GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE EXPERIENCE AND EXPRESSION OF ANGER AND ANXIETY IN A COLLEGE POPULATION

By

PAMELA CORREIA FISCHER

Bachelor of Arts
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1972

Master of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1975

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 1992

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE EXPERIENCE
AND EXPRESSION OF ANGER AND ANXIETY
IN A COLLEGE POPULATION

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my committee members for their time, knowledge, and support. I would like to thank Dr. Al Carlozzi, the Chairman of my committee, for his guidance and friendship during the last four years, Dr. Katye Perry for her kindness and patience in teaching me statistics and supervising me as her graduate assistant, Dr. Joe Pearl for his ingenious suggestion of the use of an audiotape to deliver the treatment condition and for the inspiration I recieved while a student in his class, Dr. Lynn Adkinson for her help and willingness to serve on my committee "at the last minute," and Dr. Rex Finnegan, for his support and confidence in me, his willingness to be available to me even when he did not have the time, and his special stories and appreciation for life that have helped me grow as a person as well as a graduate student.

Two people who were not on my committee that I am indebted to for their invaluable contributions in the formulation and completion of this dissertation are Dr. Dale Fuqua and Dr. Lee Parks. My discussions with Dr. Fuqua about gender issues and his willingness to teach and share his expertise in research techniques are the reason this dissertation came into being. Dr. Lee Parks at the

University of Kansas School of Medicine-Wichita helped me immensely with the data analysis.

I would also like to thank Susan Massara and the medical students at Oklahoma University Health Sciences Center who provided the voices for the audiotapes used in the treatment.

The completion of this dissertation and my graduate training could not have been completed without the help and support of my family. I thank my parents, Eddie and Lodema Correia, who took care of my children and were always willing to help in any way necessary so that I could be free to study or work on this dissertation and complete my internship training. I also appreciate my mother-in-law Jo Fischer's help with my children. I thank my daughters, Jenny and Andrea, who often managed without a mother and never complained when they were told I had to study or could not make it to special events. I especially thank my husband, John, who made many sacrifices over the last four years so that I could return to school. His understanding, unwavering support, and willingness to be both mother and father to our children during my internship year made getting a Ph.D. a possibility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Prior to the 1960s, theories concerning the psychological differences between men and women were based primarily on anatomical differences. Greek philosophers speculated that females' lack of male physical characteristics made them an inferior species. These structural differences in males and females were still assumed to imply "differences in function, and therefore differences in abilities, temperament, and intelligence" (Shields, 1975, p.749) to functional psychologists at the beginning of the twentieth century. Women's presumed more delicate nature and reproductive capacities were thought to engender a "maternal instinct," a characteristic that innately made women more relational and nurturing than men.

During the early years of the feminist movement in the 1960s renewed interest in the different natures of males and females prompted further gender research. One line of inquiry focused on sorting out "true" male-female differences from stereotypes with the primary goal of deemphasizing gender differences. This research was based on the belief that all human psychological behavior was

determined by social factors and that any differences in men and women were the result of social conditioning and cultural expectation. Macoby and Jacklin's (1974) extensive review of the research on sex differences concluded that only three differences were well-established: (1) males were more aggressive, (2) males exhibited better mathematical skills, and (3) females performed better in the use of language skills. Hyde's (1981) meta-analyses of cognitive differences and Eccles and Jacobs' (1986) work on mathematical achievement further disputed the notion that male-female differences were as universal, dramatic, or enduring as had been asserted (Deaux, 1984).

Another line of research developed during this period with the primary goal of establishing and reaffirming gender differences. Some feminists speculated that differences between men and women were in "core-self-structure," identity, and relational capacities (Chodorow 1979; Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1983; Miller, 1976). Others theorized that gender differences in psychic structure produced cognitive differences in the areas of moral reasoning (Gilligan, 1982) and the acquisition and organization of knowledge (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986). Although these theories provided varying accounts of the origins of differences in males and females, all presented differences as essential, universal, highly dichotomized, and enduring.

