FROM ANDROCENTRISM TO THE SECOND SEX

In the beginning there were men and they created their world, masculine of course, and with them came progress. In the beginning there were women, and they created their world, feminine of course, and by them, progress became possible.

In the mid-nineteenth century, the first wave of the feminist movement began and lasted until the First World War. Charlotte Perkins Gillman (1860-1935) proclaimed that the world was androcentric in the title of the book she published in 1911. In 1949, Simone de Beauvoir (1908-1986) stated that women were the second sex and her book marked a before and an after. They conceived men as the centre, as the first sex and women as “otherness”.

Seis premisas constituyen el marco de referencia: a) el dimorfismo sexual existe y subsistirá, b) las variantes culturales masculinas son respetables, c) masculinidad es a normalidad como machismo es a psicopatología, d) la virilidad sigue siendo una cualidad positiva que define a los varones, e) sólo uno de cada tres estudios psicológicos tenía en cuenta a los varones a finales del siglo XX, f) Los varones han pasado a la clandestinidad: callan y dejan que se hable de ellos con datos de segunda mano. Secularmente los hombres han fraguado su identidad social que traspasa fronteras y culturas al compartir facetas. Ante los profesionales de la Psicología los hombres hablan de sí mismos en psicoterapia, en sesiones de consejo psicológico, en cursos de formación y desarrollo. No hay Institutos del Hombre que empleen dinero público para estudiar los asuntos y problemas que les conciernen. En psicología los varones están en minoría: hacen y dejan hacer. Las pruebas de paternidad muestran que uno de cada cuatro pueden ser sólo padres putativos. La iniciativa sexual no es un privilegio masculino. Hay modos varoniles de expresar las emociones. Cada vez se impone más la organización polícrona de tiempos y actividades por las nuevas tecnologías. El liderazgo directivo tiene connotaciones masculinas. La sistematización prevalece en los modos de pensar masculinos. Los hombres son remunerados por lo que hacen y por su dedicación. La creatividad y la inventiva aflora entre los hombres y muchos genios han sido perseguidos y ninguneados en su tiempo. Pocos hombres se ven como centro o como el primer sexo. Esas son categorías ajenas. Apelativos como metrosexual, tecnosexual, retrosexual, ubsexual son alias para no hablar más de masculinidad.
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Six major premises constitute the frame of reference: a) sexual dimorphism exists and will remain, b) male cultural variants are respectable, and c) maleness is to normality as machismo is to psychopathology, d) virility is still a positive quality which defines men, e) only one out of three psychological studies took men into account in their data at the end of the twentieth century, f) men now go underground: they keep silent and let others talk about them based on second-hand data. Through the ages males have forged their social identity, sharing patterns across cultures and borders. Males meet psychologists in psychotherapy, in counselling, in coaching and mentoring programs, in training and development programs. There are no Men’s Institutes sponsored by public funding which do research on matters and problems typical of men. In Psychology, males are in the minority: they do and let others do. Paternity tests show that about one out of four may only be putative fathers. Sexual initiative is not a male privilege. Males express their emotions in a manly manner. Polychronic time schemes and activities have become widespread after new technologies. Directive leadership has masculine connotations. Systematizing prevails among males as a way of thinking. Men are remunerated for what they do and for their dedication. Creativity and inventiveness abound among men and many geniuses have faced prosecution or were ostracized. Men rarely view themselves as the centre or first sex. These are alien categories. Metrosexual, technosexual, retrosexual, ubsexual are just aliases used to avoid talking about maleness.
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proclaimed by the feminist culture. In developed countries, large sums of public money have been dedicated to the study of women’s identity and what concerns them. In Spain, for the period between 2008 and 2011, 3,690 million euros will be dedicated to Equal Opportunities for Women and Men, just a passing reference in each of the twelve axes of the Strategic Plan. The European Union has created a new Institute of Gender Equality which was initially assigned 50 million euros to monitorize what is happening in each Member State. The data will be used as a contrast, as a backdrop in which to highlight pro-genocentrism findings. In their sights, without missing a beat, are men about whom many affirmations are made.

In developed countries, there is a conspicuous absence of Men’s institutes dedicated exclusively to matters concerning men, to use data concerning women for contrast and dedicate public funding to deepen their understanding of men’s identities and all that pertains to their education, health and quality of life. Androcentrism, it seems, stands on its own. Men do not invest in propping it up.

This article walks on the razor’s edge as it tackles some questions which are, in themselves, masculine. Three men writing about maleness in a positive tone nowadays is daring! Learning, sharing and passing on something in favor of that which identifies men has become a clandestine activity.

In psychology, it was Gilligan (1986) who mentioned that most psychological theories had overlooked women in the findings and in the conclusions. The situation was not so bad and it has changed. The bibliometric analysis of the PsycINFO data base has shown that between 1887 and 1959 the proportion of articles which made a reference to men was 0.53; this tendency changed during the 1960-1973 period, increasing the proportion of articles referring to women to 0.54 and reaching 0.65 in the period from 1974 to 1997. In other words, by the end of the twentieth century only one out of three articles had to do with men (Moon & Hoffman, 2000). A similar affirmation was reached by Hoffman and Quinton (1996) after analyzing the data in PsycLIT and SOCIOFILE for the period from 1974 to 1994; in addition, the Psychology of Men and Masculinity journal of the American Psychological Association, division 51.

