methodology. Given the intent to introduce into the social sciences the Mexican-American self-view and history, analyses in terms of reification could help reveal

methodologies and ways of knowing blocking the path toward these goals.

This should not be very difficult because the Chicano critique, in denouncing Machismo as a stereotype that victimizes Latinos, also offers a clear illustration of how the concept has come to be reified.

But it is a conscious and deliberate employment of the concept that is needed, for the Chicano perspective, in all its cogency, has yet to indict method itself as a serious source of constraint for an historical view. To be fair, Romano (1973) has spoken about the impossibility of an objective social science, but he has not addressed the problems inherent in positivistic methodology, regardless of the ethnic background of the investigator. In fact, there is a statement of faith in Romano's work that the historical view will emerge automatically when the self-view of Chicanos is taken into account by the researcher or when the investigator emanates from the ranks of the investigated. Given the pervasiveness of reifying tendencies, such faith appears naive and has the potential of impeding realization of the historical paradigm.

Other Mexican-American social scientists have demonstrated similar disregard for the reifying effects of positivistic methods. As a case in

point, some of the Mexican-Americans have pointed out that psychoanalytical theories employed for the study of Machismo yield incomplete and negative accounts of Chicano males (Montiel, 1973a; Padilla and Ruiz, 1973). This is quite correct. However, at the same time advocacy is expressed for positivism in the call for "sophisticated methodology" and investigations "according to the traditional criterion of science." Let us note, then, how an epistemological awareness would help.

It will be recalled that, while empirical, substantive studies of Machismo are yet to be conducted, Mexican-American social scientists have already noted the directions this research should take. One such direction suggests work to establish and validate the behavioral referents of the concept in accordance with the traditional procedures of science. Another calls for elucidation of the meaning of Machismo. This latter work would be accomplished by disregarding traditional categories for definition but would simply note what the Mexican-Americans define the phenomenon to be. How do these suggestions appear when viewed from the standpoint of the historical-dialectical perspective?

The first alternative, by virtue of its positivistic orientation, cannot be expected to respect historical concerns. Recall the analyses by Israel (1977), Gadlin (1978) and Kvale (1977) and their conclusion that positivistic science leads to reified, ahistorical accounts of human interaction. But what about the second proposal, studies based on self-reports? Is this approach more congenial with the historical-dialectical perspective? At first sight, this may appear to be the case. However, further analysis, guided by the notion of reification as a function of ideology, would indicate that the meanings produced could also be reified, i.e., expressed in psychological terms, isolated from the context where they occurred. This is entirely possible. It has already been noted that a tendency to reify is not only a function of method, but also a function of the mode of thinking in industrial societies. This form of consciousness impinges on scientist and layman alike. Restated in the language of critical theory, this means that facts and theories, once fetishized, gradually are assimilated into the preferred explanatory systems of the culture. It follows that explanations or meanings of phenomena, to the degree that they are couched in the existing meaning systems, are bound to be reified. Marcuse (1968) has cogently

elaborated on this process, noting that it leads to "false consciousness," a mode of thinking which is blind to the fact that concepts, in addition to synthesizing and reflecting the data of experience, register the intrusion of a given society's values and ideology into the data of experience. It also follows, then, that an uncritical survey of the meaning of Machismo as experienced by Chicanos themselves would not, in itself, guarantee the unfolding of the Mexican-American self-view. The dominant Anglo societal intrusion must also be identified.

In sum, the Mexican-American perspective can benefit from the epistemological focus of the dialectical view. At a general level, the effect would be to insure that an historical perspective does indeed unfold. At a more specific level, namely research on the concept of Machismo, epistemological awareness could help establish the most appropriate, i.e., socio-historically, self-aware avenue for study. How such a study should be conducted will be discussed later.

CHAPTER 3

The Study

General Summary and Statement of Aim

Examination of the concept of Machismo revealed that present understandings of the phenomenon are unclear, incomplete, and reified. Thus, most descriptions of Machismo focus on the notion of hypermasculinity and violence while excluding more positive aspects, such as personal pride and responsibility. Furthermore, Machismo is often viewed as a psychological phenomenon alone, without serious reference to social, cultural, and historical reality. This situation has resulted in psychopathological explanations of Machismo and has yielded a view of "the Macho" as a disturbed individual.

Critics suggest that such false views of Machismo are rooted in the political and historical realities governing the relationship between Chicanos and the Anglo majority, namely the subordination of the former group by the latter. Also relevant is the contribution of an objective social science which tends to devalue subjects' self-views and thus opens the way toward what Ryan (1971) has cogently termed "blaming the victim" conclusions. As an alternative, the more phenomenological Mexican-American approach taking

into account the reality experienced by Chicanos was delineated. General agreement was expressed with this approach, but since it is not concerned with epistemological issues bearing on interpretations of history, it was concluded that the Chicano self-view cannot be automatically fulfilled simply by historical forms of analysis.

This study, therefore, will investigate the concept of Machismo in light of an epistemologically informed, historical framework. Within this context, several dimensions of the phenomenon will be explored. These are:

- (1) Accumulation of knowledge about the behavioral referents and forms taken by Machismo. Given the lack of agreement regarding the behavioral referents of the concept, this is a central goal.
- (2) Social, cultural, temporal, and spatial aspects. That is to say, is Machismo a style exhibited always and everywhere by individuals of a particular ethnic group or social class?
- (3) Objects and consequences of Machismo. Is Machismo directed to men and/or women? Moreover, what are the implications of the style?
- (4) Concrete existence. Are "Machos" real or fictional? This is important, for concepts could be held as ideal types, symbolic forms, or relics of the past, yet seldom or never be translated into action. Related to this is the need to explore the extent to which Machismo can be understood as "display" behavior.

The literature is replete with references to the "Macho's" excessive boasting and bravado. It is fitting, then, to explore whether behaviors such as these which directly imply or threaten violent action really result in such action.

(5) Structural bases. Is Machismo considered a psychological, cultural, or historical phenomenon, or an amalgam of these? It should be noted that the points enumerated above are not exhaustive. Indeed, a central concern of this study is to engage in an exploration of the concept which allows for the emergence of alternative, not-yet-considered themes.

A primary interest of this study is to explore the contemporary meaning of Machismo among Chicanos and non-Hispanic individuals. The intent is to explore whether Machismo is viewed as a strictly Latino phenomenon, or whether an Anglo-American form of Machismo is also thought to exist. Should the latter be the case, this probe could also ascertain the correspondence between the two styles. The meaning of Machismo among Hispanic and non-Hispanic females will also be studied. Thus, it will be possible to consider whether women, the assumed victims of the phenomenon, agree with males as to the meanings of the term and whether women afford a qualitatively different view.

Finally, this study will critically assess interview responses. In light of the notion of reification, the general criteria guiding the analyses follow from critical, dialectical theory. The specifics to be examined here include: (1) Scope and quality of behavioral referents. Is Machismo assigned few or many referents? Are the attributes positive, negative, or both? (2) Scope and quality of respondent explanations. That is, is Machismo explained by appeal to a single or to many explanatory systems? Moreover, to what extent do these explanations resemble positivistic explanatory systems? Is the explanatory metaphor mechanical, hydraulic, assembly line, etc.? (3) Notion of change. Is Machismo a static or dynamic phenomenon? Do referents change across time and situation?

CHAPTER 4

Method and Design

The conduct of this exploratory study depended upon the use of a methodology which allowed the unfolding of the Chicano view, as well as a critical stand toward the data produced. Thus, the methodological preference was for a qualitative approach which relied on open-ended, in-depth interviews. The effort is similar to that of phenomenological investigators (Giorgi, 1976), anthropological field workers (Junker, 1960; Zito, 1975; Schatzman and Straus, 1973), and ethnomethodologists (Mehan and Wood, 1975). As in phenomenological works, this study gives considerable attention to naive meanings and the value of such meanings for the individuals reporting them. In a vein akin to the work of ethnomethodologists and field workers, attention also centers on the structural factors supporting these meanings, i.e., group norms, values, language, world view. Some of the techniques of categorizing data by ethnomethodological workers will also be employed.

Contrary to the theoretical principles of phenomenology, however, naive meanings or the categories they constitute are not viewed as ultimate facts of the existential world and, thus, unamenable to critical analysis. Neither

is the faith expressed, as in ethnomethodology, that the faulty assumptions on which social reality is based need to be taken for granted. Both these stands do not agree with the critical aims of this project. In effect, ethnomethodologists, by not taking a critical posture vis-a-vis faulty assumptions and by accepting them as facts, render their efforts ahistorical at the same time that they mystify false consciousness by accepting it at its face value.

In sum, the procedural and analytical stands of this study were partly guided by the work of phenomenologists, anthropological field workers, and ethnomethodologists, and partly by the critical dialectical principles delineated in previous sections.

Subjects

Nineteen individuals, 9 Hispanics (5 females, 4 males), and 10 non-Hispanics (5 females, 5 males) were interviewed in depth. These interviewees were selected from the Kansas State University community since most of the Mexican-Americans living in this midwestern community are, in one way or another, connected to the University.

The criterion for selecting a potential respondent was the recognition by his peers that he or she was interested, sensitive about, or knowledgeable (either intellectually or through life experiences) about the topic of Machismo, regardless of the direction of the person's views. As a rule, at least three informal peer judgments of interest and competence were taken into account. In only one instance did these informal sociograms lead to a candidate's rejection. In that individual's case, there was consensus on the part of peers that the person had "a definite axe to grind," that he "was too paranoid," and would not, therefore, be at all open to an exploratory interview. Of 20 respondents that were selected, all enthusiastically agreed to participate. When the time came to carry out the interviews, however, one person became ill, requiring hospitalization, and had to decline participation in the study.

Out of the 19 individuals that were interviewed, most were just above 30 years of age. For the Latino group, for example, the average age was 32 years and 6 of the 9 respondents were married and had children. Further, with one exception, all Hispanics were college-educated professionals and

were active in fields such as education, family and child development, and business. On the average, this group had completed 4.2 years of college with 6 of the interviewees having completed graduate work. For the non-Hispanic group, the average age was also 32 years of age. All of them were either educators, counselors, or social scientists. On the average, they had completed 6.6 years of college work. Only 3 (of 10) of these respondents were married and had children.

Given the general nature of the study, no attempt was made to develop a representative large sample. The purpose of this study, it will be recalled, is not to generalize from sample to population as it is done in conventional social research, but to engage in a psychosocial and historical exploration of how individuals in two groups think and feel about Machismo. This investigation, in other words, is a means not of testing hypotheses but of formulating a problem such that, if desired, hypotheses might be constructed for quantitative tests.

Instrument

The major instrument in this study was an interview guide (see Appendix A) consisting of open-ended questions designed to explore different dimensions

or themes relevant to the Machismo phenomenon. Demographic information was also collected.

Interview Procedure

Interviews were relatively free and unstructured so as to facilitate the production of meanings and allow ideas to emerge spontaneously. Thus, a dialogue between interviewer and respondents was carried out. These exchanges were guided by pre-selected themes. The interviewer, however, remained alert to the emergence of themes that had not been anticipated. All interviews were tape recorded and carried out at the interviewee's home whenever possible.

Analysis

The data were analyzed as follows: (1) Tape recordings of interviews were played back to obtain a sense of the whole. During this time, careful notes were taken of the major, salient points stated by each of the interviewees. (2) Recordings were played for a second time and compared against the notes so as to verify their accuracy. (3) At this point, a dossier of interview synopses was constructed (see Appendix B). (4) Case synopses were next scrutinized in a search for patterns. (5) This work led to the

construction of two major characterizations of the phenomenon which were later scrutinized in terms of the themes which guided the interview. As indicated in the interview guide (see Appendix A), these were: a) meaning of Machismo (Is it positive or negative? Tell signs.); b) sources for these meanings; c) social or cultural aspects (Is Machismo the same for all groups?); d) temporal aspects (Does Machismo change through the life cycle?); e) objects and consequences of the phenomenon (Women? Other objects?); f) structural considerations (Is Machismo considered a psychological, cultural, or historical phenomenon?); g) as a next step, several analyses were carried out so as to delineate, in general terms, the nature of the interview process itself; namely, how and in what sequence themes came to be developed, the quality of interviewee participation, and the dialogical nature of the interview; h) next, all these data were submitted to reflective phenomenological analyses. The intent was to search for additional information of relevance to the major characterizations which did not emanate directly from the responses of interviewees; and i) finally, the entire set of results was evaluated in terms of what it might reveal about the process of reification. The general criterion for such judgment has already been described.

CHAPTER 5

Results

Following the phenomenological method described in an earlier section, the results of this study were analyzed in a series of qualitative units or steps proceeding from the general to the specific. This strategy yielded:

- 1) a general synopsis of the interview process wherein issues such as thematic development, dialogical quality of the interview, and impressions of respondents were considered; 2) a general synopsis of interview content. This unit identified, in general terms, two major characterizations of Machismo; 3) a comprehensive exposition of Machismo views. This level of analysis examined in greater detail the characterizations previously outlined and categorized the data for each major view in light of the themes which guided the interviews; 4) a phenomenological analysis. This unit provided additional dimensions of meaning on which Hispanic and non-Hispanic interviewees differed.

General Synopsis of Interview Process

Thematic development. Interview sessions, which lasted between 1 and 1½ hours, began with a reiteration of the intent of the study and a briefing on the interview format. Thus, respondents were informed that the primary aim was to inquire into the possible meanings and components of the concept of

Machismo. The term, it was explained, is often used in the social science literature, although there is some disagreement as to what the phenomenon is about. Everyone was reminded that the interview would be open-ended, and that the only guiding structure was a set of predetermined themes considered of importance to exploration of the topic. Finally, interviewees were invited to elaborate as much as they could, for it was their understanding of the term that was of interest to the interviewer.

Some of the individuals readily responded to the invitation to explore the concept. Others, however, demanded more structuring in the way of a "kick-off" question. In such cases, the respondent was asked to attempt a descriptive definition of the term. Typically, the interviewer would present the topic along the following lines: "Something that we have already established is that you are familiar with the term Machismo. Perhaps you could start by offering a general description of this concept. Tell me what you believe this term means; where and how did you acquire those meanings; how did you become familiar with the term; what does it entail to be a Macho? Tell me as much as you can. You can start wherever you want. I will ask you questions as we go along."

