

Scripting the Macho Man: Hypermasculine Socialization and Enculturation

DONALD L. MOSHER, Ph.D.

University of Connecticut

SILVAN S. TOMKINS, Ph.D.

University of Pennsylvania

Tomkins' (1979) script theory offers a coherent, heuristic, and elegant account of the macho personality constellation (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984), consisting of: (a) callous sexual attitudes, (b) violence as manly, and (c) danger as exciting. A script is a set of rules for interpreting, directing, defending, and creating the scenes making up the life of the macho man. The macho script organizes childhood scenes in which so-called "superior, masculine" affects—like excitement and anger—were socialized to be favored over so-called "inferior, feminine" affects—like distress and fear. Furthermore, both adolescent rites of passage in male youth social networks and processes of enculturation in the American culture and its mass media continue that hypermasculine socialization. The ideological script of *machismo* descends from the ideology of the warrior and the stratifications following warfare—victor and vanquished, master and slave, the head of the house and woman as his complement, the patriarch and his children. The personality script of the macho man and his ideology of *machismo* mutually amplify one another—simultaneously justifying his lifestyle and celebrating his world view. In his dangerous, adversarial world of scarce resources, his violent, sexually callous, and dangerous physical acts express his "manly" essence.

KEY WORDS: macho, hypermasculinity, script, affect, socialization

Pick up any newspaper in America today and you will read about macho men. A woman is raped on a pool table in a bar while other men laugh and applaud. A teenager, arrested for shooting and killing a random stranger, wanted to impress his buddies in the car. An argu-

Portions of this paper were presented at two conferences: Mosher, D. L., Plenary Session: Describing and explaining sexual coercion and assault. SSSS, Western Region, Beverly Hills, CA, March 27, 1987. Mosher, D. L., A script theory of mascho personality. In George Smeaton's Symposium: Extreme adherence to traditional sex roles and dating-partner abuse. EPA, Arlington, VA, April 10, 1987.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Donald L. Mosher, Ph.D., UCONN (U-20), 406 Cross Campus Rd., Storrs, CT 06268.

ment between two men who know one another turns into a murder. A husband continually beats his wife; she sues the police for failing to protect her. A college halfback scores three touchdowns but then fumbles in the final minutes—ascending to hero, descending to goat; that night, after finding a ticket on his car parked in a space for the handicapped, he assaults a security guard for giving him the ticket. Male teenagers are killed “playing chicken” in their cars, or they drive into a tree or a car while drunk, or they just drink or drug so much they die.

We want to introduce a script theory (Tomkins, 1979) of the macho personality constellation (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984), which consists of three behavioral dispositions justified by beliefs: (1) entitlement to callous sex, (2) violence as manly, and (3) danger as exciting.

In script theory, the basic unit of analysis is the scene. The *scene* is an event in a life as lived, marked by a beginning and an end, organized by at least one affect and its object. A connected set of scenes becomes the plot of a life that we call personality. A *script* connects and organizes the information in a family of related scenes through a set of rules for interpreting, responding, defending, and creating similar scenes. The macho man creates, interprets, and responds to scenes that threaten, challenge, or afford opportunities to enact his role as a macho man according to the set of rules in the macho script. The scenes, briefly described in the opening paragraph, are too common episodes in the life of macho men. Those scenes were organized by their affects and their rules for interpreting and understanding, directing and producing, and justifying and evaluating scenes that were formed during their socialization into hypermasculine scripts.

The principal motivator in humans is affect. *Affect* is defined by Tomkins as sets of muscular and glandular responses located in the face, but also widely distributed throughout the body, which generate sensory feedback that is either inherently “acceptable” or “unacceptable.” The programs for discrete affects are innate and stored at sub-cortical centers. Innate scripts initially activate and organize affects, but it is the learned scripts that generate the dynamic complexity of human experience and motivation. In contrast to drives, it is the freedoms of affect in time, in intensity, in density of investment, in choice of objects, and in investment in possibility that permit people to be concerned about almost anything with various degrees of urgency (Tomkins, 1962).

Affect amplifies the psychological processes, such as perception, cognition, and action, within the scene itself. Yet intense affect alone

may leave the scene a *transient* without much effect on personality. For scenes to generate an urgent search for a set of rules to order their affectively-pressing information, the family of related scenes must be psychologically magnified. *Psychological magnification* is the further amplification of the set of already amplified scenes by new affect during a narrative review of scenes in consciousness. Both the scenes and the rules for interpreting, producing, predicting, and controlling them are amplified in psychological magnification. For the macho man, it is the affect of interest-excitement, experienced as he consciously reviews memories and fantasies of potentially scripting scenes, that psychologically magnifies the affectively urgent search rules for how to be a "real man." This dangerous world can excite him, if he is man enough to meet its challenges.

Personality, like language, can be viewed in synchronic or diachronic perspective. At a moment in time, personality can be portrayed as a posture or position describing a set of potentialities yet to be lived. For example, such a portrait of the macho's present position might be drawn from his scores on the Hypermasculinity Inventory that assess the three components of the macho constellation (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). Through time, the macho is living a life in accordance with his macho script. To enact the macho script *is* to live macho scenes, *is* to celebrate the ideology of *machismo*.

Macho as an Ideological Script

Although Tomkin's script theory is primarily a personological theory, it also links the historical events that served as prototypic scenes to a group or nation's script. For example, the frontier, with its scenes of going west to escape restriction, produced historical scenes still linked to the American ideological emphasis on rugged individuality. A culture's script, reflected in its ideology or world view, consists of a widely-shared set of rules that interpret and solve the problems of affect within its prototypic historical scenes. Before addressing the socialization of hypermasculinity, we shall consider the script-theoretical account of gender stratification of affects as linked to the ideology of *machismo*.

Tomkins (1965) views *ideology* as a biosocial construction that humans use to understand, justify, and celebrate how they live in the world. Ideology must account for those urgent concerns that beg for understanding, yet, because the facts are unknown, produce the most uncertainty.

Just as the personality script reflects the differential magnification of affects in the individual, the culture's ideology reflects the differen-

tial magnification of affects in the society. Script theory contends that the major dynamic of ideological differentiation and stratification arises from *perceived scarcity* and a reliance upon violence to reduce such scarcity by allocating the scarce resources disproportionately to the victors of adversarial contests. Using enemies violently, taking slaves, and raping women creates social stratification that later transfers to classes, sexes, and ages within the society.