When establishing the essence of masculine social identity characteristics, the list is long; as an example we find Beynon (2002), Chafetz (1990), Edley and Wetherall (1995), Goldberg (1993), and Kimmel, Hearn and Connell (2004); in addition, the Psychology of Men and Masculinity journal of the American Psychological Association, division 51. The root of masculine identity is the Y chromosome, the trunk is the interaction between the nervous and the hormonal systems, with special attention to testosterone (Whitehead & Barrett, 2001), the sap comes to be “the endorsement and internalization of a cultural system of beliefs about masculinity and what is masculine embedded in the structural relationship between both sexes”, in the words of Pleck, Sonenstein and Ku (1993, p.88). Connell (2000) has pointed out the existence of a hierarchic order in masculine identity, the tough versus the funny and tender guy.

From an anthropological and feminist point of view, “machismo” is a word which becomes an anvil for certain stereotyped behaviors of masculine supremacy, dominance and control (Bourdieu, 2000). From a psychological point of view it is a hodgepodge of narcissism, homophobia, authoritarianism, march,

SEXUAL DIMORPHISM
One of the approaches for studying masculine identity has focused on constructing masculinity-femininity scales based, for example, on the contrast between instrumentality and expressiveness. Factor analyses using Spanish data has shown that the substratum is multidimensional (Fernández, Quiroga, Del Olmo & Rodríguez, 2007). In other words, based on these scales, created “ad-hoc” by experts, sexual dimorphism is an entelechy.

Men attend psychotherapy, counseling and coaching sessions and in these surroundings, information of a different magnitude is obtained. When the staff is assessed through interviews and group discussions, in selection and promotion processes, what adult men take into account and value positively or negatively in their inner selves and in their interactions with other men and women in their work and personal environments comes to light. These details and matters are rich in nuances of a qualitative nature (Brooks, 1998, Pollack & Levant, 1998; Good & Brooks, 2005). Sexual dimorphism exists and counts in the working world. Masculine identity is a social reality; as such, a good number of men identify themselves throughout their lives (Wade & Brittan Powell, 2000; Whitehead, 2007). 

MASCULINE SOCIAL IDENTITY
When establishing the essence of masculine social identity characteristics, the list is long; as an example we find Beynon (2002), Chafetz (1990), Edley and Wetherall (1995), Goldberg (1993), and Kimmel, Hearn and Connell (2004); in addition, the Psychology of Men and Masculinity journal of the American Psychological Association, division 51. The root of masculine identity is the Y chromosome, the trunk is the interaction between the nervous and the hormonal systems, with special attention to testosterone (Whitehead & Barrett, 2001), the sap comes to be “the endorsement and internalization of a cultural system of beliefs about masculinity and what is masculine embedded in the structural relationship between both sexes”, in the words of Pleck, Sonenstein and Ku (1993, p.88). Connell (2000) has pointed out the existence of a hierarchic order in masculine identity, the tough versus the funny and tender guy.

From an anthropological and feminist point of view, “machismo” is a word which becomes an anvil for certain stereotyped behaviors of masculine supremacy, dominance and control (Bourdieu, 2000). From a psychological point of view it is a hodgepodge of narcissism, homophobia, authoritarianism, march,
camaraderie, illusion of greatness and hormonal complications (Rubinstein, 2003). Thus, it is just a disorder, quiet different of a sound masculine identity.

The denial of what is masculine as healthy, its existence as a cultural imposition and its reduction to role-related behaviors or gender differences is an option which is very present in Institutes of Psychology and also in the Association of Psychologists. In such institutions, courses or seminars regarding matters which concern women are held periodically. Not a single topic or session is about men as the object of study and appraisal. In the same way as we speak about misogyny we can speak of “misandry” when what is masculine is rejected or diminished. This seems to be the situation at present.

Virility

It was Cicerón (106 BC- 63AD) who coined the term “virility” which has given the name to a series of behavioral patterns and ways of making oneself noticed which, in the Western world, have been considered manly.

Autonomy for competitive functioning and organization seems to be the first common factor underlying studies which attempt to identify the essence of virility. Walker, Tokar and Fischer (2000) conducted a factor analysis on the eight most common instruments and generated a principal components solution. Masculine Ideology was the label for the first factor which explained 53% of the covariance. The three highest loadings (>0.70) were due to variables belonging to the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon, 1985): a) emphasis on the success of what one does, b) not asking for help and autonomous functioning, c) sending those who bother you to hell; “not at all effeminate” was the fifth variable (loading =0.56) and the fourth due to its loading (0.60), Dominion belonging to the Gender Role Conflict Scale by O’Neil et al (1986).