As might be expected, definitions varied in quality and scope. But in general terms, almost everyone viewed the phenomenon as a complex of thoughts and actions guiding the expression of masculinity. From this point on, interviewees would usually proceed to offer a portrayal of the "Macho," an effort often grounded in the figures of relatives, friends, or movie stars, and would continue to discuss the implications of Machismo for the conduct of personal and social life. Of import here were issues such as philosophy of life, social survival, emotional isolation of men, and mistreatment of women. In general, the thematic sequence just described unfolded as a unit; it appeared to have its own internal logic. Little or no probing was necessary.

The next thematic unit related to the exploration of possible structures supporting or accounting for the phenomenon of Machismo. This topic was introduced approximately as follows: "You have been talking about Machismo in general and specific terms; you have spoken about the Macho; you have made references to the implications of the phenomenon. Now what, in your view, makes all this possible? How is it possible to have a Macho, or Machismo, at all?" Elaborations on this theme were, again, quite varied. Some respondents invoked cultural reasons, while others focused on societal or historical factors.

Some respondents, in turn, had preferences for a psychological level of analysis and consequently focused on the Macho himself. In this context, it is worth noting that some interviewees had no explanations for the phenomenon at all or considered it necessary to engage in this kind of analysis. This was particularly the case with a few of the Hispanic respondents. For them, Machismo was something to behold, a fact of life of no more or less consequence than the color of one's hair and, therefore, not in need of analysis. Moreover, the same Hispanic respondents expressed the belief that attempts to capture the why and how of Machismo would have no other result than to lead to the creation of a stereotype.

Other pre-selected units of inquiry, such as those concerned with the concrete existence of the Macho or the temporal and spatial aspects of the phenomenon, did not need to be directly introduced. Such information often arose from the context in which it was produced in the development of the other major topics already described.

General Impressions of Respondents - Having given an account of the development of the topics of inquiry, it is now appropriate to focus on the interviewees, namely, the qualitative aspects of their participation. All 19

respondents were volunteers. All welcomed the opportunity to participate in the study and had very definite notions about Machismo. In general, respondents elaborated on most topics and did so with great enthusiasm. Further, almost everyone made sure that they would not be interrupted while being interviewed.

The interviews, however, appear to represent a different kind of challenge for each of the two groups of interviewees. For non-Hispanics, for example, the interview sessions appeared to offer a nice opportunity to demonstrate one's knowledge on the subject and to be conceptually ingenious with one's responses. For Hispanics, on the other hand, while they also enjoyed being interviewed, the sessions came to be a good vehicle to reconsider and reflect upon personal experiences while growing up, and to talk about one's father or other males in the family or the community.

Cases of uncooperative or resistive behavior on the part of the interviewees were rare. Only one such case actually occurred. This was a Hispanic male who was not convinced that this research project on Machismo did not intend to measure his commitment to an a priori, defined, and stereotypical account of the phenomenon.

Dialogue quality of interviews. All sessions were carried out in the form of dialogue. Thus, given a particular line of reasoning formulated by the respondent, the interviewer, when deemed appropriate, would also engage in it and would attempt to test its limits. This was done by challenging some statements in a non-threatening fashion. This strategy proved quite useful in that it stimulated the interviewees to consider as many levels of meanings as they saw possible.

It is worth noting that, contrary to methodology textbook warnings against bias, respondents did not lose sight of their ideas or consider the interviewer's challenges to be sources of bias. A case in point: One interviewee advanced the notion that sex-role segregation is founded on the centuries-long history of oppression of women by men. The interviewer, in turn, presented the complimentary argument that such an oppressive arrangement could also be viewed not as the imposition of men over women but of a particular economic structure over both. After some reflection, the interviewee expressed general agreement with this interpretation, but noted that her own views on the matter were at a different level of analysis which she then proceeded to develop.

In this study, potential biasing of responses might, in effect, have been mitigated by several factors. One such factor is the level of maturity of the interviewees. As will be recalled, with one exception all interviewees were in their thirties, and more also were professionals in their own right. These were not the kind of individual to be easily intimidated or impressed by a researcher. More importantly, they were people quite eager to state their own points of view.

The nature of this project might have also acted as a safeguard. Indeed, since no specific hypotheses were being tested directly via interview responses, one could not bias responses in favor of a specific, preferred outcome.

All interviews were closed with a reflective statement made by the interviewer, wherein the major points articulated by the respondents were summarized. Interviewees were asked to comment on the overall accuracy of the statement. In most cases, the reply was affirmative; in some others, the respondent took the opportunity to make qualifying comments or engage in further elaboration so as to clarify their explanation of the theme. The next unit of analysis concerns the content of the interviews.

General Synopsis of Interview

The interview summaries in the Appendix reveal two major interpretations of the concept of Machismo. The most popular one regarded Machismo as a life view providing the parameters for the conduct of a man's life. The other treated the phenomenon as an instance of exaggerated sex-role.

The first interpretation was elaborated upon primarily by the Hispanic interviewees in reference to Latinos. For this group, Machismo was a culturally and historically prescribed set of values guiding the life-long task of being a man in the world. In general terms, the phenomenon was viewed as calling a man to be honest, courageous, responsible, and stoic in his dealings with life. This applies both to his private and public affairs. In the face of adversity, he must "stand straight and tall" and must not succumb to the pressures that befall him. To do otherwise, respondents believed, is to live without dignity and pride. But, more importantly, it amounts to endangering one's chances for social survival and those of the group.

This definition was often qualified. Respondents observed that Machismo outlines only the most general parameters for the conduct of life. Thus, in all probability there are as many interpretive meanings of the phenomenon as

there are individuals or situations. This, obviously, also means that the phenomenon cannot be specified with any precision or in terms of the particular behaviors involved. In fact, it was believed that an examination of the values underlying the phenomenon may not lead to a precise appraisal either. Values, one respondent observed, relate not only to one but to several of the systems regulating the conduct of life. Honesty, responsibility, and stoicism, for example, are central elements of Machismo, but they also are key values in the family and religious systems. It is impossible, then, to identify from all these possible systems that integrate man to his social world the particular one which the individual is responding to. In general, however, it can be stated that Machismo is a prosocial phenomenon aiming at the successful adaptation of man to his environment.

It bears mention that the Latino respondents invariably commented on the awkwardness of the word Machismo. All of them stated that the term was rarely, if ever, employed in the Chicano community. It was more common to speak about "the sense of being a man," or to refer to an individual as being "a true man." Furthermore, these interviewees noted that Anglo-Americans have invariably misunderstood Latin Machismo or the Latin sense of being a man.

Their preference, Latinos charged, has been to focus on the observable behaviors of the so-called Macho while making no reference to his life view. This, it was said, has led to gross misinterpretation of the phenomenon such that bravery is taken to be bravado, pride appears as cocky self-confidence, and stoicism passes for emotional detachment. It was also charged that Anglo-Americans have come to treat their own misinterpretations as the "true meaning" of Machismo and that by the compelling influence of the majority status have presented these negative views for the consumption of Latinos themselves. Chicano interviewees strongly resented this state of affairs, noting that it has had injurious effects on the identity formation of Chicanos, both as individuals and as a group.

The second major interpretation of Machismo, an exaggerated sex role, was articulated by the majority of non-Hispanic respondents in reference to the behavior of Anglo-American males. According to this view, Machismo refers to an exaggerated expression of masculine traits. "Macho men," in their daily life, characteristically rely on conquest, force, power, and competition as the preferred ways of achieving their goals. This style usually involves the overt or covert subjugation of others and, as it relates

to women, results in their physical and/or emotional abuse and in their treatment as sexual objects.

In the context of this second interpretation, it is worth noting, as was the case with the respondents adhering to the life-view notion, that the term Machismo was the object of qualifying comments. While everyone claimed to know its meaning, several of the respondents believed they had a clearer conceptual grasp of the notion of "Macho man." With this latter term, the focus of their discussion was not so much on the general concept of masculinity in a given culture as it was with the actions of men themselves.

"Macho man" was drawn as a relatively young individual, often attractive, athletic, seductive, and with an air of self-confidence. This description was ascribed validity, however, only at the level of appearances. For behind this mask hides an egotistical and insecure man who indeed seduces, but only in order to exploit; a man, in short, with a strong interest in self-aggrandizement. Also of interest to interviewees were the consequences of "Macho man's" actions. These were considered to involve the subjugation of women, and the emotional isolation of men from women and from themselves.

A Comprehensive Exposition of Machismo Views

This next level of analysis examines in greater detail the interpretation of Machismo just outlined. This is accomplished by grouping the material relevant to each of the group characterizations (which are contained in the unstructured form in the interview summaries) into its most salient constituents.

The Hispanic-American Interpretation: Machismo as Life-View

The meaning of the phenomenon. According to this view, Machismo calls for a man to be honest, responsible, courageous, and stoic in his dealings with life. In the face of adversity, he must "stand straight and tall" and must not succumb to the pressures that befall him. To do otherwise is to live without dignity and pride.

A few of the respondents believed that the imperatives of Machismo were also directed at women. Chicanas, it was argued, have come to take an instrumental role in the struggle for ethnic survival and sexual liberation. They, just as anyone else, currently benefit from a concept with the power to guide actions in the face of adverse events.

Temporal and spatial aspects. As one interviewee noted, Machismo is not a developmental phase or a fad that young men need to go through and later

abandon. On the contrary, the phenomenon amounts to a life-long task governing the private and public affairs of men. In short, the demands of life to which Machismo relates persist throughout the life span.

Structural considerations. Structurally, Machismo can be described as a system of values prescribing the most general parameters for the conduct of a man's life. In this sense, it is virtually impossible to specify the concept at the level of particular behaviors or physical appearances. Indeed, as one respondent observed, for some individuals the expression of courage may consist in eating hot chili, while for others it refers to the ability to withstand pain or the refusal to be submerged by adverse events. Moreover, the appraisal of the Macho or Machismo may prove elusive, even when the values of the individual are taken into account because these values can show themselves across the conduct of everyday life. Thus, calls to be responsible, honest, and stoic may emanate from Machismo but also from family or religion. For indeed, all these systems find these attributes to be valuable elements in the effort to relate man to his environment. In this light, the views of yet another interviewee can be easily understood. For this individual, Machismo was, in fact, a sacred phenomenon.

The functions of the phenomenon. These were seen as relating to the social survival of the individual and, consequently, of the group. An often-expressed belief was that Machismo, by emphasizing courage, strength, and stoicism, helps ensure such survival. This is important advice, for the struggle for survival is as serious today as it was in the past. While yesterday it was the physical environment that was hostile, today some of the Chicano respondents believed, the threats emanate from an oppressive social milieu. In this latter arena, Machismo is an effective vehicle for the assertion of Chicanos' ethnic uniqueness. In a more explicit elaboration of this point of view, one respondent expressed the belief that the concept of Machismo has become a rallying point in the struggle for ethnic survival. It has provided, it was argued, the blueprint for the concept of La Raza, a term not intended to mean race, which is its literal meaning, but the Chicano historical experience. Thus, the notion of La Raza today stresses, rather than individual goals, the need to demonstrate pride, courage, and responsibility in the face of ethnic and social oppression.

Quality and consequences of Machismo. The phenomenon was regarded mostly in positive terms: it is a prosocial effort aimed at the successful adaptation

of man to his environment. But, there are also some adverse effects. These result from some of the interpretations that individuals make of the phenomenon. For example, if a person's sense of responsibility, say, to his family, is too extreme, it could lead to male authoritarianism and domination of women and children, all in spite of its benevolent intent. Similarly, when stoicism stops being a way of meeting adversity and instead becomes a chronic stand, regardless of the situation, then it can result in a man's emotional detachment from himself and from those closest to him.

A woman respondent amply elaborated on this point about emotional aloofness and related it to the entrenchment of men in solitude. According to this interviewee, many men, when attempting to meet their responsibility as providers or heads of the household, avoid revealing their doubts and fears about the task and refuse to enlist the help or advice of others, namely their wives. For the woman involved, this is often a demonstration of lack of trust and respect, and engenders profound resentment on her part. Moreover, in retaliation, she may close herself to the husband and seek solace and support among her children. They, in turn, in an act of empathy and allegiance toward the mother, also move to distance themselves from the

father. The effect of this chain of events is obvious. It spells greater isolation for the man and eventually leads to his imprisonment in a world of solitude.

It is of interest that none of the respondents saw the subjugation or abuse of women as one of the consequences of the phenomenon. In fact, women interviewees stated rather emphatically that they did not see their mothers or themselves as being subjugated or oppressed.

Sources of meaning. Almost always, respondents derived their meanings for the concept from their personal life experiences. All Hispanic interviewees, for example, cited their fathers or brothers as prototypes of the phenomenon. Media influences, such as Mexican novels and films, or social science literature related to Chicano life, were also cited, although considerably less often.

An additional point of interest is that all interviewees agreed that terms like Macho or Machismo were seldom used in the context of their families or community. Instead, people would refer to someone as being "puro hombre" (a true man) or would speak about someone's "hombria," the literal meaning of which is "manliness," but which is also used to mean "a sense of being a

man." Adoption of the words Macho and Machismo were considered to be relatively recent events, perhaps resulting from the American women's movement.

Machismo: meaning II. In addition to the exploration of Machismo as life view, the interviewees spontaneously acknowledged awareness of another interpretation. According to this second meaning, which was assumed to be held by most Anglo-Americans in reference to Latinos, Machismo is an aggressive, boisterous, often violent expression of masculinity involving the dominance of women and their treatment as sexual objects. Machos, in turn, are loud, cocky individuals who are fond of boasting their deeds (particularly sexual ones).

According to the same Hispanic respondents, such a picture is completely erroneous and, in fact, is the virtual opposite of what Latinos consider the phenomenon to be. This is not to say, one interviewee noted, that no Chicano has ever engaged in bragging, fighting, drinking, or the abuse of women. Obviously these actions are possible for men within any group, anywhere. The point to be emphasized, however, is that such actions are not sanctioned by Machismo. In fact, the interviewee added, any man acting in such fashion "I'd call a 'pendejo'" (meaning a fool, idiot, or jackass at the very least).