Tomkins describes how affects become differentially magnified in a world where the primary goods of life are perceived as scarce:

Consider what must happen when the world turns more negative than positive. First, feeling as such is confused with the predominant, unwanted negative affects. To the extent that anger and violence appear to offer a favored solution to a world turned bad, many other consequences follow. The first is that of the believed benefits of slavery from warfare. One can thereby convert one's enemies to means to one's own happiness, as well as rob the other of whatever territory, property, or food he may possess. Second, the innate determiner of anger is a considerable increase in the level of neural firing which is prompted by a variety of non-optimal scenes of the now problematic world. Third, the conjunction of superior masculine strength and superior life-bearing feminine capabilities, predispose the male to violence and death and the female against it. If the die is cast toward violence, then excitement and risk taking must be elevated against the more pacific relaxation of enjoyment and communion. Fourth, surprise must be elevated against fear. Fear is a deadly affect for successful warfare, being the most serious enemy within. It is assigned to the enemies to be defeated. One should try to terrorize one's enemy. Fifth, anger must be elevated above distress. Distress must be borne manfully. A man must not weep, but rather make his enemy cry out in surrender. Sixth, the warrior must above all be proud, elevating disgust, dissmell and contempt (the fusion of anger and dissmell) above the humble hanging of the head in shame. Shame is what the proud warrior should inflict upon his enemy. He as warrior should rather die than surrender in shame.

Notice that the full spectrum of innate affects is now partitioned into two sets, and these sets are individually stratified. The successful macho warrior is excited, ready for surprise, angry, and proud, contemptuous and fearless. The loser has given up and is relaxed in dubious enjoyment, crying in distress, terrified and humble and ashamed. It is a very small step to assign these demeaned affects to women inasmuch as they are readily defeated by men in physical combat. It is also a small step to regard children as little slaves and women, and to regard lower classes in the same way. Boy children, then, must prove themselves to become men in *rites de passage*. A variety of trials by fire involve the mastery of the masculine over the feminine affects. Social stratification in general rests upon the affect stratification inherent in adversarial contests. (Tomkins, 1987, pp. 175-176).

The cultural descendent of the nomadic warrior is the macho man. The ideology of *machismo* is a warrior's ideology. The macho warrior holds dominion over all he has conquered—he is master and patriarch. Slaves, wives, and children are his property, owing him respect and fealty. To maintain that dominion, the macho man must be prepared to risk all by acts of great daring, to compel enemy men to submit through violence, and to dominate female adversaries through callous sex.

The ideological script of the macho man is socially inherited within a macho culture by virtue of being a male. In American culture, affects are divided into antagonistic contrasts of "superior and masculine" or "inferior and feminine." Thus, the act of assignment to the male or female sex tends to bias the socialization of affects into gender scripts that separate and stratify men and women through this division of human emotions to create the ideologically desired gender-stereotypic contrasts of *masculine* and *feminine*. Macho ideology honors the "superior, masculine" affects and humiliates the displayer of "inferior, feminine" affects. Thus, macho scripts exaggerate masculine gender role behavior to serve hostile-dominant interpersonal goals motivated by the affects of excitement, anger, disgust, and contempt. Not just a male, and not just masculine, the macho must be hypermasculine in ideology and action. The essentialist claim is made that that's just how "real men" are.

When the ideology of the culture elevates both patriarchal supremacy as the ideal political and familial value and adversarial physicality and toughness as the essence of masculinity, then the "superior masculine" gender script, indeed, has become an ideological script. Ideological scripts are the most important single class of scripts because of their scope and abstractness and because they endow fact with value and affect. Because ideologies represent the various faiths by which human beings live and die, they are the chief agents of bonding and of differentiation and division. Sharing the ideology of *machismo* bonds men into male honor societies, differentiates the sexes along lines of masculine dominance and female submission, and divides society into the strong and the weak in accordance with success in embodying the ideals of "real masculine superiority."

We define the ideology of *machismo* as: *a system of ideas forming a world view that chauvinistically exalts male dominance by assuming masculinity, virility, and physicality to be the ideal essence of real men who are adversarial warriors competing for scarce resources (including women as chattel) in a dangerous world.* The cultural ideology of

machismo ordains and supports the socialization of males by parents into an exaggerated, hypermasculine gender script—the macho script.

As a class of scripts, ideological scripts are both self-validating and self-fulfilling. To be a macho man is to fulfill and validate the self through scripts that interpret, predict, control, replicate, and evaluate the manly affects of surprise, excitement, anger, disgust, and contempt for the inferior foe as they lessen the temptation of relaxed enjoyment and communion and prevent experiencing the unmanly affects of fear, distress, and shame.

Ideological Polarity

Tomkins' (1965) identified a basic ideological polarity: right-wing normative versus left-wing humanistic ideology. This polarity contrasts the humanist's faith in the intrinsic value of human experience and potential with the normative's faith in the ceaseless human struggle to live up to an ideal essence beyond man's power to set or measure. In normative ideology, humans inevitably fall short of this set of idealized standards presumed to exist independently of culture. Humanistic ideology, on the other hand, perceives humankind as the relative measure of all things. In childrearing, the contrast between the polarity of ideologies is between appreciating the unique child and molding the child to an ideal. On the one hand, the rewarding or punitive socialization of affects biases scripting toward the humanist or normative ideological polarities, respectively. Just as, on the other hand, a humanist or normative ideology biases childrearing toward the respective rewarding or punitive socialization of affects.

The ideology of *machismo* is a particular variant of normative ideology. Whereas a normative ideology always entails comparisons of human nature against some elevated set of essences or ideals, the ideology of *machismo* sets the specific elevated standard of hypermasculinity—what it means to be a *real* man—for the macho man.

Seven Socialization Dynamics For the Macho Script

In Spanish, *machismo* means the essence or soul of masculinity. To be scripted to be a "real man"—thereby, to exaggerate the negative stereotypic qualities of *masculinity*—requires socialization that *differently magnifies* the "superior, manly" affects of anger, excitement, surprise, disgust, and contempt in contrast to the "inferior" and "feminine" affects of distress, fear, shame, and relaxed enjoyment. In the socialization of the macho-to-be, the "masculine" affects are systematically increased, enhanced, and exaggerated, whereas the "feminine" affects are decreased, abated, and suppressed.

Unlike many theories of socialization which focus on parental and

child behaviors per se, this approach to socialization emphasizes *scenes*. The theory of socialization concentrates on the differential magnification of affects occurring in sets of scenes that serve as the prototypes for the rules generated in scripts. These socializing scenes involve interpersonal transactions between the boy and socializing parents that are organized predominantly by parental scripts that interpret what is to be socially acceptable or unacceptable in affects and their objects of investment for their child.