Assuming risks is another male pattern consolidated since the days of going hunting and fighting. Its most relevant contemporary manifestations are the high rates of labor and traffic accidents, abusive consumption of alcohol and tobacco, the ingest of fat-rich foods, low physical activity after 35, avoidance of medical check-ups, agitated and conflictive lifestyle with the risk of heart failure, cancerous mutations and early cerebral deterioration (Mahalik, Levi Minzi & Walker, 2007). Men thrive in stressful situations, of rivalry, where they assume and manage risks or have severe traumatic damage of the central nervous system (Good et al, 2006). That is the reason for psychological counseling programs for men, so that they may adopt healthy lifestyles and take care of their health (Good & Brooks, 2005, chapter 2).

With coeducation, gentelmanliness has disappeared as an object of education and practice among boys. From the moment boys and girls coexist in the classroom, it has been taken for granted that manners will be learned spontaneously in everyday interaction, through direct actions and reactions and in any place (Von Martial & Gordillo, 1992). Behaving in a gentlymanly way with female employees, coworkers and clients was one of the premises for coexistence in work environments which is in decline. Psychological counseling programs for men with a focus on “politically correct” standards emerge as substitutes (Good & Brooks, 2005, chapters 3 and 4).

Giving little importance to one’s own appearance and to the fact of getting old is another masculine pattern which has changed (Cafri & Thompson, 2004). The number of males who consume fashion and cosmetic products is on the rise; they have discovered body culture and fitness as they age. Good appearance is one of the usual criteria in selection processes whatever the age of the candidate. Its assessment is mediated by the Body Mass Index, height, silhouette, degree of satisfaction and the precision in grading the relationship between muscle mass and build (McCreary & Sadava, 2001).

The new virility has its prototypes identified in men’s magazines written for men, which are spread among economically and culturally qualified minorities. They are founded on the analysis of the daily routines which they promote and sustain at the same time.

Gentle, weak men have become the object of desire and praise among women who consider themselves strong, who do not become frightened in the face of any inkling of masculine firmness and vigor (Blazina & Watkins, 2000). Hence, impetuosity and outbursts have become a feminine privilege in the presence of workmates and accessible bosses. The line of argument usually is: men also cry, have weaknesses, need help, face personal or professional crises, and lead chaotic lives. They appear in the third factor identified by Walker, Tokar and Fisher (2000); it explains 13% of the covariance. Such expositions turn masculine culture upside down giving way to a certain andropathic epidemic (Gil Calvo, 1997).
Metrosexual man has been the masculine culture prototype on the rise since 1994. It really consists of a revival of the classical myth of Narcissus, the English dandy, the bon vivant, the chic. He can be homosexual, heterosexual or bisexual. He is usually hedonistic, consumerist, cosmopolitan, sensitive, vain, peaceful and provocative. From the world of art and literature, he has gone on to the world of business, especially in commercial and communication departments.

The retrosexual man is its antagonist and this label began to be used in 2003. It is the most classic prototype in traditional work environments. These are men who dedicate very little time, money and effort to personal care and self-image improvement. It is usually the spouse, mother or girlfriend who takes care of their attire and poise.

The technosexual man is another prototype on the rise in the workplace since 2002. It is applied to men who are up to date in the usage of sophisticated technological gadgets and who feel comfortable with the glimmer of femininity they perceive in themselves and that they assume to be healthy. It also has sexual connotations: they dedicate more time to erotic, festive relationships in cyberspace than the face to face in the flesh ones. They are in charge of controlling their purchases, their tastes, their attachments.

The Übersexual man is another expression that has been circulating since 2005. It alludes to the man who overcomes his conditionants as a male to gain recognition and shine with his own light, inside and outside working hours. The focus is on authentic, capable men who work precisely and show perfection and greatness of spirit. It is something like the revision of superman, the ideal cathar.

Frith and Gleeson (2004) ascertained through the use of a questionnaire what men took into account when getting dressed and four criteria emerged: a) they give preference to everyday functionality and relegate esthetics to a second plane, b) they worry very little about how clothes look on their bodies, c) very few buy clothes for the purpose of exhibiting their bodies, d) they are guided by confusing cultural standards with respect to which clothes are typically used by men. These data suggest that the retrosexual man is, among the five, the one who receives respect.

The revision of these new era expressions highlights the fact that these are solid masculine myths. Terms such as virility, manly, virile are avoided. Only some perfumes are still masculine!

**Fatherhood**

The experience of fatherhood is a consequence of assuming the role of father in the family. Mackey (2001), in a study of 55,000 adult-child dyadic relationships in 23 different cultures, found the existence of an underlying bond with the son. It is a different bond to that of man-woman, woman-child.

When analyzing the way in which fathers speak about fatherhood, the first factor that emerged in Brownson and Gilbert (2002) study was “fathers as strong and responsible family leaders”. The other three factors compared fathers with mothers in child rearing, pointed out their incompetence as the caregivers of children and gave evidence of the conflict between family and work.