Hare-Mustin (1987) suggests that theories on gender embody one or the other of two contrasting biases, alpha bias or beta bias. Alpha bias, the tendency to exaggerate differences, has long been the prevailing view in our culture. It tends to view men and women as embodying opposite and mutually exclusive traits. Females are typically regarded as having nonmasculine traits. For example, if males are rational and reasonable, females are the opposite, i.e. passionate and emotional. Additionally, alpha bias minimizes within group variability, viewing outgroups, such as women, more homogeneous than dominant groups (Park & Rothbart, 1982). "Thus men are viewed as individuals, but women are viewed as women" (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988, p. 459).

Beta bias, the inclination to ignore or minimize gender differences, has been less prominent in psychological theory. It occurs when theories, therapeutic interventions, and educational programs ignore aspects of the social context and differences in the social evaluation of males and females. Hare-Mustin (1987) implicates family systems therapy as guilty of beta bias for treating family dysfuntion as an internal event, independent of social, political, or economic context.

As a result of alpha and beta prejudice, most theories of men's and women's affective issues have treated males and females as opposite and exclusive groups without addressing

variables such as ethnicity, age, marital status, sexual orientation, and social circumstance. Further, few studies have examined the situational variables in which affective gender differences occur.

To avoid an alpha or beta bias, this study examined men's and women's affective responses in two situational contexts, one considered to be anger-provoking for males and the other for females. The constructs of anger and anxiety were examined because of the widely held assumptions about gender differences in the experience and expression of these two emotions and the different societal evaluation of those expressions for men and women (Lerner, 1978; Lohr, Nix, Dunbar, & Mosesso, 1984). Men are assumed to be comfortable with anger expression because masculine gender role traits are strongly correlated with assertiveness (Lohr & Nix, 1982) and males are encouraged to be assertive and aggressive. Women are assumed to have difficulty managing anger because of their different socialization experiences and/or their special relational qualities. Females are characterized as avoiding the expression of angry feelings for fear of extreme societal disapproval (McGowen & Hart, 1990) and being abandoned or isolated if anger is expressed (Miller, 1986).

To increase the likelihood of measuring true affective responses, two situational variables were used to assess men's and women's experience and expression of anger and

anxiety. Deaux (1987) contends that most, if not all, of the experimental studies regarding psychological gender differences indicate that most of the behavioral differences in gender are highly susceptible to variations in situation and experience. From their review of the literature on aggressive behavior in adults, Frodi, Macauley, and Thome, (1977) speculated that there may be some categorical differences in what makes women and men angry, and beyond that, "differences in the outcome of arousal depend on what the provoked person is attending to" (p. 654). What may be anger-provoking for men may be anxiety-producing for women. Further, Averill (1982) suggested that experiments that present men and women with precisely the same provocation may obtain sex differences, not because men and women differ in their anger, but because the specific provocation was less effective for one sex than another. Differences in role expectations, sexual stereotypes, and status may make certain situations provocative to men and others to women.

Clearly, there are numerous situations that could provoke anger in males and females. However, the scope of this study will be limited to the anger-eliciting themes of sexual aggression and sexual rejection as outlined by Buss (1989), a study in which he identified anger-provoking situations that lead to conflict between the sexes. The construct of anxiety was also studied because women have repeatedly been found to report more anxiety and guilt about

behaving aggressively than men (Eagly & Steffens, 1986; Frodi et al, 1977). This difference in guilt and anxiety may reflect a sex difference in aggression, if, as Frodi argued, guilt and anxiety about aggression are negatively associated with the tendency to aggress.

Anger Elicitors found by Buss

In studying sources of anger and upset that lead to conflict between men and women, Buss (1989) found the most significant anger elicitors for both men and women in an undergraduate population to be in the area of sexuality. Women reported more anger and upset about men demanding intimacy and touching their bodies without permission while men were significantly more angered by sexual withholding and rejection by women.

Buss maintains that this kind of conflict is expected between men and women because of their fundamental differences in reproductive strategy (Tivers, 1972). According to Tivers, the relative parental investment of males and females in their offspring influences sexual selection. In humans and other mammals, male investment tends to be smaller than female investment. Due to the female's higher investment in offspring in terms of time, energy, and resources, female reproductive strategy is expected to be more discriminating, involving withholding of

actual mating until sufficient resources have been invested or promised by the male.