Because socialization inculcates rules or norms considered by the socializing parent to be "correct" or "good," the parent seeks a complementary response from the boy. Reciprocity entails correct performance or compliance with norms by a submissive child to a dominant—whether friendly and teaching or hostile and disciplining—parent. Socializing scenes, to be considered effective as socialization, require a conjunctive rather than a disjunctive ending; hence a complementary exchange is sought to conclude the scene. A disjunctive ending is a challenge to the parent's authority to be dominant.

Seven socialization dynamics differentially magnify "superior masculine" affects:

(1) *Unrelieved and unexpressed distress is intensified by the socializer until it is released as anger.*

The process of becoming a "real man," callous to the cry of distress in others, begins with a callous response by the parents to the distress cry of the infant. In a rewarding socialization of distress, the parent would strive to reduce the crying by removing the source of distress and, furthermore, to comfort the child by relaxing, enjoyable, sympathetic soothing. The reduction of distress would elicit the smile of joy in the child, eliciting the smile of joy in the parent. Such a complementarity in joyful affects and joyous acts sows the seeds of empathy for distress in others.

In contrast, the aim of the punitive socialization of distress is not to remove the source of stress but to suppress the cry of distress itself. It is to stop *emotionality*—conceived as consisting exclusively of "inferior feminine" affects—without relieving distress. The socializing agent punishes the crying child for expressing his distress or even increases the suffering of the child who dared to cry to inhibit all future crying. The parents' anger, disgust, or contempt initially evokes surprise and fear in the infant, and subsequently evokes anger, self-disgust, and self-contempt in the young boy.

Unexpressed distress becomes increasingly toxic. In Tomkins (1962) hypothesized affect dynamics, unrelieved and intense distress is a

specific releaser of anger. According to Tomkins' theory of innate scripts for affects, although anger is at a higher absolute level than distress, both distress and anger share a pattern of innate activation by a continuing, high level of neural stimulation. The level of distress can elevate to that of anger if intense and unrelieved, or with the addition of neural stimulation at a high, continuing level. The "inferior feminine" emotion of distress is, thus, transformed into the "manly" emotion of anger. The rule becomes: "Big boys don't cry"; they have temper tantrums. Moreover, anger expression now generates both extrinsic rewards—if it is instrumental in securing desired goals—and intrinsic affective rewards because "the sudden reduction of aggression is the activator of joy" (Tomkins, 1962, p. 290).

The rules of the script are liable to be nonconscious, but, if conscious, the rules might be, "Don't cry, be tough, have contempt for those who cry" and "Don't cry, get mad, and make them cry instead."

(2) *Fear-expression and fear-avoidance are inhibited through parental dominance and contempt until habituation partially reduces them and activates excitement.*

Tomkins' theory of innate scripts posits that the affects of surprise, fear, and excitement are all activated by accelerating gradients of neural stimulation. Specifically, surprise is activated by a sudden, brief, and sharply increasing gradient of stimulation. The gradient for fear is less steep, but can last longer. Finally, excitement, with an even less steep and longer lasting gradient, continues as long as novelty can be extracted from the scene. In the macho man, danger is perceived to be exciting rather than eliciting the typical affect of fear. How does this transformation occur?

First, fear-expression in the young boy is inhibited by parents—angry because the boy is afraid—who incite even greater fear of them than of the feared stimulus or act. Second, boys are socialized to experience disgust and dissmell (dissmell is a drive-auxilliary affect related to olfaction just as disgust is related to gustation) over their "cowardice" by angry, disgusted, and contemptuous others. Third, the boys are held in the fearful scene until they habituate and engage in the feared act or confront the fear-inducing stimulus. Fourth, the enforced facing of the fear produces a partial reduction through habituation of the fear and of their shame over their fearfulness. If the boy had faced the fear on his own, he might have completely reduced the fear and shame and experienced joy. But, because the "bravery" was required in the face of fear, and with a shameful knowledge of the inhibited inner fear, only a partial reduction of the affect occurs. More-

over, the punitive socializing agent would not remove the fearful stimulus, so exploration or habituation were the only alternatives available. Fifth, Tomkins' (1962, p. 290 and 294, respectively) tenth and twelfth affect dynamics ("The sudden reduction of intense enduring fear, if complete releases joy, if incomplete releases excitement," and "The complete sudden reduction of intense, enduring shame activates joy; the incomplete sudden reduction of intense, enduring shame activates excitement," respectively.) specify that the partially reduced fear and shame transform into excitement.

This socialization dynamic ensures the differential magnification of excitement over fear and shame in the macho script. Excitement is, henceforth, released by partially reduced fear in situations of danger. If such socializing scenes, when coassembled in consciousness, are magnified by excitement and pride over the mastery of the shameful fear, a script is formed wherein the individual will flirt with death.

An actual case in point is the linkage of avoidance of one negative affect, fear, with another negative affect, shame, as with the bullfighter who must expose himself to the danger and fear of death to "avoid" it and who is vulnerable to the contempt of the audience and himself if he is unwilling to come close to his adversary. (Tomkins, 1962, p. 315)

And who better symbolizes the macho in Latino culture than the bullfighter?

Thus the young boy is scripted by rules which mandate, "Don't be scared. Be brave. Be tough. Be daring. Become excited by the danger. Risk injury or death. Be proud of fearlessness. Be contemptuous of danger and cowards."

(3) *Shame over residual distress and fear reverses polarity through counter-action into exciting manly pride over aggression and daring.*

The rejecting, cold, and punitive parenting style that follows from the ideology of *machismo* emphasizes the use of humiliation and contempt to control distress and fear. The parents, having embraced the macho ideology, feel superior to the child and regard his distress and fear with disgust and dissmell. As the child learns to respond to himself as an object of his affects of distress and fear, he consequently begins to experience self-disgust and self-contempt. The shame of being "unmanly" (or not a "real boy," but a "sissy," "wimp," "faggot," "cry-baby," "coward," etc.) is no more than partially reduced by parents who enforce the "masculine" response. Shame itself, is viewed as an "inferior feminine" affect. The parents induce even greater fear and shame through anger and contempt at any expression of fear (or distress) by the boy. Simultaneously, they refuse to remove the fearful (or distressing) activator until the desired transfor-

mation in affect occurs—until counterphobic and daring (or counter-distress and angry) counter-action gives the scene a “manly” ending. Then, the parents can feel pride that their son is a “real boy,” a macho man-in-the-making.