The patriarchal notion of fatherhood entails the assurance of a male successor who will lead and protect women in the bosom of the family, a duty which also concerns male brothers. At the same time, these two aspects constitute the essence of fatherhood in masculine experiences (Alemany García, 2005). From the same time, these two aspects constitute the essence of fatherhood in masculine experiences (Alemany García, 2005). From the moment mothers and daughters insisted on refusing unsolicited paternalistic behaviors, this has entailed a correction of roles and tasks within the family. For example, brothers can intervene in defense of their sisters when these ask them to, but not before. This implies a change of perspective in the patriarchal culture, protective of females of their own lineage if they are submissive.

Walby (1990) also establishes a new category, the public patriarchy which is protective in appearance but which generates inequality and discrimination in organizations and jobs, as can be extracted from a reading of the Spanish data shown in Cantera, Medrano, García-Perrate and Barros (2007).

With respect to the attribution of the paternity of offspring, the mother’s declaration has been considered trustworthy. It has not always been this way. In the roman tradition, in Hispania, the midwife accompanied the mother in labor. The man stayed outside the house. The midwife went out and gave the baby to the father who took a walk around the house contemplating it. At a given moment, he made a decision: he could either go into the house with the baby recognizing it as his own or he could leave it at the door and it became a foundling. Recent investigations have confirmed that this practice was not so preposterous. Experimental studies have shown that two
out of three fathers can correctly recognize their children if they contemplate them for 10 minutes or more. Mothers also identify them by their body odor (Bader & Phillips, 2002).

Fatherhood seems to be at a critical moment. It is possible to eliminate uncertainty and reveal harsh and destabilizing realities. If the hiring of detectives was the pattern during the twentieth century, DNA studies have given way to several protocols. These are “paternity tests” reliable in 99.99% of the cases. With the first validation studies, in the seventies, conclusive data began to emerge: slightly more than 5% of children had putative fathers and, at the beginning of the twenty-first century this percentage seems to be in the region of 25 to 30% according to studies by the American Association of Blood Banks in the US (AABB, 2005). These data are biased as they have been obtained by request of the interested party when they want to find out to what extent the mother has committed “paternity fraud”. The retail price of the so-called “paternity-testing kits” has decreased year after year in a pattern which is opposite to purchases and applications. Hence, the number of fathers and grandfathers who make verifications on their own and draw conclusions regarding monthly payments, distribution of patrimony and inheritance has increased.

To the extent that adult men are economically solvent, the number of mothers and potential heirs who resort to these tests if it is in their interests has also increased. Thus, paternity recognition is becoming a slippery slope, a weapon against adult men, even years after adventures and love affairs in their youth. Like karma in Hindu and Buddhist traditions, past actions take their toll in this life or in a future life, even in direct or indirect descendants. But in the cases where it has been proven that the child is not biological, sentences have established that pecuniary obligations toward the raised child subsist according to the quality of life standards he/she is used to. The putative father pays.

Technology has another asset as it has opened the possibility of conceiving “without a father”: women use sperm banks from anonymous men with well qualified genetic stocks which are awaiting their opportunity. This way, reproduction is dissociated from masculinity. The stud unknown; the surrogate mother has a name and surname.

Throughout the centuries, the preference for male offspring has predominated in many cultures. The presence or absence of the Y chromosome determines the sex of the progeny and it is transmitted from the father to the son in almost identical form, except for mutations, generation after generation. Thus, masculine identity is rooted to the spot, with a thread of genotypic continuity: with respect to Y, father and son are identical (The Y Chromosome Consortium, 2002). This implies that in paternity tests the consent of the father is irrelevant; it is enough to obtain collaboration from a direct relative who shares the same Y chromosome. Patriarchal identity has its fundament in this and in the reiteration of one or several masculine first name characteristic of the paternal lineage.

Separation or divorce leaves men’s feelings of fatherhood unharmed: if they existed, they are maintained. However, they have been systematically questioned during the second half of the twentieth century on attributing a secondary role to fathers in the rearing and education of children, on circumscribing programmed visits to a limited time. In separation agreements granted by the court, the rights of the mother prevail over those of the father. It has been divorced and separated men who have had to fight for their rights and, gradually, with changes in labor legislation, they have been able to make use of benefits such as workday reduction, days off for personal matters, flexible hours.

In the study by Walker, Tokar and Fischer (2000), these types of problems appear as the second factor: it explains 24% of the covariance.

Sexual initiative

Sexual initiative is the third of the characteristics that make up masculine identity. The situation has changed drastically throughout the last decades of the twentieth century, when fortunately women can express their preferences directly, shorten distances and make their intentions explicit. The best example of this is the book by Millet (2001) where she relates, in great detail, her numerous sexual encounters in the workplace. Being a woman she took the lead, and men accommodated her overtures to the point that a coworker felt insulted because she had had sexual relations with all of them except for him.