It was further expressed, and with great resentment, that erroneous views of Machismo are the result of a general lack of understanding of Latino life by Anglo-Americans. Anglos, one interviewee commented, as a group are "culturally lazy." They seldom make the attempt to understand a different group from the perspective of its members or with reference to their construct of reality. What seems to occur is a casual observation of Latinos by Anglo-Americans and then an interpretation of these observations in the context of Anglo meaning systems. Another interviewee expressed similar beliefs and added that the only understanding that Anglo-Americans are able to obtain, via these analyses, is a glimpse of their own projections.

The misunderstanding of Latino life or, as it is in this case of Machismo, was considered to have serious consequences for Chicanos. One effect is that these erroneous interpretations lead to derogatory descriptions of both Latino males and females. Men are depicted as authoritarian, violent, irresponsible, and invested in the ways of oppression, while women are believed to be submissive and even regarded as enjoying their submission.

Another serious effect involved identity formation among Chicanos. Anglo-Americans, this view held, treat their misinterpretations as the "true

meaning" of Machismo and then, by the compelling power of their majority status, offer these negative views for the consumption of Chicanos themselves whom, if ambivalent on their degree of commitment to the cultural ways of their ancestors, may come to accept these definitions. By this process, the identity formation of Chicanos as individuals and as a group can be seriously affected.

The Anglo-American Interpretation: The Exaggerated Sex-Role

As noted in earlier synopsis, this view was held by most non-Hispanic respondents in reference to Anglo-American males.

The meaning of the phenomenon. Machismo was regarded as an exaggerated form of traditional masculine sex-role and found to be best exemplified by the actions of "Macho man" or those of the "tough guy."

In his attempt to stay on top or dominate, "Macho man" is constantly engaged in the exercise of force. This can take many forms depending on his social class membership. Thus, lower-class individuals may employ physical force, while their middle-class counterparts rely on intellectual ability. Indeed, reflecting on the oppression of women by "Macho males," one interviewee noted that while a blue-collar individual might command or physically

threaten a woman into submission, a middle-or upper-class individual might achieve similar ends through clever manipulation and seduction into double binds.

The existence of Macho women was also posited but only by a minority of the respondents. It was believed that women who uncritically accept or identify with the negative aspects of masculinity are likely candidates for this role. And, given the greater possibility of sex-role crossing in today's society, the likelihood of a "Macho woman" can hardly be said to be remote.

Sources of meaning. Respondents view their knowledge of Machismo as based on observations of the behavior of Anglo-American males, exposure to media such as television and films (John Wayne being the most often invoked name), social science literature (but only for a minority of the respondents), and statements they associated with the women's movement. Indeed, with regards to this latter source, the majority of the interviewees believed that their concrete, conscious awareness of terms like Macho, Machismo, or "Macho man" was brought about by these feminist arguments. Elaborating on this connection, one respondent noted that the adoption of these terms by the movement has resulted in their politicization. Thus, the notion "Macho

man" not only describes a cultural type, but also describes the political enemy of women. This fusion of meanings, the respondent added, has to be taken into account if one is to ascertain the possible meanings of the phenomenon.

Quality and consequences of Machismo. Most interviewees saw the actions of "Macho man" as decidedly anti-social, since these actions have an injurious effect on human relationships. In this context, everyone noted that women are invariably abused. One respondent, for example, stated that "Macho man" is avidly interested in relating to women but only for the sexual favors that he might obtain. He is simply interested in his pleasure while totally disinterested in relational "give and take." This, it was believed, is emotionally disruptive for women who usually enter relationships for the long-lasting bond they might be able to establish. Thus, women may lose their self-respect.

Another consequence of Machismo often mentioned is the sexual objectification of women. One respondent believed that the treatment of women as sexual objects has become so common-place in America that it has come to be accepted and flaunted by women themselves, the very victims of the process.

As a case in point, a recent best-seller, The Total Woman, was cited. In this work, women are encouraged to become sexual objects as a strategy to keep their husbands faithful and thus confined to a Christian, romantic, monogamous relationship. One piece of advice, for example, encourages women to meet their husbands' arrival from work seductively clad in a cellophane wrapper. This kind of objectification was considered extremely damaging to women's identity formation, for it tends to preclude other, more independent lifestyles.

Another casualty of "Macho man" is "Macho man" himself. This view was expressed by all interviewees. His ways, it was argued, actively interfere with the pursuit of constructive relationships with women and with men. This creates a problem of intimacy and leaves this type of individual in a state of emotional isolation, a virtual prisoner of himself. Further, according to one respondent, this condition might, in time, contribute to somatic effects such as ulcers, heart problems, or generalized stress. The ways of "Macho man" can backfire on him in yet another fashion. His quest for sexual favors may lead to the glorification of his own body, since in America physical attractiveness is one of the prized commodities in the sexual

marketplace. The "Macho man" may then, in effect, contribute to his own reduction to a sexual object.

The functions of the phenomenon. For almost all respondents, the functions of Machismo were seen in terms of their consequences; that is, the oppression of women and maintaining the power of men. A minority of respondents, however, by adopting a larger frame of reference, saw American Machismo mediating the requirements of the American way: it acts to legitimize conquest, violence and competition; it keeps individuals locked in the success game. In the light of this view, Machismo, in a paradoxical way, can be said to be prosocial, for it helps ensure concrete realization of the nation's collective ideology.

In a more restricted fashion, another respondent also reflected on the prosocial functions of the phenomenon suggesting that in a hostile environment, such as a "tough neighborhood" or a jail, the ways of "Macho man," no matter how injurious to his fellows, act to guarantee a man's social survival. In fact, failure to act as a "tough guy" in such contexts would amount to social suicide.

Structural considerations. Machismo was regarded as a social role, an exaggerated expression of traditionally masculine traits. Men are inducted into such a role via the traditional socializing agencies, such as family, school, church, and the mass media, particularly television and films.

But, while granted its reality as sex-role phenomenon, Machismo was not seen as an authentic behavior pattern. Indeed, all respondents viewed the actions of "Macho man" as a mask, a facade, a matter of superficial appearances. The "real" man behind the mask was envisioned as emotionally repressed, defensive, and insecure. He was assumed to be a man of many fears but particularly afraid to be close to someone and afraid to love. In this light, everyone agreed that "Macho man" is a sad figure, a man escaping his own reality. Yet, such a man was not considered beyond redemption. For one interviewee, this could be accomplished if the individual came to accept his anima, his feminine side. For another, the transformation of the Macho into a "true man" depended on his reducing the gap between his private and public worlds. Many men, it was claimed, can be and actually are, in the privacy of their homes, sensitive and nurturing individuals.

What is necessary is for these men to assert such qualities outside of the home or in other environments. Still other interviewees believed that the process of change for "Macho man" depended on his willingness to abandon defenses, and to confront and accept his own reality, namely, feelings of fear and vulnerability. One interviewee, finally, cited psychotherapy as a suitable context for the transformation.

Previous analyses focused on results revealing two different, general interpretations of Machismo, one of which, predominant among Hispanics, regards the phenomenon as a life-view. The other, predominant among non-Hispanics, conceives the phenomenon in terms of an exaggerated male sex-role. The material below presents further reflection upon these analyses, and the case synopses also point out additional dimensions upon which these groups differed. Whenever appropriate, sex differences will also be noted.

Phenomenological Analyses

In general, it can be said that while Hispanics elaborated on the notion of Machismo, non-Hispanics focused on the figure of the Macho. That is to say, there was a preference for analytical units that differed in scope. Consequently, Hispanics placed greater emphasis on molar units, such as meaning systems or values, and expressed the belief that Machismo could be understood with reference to these units although probably never in such a way as to yield a precise, categorical definition. Non-Hispanics, in turn, paid greater attention to more molecular units, such as observable behaviors, and went ahead to give a quite specific behavioral portrayal of the so-called "Macho man." In a sense, it was as if, from the outset, the groups were differentially committed to a scope-precision trade-off, where emphasis of one side of the equation meant de-emphasis of the other.

The different conceptualizations of Machismo by the two groups can also be perceived as a manifestation of different cognitive preferences. In general terms, Hispanics elaborated on the phenomenon as if it was an independent variable. Thus, given the situation (adult/man/his environment), Machismo guides or instructs the individual's response (courage or stoicism).

Non-Hispanics, on the other hand, seemingly see the phenomenon as a dependent variable. In this context, Machismo is the response itself (display of force or bravado).

Another salient difference between the two groups relates to what one might term a substance-appearance distinction. For Hispanics, given the relevance of Machismo to the task of social survival and its nature as a life-view, the phenomenon was regarded as decidedly substantial. Non-Hispanics, on the other hand, did not grant Machismo similar status. On the contrary, Macho-type of behaviors were considered a mere mask or a passing phase. For this group, authentic living was something at which the Macho might arrive, provided he abandoned his facade. But then, assuming that the transformation had taken place, this individual would no longer be called a Macho but someone who had transcended sex-role.

A group difference bearing further reflection relates to expressed feeling tones. As was noted earlier, the participation of Hispanics was effectively more charged since their explorations had them recall either fond or painful personal experiences. Emotions nowhere became more evident than when Hispanics reflected upon what they considered to be the

Anglo-American interpretation of Latin Machismo. Almost all expressed a sense of victimization over this state of affairs and were quite vocal in expressing their anger and resentment toward Anglo-Americans. Male respondents, for example, were indignant that most Anglo-Americans view them as emotionally insecure, pathological figures bent on the abuse and exploitation of women. Female respondents, in turn, were quite disturbed by the implications that they were passive individuals, husband-dominated, and lacking influence on decisions or having no decision-making capacities at all. Everyone was emphatic in condemning these derogatory interpretations of Latino life. Almost everyone was aware of and, therefore, quite angry over the effects of these negative views on the image that Hispanics have about themselves.

Hispanics were also quite vocal in their statements of appreciation for being interviewed. Many believed it was high-time for their views to be heard, for only in this way could erroneous interpretations of Machismo and Latino life in general be effectively challenged. Another respondent was appreciative of the fact that exploration of the theme made him more aware of his own heritage, the maintenance of which for a bicultural individual,

was viewed as quite essential although not easily achieved. Another respondent simply stated having enjoyed the dialogue since, to that point, whenever he tried to explain Machismo to others (meaning Anglo-Americans) the conversation turned into debate.

For non-Hispanics, the feeling tones expressed were, in general, more casual. The interview sessions seldom engaged these respondents at the level of direct personal experience. For the most part, the interviews appeared to be an exciting opportunity to elaborate on a topic of great interest, a chance to be verbally articulate and conceptually ingenious. The prevailing feeling tone, therefore, was one of light-headed enthusiasm. This was not always so, however.

There were some exceptions that are worth noting. A few of the female respondents were quite emphatic in their condemnation of the Macho, an individual they consider to be interested in the victimization of women. One respondent, for example, made it very explicit that as a woman in today's America it was difficult for her to leave her anger out of any analysis of the Macho and his ways. Men respondents, it should be noted, were also disturbed about the victimization of women that the practice of Machismo

entails and were additionally upset about the limitations it imposes on the lives of males themselves; namely, in the expression of emotions or in the ability to be nourishing in relationship to others.

If there was one salient similarity between the groups, it was in the relative absence of references to the genesis of the phenomenon. The closest thing to an elaboration on origins was a tentative, in passing, statement offered by one non-Hispanic respondent to the effect that the sexual and power aspects of Machismo may relate to the protestant ethic or to the dynamics of capitalism in industrial societies. Another non-Hispanic interviewee, also in passing, simply reflected that Machismo has always been around because segregated sex-roles which provide the structural base for the phenomenon have also always been around. Finally, one Hispanic respondent speculated, with little interest, that Machismo must date back to "Old Mexico" or to the Iberian peninsula itself.

These passing, tentative statements never developed into substantial discussions. There appears to be an unspoken belief that it is enough to have a structural and functional understanding of the phenomenon and that any exploration beyond those levels would add very little or nothing to the

effort to understand. This seems to be clear evidence of an historical detachment which can also be understood as a sign of reification at the concrete level. This possibility of reification in action becomes more clear, especially for Anglos, when one considers that the concept of Machismo only enters historically when feminists use it as a political stereotype.

An assessment of responses by a consideration of the sex of the respondents, disregarding ethnic membership, also bears some mention. It should suffice to say that the views of males or females never coalesced into a cohesive picture that might require a characterization. The views of individuals only resembled those of others in their own ethnic group.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

The most conspicuous finding of this study is that individuals of different ethnic background hold markedly different, and often contrasting, conceptualizations of Machismo. As it was amply documented in the interview synopses and subsequent analyses, non-Hispanics regarded the phenomenon as an anti-social form of hypermasculinity, while Hispanics viewed it as a pro-social set of rules guiding the social survival of Latino men (and more recently, women as well). Distinct characterizations such as these, it was also found, did not emerge when the data were examined with regard to the sex of the interviewees. A third major finding derived from the phenomenological analyses. Individuals, in addition to addressing the connotative definition of the phenomenon, elaborated extensively on attendant socio-political concerns and goals.

The discussion of these results is taken up in the section that follows (1. General Discussion). The major point that will be made is that the first two findings can be understood with reference to the third. That is, the contrasting conceptualizations held by the two groups, and the absence of characterizations with regard to the sex of the interviewees, can be seen

as being influenced by the particular socio-political concerns and goals which individuals in each ethnic group have. In order to show this connection, issues relevant to the socio-political positions of Hispanics and non-Hispanics, and the absence of sex differences will initially be discussed separately.

In addition to a general discussion, the findings will also be scrutinized in light of the critical stand guiding this study (2. Critical Discussion: Reification). The main thrust will be to assess interviewee's views on Machismo so as to determine their degree of reification. Finally, a presentation of conclusions and implications will be presented. In this context, directions relevant to the content and practice of future research will be suggested.

1. General Discussion

The Hispanics. As it will be recalled from the protocols, the effort by the majority of Hispanic interviewees to characterize the meaning of Machismo was intimately intertwined with statements of socio-political concerns involving: 1) a denunciation of the many ways the life of the group is believed to be stereotyped (in this case through the employment of the concept of Machismo in its negative, anti-social connotation), and

2) the articulation of corrective statements (i.e., the phenomenon is a positive force) so as to neutralize the victimizing action of the stereotypes. To speak about Machismo, then, also involves addressing these concerns with one's defense.