Only daring and aggressive counter-action can control the fearful and distressing scene and gain a rewarding response from parents. A “real boy” can be proud of his aggressive and daring counter-action that reduces his distress and fear, creating excitement or joy. Basking in the parent’s prideful boasting, the “real boy” can boast himself. Their mutual celebration of macho ideology resonates with the developing macho script.

(4) *Pride over aggressive and daring counter-action instigates disgust and contempt for shameful inferiors.*

Furthermore, parent and son can now share disgust and contempt for their inferiors—the sissy-boys and all girls. Engaging in acts of daring and aggression sets the “real boy” above the scared and crying inferiors who hang their heads in shame. Head held high, daring anyone to match his bravery, toughness, and callousness, the young macho celebrates his pride and arrogant contempt for the weak and submissive inferior. Like any warrior, he assumes power, pride, and glory as his entitlement; the vanquished reap the fear, distress, and shame that once was his.

Intolerant of any ambiguity in the dichotomous classification mandated by the criterion of his ideals, he understands the world is divided into the strong and the weak, the masculine and the feminine, the emotionally callous and those who weep, the proud and the shamed, the brave and the cowardly, the excitement-seekers and those basking in safe and dubious enjoyment. He understands; his ideology of *machismo* tells him so.

For the macho boy, learned disgust is generated by deviation from the ideals of manliness, toughness, and bravery. Disgust is generated by any display of “emotionality”—*intense*, “inferior feminine,” affects. Inferiors who display such disgusting affects activate angry dissmell, producing this affective-cognitive blend of intolerant *contempt*. Contempt, with one lip raised and head thrust forward, is angry; dissmell, with wrinkled-nose and head pulled back, is arrogantly superior and distancing. Anger may be reserved for the heat of battle, whereas, the cool contempt for inferiors characterizes the arrogant distance of master-to-slave. Any infringement on his masculine prerogatives elicits the anger-in-readiness for a contemptuous put-down.

(5) *Successful reversal of interpersonal control through angry and daring dominance activates excitement.*

Having been controlled by parents through rejecting-dominance, the macho seeks to reverse his history of hostile-submission. If successful, he assumes hostile-dominant control through his anger and contempt for the weakness of others. His hostile-dominant interpersonal style helps him lose his own sense of inferiority—implicit in his world view whenever he is in the role of submission, even when it is a begrudging, resentful, hostile submission. As the macho candidate moves from infancy to childhood or childhood to adolescence, the worm turns.

The “real boy” becomes a “real man” when he discovers one or both of his parents, other authority figures, or even his peers would rather switch than fight. The sudden interruption of exciting play by the parent instigates anger proportional to the intensity and duration of the excitement. If anger-expression turns the tables on the parent attempting to assert dominance, the anger is reduced, thereby producing joy, and the balance of power has been reversed along the axis of control. Thus, he learns the exciting script-rule that anger provides the power to dominate and to continue exciting play or action. The macho welcomes intense “superior masculine” affects of anger, excitement, and pride as he revels in dominating “inferior,” disgusting, and contemptible submissives.

(6) *Surprise becomes an interpersonal strategy to achieve dominance by evoking fear and uncertainty in others.*

Surprise-startle is the innate affect that is instigated by a sudden, rapid, but brief, increase in the gradient of neural stimulation. Within Tomkin's affect theory, the affect of surprise serves a resetting function—clearing the central assembly to react to the surprising stimulus regardless of on-going motivated action. The surprise-startle affect interrupts whatever is going on, permitting a reassessment of priorities of needs and opportunities.

The boy-becoming-macho-man learns that surprising others interrupts their ongoing behavior; moreover, such surprising behavior, if continued, often activates affective fear. Surprising others becomes a strategy for inducing fear in them and activating excitement in himself. Sudden and intense anger can surprise. Risky acts of daring can surprise. A callous toughness in the face of other's emotions of distress or fear can be surprising and unsettling. Unpredictability in the macho produces uncertainty and apprehension in the alter. Surprising others becomes an exciting rule—put to strategic use in interpersonal transactions—in the macho script.

(7) *Excitement becomes differentially magnified as a more acceptable affect than relaxed enjoyment, which becomes acceptable only during victory celebrations.*

Ever vigilant against the lure of relaxed enjoyment, the lifestyle of the macho man entails seeking excitement. Although the positive affect of enjoyment-joy is an inherently acceptable subjective experience, the scripting of the macho associates such unalloyed, relaxed enjoyment with a seduction that is dangerous to manhood. Excitement, stoicism, hard work, success, becomes necessary conditions before the activation of enjoyment becomes acceptable. Excitement is manly; enjoyment is temptingly "weak, inferior, and feminine." The smile of communion is at odds with an ideology of an adversarial and dangerous world. The smile of joy becomes increasingly limited to the smile of triumph shared within a male group to celebrate victory over opponents. In his dangerous world of perceived scarcity, there is only the joy of victory or the agony of defeat.

Macho Rites of Passage During Adolescence

Although these socialization dynamics began in infancy and often are well developed during childhood, the family of similar scenes continues to collect and modify and refine the rules in the script through time. Conditional requirements are added. Assessments of relative dominance-submission—who can manifest interpersonal control—become important. Other real-boys-becoming-macho-men also know how to intimidate and aggress, to be daring and heroic, and to be tough and callous. The world of boys becomes a stage to try out and rehearse macho roles. The world of boys becomes, in time, a world of youths. This transition from "real boy" to "real man" requires trials by fire—*rites de passage*.

The macho world is adversarial. To the victors: honor and pride; to the victims: distress, fear, and shame. To earn acceptance within the young warrior's honor society, a man must slay his lion. The *rite de passage*—a ritual marking the transition from boyhood to manhood—is a scene of special significance because it tests the manliness of the macho aspirant. The jury—the male youth group—stands in judgment; their sentence: acceptance or rejection.

Because the parents were rejecting rather than accepting, acceptance by male peers becomes proportionately more important. Adolescent status and "rep" within this social network is often scaled on these salient physical dimensions of masculinity. Three ritual scenes require physical action to test a "real man": (1) the fight scene, (2) the danger scene, and (3) the callous sex scene.

Gaining admission to a male peer group in a subculture of macho youths requires fighting your way in. A place in the pecking order is pugilistically promoted. You have to have "heart." Simultaneously dangerous and exciting, the fight tests the triumph of anger and excitement over distress and fear. In the balance hangs pride and shame. Although victory is sought, it is more important to demonstrate courage and toughness through the willingness to fight. If the fight is within the confines of the gang, acceptance and friendship await the combatants. Even macho men can smile and touch one another with affection after a fight (or other adversarial contests) to show mutual respect and friendliness. If the fight is with an enemy, by definition someone contesting for power who must be proven inferior, then the macho is to be callous, even cruel, in his anger and contempt. Gang fights (or adversarial contests) bolster group cohesion and mutual acceptance and liking of gang members.