In organizations, flirting is a one of the patterns which can be observed in a wide range of circumstances. It is usually superficial, but initiative is not neutral. Pioneering studies (Gutek, 1985) showed that 67% of men (N=393) acknowledged being flattered when a woman made advances, whereas 63% of the women (N=814)
considered it offensive if it was the man who made his desires known. Subsequent studies confirmed that this trend is not impartial (LeMoncheck & Sterba, 2001).

Successive barometers by the Center of Sociological Research indicate that sexual flings in companies have increased from 15% to 30% in the last two decades. The ingredients are usually physical attractiveness, economical stability and a reasonable age difference. In companies where emails between employees are analyzed, around 20% of these have been identified as flirtatious (Salas, 2003). In their meta-analytical revision, Rotundo, Nguyen and Sackett (2001), have shown that there are distinguishing patterns between men and women when feeling they are the object of sexual harassment.

For security reasons, the use of video cameras in transit zones has increased considerably in companies. These cameras have become a part of the work environment; thus, employees eventually become unaware of them placed here and there. Somewhere in the building there is, at least, one person paying attention to the recordings, who reviews them with a certain periodicity. One of the most consistent findings is the showings of affection between employees in transit areas, where they do not only exchange kisses but also caresses and, on occasion, engage in complete sexual relations. When these videos are studied it comes out that men do not report. Some of these recordings end up in online environments which are very popular and of free access where it is enough to type in words such as “secretary”, “boss”, “maid” etc... in order to see who is arousing who, as can be seen on such recordings. Thus, the pertinence of one of Browne’s (2002) statements is substantiated: harassment studies are biased. Only on rare occasions do men report; they decide to keep quiet; they attach little importance to what has happened. Neither do they complain about the increase in the publication of naked men in magazines: it has gone from 3% in the fifties to 35% in the nineties (Pope, Olivardia, Borowieki & Cohane, 2001).

Business trips are a second variant in which the shortening of emotional and sentimental distances between persons of equal or different work categories can lead to circumstantial or prolonged matches. Initiative can correspond to the man or to the woman, but it is not comparable. From rubbish TV programs, the display of giving name and surnames, exhibiting photos and memories, truthful or tricked, has been transferred to the workplace or campus. In traditional masculine culture “being a gentleman is to be discreet”. The garrulous are not gentlemen.

In organizations, sexual initiative on the part of the male has been increasingly penalized as a counterpoint to years of impunity and silence. In the twenty-first century, with legislation in her favor, a female employee can accuse a man of taking liberties and attain appropriate institutional or associative support, whereas if it is a male employee who states that a female coworker, boss or subordinate has harassed him, he has to fight to gain credibility for his assertions in order to get protection. A man, as the accused, is under suspicion from the beginning whereas, as the accuser, he is not believed at first.

Another related aspect is the presence of seductive behaviors in the workplace. Gerrity (2000) studied the patterns of non-desired sexual attention toward male employees at universities and found that women opted more for seduction than harassment. The degrees of freedom in clothing and corporal expression in men are more conservative and restrictive in comparison to those acceptable in women, during and after working hours. This has entailed that ways, patterns and clothing characteristic of time off or night life are often seen in organizations. In addition, women can enter into their co-workers’ personal space, even touch them, without having to ask for permission expressly; it is not so for men who take risks if they shorten distances or invade women’s personal space in the workplace. This has entailed the pertinence of introducing coexistence protocols where the nuances between seeing, hearing and touching are underscored (West Allen, 2004). In the study conducted by Gutek (1985), 84% of women felt harassed if it was the man who took the initiative to touch, and 80% felt harassed by their gestures or ways of looking at them.

In recent cases, such as those of Paul D. Welfowitz (World Bank), Todd Thompson (CityGroup), a Boeing managing director and Bill Clinton in the White House, it has been the men who have been required to give an explanation and have been penalized for their festive erotic relationships with female coworkers. The yardstick of multinational companies continues to be strict with management. The euphemism used is “violation of internal behavior code” and is still in force in multinational companies and North American universities (US Department of Education, 2004).

In Psychology, the first known case to have disciplinary measures brought against him was John B. Watson
(1878-1958), father of behaviorism, for engaging in sexual relations with a doctorate student. His wife reported him and he had to resign from Johns Hopkins University. At Spanish universities, there are no such codes and professors can express themselves as Fred B. Skinner did (1904-1990): “At the Universities of Minnesota and Indiana, I violated the professor-student taboo. I believe it is because I began teaching at a time when nobody brought this question up, that it was endemic like homosexuality in English university colleges...there were no ethical standards with respect to this...I have always treated my students as equals...I have always used first names...the treatment was of equality. Like this, it is much easier to behave as one behaves with other people who are not students” (Wiener, 1996, pp. 96-98). He was alluding to his sexual adventures during the period from 1941 to 1948.

**Emotional Expressivity**

Emotional inexpressivity in males is a virtue according to epicurean and stoic tradition: it was called ataraxia. In Psychology, Levant (1998) opted for the expression alexithymia when referring to fearless, stern, emotionally distant people. It is a consequence of a very high emotional activation threshold, of not being conscious of the emotion that flutters, of inefficiency when identifying feelings, of very little appreciation of one’s own feelings, of very few circumstances in which to be able to express feelings openly (Wong & Rochlen, 2005).