This "Chicano defense" appears to embody the belief that a problem of unfair stereotyping which is worthy of confrontation exists. Concurrently, the conviction is expressed that if one is to achieve the group's socio-political goals, namely liberation, self-expression, or social power, the problem must be met in a particular way; more specifically, there seems to exist a clear sense of awareness that the victimization of individuals through stereotypes occurs because a stereotype is allowed to go unchallenged and take hold. Consequently the belief seems to go, the confrontation of the victimizer is imperative at the very moment that an individual utters the stereotype. Whether calmly or in anger, the user of the stereotype has to be told of the incorrectness of his judgement and be presented with the historical facts. It is through actions that the oppressor will come to see the innocence, and thus the humanity of the oppressed, and that the group's socio-political liberation will become possible.

This pattern of finding will be discussed later in this chapter. For the time being, however, it should be noted that group attempts to defend by stating one's view of the world, i.e., one's innocence from derogatory charges, are not without historical precedents. As noted by Kren & Rappoport (1974), European Jews during the Third Reich engaged in such defenses and believed, although fallaciously, that stating one's case of innocence would come to change the view of their victimizers. And in modern times, the effort to prove innocence is also witnessed. As in a matter of common knowledge, many ethnic groups, and more recently women, have confronted their defined oppressors in a similar manner and to achieve similar liberating goals.

Non-Hispanics. For this group, the exploration of the meaning of Machismo also documents matters of socio-political intent. These group concerns, which are not in all cases consciously articulated by the interviewees, appear to involve the identification of destructive forms of masculinity among Anglo-American males. An effort that some of the respondents considered crucial to the quest for sex-role equality, and to the attempt to facilitate women's own struggle to liberate. Indeed as it will be recalled, interviewees were almost unanimous in using the term

Machismo in its anti-social sense, for it is useful in the condemnation and rejection of rampant Anglo-American hypermasculinity. This behavioral style, it was believed, must be singled out since it has destructive consequences for the psychological and social life of both females and males.

The absence of substantive sex differences. Another salient result in this study is that when the sex of the respondents, rather than their ethnic background, was considered, unified characterizations of Machismo did not emerge. It was, in fact, as if there was no particular dimension of the phenomenon that could serve as a point of mutual concern for women or that could provide the basis for a common stand that could differentiate them from that of men. The majority of women, for example, did not believe that Machismo entailed their abuse or sexual objectification. Of ten interviewees, only five (four of them Non-Hispanic) held such a belief.

Thus, it appears to be the case that for Hispanics and non-Hispanics, the exploration of the concept of Machismo documents the existence of two interrelated levels of discourse. One relates to the concrete meanings of the concept and another pertains to the socio-political intention (whether consciously acknowledged or not) the group wants to advance. Statements

of meanings, in other words, are not divorced from statements of practical, everyday concerns.

From the perspective of theoreticians of the everyday world (Douglas, 1970a, 1970b), this interdependence of meaning levels relates to the fact that human thought or consciousness is intentional. Intentions order human consciousness; they determine the relevance of information and ideas about the world and ourselves. "Human thought," Douglas asserts (1970a) "is fundamentally oriented toward usefulness, toward doing things that have the effects we intend." Consequently, when individuals are asked to express their views on a concept they live by, they cannot but state what they also hope that concept will achieve.

But what may account for the choice of content and the cohesiveness of the respondents' views? Two mutually related sources of influence may be operating. From one perspective, it is quite possible that interviewees drafted their stands quite deliberately by drawing from the political articulations of the Chicano and women's movements. Several of the respondents, it will be recalled, acknowledged being influenced by consciousness-raising material that has appeared in various media.

But it is also quite possible, since such material is not cited by everyone who was interviewed and since the views expressed by most were characterized by a high degree of spontaneity, that individuals also draw from their own experiences in groups and relatively intuitive personal knowledge. Referring to this "naive" form of psychological understanding, Heider (1950) has noted that it is contained in everyday language and everyday experiences, and that it is through it that "we interpret other people's actions and predict what they will do under certain circumstances" (p. 5).

The relative absence of sex differences in the results can be explained by reference to the preceding discussion. Since individuals articulated issues and concerns of the ethnic groups in which they are members, it could be assumed that ethnic membership and its attendant intentions and goals had a larger role in ordering the consciousness of interviewees. It is from their ethnic experiences that these individuals come to construct the ideas (and underlying "naive" psychology) they express.

In sum, the preceding discussion of findings suggests that, at a general level, human thought and intentions are intimately connected such that the

expression of one implies or involves the expression of the other.

Individuals do not elaborate on or define a concept for the sake of definition, but do so in order to accomplish valued group goals. Moreover, it would also appear that these goals or intentions are ordered by the particular historical positions adopted by the group in which one claims a primary membership. Additionally, and at a more specific level, it would seem to be the case that the concept of Machismo, in its contemporary meaning, is no longer an exclusively sexual concept, as it has commonly been believed to be, but seems instead to be an eminently political term.

One additional point needs to be made, however. The participants in this study were highly educated, socially aware individuals. Thus, what they have revealed about Machismo and issues of social power may or may not have a counterpart in the expression of individuals lacking in these attributes. Similarly, issues of sample composition are also a consideration. Interviewees, it will be recalled, were selected precisely because of their known (as rated by peers) awareness and sensitivity about the phenomenon under investigation.

2. Critical Discussion: Reification

Also central to the purpose of this study is an assessment of expressed views on Machismo in light of the notion of reification. In previous chapters, a broad schema for such assessment was composed, based on the literature on critical theory. In general terms, a concept was considered to show signs of reification: a) if its meaning was narrowed so as to be presented onesidedly, in a manner that excluded opposing or contradictory aspects of the phenomenon; b) if the phenomena outlined by the concept was conceived as relatively static, changing very little across time or place; or c) if there was a disregard for or ignorance of the context where the concept was originally conceived and developed; that is to say, if the concept was treated in ahistorical terms.

With reference to the first guiding point, there is no need for extensive elaboration. It is clear that both groups conceived of Machismo in a onesided manner. Indeed, the phenomenon was either pro-social or anti-social. It was simply a matter of what position was more advantageous (given the socio-political intention and goal) to uphold.

As it relates to the second point, the views of Machismo held by non-Hispanics were that of a quite concrete, easily identifiable behavior pattern

whose presentation is quite constant. Place of presentation or age of the individual do not seriously alter the definition of the phenomenon.

Hispanics, in turn, overtly defined the concept as dynamic or constantly changing, depending on the individual or the situation in which the person found him/herself. Given the connection between meanings and socio-political intentions and goals, however, it is highly probable that Hispanics were not expressing a conviction on the ultimate dynamism of social phenomenon but aimed instead at impeding the creation of a new stereotype.

Disregard for the original context of the term can be observed in the characterizations of both groups. Hispanics, for example, while aware that the concept of Machismo was of Hispanic origin, had no sense of how or in response to what phenomena or events such a concept had come to develop. If nothing else, there was a complacent belief that it is enough to have a structural and a functional understanding of everyday life, and that any exploration beyond these levels contributes little to the effort. Among non-Hispanics, the historically detached conception of the phenomenon took the form of relative unawareness that the notion of Machismo had its development in Latino culture. In fact, for most of these respondents, their

awareness of the term was as recent as the advent of the women's movement and, in fact, they believed that the concept of Machismo had emerged from that context.

On the basis of the guiding points outlined, it would appear that the notions of Machismo, as held by the two groups, show signs of reification and that the tendency to reify is a consequence of the individual's efforts to "make sense" of the world and to advance group goals. Keeping in mind preceding discussion, the following seems to be involved. Individuals share in the values, goals, and intentions of their primary groups. These goals, in turn, which are historically bound, dictate the content and scope of the meanings attributed to a psychosocial concept at a given point in place and time; that is to say, whether a concept is viewed onesidedly or as historically detached. Consequently, it is these intentions which can be assigned partial responsibility for contributing toward the reification of a psychosocial concept. Individuals narrow or omit meanings because it serves the purposes they have in mind.

Contained in these dynamics is an illustrative paradox. The reification or ahistorical treatment of a concept is a historically defined event. Psychosocial concepts, in other words, can be conceived as historically defined reifications. An excellent illustration of this is found in

Samelson's (1978) documentation of thematic reversals in the study of "race psychology." This effort, which in the 1920's kept psychologists busy with the assessment of mental differences between races, had, by 1940, dramatically reversed. Researchers began instead to search for the sources of "irrational prejudices" focusing consequently on attitude research. There was a switch in focus, Samelson (1978) noted humorously, from the figures of "Amos 'n Andy to (that of) Archie Bunker." According to Samelson, while

. . . this shift can be seen as a victory of objective-empirical research, there were other contributing factors: passage of the Immigration Restriction Law, which shifted the political problem from justification of differential exclusion to conflict resolution in this country; the influx of ethnics into the originally rather lily-white profession of psychology; the Great Depression and the leftward shift among psychologists; and finally, the need to unite the country against a dangerous enemy proclaiming racial superiority (p. 265).

If meanings and intentions invariably go together, and if the carrying out of intentions calls for reification of such meanings, then it would appear that the tendency to reify is inevitable. This indeed seems to be what this study suggests. And not only as it relates to social scientists in the context of their work but also to lay individuals in the everyday world. However, since the state of meanings is influenced by the history of the group that constructs them, one can also expect reification to change as time goes by. It would be quite conceivable then, for example, that as the aims of the women's movement, which appears to have popularized the term Machismo, are achieved, the on-going reification of the concept might decline. And the resulting stereotype might go away as other stereotypes have, to be replaced by others, just as Archie Bunker has replaced Amos 'n Andy.

The inevitability of the tendency to reify need not lead into despair or the sense that social psychological knowledge is not worth obtaining. It should, however, highlight its historical constraints and invite a critical stand. Gergen (1973), among social psychologists, it will be recalled, has argued for an awareness of such limits and for the resulting realization that the effort of the researcher, in addition to being an

exercise in the scientific pursuit of knowledge, is also a documentation of the history of the social groups being examined. Moreover, given the results of this study, it would seem that this kind of critical awareness also seems warranted on the part of lay individuals toward the views they hold in everyday life. In fact, a critical stand could be advantageous in that it could instruct individuals on the often unexpected consequences that derive from uncritical allegiances to ongoing group intentions and goals.

Indeed, when views of Hispanics and non-Hispanics are further scrutinized, there are some signs suggesting that critical awareness may be needed by both groups. Non-Hispanic interviewees, for example, in their adoption of terms like Macho or Machismo to refer to anti-social forms of masculinity, fail to realize that they are turning against themselves a stereotype which, if we are to take the charges of Mexican-American critics and interviewees seriously, has proven damaging to the personal and social identity formation of great numbers of individuals. In the case of Hispanic interviewees, the need for critical awareness also appears warranted. The distinct possibility exists that this group, in their haste to free themselves from the victimizing action of a stereotype and in their desire to define their own personal and

collective images, might simply succeed in developing a "new" stereotypical account of their lives.

3. Conclusions and Implications

The stated goals of this study were theoretical and methodological. The thrust was to explore the possible meanings of the concept of Machismo in a manner that allowed for the unfolding of impressions as perceived by the individuals themselves and which is, at the same time, sensitive to the reifications present in those views. A consideration of the obtained results suggests that these goals have been accomplished and that in the process salient arguments pertaining to matters of theory and method have been raised.

From the point of view of theory, this study contributes toward the understanding of contemporary meanings of Machismo. This is noteworthy, for as was noted in the literature review, the concept has been abundantly used but seldom explored by social scientists. More specifically, the present study suggests that the concept of Machismo is not a unidimensional concept upon which most individuals agree. Indeed, if the views of interviewees are taken at face value, the concept does not refer exclusively to exaggerated

sex role performance among males but also constitute a set of rules open to many interpretations guiding men and women in their efforts at social survival. Moreover, which dimension of the concept is adopted is a matter that changes depending on the group membership (ethnic) of the person uttering the meanings. Additionally, if the meaning of Machismo is assessed against its attendant context of intentions, yet a third major meaning could be said to exist, namely, that Machismo is directly neither a sex-role nor a prescriptive phenomena but primarily a convenient political term.

Another salient contribution pertains to an area which one might term theory of social meaning. This study highlights the point that the views expressed by individuals in the everyday world should not only be taken at their face value but also assessed in light of the context of historically defined (and therefore likely to change) intentions. It is a consideration of the latter level of meanings that elucidates the current state of a psychosocial concept.

This point is indeed not new. Analytical social psychologists and psychotherapists have devoted a great deal of attention to the

context of intentions and goals, and have assigned it a primary role in the interpretation of meanings. Indeed, it would be quite rare to encounter an analytical psychotherapist, for example, who, upon hearing a statement from a patient, would be satisfied with its face validity and would not reflect on the "hidden meanings" that individual is intending to communicate. The point, however, is that traditional social psychology has assigned this important context of meaning a secondary place and has additionally negated its historical connections. Indeed, as is the case with attitude research, the context of intentions appears to be attended to only in the initial stages of the research effort so that the investigator might be able to gather enough data to develop a particular scale. Having accomplished this goal, however, these meanings become discrete ahistorical items (i.e., reified) to be guaged by an ascending/descending set of quantitative values (i.e., Machismo is a political term - strongly agree/agree/undecided/disagree/strongly disagree) or are regarded as "noise" to be eliminated at all costs through the artifact of design.

A third major contribution of this study has to do with the employment of a critical criterion, that of reification. It is not enough, it was suggested, to go beyond face value and to state that meanings respond to historically defined set of group intentions. It is also important to recognize that these very same intentions can contribute toward the reification of a term and thus can give rise to consequences other than those originally intended (as would be the case when a stereotype comes to turn against its user). The concept of reification was useful in an additional way. It helped maintain a sense of objectivity via the views which the individuals expressed. This employment of critical concepts such as reification constitute a unique effort in the conduct of social research. As was noted in earlier sections, the term has been used primarily in critical analysis of past research. And to our knowledge, this study might be the first where the notion of reification is deliberately used to guide the empirical work from its very inception.