The danger scene represents another crucial test of "masculine" fearlessness, often as much bravado as courage because the stakes are trivial—just a needless risk of life and limb. Particular locales may have specific rituals—to climb the watertower, to race your car, to steal, etc. The challenge of *the dare* looms large in invitations to danger. The test is to dare-to-do when a common sense assessment of risks would say the potential costs outweigh the potential gains. But in such a rational calculus, the cost of shame and the benefit of pride to the macho are not factored in. Loss of face, of honor, can mean rejection by the group. If the group exists in a truly dangerous environment replete with enemy others following the macho code (such as is found in certain urban ghettos), then greater danger awaits the boy without the protection of the gang. The use of alcohol and drugs can generate the necessary recklessness to engage in the scene or to celebrate its triumphant conclusion.

The callous sex scene is the third prerequisite to admission to macho manhood. The specific callous sexual act that is to count as manly varies: "You're not a 'real man' until you catch the clap," or "You're not a 'real man' until you've scored ten times," or "You're not a real man unless you take what you need." The 4-F philosophy—"find them, fool them, fuck them, and forget them"—encapsulates the macho's sexual ideology. Sol Gordon's joke has it that neither party enjoys their initial experience with sexual intercourse, the boy gets his orgasm the next day when he tells his friends.

To participate in these scenes in the presence of male friends or to recount these scenes in their presence bonds the male group together

in a camaraderie of shared hypermasculinity. Just as inclusion is a sign of "superiority," the exclusion of inferior males, females, and children attests to their inferiority. The social stratification into the strong or the weak has subsumed a sexual differentiation as strong *and* masculine or weak *and* feminine.

Masculinity is now established. Within the male group, moreover, shared laughter, humor, and enjoyment is permitted. You can smile with your friends and relax a bit, but not too much since someone may be testing the pecking order. Although dominance and submission—the control axis—remain important, it can be shifted into the friendly half of the interpersonal circle (Kiesler, 1983). You can accept a friendly-submissive role with your friendly-dominant leader. Free to banter, as long as there are mutual smiles, the macho gang can boast and ridicule and tease, even with affection.

These ritual scenes testing manliness share a common solution of *counter-action* to overcome "inferior feminine" emotions. The macho deploys his power strategy to maximize "masculine" affects and, hence, his "superiority," and to minimize "feminine" affects and, hence, his "inferiority." A power solution always emphasizes control; the macho power solution, hostile-control over man, woman, and nature.

Three Enculturation Dynamisms into Macho Ideology

What is the distinction between socialization and enculturation? To socialize means *to make social or fit for life in companionship with the family and others*, whereas to enculturate means *to adapt to a culture and adopt its values*. The seven socialization dynamics describe the affect dynamics in sets of scenes involving boys and their families. The scenes described as rites of passage during adolescence invoke the importance of the male youth reference group in socializing and enculturating the macho man.

Three related and overlapping enculturation processes deeply involve the macho man in vicarious experience of the ideology of *machismo*: (1) celebration, (2) vicarious resonance, and (3) identification and complementation.

Resonance is defined as *the mutually amplifying engagement of the ideo-affective posture of a person with the ideology of a subculture*. *Ideo-affective posture* is defined as the "loosely organized set of feelings and ideas about feeling (Tomkins, 1965, p. 74). (Tomkins now calls "ideo-affective posture"—a script.)

Such mutual resonance—an amplification and prolongation of

sympathetic vibrations between a macho personality script and the ideology of *machismo*—is a syndetic and synergistic enculturation process. Resonance connects, combines, amplifies, and prolongs both script and ideology. At *one with his world*, the macho's actions celebrate his world view, his ideology justifies his actions.

One psychological process of enculturation, thus, is *celebration*—to observe, perform, commemorate, proclaim and praise widely the ideology of *machismo* through the ritual scenes of macho acts. The macho reference group either shares in the celebration or is its vicarious audience of devotees. Boasting and basking in the glory of the celebration produces still more vicarious resonance in actor and audience.

One example of such a macho ritual is the informal celebration following the formal military parade-ritual of completing boot camp in the military. The recruit, shorn of his civilian dignity and hazed as a coward, a faggot, a mama's boy, and the like, undergoes an ordeal. If successful, he leaves the status of recruit behind to assume his new military identity as a warrior. In ritual celebration, the new soldier, sailor, airman, or marine *must*, with his buddies, go to the bar, get drunk, get laid, get into a fight with an outgroup member, and do something daring.

Whereas celebration involves a resonance that is based upon ritual acts as a participant, *vicarious resonance*—a second enculturation process—can occur in any member of an audience who becomes deeply involved in vicarious experience. The sum total of ways of living passed from one generation to the next also includes cultural products such as myths and dramas. These prototypical idealized scenes are experienced and re-experienced with roles recast or reversed in new but still idealized scenes of fantasies of heroic triumph that incorporate the hero and his rules into our scripts. But not all scripts resonate with macho mythic dramas. Only those cultural dramas sharing a goodness-of-fit to the scripting of the particular person amplify his involvement (Mosher, 1980; 1988) in memory, fantasy, pornography, and the mass media. Deep involvement in the ideas and images of *machismo* requires goodness-of-fit between the person's script and the presented images or narrative. Only macho men become deeply involved in filmed or written macho dramas.

Our mass media frequently reflect our culture's ideology of *machismo*, but the mass media do not, in themselves, create macho personality scripts. Enculturation justifies socialization; socialization resonates with enculturation. There is resonance without an equiva-

lence in causal influence because vicarious scenes usually are less amplified by affect than socializing scenes. The mass media may contribute to the enculturation of an ideology of *machismo* in a receptive audience of boys and men already having macho scripts, but non-macho men and many women reject that world view.

A pair of complementary psychological processes comprise the third psychological process of enculturation into macho ideology: *identification* and *complementation*. *Identification* is defined as *the vicarious process of role and value incorporation by perceived similarity to a role model*. *Complementation* is defined as *the vicarious process of role and value incorporation by perceived dissimilarity to an alter in a role that is complementary to the valued role*.