Among males, the expression of belligerence and aggressiveness is an emotional pattern which is assumed to be pertinent under numerous circumstances (Thomas, 2003) and becomes defined in rituals such as wrestling, boxing, sumo, and martial arts, masculine even when done by women. Boys will be boys and fights are a way of testing oneself, to be fit just in case. “Aggression and competitiveness are backed up and approved socially as masculine styles of confrontation. …Masculine socialization incites men to get involved in more aggressive activities in order to validate their masculinity. …In men, cynicism and hostility are ways of getting rid of aggressiveness.” (Greenglass, 2005, p. 135).

If the thousand and one courses and workshops on Emotional Intelligence are reviewed, they all have one goal: introducing changes in emotional tone throughout and across personal and group interactions, paying attention to feelings generated in the short or medium term. A feminized climate of labour coexistence is achieved in which agreeing, sympathizing and getting on well is inevitable. Empathetic manipulation is intrinsic in the definition of Emotional Intelligence given by pioneers in the topic, Salovey & Mayer (1990) “ability to monitor one’s own and others’ emotions and feelings, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s own thinking and actions” (p. 189).

From this perspective, masculine inexpressivity makes no sense, austerity is undesirable. Warmth in communication, a smile on the face is favoured. Displays of indignation are not pertinent; complaints are in writing and without raising the voice using written format so that the answer arrives when it is no longer important. A pleasant atmosphere in which people get along is achieved in this way. It becomes secondary whether tasks are done on time and work is finished; love of a job well-done is conspicuous by its absence. The importance of people and the web of sensibilities are emphasized; the attainment of objectives through hard work and production is relegated to the back room. It is an undesirable emphasis according to Blake and Muton’s (1964) classical grid. In more recent terminology, Baron-Cohen (2003) differs between a female empathizer brain and a male systematizer brain. Emotional Intelligence workshops have crowned empathy as sovereign in the workplace.

**Monochronism**

The anthropologist Edward T. Hall (1989) brought to light the contrast between monochronous and polychronous behaviour in the workplace. These are two ways of making time operative, one more obsessive, disjunctive (“this or that”), the other more copulative, hysteric (“this and that”). Monochronous focuses favour a sequential order to activities, while polychronous focuses promote simultaneity.

In his first analysis, he pointed out that in productive entities from central and northern Europe, organizational monochronism is characteristic while in the Mediterranean, polychronism abounds. In a second analysis, he pointed out that “at a preconscious level, Monochronous time is masculine time and Polychronous time is feminine time and the ramifications of this difference are considerable” (p.54). It was Lindquist and Kaufman-Scarborough (2007) who, from Work and Organizational Psychology, have studied this contrast assiduously. There are a number of women who have entered monochronic organization and many of them are
aware that their personal time is handled, in fact, polychronically. New information and communication technologies favour polychronic modalities; the tendency seems to be irreversible. The masculine pattern, monochronic, is in the process of being reconverted.

**Leadership**

From the beginning of time, leadership has been a masculine invention. It is known by many different names, the essence is the same: it is up to somebody to say exactly what there is to do, when, how, who has to do it and who has the last word. Lewin, Lippit and White (1939) baptized this style of leadership as autocratic while House (1971) preferred to call it directive. The father of the family has stepped into such shoes if uncertainty called at the door and he had to take charge, like it or not. A variation of autocratic leadership has been consultative leadership: when things are not clear or there are various options in play one can ask and listen; dialogue and guidance enter into the game. Hierarchical and directive relationships have prevailed in productive environments throughout the ages. The male could have refrained himself, and he did not, and there were females who did not refrain themselves and they carried the staff of command and in history books they are classified as masculine. They directed and commanded because it was up to them. They assumed the role.

Social sciences, on investigating the pros and cons of autocratic and directive leaderships, usually highlight numerous negative aspects repeatedly. They are small group studies, sometimes testimonial. However, the masculine style of leadership continues to prevail in most of the areas where important decisions are made and in politics, for example, both those of authoritarian and consultative types are and have been clearly visible.

Another way of speaking about the same thing but with a different name is the so-called “charismatic leadership”: leaders who have the charm and attractiveness to win over admirers and followers. Conger and Kanungo (1998) have studied its background in depth. “Transformational leadership” (Pawar, 2004) is nurtured by similar roots: it attempts to transmit a viewpoint to followers which makes them aware of the importance of their work and of their personal growth. For centuries, charismatic and transformational leaders have been religious leaders, men and, on occasion, women, masculine in their stubbornness.

In the mausoleum of the gods, there are males and females, in the East as well as the West. This said, who presides, the Supreme Being, is masculine and patriarchal. In those religions where God is not represented, few doubt the gender when invoking it. Madonna, the singer, with a bikini in the cross, caused a great scandal in her day among the devout, faithful and assiduous, in the front-row pews, in the presence of a man, alone, in a loincloth, on the cross.