A final contribution relates to method. The critical quasi-phenomenological approach which relied on in-depth interviews was successful in several respects. It provided access to different levels of meanings, feeling tones, intentions, and goals as perceived by the actors themselves, and it allowed for a critical appraisal of these data. This kind of effort could not have been carried out in the context of attitude research. Such investigations are, in fact, incompatible with the goals of this study since they are not concerned with a full exploration of meaning. Moreover, attitude research focuses mostly on measurement and lacks a critical stand. In effect, it could be argued that attitude research actually begins with a reification.

The approach of allowing individuals to unfold their own views of the phenomenon was also especially valuable given the fact that the existing definitions of Machismo in the literature were the object of much confusion and criticism. The extensive elaborations that are obtained are useful in clarifying the contemporary state of

the concept and can also be instructive in the formulation of further research.

With regard to this last point, it would appear advisable to continue the reliance on qualitative methodology such as what was adopted in this work. The investigative aim, in turn, needs to be directed toward an exploration of the term in the context of a sample that is both larger and more representative. It would indeed be valuable to find out whether individuals from different social or geographical extraction than the ones interviewed here would imply or elaborate as extensively on the context of group intentions and goals; whether their views exhibit similar signs of reification. Moreover, the outcomes of such work would prove useful in the determination of whether the results we have obtained possess the necessary universality so as to make more definite statements about the state of the phenomenon of Machismo.

REFERENCE NOTES

Giorgi, A. Methodological reflections on qualitative analyses of descriptions of the phenomenon of learning. Paper presented at Conference on Dialectics, 1976.

REFERENCES

- Adolph, J. The south american macho: mythos and mystique. Impact of Science on Society, 1971, 21, 83-92.
- Adorno, T. Sociology and Psychology. New Left Review, 1967, 46, 67-80.
- Adorno, T. Sociology and Psychology. New Left Review, 1968, 47, 79-97.
- Adorno, T. Negative Dialectics. New York: The Seabury Press, 1973.
- Alvarez, R. The unique psycho-historical experience of the Mexican-American people. In R. Rosaldo, R. Calvert, & G. Seligman (Eds.), Chicano: the evolution of a people. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.
- Aranomi, A. Psicoanálisis de la dinamica de un pueblo. Mexico, D.F.: UNAM, 1961.
- Aranomi, A. The Machismo solution. In B. Landis & E. Tauber (Eds.), In the name of life. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1971.
- Baca Zin, M. Political familism: toward sex-role equality in Chicano families. Aztlan, 1974, 6, 13-26.
- Chaplin, J. Dictionary of psychology. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1968.
- Connell, M. "Macho" is name of paternity game in Mexico. Arizona Republic, June 30, 1978, p. A-28.
- Douglas, J. Understanding everyday life. Chicago: Aldine, 1970a.
- Douglas, J. The relevance of sociology. In J. Douglas (Ed.), The Relevance of Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970b.
- Gadlin, H. Scars and emblems: paradoxes of American family life. Journal of Social History, 1978, 11, 305-327.
- Gergen, K. Social psychology as history. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 309-320.

- Gilbert, G. Sex differences in mental health in a Mexican village. The International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 1959, 3, 212-222.
- Giraldo, O. El Machismo como fenomeno psicocultural. Revista Latinoamericana de Psicologia, 1972, 4, 295-309.
- Horkheimer, M. Critical theory. New York: The Seabury Press, 1972.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. Dialectics of enlightenment. New York: The Seabury Press, 1972.
- Israel, J. From level of aspiration to dissonance or what the petty-bourgeoisie worries about. The Insurgent Sociologist, 1977, 7, 31-39.
- Junker, B. Field Work. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Kren, G., & Rappoport, L. Victims: the fallacy of innocence. Societas, 1974, 4, 111-129.
- Kvale, S. Dialectics and research on remembering. In N. Datan & H. W. Reese (Eds.), Life-Span developmental psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Lewis, D. The children of Sanchez. New York: Random House, 1961.
- Limon, J. Stereotyping and Chicano resistance: an historical dimension. Aztlan, 1973, 4, 257-270.
- Lukacs, G. History and class consciousness. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1971.
- Marcuse, H. One-dimensional man. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Mehan, H., & Wood, H. The reality of ethnomethodology. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- Montiel, M. The Chicano family: a review of research. Social Work, 1973a, 18, 22-31.
- Montiel, M. The social science myth of the Mexican-American family. In O. Romano (Ed.), Voices. Berkeley: Quinto Sol, 1973b.

- Padilla, A., & Ruiz, R. Latino mental health: a review of literature.
(DHEW Publication No. (ADM) t4-113). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government
Printing Office, 1973.
- Paz, O. The labyrinth of solitude: life and thought in Mexico. New York:
Grove Press, 1961.
- Ramos, S. El perfil del hombre y la cultura en Mexico. Mexico, D.F.:
Imprenta Mundial, 1934.
- Rappoport, L. On praxis and quasirationality. In K. Riegel (Ed.), The
development of dialectical operations. New York: S. Karger, 1975.
- Rendon, A. Chicano manifesto. New York: Macmillan Company, 1971.
- Riegel, K. From traits and equilibrium toward developmental dialectics.
In W. J. Arnold & J. Cole (Eds.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation
(Vol. 23). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1976.
- Reyes-Nevarres, S. El Machismo en Mexico. Mundo Nuevo, 1970, 46, 14-19.
- Rocco, R. The Chicano in the social sciences: traditional concepts, myths,
and images. Aztlan, 1970, 1, 75-96.
- Romero-Buj, S. Hispanoamerica y el Machismo. Mundo Nuevo, 1970, 46, 28-32.
- Romano, O. The anthropology and sociology of the Mexican-Americans. El Grito,
1968, 2, 13-26.
- Romano, O. Social science, objectivity, and the Chicanos. In O. Romano (Ed.),
Voices. Berkeley: Quinto Sol, 1973.
- Ruiz, R. The delivery of mental health and social change services for Chicanos:
analysis and recommendations. In J. Garcia (Ed.), Chicano Psychology.
New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Ryan, W. Blaming the Victim. New York: Vintage Books, 1971.

- Samelson, F. History, origin, myth, and ideology: Comte's 'discovery' of social psychology. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 1974, 4, 217-231.

Samelson, F. From "race psychology" to "studies in prejudice": some observations on the thematic reversal in social psychology. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 1978, 14, 265-278.

Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. Field Research. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1973.

Stevens, E. Machismo and Marianismo, Society, 1973, 10, 57-63.

Vaca, N. The Mexican-American in the social sciences, 1912-1970, Part I: 1912-1935. El Grito, 1970a, 3, 3-24.

Vaca, N. The Mexican-American in the social sciences, 1912-1970, Part II: 1936-1970. El Grito, 1970b, 4, 17-51.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW GUIDE

Introduction. As I mentioned to you earlier, I am doing research on Machismo.

The meaning of this term, in the social science literature, is vague, unclear.

Thus, as a first step in my work, I want to focus on the meaning of the

concept. The few questions that will follow have been designed with that

intention in mind. Let me assure you that none of the questions will

embarrass you and that your responses will be confidential.

Background Information.

Code #

Age

Number of Children

Sex

Occupation

Marital Status

Years of Education

Interview Themes.

1. Meanings of Machismo (positive?, negative?, both?, identifying signs?, etc.)
2. Sources for meanings (life experience?, media?, etc.)
3. Social or cultural aspects (Is the phenomenon the same for all groups?)
4. Temporal aspects (Does Machismo change through the life cycle?)
5. Objects and consequences of the phenomenon (women?, men?)
6. Structural considerations (Is Machismo viewed as psychological, cultural, or historical phenomenon?, etc.)

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SYNOPSES

Hispanic Female #1Interview Summary

The notion of Machismo refers to a pattern of male dominance and supremacy over women. The meaning of the phenomenon was derived from observations in the Mexican-American community of southern Kansas and from experiences at home. The father was often presented as a model of Machismo. He was described as a domineering man, the sole decision-maker in a marriage that revolved around him. Chicano males, in general, were described in similar terms. The interviewee also noted that her awareness of the term came only recently, perhaps four years ago, from exposure to Chicano and women's rights literature. Machismo was considered quite prevalent among Mexican-Americans and also among Blacks. Anglo-Americans, whose ways do not resemble those of Chicanos or Blacks, were not seen behaving as Macho men.

The Macho is an individual who regards women as roles, whether mother or wife, rather than as individuals in their own right. He has a view of himself as being superior to a women, even when the evidence is to the

contrary, as is the case in relationships where the woman is more educated. The characteristic posture of the Macho is one of egotism, believing that women "have to be there for him."

Also very common for the Macho is to be unfaithful to his woman and to brag about it. Indeed, the interviewee could not recall a single instance of marital fidelity among her male relatives.

As a rule, the Macho does not demonstrate affection, and in cases where he does, the expression may vary according to the sex of the individual involved. Thus, the interviewee's father felt free to hug and kiss her but could not do the same toward his sons. Moreover, father and brothers never talked about their problems with their own spouses and would teach their male children, as they themselves were taught, that men do not cry.

Machismo was viewed as affecting Chicanos of all social classes. Its expression, however, may vary. Thus, lower-class Chicanos were considered more prone to violence such as fighting, beating up women, and even killing. Middle- or upper-class Mexican-American males were not viewed as physically violent although they still impose a pattern of dominance and are unfaithful to their women.

Along a private-public dimension, Machismo was viewed as unchanging, for it is in both contexts that "Chicanos are trying to prove something, (trying) to keep you in place."

Male dominance and supremacy causes much suffering to Chicanas. As a case in point, the interviewee spoke about her mother whose talents could not be developed since her life had to center around her husband. Moreover, the mother, who realized her oppression, came to see herself as stuck, lacking any alternatives or ways out. It was in this context that the mother advised the interviewee to not marry a Chicano.

Chicanos also suffer when they reject the role expectations assumed by Machismo. Such a stand brings about a lack of acceptance or even clear rejection by one's own people, both men and women. Consequently, few are the Chicanos who are courageous enough to pay such a price for their liberation.

But the oppression of women is also the oppression of men, for the maintenance of the status quo occurs at the expense of the Macho's own opportunity for growth.

The immediate existence of Machismo was predicated in terms of the ego-uplifting function that it has for males. Why this form of "satisfaction" should exist was not clear to the interviewee. It was volunteered that the pattern of male dominance has always existed, but a more interesting point is a consideration of the ways by which Machismo is maintained. In this context, history's insistence on a portrayal of women as weak is to be blamed. Moreover, Machismo is often supported by women themselves who "drool" over men with Macho traits. It follows that many men behave in a Macho way because many women like it.

While prevalent, Machismo was considered an endangered phenomenon. Indeed, as Chicanas realize their oppression and become stronger, "Chicano males are going to find that their Macho thing is not going to work," and male resistance notwithstanding, "they are not going to win."

Hispanic Female #2Interview Summary

For this interviewee, the notion of Machismo refers to the stand that a Mexican or Chicano man assumes toward life.

According to the requirements of Machismo, a man is a person who is committed and upholds values such as honor, pride, and dignity in his dealings with life. The Macho is also an individual who views himself as protector of his family and his land.

The exigencies of Machismo are taken to be a man's responsibility and his alone. Consequently, men estrange themselves from women or support and refuse to relate with women in any other way than as their protector. The interviewee cited her closest brother as a case in point. Upon reaching adolescence and being granted some care-taking functions, he no longer exchanged with his sister with the candor and closeness he had done before. This distancing from women, the interviewee reflected, is like a rite of passage into Machismo. From that point on, men come to seek solace in their male friends, heavy drinking, or both.

While it is conceivable for a Macho to act cruelly or be dominant toward women, it would not be accurate to consider these actions as core aspects of the phenomenon. More telling is his solitary stand and the eventual aloneness he imposes on himself. The interviewee's father was cited as an example. On one occasion, although incapacitated by arthritis and in need of convalescent care, he refused the invitation of one of his daughters to recuperate at her home. This eventuality, as any other, had to be faced alone. To have done otherwise would have meant a loss of dignity and pride. Indeed, the interviewee believed that "the ability to survive solitude with dignity defines what I hold to be quintessentially 'Macho'." To the extent that one understands aloneness, one understands Machismo. And, for the interviewee, it also meant to understand her father was to understand her own Machismo.

Stands like the one just described, in addition to acts of emotional distancing from women, often sadden the women in the Macho's life. Anger and retaliation may also ensue, as was the case with the interviewee's mother who, feeling rejected by the husband, began to emotionally invest herself in her sons, a move which further enhanced the husband's solitary stand.

Obviously, unlike the claims of many Anglo-Americans, Machismo and chauvinism do not equate. Such a comparison ignores the cultural (values) and the emotional and historical ties that Machismo has. Further, it erroneously assumes that this latter term is uni-dimensional and that it simply stands for the subjugation of women.

The interviewee's own concept of Machismo was regarded as rooted in two distinct sources of meanings. One which has already been elaborated upon concerns family and community experiences. The other is the media, particularly the cinematic portrayals of Mexican actor Pedro Infante. The figure of the Charro (a kind of Mexican cowboy not at all like his American counterpart which Infante portrayed) struck the interviewee's teenage mind and, thus, she came to think of Machismo as embodying goodness, honor, and sexuality. Another contribution from the media came much later, in the figure of Artemio Cruz, a literary creation of a Mexican novelist. Cruz also came to embody aspects of Machismo, but this also had the effect of rounding out the concept, making it more somber, and adding depth to it. Other influences were acknowledged in Octavio Paz's Labyrinth of Solitude, a

historical-philosophical work. This author may have influenced the interviewee's own belief that the solitude of the Macho has its origin in the events of the Spanish conquest of Mexico.

Hispanic Female #3Interview Summary

Machismo refers to a man's sense of responsibility, his love for his family, and his awareness of the world around him.

To be a Macho means to be protective of those one loves and to be sensitive to social and family needs. Someone who is Macho is also affectionate. He is the head of the household, the decision-maker. He is a man confident about his abilities and skills.

The interviewee reported that her father and husband would fit this definition. As a case in point, the father was cited. His sense of commitment to family was so strong that at a young age he acted as provider for his mother and his own wife and children, although this meant he had to forego plans for a college education. In reference to the husband, his openness and affection to the interviewee and their child was noted. It was suggested that Machismo has changed generationally in the direction of more expressiveness on the part of males.

A Macho often relies heavily on male friendships and spends time at bars. This, however, need not interfere with family life, and it usually

does not, nor should it be interpreted as a case in which the man is running around on his wife.