Following Kiesler's (1983) interpersonal circle theory, a complementary transaction corresponds on the interpersonal axis of affiliation (friendly-hostile) and is reciprocal on the interpersonal axis of control (dominance-submission). Thus, hostile-dominance elicits, pulls, or evokes hostile-submission, just as hostile-submission elicits, pulls, or evokes hostile-dominance.

In any scene, the protagonist is vicariously learning the multiple roles available in the scene as he plays his own. You can not learn to be a man without learning how to transact with women; as you learn to play one gender role, you also learn the alter's role. Of course, we believe, apart from the biology of reproduction, there are no inherent masculine or feminine roles. Yet for the hypermasculine man, "feminine" transaction and roles are considered "inferior"—to be avoided or else they count as evidence against hypermasculine identity. To be "feminine" is to be a slave, not a warrior.

Masculinity is socialized and enculturated both by interaction and complementation with women and by interaction and identification with men. Thus, the macho man learns not only by identifying with macho roles, but also by the reciprocity of complementary role transactions that elicit, pull, evoke, and invite a macho transaction. Both initiating macho transactions that elicit complementary responses and responding with macho transaction to alter's eliciting transactions validate the macho position.

Although such a process of vicarious learning ensures *knowledge* of all roles, the bifurcation of affects and invidious stratification of gender roles precludes flexible role *performance* in hypermasculine men. The psychological magnification of the macho script by affect makes the macho care deeply about enacting his script. Guided by his script, the macho's role performance is made urgent by affect—by

both the needs to experience the "manly" affects and to avoid experiencing the "unmanly" affects.

The personality scripts of men socialized as macho resonate with the ideological script of *machismo*. That interdependent resonance mutually amplifies both script and ideology by making both rules and beliefs still more *necessary and true*. Socialization and enculturation prepare the individual for living within a culture defined by its norms, values, and world view. The resonance between the scripts of macho personality and ideology validates the self, justifies the macho lifestyle, celebrates the macho ideology, and provides a basic understanding of the self-in-the-world.

Forming The Macho Personality Script

Affects are the most important class of motivators and amplify all psychological processes. Yet not all scenes have an impact upon personality. Some remain transient scenes in spite of their affective intensity. For families of scenes to become transformed into scripts, they must be reviewed in consciousness and psychologically magnified by new affect.

A *script* is defined as *a set of rules for ordering information contained in a family of scenes*. The script consists of rules to interpret and understand, to predict and produce, to direct and manage, and to explain and evaluate the family of scenes governed by the script. The set of scenes share a similarity, a family resemblance, in their affects and the objects of those affects. Prototypical features define the present scene as similar or analogous to the scenes governed by the rules of the script.

The scenes of macho socialization, the rites of passage, and macho celebrations are potential scripting scenes. Potential scripting scenes share three characteristics: (a) they include *intense* affect, (2) they are *replications* of a family of scenes sharing some differentiating affects and their objects, and (3) they are *consequential* in the sense of containing sharp changes in the quantity or quality of affect.

Yet, it is not the affective intensity of the scene, nor its repetition, nor even its changes in affect intensity or polarity within the scene, that, in themselves, produce the script. These intense, repeated, consequential scenes are only a potential source of scripts. The affect in these experiences amplify the psychological processes occurring within the scenes as they were lived. The formation of the script requires *psychological magnification* by new affect of these potential scripting scenes.

Psychological magnification is defined as *the experience of new affect during a narrative review of the family of scenes co-assembled in consciousness that further magnifies that family of scenes*. The affect that psychologically magnifies the family of scenes may or may not be the same as the prominent affects in the scenes themselves. This magnification by new affect makes urgent a search for rules to interpret and understand, to predict and produce, to direct and manage, and to explain and evaluate the family of scenes.

In the macho script, this process of co-assembly of the family of past scenes and of rehearsals in fantasy of potential future scenes is psychologically magnified by excitement. Excitement is *the* affect that magnifies the rules drawn during the narrative review of macho scenes during script formation. The macho script contains rules requiring exciting, decisive, physical action.

The scenes that are thus reviewed include not only potential scripting scenes but also idealized counter-scenes (counter-scenes undo the traumatic scene) and fantasies of future scenes. It is here that the vicarious processes of enculturation play their part. The vicarious scenes are not usually affectively intense enough to require an urgent search for rules. (Resonance from precise goodness-of-fit of a script to a cultural product might produce exceptionally deep involvement in the fantasy, but this implies, at least, the existence of a protoscript.) Nonetheless, vicarious scenes can provide a cast, a setting, roles, props, and functions to be assimilated to a script or to enlist in a counter-scene. For example, a boy dominated by an even more macho bully, may use the words or weapons learned from the media to triumph in fantasy if not in reality. A counter-scene envisages the troublesome scene with a reversal of affective outcomes through a change in cast, reversal of roles, or more competent performance. For example, in fantasy, he is now such a wizard of words and warfare, so manly and tough in his role of turning-the-tables, that his once proud foe is reduced to the tears and fears that were once his. Anything he pretends, he may master.

Psychological magnification by new affect (the script-affect) during the narrative review invests the rules with emotional amplification making each psychological process more so. For the macho man, predictions seem more sure, explanation more exhaustive, interpretations more significant, management more possible, and evaluations more fitting because of their magnification by the script-affect of interest-excitement. By contrast, if, as he reviewed these scenes, he felt fear—the principle enemy—it would increase uncertainty and meaninglessness, making control impossible, and defeat more shaming.

A rule can be defined as a decision to use an algorithm for solving a particular problem posed, or for reaching a desired goal afforded, by the information in the scene. A script rule is intended to be a procedural guide to problem solution, yet on closer inspection, it turns out to be a procedural guide to validating the rules of the script. That is, people order the information in scenes, and thus their lives, by rules that guide their actions in ways more consistent with their script than with actual problem solution. They try to solve their problems or conflicts or to fulfill their needs or motives with patterns of rules that replicate their past experience more than they consider the novelties and possibilities of the new scene.

A set of rules is like a scientific theory. The rules of a script contain a favorable ratio of few procedural rules to many sets of potential scenes. Just as a scientific theory offers a few postulates to account for many derivative phenomena, a script attempts to specify algorithms for interpreting, understanding, predicting, producing, directing, managing (or avoiding), explaining, and evaluating all scenes showing a family resemblance to the prototypical scripting scenes. The rules are "hot" cognitions, being amplified by the script-affect, and in the scene itself, by the affects instigated in the living-enactment of the rules within the unfolding episode.