**Systematization**

A system can be considered “a set of interdependent elements” according to what the Technical Scientific Vocabulary (Royal Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences, 1996) says. The importance of this notion becomes evident since nine pages are dedicated to describing almost 300 entries derived from the word system. The psychologist Baron-Cohen (2003) resorted to the term systematizer to describe how operates the masculine brain. It is an elegant solution given that in more classical texts they opted for expressions such as rationality, abstraction, technical thinking, logical mind, objectivity, organization.

The key is in technical thinking, in the perception of objects, both stable and in movement. It has been confirmed that from the first day of life, newborns – males – pay attention to a mechanical object that moves above their heads while female newborns centre their attention on the face of their caregiver (Connellan et al, 2001). This pattern continues in the handling of toys, tools, and in the repair and maintenance of equipment. In formal and non-formal education, males feel comfortable systematizing. Herein, the clear bias in career choices is derived. During the academic year 2005-2006 at the Polytechnic University of Madrid, 7 out of 10 students enrolled for the first time in a technical career were males, and first place was in the school of computing where 8 out of 10 were males.

In the subject Differential Psychology, sex-differences findings point out how males stand out in certain tasks of the following nature: spatial, perceptive, rotatory, directional, 3D modelling, handling and capture of objects in movement, categorization and classification systems. Baron-Cohen’s research team developed tools which permit the establishment of a systematization quotient. Males always scored at the top in this quotient (Baron-Cohen et al, 2003).

This array of findings has consequences in the workplace because it prompts a fact: the patterns of
masculine performance in tasks such as those described, is higher and more competitive, with a very high probability of recruitment and employment in certain jobs which require such abilities and skills. In them, males stand out for their operative potential as human capital and have a higher probability of being selected for these positions. The question is not based on gender but rather on the skill that is required. In the highest positions of an organization, people who are accustomed to systematizing and resolving tend to be welcomed; it is their added value. Therefore, the proportion of people who are systematizers is greater in management positions and this leads to differences in remuneration.

Men can be obsessed for years by a matter, a problem, a challenge that has nothing to do with their personal lives, that provides them with no direct short-term benefits. It all goes with the territory of the systematizer. They can operate and speak about themselves in an impersonal manner, that is, without speaking in first person about what concerns them. The systematizer looks for long-term solutions which will materialize when the time comes. Its prototype is George Boole (1815-1864) whose book “The Laws of Thought” was published in 1854. During the first half of the twentieth century it was the vade mecum of electrical engineering and, on the Internet, the basic tool for full-text search engines, the best examples, Altavista, Google.

The “masculine” orientation towards collective rationality, above and beyond the organic links of the “litter” underlies the concept of productivity. The priority for the common good over private benefit (individual or group) implies exigency criteria and orientation towards results, regardless of the empathy and comprehension of the individual limitations of each one.

Remunerated work
Callahan-Levy and Messe (1979) were possibly the first in Psychology to point out the existence of a salary gap ranging from 20 to 30% between men and women who are employed in similar jobs. If these salary differences can be attributed to seniority in the job, capacity, and experience, then these are just the rules of the game in equitable interchange from a human resources perspective. If the differences have to do with occupying different labour niches (for example, psychologists versus engineers) the gap will be maintained, shortened or lengthened according to the added value of each niche. Both aspects have been contrasted and verified, for example by Blau and Kahn (2000).

Psychological studies in the laboratory brought to light that a) women assigned themselves less pay than men in specific tasks, b) with the same pay, women worked longer hours and did more (Major, 1987). Desmarais and Curtis (1997) put the emphasis on socialization norms between men and women when it came to place a value on themselves or on what they did.

From the perspective of Economic Psychology, Kanazawa (2005) posed three hypotheses and contrasted them affirmatively using data from the General Social Survey (in Spain, similar to the indicators of the Center for Research on Social Reality): a) men desire to accumulate material resources and money much more than women do, b) gender differences in the desire to earn money are greater among parents and married people than among those who are unmarried and do not have children, c) gender differences in the desire to earn money is greater among older people and lesser among young people. His conclusions are clear: “reproductive success (more than earnings) is the ultimate goal (although unconscious) of all biological organisms including human beings and income is the means for success in men, not in women. Below 40 years of age, there is no gap between unmarried men and women without children…Women are less motivated to earn money than men are because the accumulation of resources does not increase female reproductive success in the environment of adaptive evolution while it does increase in men. … Women have better things to do than earn money and the differences between sexes disappears if there is no reproduction” (Kanazawa, 2005, p. 269 y 284).

Creativity
More than 95% of those awarded with the Nobel Prize have been men, some with their wives. It is possible to state something similar when revising studies carried out for two decades by Simonton (2004) on the world of science and technology or on outstanding figures in Psychology (Simonton, 2002).