As fathers, Machos are usually more protective of their daughters, and as husbands they tend to be dominant toward their wives. But this situation is not static. In fact, at one point in her marriage the interviewee's mother objected to the husband's repeated absence from home and decided that she would start coming to the bar with him. She did exactly this, a move the husband did not choose to resist.

The interviewee noted that the words Macho or Machismo were not frequently used while she was growing up. Moreover, she took issue with the contemporary usage of the term which was viewed as inaccurate, for it focuses on sexuality, marital infidelity, arrogance, and dominance of women. Further, the description is always derogatory, and it leads to a misunderstanding of Chicano life. In this regard, the interviewee recalled her own bewilderment upon hearing the term used in the above narrow and negative way by literature and sociology professors in college.

Perhaps these references were to the behavior of Pachucos, but this context was never specified. Pachucos are young males with a cocky self-

confidence about their abilities and who take great pride in their physical and sexual prowess. But then these are not adult men, and neither are they the prototype of Chicano men.

Why Machismo should exist the interviewee did not know. She alluded, however, to the sense of responsibility of the Macho and the functionality of such a stance for the conduct of family and community life.

Hispanic Female #4Interview Summary

The terms Macho or Machismo were seldom used in Mexico where the interviewee grew up. A preferred expression was to say that a given male was "muy hombre" (meaning very much a man rather than very manly), or to speak of his "hombria" (his sense of being a man rather than the literal meaning of manliness). It is only in the United States that the word Machismo becomes an everyday word. Thus, when one is speaking about the phenomenon, one is making reference to clusters of meanings constellated in the United States.

Machismo, as understood in America, is a stereotype and refers to a male's compulsive attempt to prove that he is a man. The effort involves negative behaviors such as drinking, fighting, beating up women, or failing to bring the paycheck home. Machismo is a defensive stand which conceals a man's doubt about his masculinity. It is also an overcompensation for fears that others may doubt he is a man. In America, the phenomenon is attributed to or associated with Latino males.

The above description and interpretation, if indeed valid, resemble the behavior of some lower-class Mexican males, as well as lower-class Chicanos and other minority males. Their behavior which at times is provocative and violent, however, need not necessarily be an expression of Machismo but an angry reaction to a world that exploits them and discriminates against them.

Middle- and upper-class Mexican or Chicano males do not behave as predicted by the definition of Machismo. Claiming her experience at home, the interviewee noted that her father was a considerate and thoughtful man who came home every night and never inflicted physical punishment either on his wife or children. This conduct is not atypical. It was also observed among relatives and friends in both Mexico and the United States.

There are some attributes characteristic to Latino males that appear to add substance to a notion of Machismo as defined in America. Latino men, for example, are more authoritarian ("at home, my father's word was the law") and are known to have affairs outside of the marriage (which are tacitly acknowledged and even accepted by the wives). Latino males are also more

inclined to demonstrate an emotional sense of valor which, at times, calls for facing danger at the expense of one's life. Where this sense of valor comes from is not clear. Perhaps it comes from the Spaniards, the conquistadores, for whom it might have had survival value, particularly in harsh environments.

The concept of Machismo as it is presently understood does not address the Latino man's sense of honor. Perhaps this is the difference between the notions of Machismo and "hombria," for in terms of the latter, to be a man is to be a man of honor, straight and responsible to the situations to which he is committed.

Comparing Latino to Anglo-American males, the latter group does not possess a sense of honor, at least not in the Hispanic sense and, therefore, one cannot think of them as being "muy hombres." The expression of masculinity in America takes other forms. "Hombria" is not a term for it.

The interviewee was not sure what the consequences of the phenomenon were. Americans tend to believe that Chicano women are forced into submission. This may be an observation based on appearances and scant knowledge of Chicano cultural ways. Latino women have done and continue to do what they want.

Hispanic Female #5Interview Summary

According to the view held by most Anglo-Americans, Machismo refers to a behavioral style of some males, characterized by the display of physical strength and emotional detachment. The Macho is an individual who acts cocky, is self-centered, relates to women as objects, and is willing to fight and provoke fights. In the minds of most Americans, the Macho is often someone who is athletic and young. And, while the behavior is often ascribed to Latinos, it is also reserved to describe the actions of Anglo-American males.

The above concept does not correspond to the meanings that Chicanos have about the phenomenon. The term, which is rarely employed among Chicanos, refers to a man's strength, meaning a sense of responsibility to his family. Citing her father as an example, the interviewee noted that a Macho, in carrying out his responsibilities, may at times be dominant. He is not, however, oppressive. He cares for everyone in a loving way and is more often than not quite open to his wife and children. Recalling her mother, the interviewee did not perceived her as oppressed or unhappy. Although she is

not the "head of the household," she has leadership in most matters concerning the rearing of the children.

The Machismo of a Latin man is quiet, unlike that of Anglo-American Machos, and is not loud or based on physical appearance or youth. Machismo is a quiet, reserved attitude toward the world. It lasts a lifetime and is continually evolving. Machismo serves men well, for it helps them to adjust to the realities of life.

The above should not be construed to mean that no single Chicano ever behaves as described by the definition commonly held by Americans. Some young Mexican-Americans do indeed act in such boisterous ways. A young brother was cited as a case in point. The point to be noted, however, is that such behavior does not correspond to what Chicanos believe Machismo means, and to insist that it does amounts to bypassing the values inherent in Machismo.

Hispanic Male #1Interview Summary

Machismo refers to a complex network of behaviors and values governing the expression of masculinity among Chicanos and other Hispanic males.

Machismo is also a set of values and ideals guiding the life-long task of defining what is involved in being a man.

According to Machismo, to be a man means to be responsible for oneself, one's family, and one's community. Thus, to oneself one must be honest; to others, equally honest, protective, and respectful. Machismo also involves courage, for otherwise these demands could hardly be achieved, pride, which is a privately felt satisfaction about a job well done, and honor, the public recognition that a man follows the ideals of the phenomenon.

The terms Macho or Machismo were rarely used in the interviewee's home or community. A more common expression was to say that a given man was "muy hombre" or "puro hombre." Moreover, the term is never self-ascribed but earned. It is by virtue of a man's actions that others may come to refer to him as a Macho or "puro hombre." In this sense, the boasting of one's deeds, an inclination often associated with the expression of Machismo, is

actually antithetical to the phenomenon. Bragging, as well as fighting, drinking, and abuse of women, are behaviors attributed to the Macho by Anglo-Americans. This is not to mean no Chicano ever behaves in such a way. The point to be noted, however, is that to Chicanos this is not Machismo. In fact, the interviewee added, any man acting in such a fashion "I'd call a 'pendejo'" (meaning a fool, idiot, or jackass).

Americans misunderstand the meaning of Machismo because of their lack of interest in understanding Latino life. Indeed, Chicanos in some communities express their discontent with oppressive circumstances in ways suggestive of the American definition of the phenomenon. What is ignored, however, is that these men are not engaged in an empty, aggressive display of masculinity, but in the assertion that they are an ignored group of people. In the same vein, the behavior of Pachucos is often singled out as unconstructive. These observations fail to note that, within their own territorial and social boundaries, these individuals are responsible to one another and quite committed to other values such as honor, pride, and respect. Another major misconception comes from the women's movement, namely, the assertion that Machismo and male chauvinism are the same.

These misunderstandings have serious consequences. Some Chicanos play into them simply because it is the only way by which they will be heard or taken into account, or simply because Chicanos grow tired of explaining their reality in vain. It was the interviewee's opinion that the concept of Machismo cannot be comprehended unless one also understands the cultural framework in which it is embedded. Of import here is the view that Chicanos have about the world, their family structure, and patterns of friendship. Machismo was found to be related to all of these. Machismo was also viewed as a dynamic phenomenon, changing across generations. Thus, to be a man today entails different requirements than a generation ago. It was the belief of the interviewee's father, for example, that the man is the sole head of the household and, as such, makes decisions for all its members. Today, the notion of manhood involves the practice of mutual decision-making, for this is the contemporary way of asserting respect for others and for oneself. Thus, while the expression of Machismo has changed over time, its core values have not. Honor, pride, and respect will certainly not change, only the ways of obtaining them. And, just as the man from old Mexico took pride in his horse, so does the modern Low Rider take pride in his modified car.

Hispanic Male #2Interview Summary

The concept of Machismo, as understood by most Americans, demands that a man be physically strong ("always pumping iron"), emotionally detached ("Joe Cool"), invested in sexual conquest ("Don Juan") and subsequently boasting of his prowess. To be a Macho is to prove to everyone how much of a man, in the physical sense, one is.

The above meaning is narrow and bastardized, for it is not based on cultural understanding of Chicanos. It is simply an American invention, an image that sells perfumes and disco sounds. And, for young men, the embodiment of this image often means greater availability of girls. In fact, as an adolescent the interviewee played into the American definition of Machismo as a deliberate way of enhancing his attractiveness to the opposite sex. But the assumption of the role of the Macho never involved issues or values of substance. On the contrary, it was based on the adoption of such externals as clothing and body posturing. The result was a caricature, an image bearing no resemblance to what Latinos understand a Macho to be. Further, in the light of the American version of the phenomenon, membership in a particular cultural

group is not a requirement. Anyone who exhibits the appropriate signs can be termed a Macho.

If the culture of Mexican-Americans is taken into account, the notion of Machismo assumes different, more complex meanings. First of all, it needs to be noted that words like Macho or Machismo are seldom used in the Mexican-American community. A preferred expression relates to "the sense of being a man," although the term Machismo could be viewed as a synonym. Machismo, then, is a code of personal honesty, honor, and responsibility. It suggests that to be a man, one must "stand straight and tall," acknowledge when one is wrong, even when it is risky to be honest. To be a man is not to allow oneself to get caught in a lie or be pressured into foolish daring. Further, a man respects women and if sexually involved with her, he does not divulge this aspect of the relationship. Citing the father as a model, the interviewee noted that the Macho, as a married man, is responsible for and protective of his family and the family name. In his conduct, a man strives to integrate community and home so that the values he professes in one setting are in accord with the ones espoused in another.

Contrary to common understanding, a Macho need not conceal his emotions, and neither need his wife be oppressed or dissatisfied. The interviewee's father, for example, was described as affectionate toward both his wife and children, never afraid to hug them or express pride in them. The mother was described as a stoic woman who took things in stride, a person not inclined to complain about things being rough. Both father and mother were involved in the decision-making of the family although along traditional instrumental versus socio-emotional lines.

Machismo is not a developmental phase or a fad that young men need to go through and later abandon. Instead, it is a code for personal and social conduct that guarantees social survival and to which one is committed throughout life.

In contemporary America, a courageous response to the ideals of the phenomenon is difficult for the Mexican-American. This is due to the lack of clarity that many Chicanos have about its meaning, a byproduct, no doubt, of bi-cultural membership. Many Chicanos are unaware that the present version of Machismo, with its emphasis on external behavior, is an American version and not the value-laden legacy from old Mexico. Indeed, many

Mexican-Americans, in the belief that they are expressing their traditional culture, enact the American brand of the phenomenon. This confusion is serious for it leads to Chicanos buying into negative stereotypes and consequently losing their own ways.

Another factor working against the practice of traditional Machismo is the very quality of American life. For whatever reasons, socialization of individuals no longer stresses the need for a solid life stand. On the contrary, what is rewarded is the ability to present oneself in different ways depending on the circumstances, to wear many masks. To the extent that this is true, the core values of the Macho can be said to be endangered.

Hispanic Male #3Interview Summary

In its traditional meaning, the notion of Machismo refers to a Mexican-American man's posture of bravery and stoicism vis-a-vis life events. The Macho is a proud, self-confident individual, able to exercise common sense and self-control, a man who owes respect both to others and to himself.

Unlike the Anglo-American version of the phenomenon, the Macho neither boasts nor acts cocky. Both these postures are too overt and self-serving. The Macho is not moved by a desire for recognition. He acts the way he does simply because he must, and all this is done in complete silence. Besides, as it relates to cockiness, this attitude demands an exaggerated sense of self-confidence. The Macho, on the other hand, is someone aware of his limitations. Otherwise, he could not survive.

A precise description of Machismo cannot be formulated. In the Mexican-American community, the concept has as many meanings as there are individuals or situations. Thus, for some, Machismo may consist of eating hot chili, while for others it refers to the ability to withstand fear or the refusal

to be submerged by the adversities of life. However, the core values of the phenomenon, such as pride, stoicism, and bravery, are constant through time and space.

Social scientists interested in Machismo do not recognize its dynamic character. This is because they do not attempt to understand the cultural context, the values guiding Chicano life. What scientists see and later report are often projections of their Anglo-American experiences interacting with their analytical techniques. The result is a narrow and biased view of Machismo and Chicanos. Social scientists, if they are to understand Latino life, must take an historical stand. That is, they need to become recorders rather than interpreters of events.

Machismo values have also been incorporated by contemporary Chicanas, although not all of them have done so. Historical events, such as the movement in the 1960's and the mode of consciousness it articulated, ERA, the women's movement, and the state of the economy, have all contributed to a greater equalization of sex roles. But beyond this, Chicanas have come also to partake in the spirit of the phenomenon. Today, they exhibit much pride, self-respect, and bravery. Contemporary Chicanos, pragmatic as they are, have not resisted these changes.

Merely one generation ago, the interaction of Machismo and the situation of women was different. Not only were they denied the expression of Machismo values, but they were required to assume a submissive stand vis-a-vis the husband, who was the sole authority in the home. Anglo-Americans often cite these circumstances, which were not all that different among Anglo-Americans themselves, as an example of the abuse of women by Macho men. This interpretation is erroneous because it is incomplete and based on scant knowledge about the group being judged. These women, while certainly not the ultimate decision-makers in the household, were regarded as the "heart of the family" and commanded the respect and admiration of everyone in the home. Further, this interpretation ignores the Macho's sense of responsibility toward his wife and family. It fails to see that his posture is protective and not punitive.

The concept of Machismo, in addition to sanctioning a personal life stand, has also become a rallying notion in the struggle for ethnic survival. In a sense, it can be said that the concept of La Raza, a term not used to mean race (which is its literal meaning) but the Chicano historical experience, is the cultural-political counterpart of Machismo. This latter concept may

have served as the blueprint for the former. And, indeed, both terms stress pride and bravery as well as they demand from both men and women the courage to survive in the face of adversity.