Even if they once were, the rules do not remain in conscious awareness. Conscious awareness is focused more on our intentions and subjective experience of affects than on procedural rules. Once any procedure becomes practiced enough to be habitual, we no longer attend to its details. It passes within a *valley of perceptual skill* where it remains unnoticed—outside of consciousness and attentional awareness—until events conspire to heighten its salience once again.

Moreover, the rules of a script are analogous to speech production. We are aware of wanting to say something to someone—our intention. We are not aware of the algorithms used to select either the words chosen from our vocabulary or the syntactical choices that arrange our sentences.

New scenes, however, can change old scripts. But the novel features and novel affects must alter preexisting biases in interpretation, understanding, prediction, production, direction, management, explanation, and evaluation of the new scenes whenever they share a family resemblance with the old scenes that generated the script rules. Rules conserve the past because of their great economy in conserving energy. A rule makes a decision and solves a problem efficiently—when it works.

A script biases the construal of scenes toward viewing them as replicants of a family of scenes that generated rules for *how to live* in that past family of scenes. Given affect that makes us care, we urgently search for a rule for how to live, then we continue to live using that rule, until circumstances require revision of the rule. Information changes faster than the rules which order it. The information in scenes is made urgent by our affects, and particularly by any consequential changes in the intensity or polarity of our affects. Human life is dramatic; human affect produces drama; our scripts direct the dramatic scenes.

The Conditionality of Scripts

The application of the script to scenes is a function of an *interscript* script that determines relevance and applicability. Even the degree of magnification of the script is relative to times, conditions, and reference groups.

Times can refer either to stages in the life cycle or to specific opportunities for macho scenes to unfold. The macho script, because of its emphasis on *physicality* is a young man's script. Physicality means either: (1) the overdeveloped or overemphasized physical attributes of a person, or (2) the preoccupation with one's body, physical needs, or appetites. Physicality, as preoccupation and overemphasis on the body's attributes and needs, is part of the macho's definition of real manliness. To be physically strong and tough, to need to indulge his appetites for drink and daring and for sex and violence is to enact the macho style of life. In adolescence, macho physicality waxes; in mid-life, it wanes.

The time to be macho is any time when "masculinity" is challenged; the macho must seize the moment. An opportunity to be macho is a challenge to be dared. Given a direct threat to hypermasculine status or self-esteem, the macho strategy is to be "mucho macho." The macho man follows the same rules when threatened, only more so; he escalates the intensity of his affects and actions. His increased affect increases his caring about his masculine self-esteem and its ideology. The challenge evokes counter-action that is proportional to the degree of threat to hypermasculine identity.

Challenges of nature require daring and heroic physical action to conquer the danger to masculine status and self-esteem. Challenges by male adversaries require escalating violence to be more manly. Challenges by adversarial females require their physical subjugation or their physical *and* sexual subjugation. The rule: escalate anger, daring, callousness until dominance is established.

Challenges-as-opportunities afford many occasions for macho action. Any scene organized by the "masculine" affects of surprise, excitement, anger, disgust, contempt, and pride call forth the macho script. Situations of perceived scarcity of resources or adversarial competitions that permit interpersonal hostile-dominance or physical power strategies to determine outcomes recruit the macho script. Situations of danger, competition, and the presence of adversaries elicit the rules and strategies of the macho personality script. Of course, potential sexual scenes elicit "scoring" responses. These potential scenes are organized in accordance with a hierarchy of potential motives-in-affordances that is a function of affects instigated within the scene, as processed by the man's script with its rules for interpreting and evaluating opportunities and contraventions.

Because the reference group of macho men is composed of other macho men, the bonded-male-group permits the contagious celebration of macho ideology. The contagion is both *affective* and *social*. The affect of excitement contagiously activates itself; the affect of excitement in other macho men also activates excitement through social contagion of affect-expression in the face and body.

Three Variations in the Macho Script Across Life Stages

Because the scripting of personality is based upon an individual's experience of unique scenes, each man's script reflects the uniqueness of his personal history in the sequencing, intensities, and magnification of affects. Yet, the macho script does have three prototypical variations that occur at different stages of life as a function of the ratio of positive to negative affective outcomes from following the rules of the macho script emphasizing physicality.

The ratio of positive to negative affects experienced in the scenes governed by the macho script determines the relative preference for the variations of the macho script. As long as the ratio of positive affects to negative affects, generated both during and as outcomes of the script-governed scenes, remains rewarding, the macho employs a *counteractive script*. This is the main macho script described as counteraction to opportunity, challenge, and threat by daring, violence, and callous sex to take advantage of opportunities, to rise to the challenge, and to reverse the threat by demonstrating "masculinity," and, thus, to bolster "masculine" identity, status, or esteem. The counteractive script relies upon exciting, vigorous, decisive, physical action. Experiencing the invulnerability of youth, the young macho relies on his strength, dominance, toughness, callousness, aggressiveness, violence, virility, and physicality.

The *defensive script* of the macho comes into play when the ratio of positive to negative affects associated with being a macho man is becoming more negative than positive. As physicality declines, or as the macho man begins to reap the costs of the macho lifestyle, direct counteraction begins to pall. Feeling more vulnerable as youth is left behind, the macho man becomes vulnerable to the shameful discovery that he is not as fearless and as free of distress as he had claimed. He may suffer the violence of other men, injuries from daring fate and nature, and abandonment by the women who gave him respite and solace when his guard was down. When in transition, counteractive and defensive scripts may alternate as a function of specific affect histories and expectations.

The *defensive script* for the macho man seeks to preserve masculine esteem in the face of increasingly negative affective outcomes accrued while following the counteractive script. It is often a substance-abusing script. Alcohol or other drugs are simultaneously “manly” and excuses for the “unmanly.” The unwanted “inferior feminine” affects inhibited by his scripting now may begin to appear. Whereas, when drunk, the young macho man wants to gamble, fight, and fuck, the aging macho finds, when in his cups, the return of the suppressed. The suppressed tears of distress return, the fears of life’s challenges and contraventions return, the lure of pacific relaxation—just “nodding out”—return; and become insidiously attractive. Yet the shame of knowing these “inferior feminine” affects are now his, is shaming. Being drunk justifies a respite, being a drunk (or a “head,” or an addict), justifies a retirement from the macho lifestyle of counteraction. The tattoo, “born to lose,” is the banner of the defensive macho script.

When the ratio of positive to negative affects resulting from living a macho lifestyle has reached its nadir, the macho man still clings to hope for a heroic rescue of his failed life. He believes that he can save the meaning of his life by heroically losing it. To repair his hyper-masculine identity from his failure-at-living, he gives his life in glorious ascension from nadir to zenith—before the fall.