Wilson (1992) approached the issue in detail from a psychological perspective and came to the following conclusions: “variations in women’s social position do not bring with them any change in the distribution of geniuses by sex….There are many male geniuses who have had to face a difficult infancy, terrible educational and social circumstances, total opposition to their findings and affirmations by religious authorities …None of the social learning theories account for the reason why in some
areas such as literature and politics there have been women who have stood out, but not so in other areas such as science or architecture” (p. 97-99).

Their findings dismount the prevalent line of argument among second generation feminists: women have not counted on the educational, economic and social support that would have allowed them to prosper. A good part of male geniuses either. They dedicated a lot of time to the work which they were developing although it required months or years, knowing that success or fame could come years after their deaths. According to analysis by Csikszentmihalyi (1998) through extensive interviews, there is much more than being profoundly gifted and that something seems to surface, flow reiteratively, in men. Creativity requires dedication, continuity. Creativity, inventiveness has brought with it progress century after century.

Testosterone and bachelorhood also seem to be implicated. Kanazawa (2003) contrasted the biography of 280 illustrious scientists with data about jazz musicians, painters, writers and criminals: “One sole psychological mechanism is responsible for making young men highly competitive when they are young adults and for causing them to desist later when marrying in their subsequent adult life. …. Both crime and genius are manifestations of the competitive wishes of young men to be able to access the reproductive resources of women (p. 270).

**FINAL COMMENTS**

Perhaps the career of psychologist requires more “feminine” characteristics (“field dependence”, “counselling”, “social skills”) than masculine characteristics. But it is proper of this profession to look after what it humane, which Aristotle initiated when he brought the psyche into his point of view. And in this species there are – approximately – two halves.

“Androcentrism” as a theorem and “the second sex” as its corollary is a way of understanding reality. It makes sense and is coherent in order to make improvements in the quality of women’s lives. As a tenet, they have functioned as intrinsic motivators to achieve the qualitative leaps that have been given in Spain, for example, after the political transition. Behind them, there are progressive ideological components. With all that, androcentrism as a theorem and being the first sex as a corollary is not a tenet which forms part of the masculine identity.

Men learned to survive in the wilderness; somewhere in nature they are small figures, fragile. They are depicted so in Chinese landscapes drawings of taoist or zen tradition and in animated landscapes of the Barbizon school. Men are not the centre of animal life; they are sentient beings by the country side, in the mountains. In the village, in the cabine, whoever went to hunt, fish or fight was awaited.

Throughout the centuries, man has done what he has done because so it has pleased him, because that has been his preference when he has been able to choose. It was Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) who pointed out the importance of the Pleasure Principle, which is much more than positive reinforcement, much more than levels of aspirations and expectations, way more than perceived self-efficiency. Those who enjoy what they do are in the centre, whether they are men or women. Those who complain tend to be on the periphery.

Consciousness-raising workshops were implemented for psychologists, sociologists, social workers, so that women “could meet in small groups for a given period of time to talk about their own lives and discover how they had become women” (Pilcher y Whelehan, 2004, p. 17). Testimonial novels written by women, which narrate and go deeply into women’s experiences, are on the rise.

In the United States and in some European countries, consciousness-raising workshops as well as psychotherapy programs aimed at males have been put into practice (Brooks, 1998; Pollack & Levant, 1998; Good & Brooks, 2005). Bly’s book (1992), which has been translated into Spanish, is an example of such sessions and of the issues which are broached there. Similar attempts in Spain have not worked, except for those support groups which are carried out with male delinquents who abuse their wives, girlfriends or female partners. Through group dynamics, they become aware of the psychological disorders which underlie their relationship with the victims.

Male psychology does not seem to be a research and intervention area as delimited and prolific as feminine psychology seems to be. Women are accustomed to being experimental subjects, to participating in studies, in seminars. This does not seem to be the case in men who prefer to take action and are averse to talking about and self-analyzing themselves (Schoenberg, 1993; Levant & Pollack, 2003). “In spite of so much being written about masculinity, we still need to know how men perceive masculinity in the present, if they have and how they
experience intimate masculine crises, how masculinities are favoured, and how they relate to other men and women” (Beynon, 2002, p. 143).

Women are in the point of view of masculine culture; they are the centre, the Ladies, Madonnas. Men do not view themselves as the vital centre; they coexist with women, with their children, with their friends. Whoever sees the male as the centre has invented a story which has been stretched to the limit; it pays off. Moreover, there are plenty of women. Moreover, there are plenty of women who are fond of being the lady of the gentleman, the lady of the house.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Rosario Martínez Arias, Gloria Castaño Collado, Yolanda García Rodríguez and Amadeo Enríquez for their comments on a longer version. Address all objections to the first author. He consents. He enjoys it.

REFERENCES


Brownson, C., & Gilbert, L.A. (2002). The development of the discourses about fathers inventory: measuring fathers’s perceptions of their exposure to discourses. Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3 (2), 85-96


Organizational Change Management, 17, (2), 120-231


Salas, C. (2003). Dime con quién trabajas y te diré con quién te acuestas [Tell me who you work with and I will tell you who you are sleeping with]. Barcelona: Plaza y Janés.