Hispanic Male #4Interview Summary

Machismo was not a term frequently used in the upbringing of the interviewee. The popularity of the term is a recent event, a result of the political articulation of the women's movement.

In its Anglo-American interpretation, Machismo refers to a man's abusive treatment of women. This meaning is found to be bewildering. Machismo, the interviewee believes, is a culturally prescribed way of being a man. It emphasizes such values as stability and strength, for these are the requirements for survival in daily life. The expression of the phenomenon is quiet, its existence seldom consciously articulated and defined but lived instead. Machismo is a matter of fact; thus to declare that someone is a Macho is of no more or less consequence than the statement that someone's hair is black.

The Macho's sense of strength needs to be clearly understood. Its meaning does not pertain to force or power, connotations commonly held by majority Americans, but to inner, quiet strength. The Macho is not interested in "ripping or tearing apart;" instead he is someone committed to his values

and who likes to maintain a low profile. He is an individual like any other, involved in the business of his survival and that of his family.

The notion of Machismo as presently understood by Anglo-Americans, particularly women invested in the struggle for equal rights, is narrow and superficial, no longer resembling the Chicano expression of being a man. Words like Macho or Machismo have become caricatures or labels possessing no more substance than similar caricatures found in films.

Several events may account for the segmentation and distortion of these terms. One possibility is that these concepts have received too much attention and have, subsequently, been overanalyzed. This may account for the narrowness in meaning. The distortions, on the other hand, stem from the biases or intentions of the observer. Liberationist women, for example, in their appropriation and popularization of the terms Macho or Machismo, have intended not to preserve its cultural meaning but to coin a new word that accurately describes the behavior of their alleged aggressors. And it is the definition of these terms by the women's movement that now dominates the consciousness of most Americans.

But, the fact that transfers of meanings across cultural context can be so conveniently achieved points to an earlier, larger, and more pervasive event, the systematic obliteration of cultural differences in the United States. American institutions, long before the advent of the women's movement, have managed most successfully to interpret the behavior of Chicanos outside of its cultural context. Moreover, United States institutions, whether schools, newspapers, films, or publishing houses, have efficiently standardized these negative, superficial, and narrow interpretations and presented them for the consumption of all Americans, the group whose ways have also been redefined.

Machismo has been standardized or processed by the efficient but "culturally lazy" American system. To the extent that the phenomenon in its shorter, incomplete version provides us with fast meaning and dispenses us from reflection, we can sadly say that the American system works.

The distortion of Machismo has consequences for Chicanos, for they come to consume definitions which are only based on surface and which they have not helped to write. The effect is injurious not only to their cultural ways but to their own personal sense of self. But everyone else in the culture is also affected, for now all those who have accepted the standard term can no longer see beyond appearances.

Non-Hispanic Female #1Interview Summary

The notion of Machismo refers to "typical male behavior;" that is to say, actions asserting male superiority and dominance. These include any exploitive conduct toward women (both sexually and economically), a reliance on physical strength and power, and a preference for social roles such as provider and decision-maker.

The interviewee did not recall how she came to acquire the term but believes she derived its meaning from 12 years of observations of and working contacts with blue-collar workers in central California. Associations to the behavior of Latino males were not made. Young Blacks, however, were found to be described by the term.

Middle-class males also display Machismo but in somewhat different ways. Focusing on the behavior of White male peers, the interviewee noted that these men, like their blue-collar counterparts, also engage in the oppression of women. Only the means seem to vary. Thus, while a blue-collar individual might command or physically threaten a women into submission, a middle-class man achieves similar ends through clever manipulation and seduction into double binds.

Whatever form Machismo takes, the consequences of the phenomenon are the same: the oppression of women. However, since no one can engage in an act of oppression without suffering a similar fate, males are also victimized.

Why Machismo should occur was not clear to the interviewee. It was speculated that since Machismo is also sexual pomp, "like the rituals of peacocks," it might have a survival value for the species. Similarly, the valuing of physical strength, the allocation of social roles on the basis of such criterion, and the rigid induction of individuals into such roles might have also contributed to the survival of social groups. Machismo is "basic behavior," but the rudimentary basis of the phenomenon makes it, in contemporary urban America, a virtual anachronism. Indeed, modern living no longer requires physical power and a division of labor predicated in those terms.

Granting the anachronistic nature of Machismo, how is it that the phenomenon continues to exist? The answer may lie in the fact that Machismo has also been transformed by the times. Thus, the notion of skill has replaced the notion of physical strength. There is a new kind of Machismo being

rewarded, whether in the world of business or academia. In spite of "the bullshit about the great strides of women," the world has not substantially changed; it has only transformed.

Non-Hispanic Female #2Interview Summary

A Latin-American and an Anglo-American version of Machismo were recognized.

The original meaning of the term comes from Hispanic cultures, and it refers to the groups' codes for the expression of masculinity. As such, it involves attributes like strength, aggressiveness, and courage. The Macho is adventurous, displays outward sexuality, can be arrogant, and also can be boastful of his sexual conquests. The Macho is someone who is proud.

Several experiences contributed to the above definition, namely travels in Spain, Mexico, and face-to-face contact with Puerto Ricans in New York. Other sources of meaning included the anthropological work of Oscar Lewis and the literary work of Cervantes, namely his Don Quixote, a hero who brought courage and honor into such absurdity that he can well be regarded as the very parody of Machismo.

The second meaning of Machismo refers to the expression of masculinity among American (non-Hispanic) males. Attributes stressed include strength, power, dominance, competitiveness, and repressed emotionality. The image behind this representation is John Wayne.

This second meaning of Machismo can be said to be derived from the Latino concept. However, it does not refer to the Latino group. The term is of recent acquisition and coined by the feminist movement as an attempt to specify the attributes of the oppressor.

All in all, this new term has negative connotations which the Latin notion does not. When one thinks of an American Macho, notions such as honor, pride, or true courage are not conjured up. On the contrary, one thinks of a man who, in addition to the attributes already specified, is capable of violent acts.

A note on this violence issue. It would not be accurate to suggest that the Latino Macho is not capable of violence, for indeed he is. His outbursts, however, are qualitatively different from those of his Anglo-American counterpart. Latino explosions are usually "cathartic," seldom intended to be truly destructive of people or things. In effect, violence often occurs only as a response to oppressive conditions such as those in school or at work. Anglo-American violence, in turn, is deliberate, having a clear object and no redeeming protest value.

The politicization and negativization of the Spanish term Machismo has clouded the original or traditional meanings of the concept and has resulted in erroneous and stereotypical interpretations of Latino life. But it should also be noted that the term, in its present state, has also successfully stereotyped the Anglo-American male.

Stereotyping does not issue exclusively out of the labeling power of a word. It is cultures and unquestioning men, whether Anglo or Latino, that contribute to the one-dimensionality of individuals. More specifically, men stereotype themselves by accepting one-sided notions of masculinity that deny their inner struggles, sensitivity, and gentleness.

In general terms, Machismo outlines the sex role expectations that a culture has for its male members, whether in Mexico or in the United States, namely that he should be strong, powerful, aggressive, and competitive if he is to be a "real man." In a sense, it can be said that given cultural variations, Machismo, as a sex-role phenomena, is universal.

Given the recent entrance of women into traditionally male roles and their uncritical acceptance of male values, such as competition, one could well speak of Machismo as a term that also defines the behavior of some women.

In America, Machismo finds support because it fits nicely with other values deemed important by the society, such as competition and success. In a sense, Machismo keeps one committed to the success game or locked in the particular demands of the economy. Other sources of support can be found in traditional ideas about the differential value of masculinity and femininity (where masculinity is positive and femininity is negative) which goes back to biblical times.

It has been noted that Machismo, as sex-role, is universal. It should also be stated that the phenomenon is also oppressive to both men and women and that it precludes the existence of man-woman relationships predicated on equality. Thus, Machismo can proudly be excusable, and arguments to the relative positivity or negativity of the term cannot but be inconsequential.

Non-Hispanic Female #3Interview Summary

This interviewee preferred not to address herself to Machismo, the Hispanic cultural expression of masculinity, but chose to elaborate on the "more general" description of a "Macho male" in the context of Anglo-American males.

As a way of preface, it was noted that any attempt at characterizing the "Macho male" as a cultural type by necessity engages in stereotyping. Further, although rare, the existence of a "Macho woman" was also posited.

Drawing from personal and professional experiences, the "Macho male" was described as cocky, self-righteous, emotionally immature, and defensive. This type of man, who is almost ubiquitous in the United States, is avidly interested in women but only for the sexual favors that he might obtain. Moreover, sexual intercourse with "Macho man" is centered around his pleasure. A relational give and take seldom occurs. This is emotionally disruptive for the woman involved and leads to her loss of self-respect.

The closedness in relationships with others, but particularly women, is characteristic to a "Macho male." Only on rare occasions will he be

able to open up, and then only to the woman who knows him very well and who accepts the infrequency of his disclosures.

Casual relationships with a "Macho male" can also be problematical for women, particularly for those who like to be direct. The defensive posture of this type of man forces the interlocutor into being cautious; she has to circumvent him, dance around his weak spot so as not to hurt or embarrass him or incur his wrath. In the world of business where one is the subordinate of "Macho male," the interaction can be more problematical yet. In this context, the power structure inherent to the situation interacts with the Macho's character style. He is now able to hide behind another facade, making direct communication virtually impossible. The "Macho male," however, by obtaining no feedback, goes on to believe that he is a strong, if not great, man.

While the corporate world sanctions the behavior of "Macho males," their greatest source of reinforcement can be found in the actions of women themselves. "The Macho man exists because we (women) allow him to." Women, particularly when young, are attracted by this man's good looks, his self-confidence (which one finds out later to be a mask for self-doubt), and are lured by the prestige associated with being his companion. What is involved

here is women's own "double standard." They both wish for and reject a man who acts in a sensitive or understanding way. And, while women are torn by their ambivalence, "Macho males" lick their chops.

It is interesting to note that Machos were not viewed as actually powerful men. Power is only in the Macho's head, a conviction that is seldom changed since subordinates may be too cautious to provide the needed feedback or may be too infatuated with his alleged self-confidence.

Can the notion of Machismo be considered in cultural terms? That is, is the white Anglo "Macho male" the case example of a larger event? This was a problematic question for the interviewee. The notion of Machismo as a cultural artifact was found excusable for Chicanos or other oppressed minorities for whom it serves as a source of male identity or as a way of bringing cohesion to family and group. For white males, however, this argument was not acceptable, for here Machismo, which is also "the American Way," is "the result of mistakes" and functions to no other end than "to promote competition and lack of feeling." It is true, the interviewee reflected, that one could also think about the American male as being equally oppressed and thus find his Machismo understandable. This makes logical sense. However,

it is not possible to discount "a certain amount of bitterness toward the white man, and this (anger) comes into play." Moreover, when the problem is set in cultural terms, it is no longer possible for one to manage or control it. "It is funny," the interviewee noted, "that I am more willing to accept it (Machismo) in your culture than in mine . . ."

Non-Hispanic Female #4Interview Summary

Machismo is a stereotype, an exaggerated expression of traditionally masculine traits. It is a cultural dictum compelling a man to be strong, reserved, and emotionally unexpressive.

The context for the interviewee's elaboration was the American cultural scene. It was noted, however, that the terms Macho or Machismo are of Hispanic origin. These concepts were probably heard in Arizona some 10 years ago. The belief was also expressed that Machismo in Latin American countries may not be as influential (on the actions of women) as generally believed. In the male-dominated Mexican culture, for example, birth control has been widely practiced and accepted by women long before men knew it.

In the United States, a preferred term is "Macho man." This concept is of late advent, a product, no doubt, of the political articulations of the women's movement. A "Macho man" is someone who acts according to the definition of Machismo given above.

The existence of "Macho man" is the direct result of socialization into traditional forms of masculinity, into segregated sex roles.

The subsequent maintenance of this type of man is accomplished via the interplay of sex-role definitions and other social or psychological phenomena. Pressures to conform and issues related to identity formation, for example, lead men and particularly adolescents to advocate and practice only the extreme and traditional expressions of masculinity. Deviation into uniqueness is not valued or allowed.

When traditional masculinity aligns or coincides with access to experiences like power, status, and respect, the incentives to live as a "Macho man" become more compelling yet. Moreover, as this individual becomes ego-invested in status or power, he gets further entrenched in his masculinity and begins to resist any demand that he should change his ways or share what he has.

A more dramatic fear of change may also contribute to the maintenance of the style of the "Macho man" and, thus, ultimately to the existence of segregation and discrimination on the basis of sex. Many Americans, for example, and perhaps the great majority of them, object to sex-role crossing, arguing that it will destroy the family or the very fabric of the society.

While the term "Macho man" is a recent introduction in the consciousness of America, the image of this man has long been present in the history of humanity. The biblical accounts of Adam and Eve's expulsion from paradise and entrance into a world of toil, for example, can well be read as a story of the casting of man and women into traditional sex roles.

Non-Hispanic Female #5Interview Summary

Basing her observations on years of working experience and friendships with Chicanos in the Los Angeles area, this interviewee regarded Machismo as an adult expression of masculinity involving strength, self-sufficiency (when need be), protection of one's family, responsibility, and a "courageous sensitivity."

As a code for action, Machismo is "ingrained" in Mexican-American males. It is not something external, "something that you wear . . . or brag about." Machismo is a silent world view.

The perception that most Americans have about the phenomenon is narrow and stereotypical. The ruling image is that of a man who is strong, forceful, and many times violent. These meanings do not emanate from direct contact with Latinos but from superficial observations of this group which Americans do not bother to understand, and from media such as films or TV.

It is of interest to the interviewee that Anglo-Americans speak about Macho rather than Machismo. Moreover, Macho is no longer a word possessing original meanings. It is a term from which meanings have been "cut, coined,

and anglocized," a convenient label that one can now apply to anyone whether Chicano, Black, or White, and thereby place him into a category.

All this is very American. It is part of a larger institutional effort to obliterate cultural differences and thus keep people under control. This has serious consequences for the particular group involved and everyone else as well. When we learn to respond to labels, we fail to understand each other's experiences and come to sell each other short.