The *pseudo-reparative script* of the macho man embraces heroic death. The motto of the death-embracing macho man, often tattooed across that emblem of strength—the bicep, is “death before dishonor.” Macho men fantasize and enact going out in a “blaze of glory,” just as Phaeton did in the archetypal male myth (May, 1980). Phaeton beseeched his father, the sun god Phoebus, to permit him, as proof of admitted paternity, to drive the Sun Chariot with its powerful winged horses. Phoebus warns him of the danger, offers his own (“feminine”)

fear and love as proof of paternity, but Phaeton's manly pride requires dangerous and proud action. But, Phaeton, a mere mortal, was not equal to the task; the horses run wild, scorching the earth, until Zeus strikes Phaeton with his lightning bolt. They carved this epitaph—surely a testimonial to macho ideology:

*Here Phaeton lies,
Who drove his father's chariot: if he did not
Hold it, at least he fell in splendid daring.*
(As cited by May, 1980, p. 3)

The pride of masculine ascendancy—the hubris of “masculine superiority”—precedes a fall into death. Death offers the comfort of relaxation so long denied. If heroic, it validates the life governed by the macho script. A hero's death, by the dramatic power of the final scene, can rescue a failing macho and transform the meaning of his life from failure-at-living to that of a *real man*. Songs will be sung around the campfire, myths bear tribute to his courage and stoic acceptance of his manly fate.

A truly *reparative script* would require the macho to embrace life, and, thus, to embrace the culturally proscribed feminine gender script. To renounce death, the macho must embrace life, love, communion, and his “feminine” affects in order to become a more total and complete human self. To integrate a truly reparative script, the macho must question his identity and ideology and magnify the suppressed affects here-to-fore pejoratively assigned as “inferior and feminine.” The longed for loving, pacific, relaxed communion with “inferior, emotional” fellow humans can indeed be reparative of the macho script. But “death before dishonor” precludes easy acceptance of a rewarding world that is defined as “feminine” and “inferior.” Having been denied the warm, emphatic, enjoyable, communion during his time of childhood fear, distress, and shame, the self-disgust and self-contempt at being unmanly in the face of fear and distress may close the door—if not lock it—to a human reparation of his sense of loss, leaving him only heroic death. The alternative is a radical transformation of the meaning of his world and style of life from experiences in a family of countercenes in which “inferior, feminine” affects are rewarding and acceptable. Psychotherapy may provide the best context for a narrative review in consciousness to consider the rules for how to be a man—a *mensch* —without being a macho man.

Variations on Variations

This account of the macho man describes the socialization of *physicality* and enculturation from the informal social networks of the

gang or street corner. Within the counteractive, physicality macho script, there are still more variations. A macho man can be a *ladies' man* or a *man's man*. The former may deemphasize violence as manly and concentrate on the roles of "stud" or "cocksman." The latter may deemphasize callous sex in favor of living in a man's world of physical stoicism and the pursuit of war. Another variation is the *con man*, who emphasizes verbal skills rather than physical skills to "run his game." He is a macho man who uses, in contrast to brute force, his Machiavelian (Christie & Geis, 1970) unscrupulous, cunning, deceptive, manipulative skills to attain personal power. Members of the underclasses should be overrepresented in macho scripts of physicality.

Other variations on the macho script may deemphasize physicality and violence in favor of adversarial competition for scarce resources within culturally acceptable organizational networks. Such scripts may be more characteristic of middle-class socialization. For example, Orman has described a macho presidential style as:

- (1) competitive in politics and life, (2) sports-minded and athletic, (3) decisive, never wavering or uncertain, (4) unemotional, never revealing his true emotions or feelings, (5) strong aggressive, not weak or passive, (6) powerful, and (7) a "real man," never feminine. (Orman, 1987, pp. 7-8)

Although presidents, entrepreneurs, etc. may have macho scripts resulting from the socialization dynamics we have described, many of them have moderated the simple reliance on *physicality as masculine power* to include the skillful uses of symbolic power and organizational power. They may share the ideology of *machismo* without sharing all aspects of the scripting scenes and adolescent rites of passage in macho socialization.

In fact, enculturation into macho ideology in America may be more pervasive than socialization into the macho personality script. Exposure to social networks composed entirely of men in adversarial competitions with other men is nearly universal in America. The mass media ensures universal exposure to the ideology of *machismo*, albeit with varying effects as a function of resonance to scripts. In particular, television, with its emphasis on exciting action, violence, and male heroes, enculturates certain aspects of the ideology of *machismo*. From the script perspective, however, strategies for change are never as simple as, for example: "stop pornography and you stop sexual violence against women."

If, as claimed, this theory is coherent, heuristic, and elegant, we must demonstrate its value to skeptics by generating additional measures of its constructs and a research program that permits a spiraling-upward from theory to valid measurement to empirical dis-

coveries to theoretical refinements and so forth. Such an enterprise is, in itself, one contrast case to macho scripting of the beneficial motivating effects of the affect of excitement generated by ideas in a scientist's script consistent with the ideology of scientific progress to achieve humanistic goals.

References

- CHRISTIE, R., & GEIS, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.
- KIESLER, D. J. (1983). The 1982 interpersonal circle: A taxonomy for complementarity in human transactions. *Psychological Review*, *90*, 185-214.
- MAY, R. (1980). *Sex and fantasy: Patterns of male and female development*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- MOSHER, D. L. (1980). Three dimensions of depth of involvement in human sexual response. *Journal of Sex Research*, *16*, 1-42.
- MOSHER, D. L. (1988). Pornography defined: Sexual involvement theory, narrative context, and goodness-of-fit. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, *1*, in press.
- MOSHER, D. L., & SIRKIN, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *18*, 150-163.
- ORMAN, J. (1987). *Comparing presidential behavior: Carter, Reagan, and the macho presidential style*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- TOMKINS, S. S. (1962). *Affect, imagery, consciousness: Vol. I, The positive affects*. New York: Springer Publishing.
- TOMKINS, S. S. (1965). Affect and the psychology of knowledge. In S. S. Tomkins and C. E. Izard (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and personality*, pp. 72-97. New York: Springer Publishing.
- TOMKINS, S. S. (1979). Script theory: Differential magnification of affects. In H. E. Howe, Jr., & R. Dienstbiener (Eds.), *1978 Nebraska symposium on motivation*, pp. 201-236. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- TOMKINS, S. S. (1987). Script theory. In J. Aronoff, A. I. Rabin, & R. A. Zucker (Eds.), *The emergence of personality* (pp. 147-216). New York: Springer Publishing.