Non-Hispanic Male #1Interview Summary

Machismo is a cultural phenomenon governing the expression of masculinity. The word itself is derived from Spanish; Machismo, however, also occurs among many cultural groups.

In its "white version," for example, a Macho is a jock, a stud, the hot shot, a Joe Namath or John Wayne. He is a man of power, be it through physical force, sexual prowess, or ownership of tools, electronic equipment, and powerful cars. The Macho can be anywhere, on a street corner or in academia. In the latter setting, his love for power is displaced onto his research tools.

The Machismo of Chicanos takes a different form. Recalling high school years in the predominantly Mexican-American area of East Los Angeles, the interviewee noted that the Machismo of Chicanos, in addition to physical power, is aimed at the expression of pride. This was particularly observable in the devotion of time and money young Chicanos placed on the exterior embellishment of their cars (an activity in which the interviewee himself partook), or in their concern with their personal looks. This latter preoccupation often made the Machos appear cocky; however, they seemed unaware of

this effect. If they were aware of it, they simply just did not care. The young Macho was also protective of his sister and emotionally close to his mother. The relationship to the father was remote.

To the best of the interviewee's recollection, Chicanos seldom, if ever, used the terms Macho or Machismo. In fact, they did not use any descriptors at all. Anglo-Americans, on the other hand, did use the term Macho and in derogatory ways.

In the interviewee's mind, the expressions of Machismo described above continue to have negative connotations. This is so because both versions are too overt; they are caricaturizations of masculinity. These forms of Machismo are false, for they evade their opposite, femininity. None of the Machos observed, for example, can be thought of as being soft or stoic. Machismo, it was felt, should be an expression embodying both masculinity and femininity, anima and animus. As such, it should guide the behavior of men and women alike. Machismo should be inner strength.

Why should Machismo be so prevalent is not clear to the interviewee. Perhaps it is a function of social and economic oppression. This may not be far-fetched, for indeed, it is very rarely that we think of a wealthy man as a Macho man.

Non-Hispanic Male #2Interview Summary

Machismo is sex-role behavior. It refers to an adult male's posture of stoicism, self-reliance, and emotional insensitivity. The Macho is usually someone who is self-centered, unwilling to share his weakness, and whose behavior is very sexualized. He has a sort of mystique, an aura of swaggering self-confidence. Violence is not central but is a derivative aspect of the phenomenon.

Machismo in its extreme or pure form exists only as a stereotype. Machos do not enact the phenomenon in its totality, but they do, indeed, exist.

While the word Macho is a Spanish word, its immediate imagery does not relate to Latinos but Anglo-American males. Moreover, the meanings associated with the term are of recent constellation, an artifact of the women's movement. In this context, it is interesting to note that the word Machismo is seldom used. Only the word Macho has become popularized.

Machismo, or "Macho-ism" as the interviewee sometimes preferred, should vary as a function of age. For, as Jung suggested, the masculinity of middle

age and senior adults comes to be transformed by the acceptance of the contrasexual side of the self. Men, therefore, should become more caring, more feminine, less aggressive.

Social class accounts for different expressions of Machismo. Thus, while lower-class individuals base its expression on machines or physical strength, middle- and upper-class males rely on intellectual or social strength. Moreover, since the power base of upper- and middle-class individuals is viewed as more legitimate, lower-class males, in their resentment, are likely to be more boisterous in the expression of the phenomenon. Only in the expression of competition, which is also central of Machismo, do all these groups coexist.

The consequences of Machismo are serious. It imposes the isolation of men from each other and from themselves. This creates problems of intimacy for most men. Machismo may also contribute to somatic effects, such as ulcer, heart conditions, or generalized stress. Available research, it was noted, has already demonstrated that resistance to stress is greater for individuals who rely on social networks for support, and lesser for those who do not.

Machismo traits are sanctioned by the culture in many ways. In addition to the traditional socializing agencies, media, such as television or films, virtually guide men into an idealized masculine myth which closely corresponds to the ideals of Machismo.

Machismo can also be observed among Blacks. Their behavior is overtly more sensuous than that of Whites.

Non-Hispanic Male #3Interview Summary

Machismo is a form of masculinity calling for a man to be powerful, aggressive, domineering, always in control. For this type of man, women are objects to be dominated or sexually used. The Macho is a "tough guy" who is willing to inflict pain. He never displays emotions that might signal weakness, be they affection or fear. Anger and violence, on the other hand, need not be concealed.

The above meanings did not emanate from knowledge and observations of Latinos but from personal life experiences while growing up in a "tough neighborhood" in Chicago, and later from work experiences as a cop in the same city, as well as a correctional worker in the prison system in Illinois.

Machismo, as described above and in the contexts named above, exists because it is essential not only to the physical but, more importantly, to the social survival of a man. If one is to be worthy as an individual to oneself and the social group, one must be able to exert power and physical force. There is no way around this fact. Failure to act as a "tough guy" means no identity, no possibility of survival and less yet of success. It is social suicide.

The ways of the "tough guy" are imparted via the socializing influence of family and street groups. In the language of Transactional Analysis, these men, while growing up, are "scripted" through subtle or overt messages about who they are, how the world is structured, where they fit, and what they need to do to survive and become a success. Given the nature of the setting, whether prison or tough neighborhood, it makes sense that most messages should spell out the ways of the "tough guy." No other social role is more functional or socially reinforced. All these events lock men into Machismo and offer them no way out. Wherever they go, they gravitate toward social settings with mores and rules similar to the ones they own.

Ethnic variations of Machismo do occur. These differences were noted in the rules guiding the behavior of gang youth. In their dealings, Whites and Blacks were described as acting like "capitalists in a capitalistic society." Social activity would center around the acquisition of money, and violence would be inflicted to those interfering with the capitalist aims. In this last regard, White gangsters were viewed as probably more determined and aggressive, or at least more overt. Puerto Rican and Mexican-American youths, on the other hand, did not play according to the clear-cut rules of the

marketplace. Their behavior was not as linear or rational. It was not rare, for example, for these Hispanics to kill someone simply because the mother or sister's name had been affronted. This emotional type of response would baffle other gangs and juvenile authorities as well.

But, Machismo can be transformed. What is necessary is for these men to confront the very emotions they avoid, fear or love. In the incorporation of these, the collapse of the "tough guy" and his transformation into a constructive man takes place. It is precisely this confrontation and change that therapeutic efforts in the prison system try to effect. It is worth noting that what a man is being required to do is not abandon his masculinity or deny the ubiquitous presence of violence. In whatever setting, the tasks of survival and success will call for the exercise of strength. What the "tough guy" is being asked to do, though, is to compliment his excessively masculine stand. In this effort, his humanization is at stake.

Non-Hispanic Male #4Interview Summary

The concept of Machismo has an Anglo-American and a Latin-American form. Many times this leads to confusion where Latinos are attributed by Anglo-Americans to have certain traits which do not belong to this group.

In its Anglo version, Machismo refers to "the most aggressive, most stubborn aspects of masculinity . . . , to maleness for its own sake." The American Macho is someone invested in muscling others around; he is committed to the maintenance of male supremacy.

The Latino version of the phenomenon which the interviewee described from prolonged living and working contacts with Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Mexican nationals, and Spaniards does not revolve around the expression of force but the exaltation of "healthy sexuality." The Latino Macho is a very sensuous individual; moreover, he is someone not at all ambivalent about his sensuality. This he will often express in the graceful way he dances or carries his body around, or in the seductive expression of his eyes when he is interacting with a women. When sexually interested in a woman, his intent is not to conquer but to seduce.

For the Latino, Machismo does not entail trampling on women. Moreover, Latinos are trained to value and protect women. When she is their mother, they are even expected to idealize her.

Then, there is probably a women's code counterpart to Machismo, call it Hembrismo, instructing women not to be complacent or inactive.

In Latino culture, sex-roles are indeed traditional, but it seems that men and women are proud to be what they are. This is probably because both sexes have their distinct power base. At the same time, the actors are more attuned to the interdependency and functionality of their roles, particularly as they relate to the conduct of family life.

The Anglo-American Macho does not understand his Latino counterpart and is actually contemptuous of him. Indeed, the Anglo-American male is taken aback by the gracefulness of the Latino which he regards as altogether too feminine a behavior, and is turned off by his sensuality which may be seen as too overt and, therefore, distasteful. Moreover, the posture of American Macho males vis-a-vis women is not one of interdependency, but one of supremacy. In this sense, the American Macho reflects the values of a society which devalues sexuality and femininity, while exalting force, conquest, and

masculinity. It is hard to say precisely what events account for this equation. At a macro-historical level of analysis, it could find its antecedents in the frontier days where the emphasis seems to have been on the expression of force and drive and on the maintenance of loose social ties. It all may be viewed as an imposition of capitalist structure or its protestant ethic.

What may account for the Latin American equation where the feminine values, such as grace, sensuality, and expressiveness, appear to be regarded in high esteem? The historical antecedents are not familiar to the interviewee. However, the closeness and life-long attachment of males (and females) to the figure of the mother may render them more amenable to and accepting of qualities that other groups, such as Anglo-Americans, would reject as being too feminine.

Non-Hispanic Male #5Interview Summary

Machismo is understood as the aggressive, sexually-based behavior of some males. Machos are individuals invested in the conquest of women, in their treatment as sexual objects.

These meanings were originally learned in connection with the behavior of Latin Americans and were regarded as negative, anti-social traits, characteristic of peoples at a low level of socio-cultural evolution. Further, the demands of Machismo were regarded as an objectionable departure from Christian notions that place sex in the context of a marriage relationship.

This "cultural imperialistic view," as the interviewee called it of Latin American males, was acquired prior to departing for Colombia at the end of the college senior year to conduct sociological research. Later, while in the South American country, the view came to be validated and maintained by professional and social experiences there. It was observed that women, for example, did behave submissively vis-a-vis men, and that males did emphasize sexual themes in their conversations and bragged about their conquests and sexual prowess.

Later in the 1960's, the displeasure with the phenomenon no longer was based on the "racist theory." Machismo was now problematical because it ran against the interviewee's liberal humanitarian and religious values, and caused concerns related to the development of the self. Machismo was still negative, but the now it was so because it made objects of women, abused their humanity, and damned their possibilities for being a whole person.

Machismo no longer referred to the behavior of Latino males exclusively. The phenomenon had a counterpart on American soil, and its popularity appears to be on the increase.

As observed in America, Machismo also involves the objectification of women and as this relates to males in the worship of their own bodies. All this has come along with an increase in violence and the decline in belief in monogamy. The existence of many potential sexual partners has encouraged the glorification of one's body, since physical attractiveness becomes one's prized commodity in the effort to negotiate for sexual favors.

The media and the fashion industry have covertly sensed this mood and have exploited it to the utmost. This has meant that gender identity has come to be more manipulated and managed, and by sources that have an exclusive monetary interest.

While both Latinos and Anglos partake in the expression of Machismo, some differences between the two groups exist. When their sense of Machismo is threatened, the Latino group may be more prone to act violently than the Anglo-American counterparts. Assume, for example, a case where a woman is unfaithful to her husband. The Latino male would retaliate with physical force, while the Anglo husband would demand a divorce. This differential response is accounted for by the stronger feeling among Latino husbands that wives are their personal possession. Of course, this pattern can be affected by social class. Membership in the lower strata would account for increased violence for the two groups, with still greater violence for the Latinos.

In human terms, Machismo is a costly affair. The objectification of women, for example, is extremely damaging to their identities. It tends to solidify them into ways which prevent other possibilities of being. This objectification works in subtle ways. Such is the theme of the movie, "Killing Her Softly." A good example of the process involved in the objectification of women is offered in the book, The Total Woman. Here, the authoress advocates the idea that a woman, if she is to keep her husband faithful to her within a Christian, romantic, monogamous relationship, has to adopt a more explicitly

sexual behavior. In other words, married women have to compete with other already sexually objectified women. This kind of advocacy is damaging to women. Further, it has the effect of validating Macho ways of relating.

Machismo has a negative effect on men themselves. It keeps men from fully participating in family life and in the rearing of their own children. This absence of the male from the household also acts to support Machismo, since it impresses on male children the way they should act and respond as adults.

MACHISMO: A CASE STUDY IN REIFICATION

by

JULIO ANGULO

B.A., University of Houston, 1970

M.S.W., University of California, 1972

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCES

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1980

Abstract

This work examined the psychosocial concept of Machismo. As presently found in the literature, this term refers to hostile, aggressive forms of masculinity characteristic of Latin American males. Chicano social scientists, however, disagree with this interpretation arguing instead that it is a pro-social, courageous, proud stand which men assume in the conduct of family or civic affairs. Thus, anti-social conceptions of the phenomenon are inaccurate, Anglo stereotypes serving to keep Latino minorities oppressed. It is further claimed that more accurate accounts of Machismo will only emerge when social scientists attend to the views that Latinos have about themselves.

Taking the Chicano critique as a point of departure and drawing from critical theories of society, in this study it is additionally argued that the concept of Machismo has become stereotypical and ahistorical through the process of reification. This process does not issue from the dynamics of discrete historical events such as the socio-political oppression of one ethnic group by another but from the historical fact that individuals (regardless of their ethnic backgrounds) partake in a dominant epistemology, which in the social sciences has taken the form of positivism. Consequently,

if the historically minded expectations of the Chicano critique are to be fulfilled, researchers need also be aware of the effects which empiricist methodologies have on the phenomenon under study.

In addition to reviewing the processes which transform a psychosocial concept into a stereotype, an empirical study designed to explore the meaning of Machismo was conducted. The method adopted could be termed "critical quasi-phenomenology." In-depth interviews of Hispanic and non-Hispanic individuals were carried out. The obtained reports were analyzed in a manner similar to that of ethnomethodology. Additionally, the data were assessed in light of the critical concept of reification.

The results documented several major points: a) individuals of different ethnic backgrounds hold markedly different and often contrasting conceptualizations of Machismo; b) denotative statements of meaning (i.e., what Machismo is) were inseparable from statements of the socio-political goals and intentions which each group, via those meanings, aimed to accomplish; and c) both the expressed views of Hispanics and non-Hispanics exhibited signs of reification. Finally, the implications of these findings were also discussed.