In contrast, males do not incur the direct costs associated with these forms of investment. Historically the costs of indiscriminate copulation have been less severe and the reproductive benefits greater for males. Consequently, men have lower thresholds for mating attempts. Thus male reproductive strategy is hypothesized to be more indiscriminate, sexually aggressive, and wanton (Buss, 1989).

As a result of these fundamental differences in reproductive strategy, Buss outlines two predictions about the type of conflict that will occur between men and women: (1) women will be upset and angered by features of male reproductive strategy that conflict with their own, namely the male tendency for greater sexual assertiveness or aggressiveness (initiating sexual advances sooner, more frequently, more persistently, or with more partners than the woman); and (2) men will be upset and angered by features of female reproductive strategy that conflict with their own - those involving selectively withholding or delaying of consummation opportunities (e.g., declining to have sex, desiring it less frequently, or requiring more stringent external conditions to be met prior to consummation).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate gender differences in anger and anxiety arousal, traits of anger and anxiety, anger expression, and anger inhibition in a college population under the anger-provoking conditions of verbal sexual aggression by the opposite sex and verbal sexual rejection by the opposite sex. The specific objective was to determine if females experience higher states of anger and anxiety when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually aggressive male but simultaneously suppress or control their anger by reporting significantly higher scores on scales measuring anger-in and anger control than males when exposed to a similar audiotaped scenario recorded by a female. Another purpose was to determine if males experience higher state anger when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually rejecting female and direct that anger outward by reporting significantly higher scores on scales measuring anger reaction and anger out than females do under similar treatment conditions with a male.

All human beings experience anger several times a day and anger is an interpersonal emotion primarily targeted to those with whom we have a close relationship (Averill, 1982). Therefore, it is important to clarify and understand the different situational determinants of men's and women's anger and the manner in which they express angry emotions. As Averill writes, "A typical episode of anger may not be

particularly noteworthy in its own right, but the cumulative effects of innumerable small episodes may be more significant (both theoretically and practically) than the consequences of an isolated but dramatic outburst" (1983, p.1156). Further, Averill maintains that while the effect of anger may be on the individual experiencing the emotion, anger often arises in an interpersonal context and has deleterious effects on others besides the person experiencing the emotion. It is these chronic episodes of anger (and the lack of resolution) that often lead to interpersonal conflict between men and women and subsequently unsatisfactory relationships. Though there is evidence that anger serves some positive functions (Averill, 1982; Novaco, 1975), Averill (1982) found that both the angry person and the target tend to feel irritable, depressed and/or anxious after an angry episode. Surely, chronic episodes of these feelings of distress cannot prove beneficial to relationships between men and women.

Studying gender differences in affective response in the context of verbal sexual aggression and verbal sexual rejection will provide information as to how men and women experience and express anger and anxiety when exposed to the theme of reproductive strategy interference (i.e. their "typical" style of sexual interaction) and provide further insight into the situational determinants of men and women's anger.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that this study addressed was gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety under the conditions of verbal sexual aggression and verbal sexual rejection by the opposite sex. The following specific questions were investigated in this study:

(1) Are there gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety in a college population under non-stimulus conditions?

(2) Are there gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety in a college population when subjects are exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually aggressive person of the opposite sex?

(3) Are there gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety in a college population when subjects are exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually rejecting person of the opposite sex?

Definition of Terms

For purposes of the study, the following definition of terms were employed:

Suppressed Anger - The frequency with which angry feelings are experienced but not expressed. A person who suppresses or inhibits anger is said to direct anger internally towards the self or ego rather than by expressing it externally. This style of anger expression is defined as anger-in as conceptualized by Funkenstein, King, & Drolette (1954).

Expressed Anger - An individual's expression of anger towards other people or objects which may be reflected in a variety of aggressive behaviors (i.e. assaulting other persons, destroying objects, slamming doors, or the use of profanity, insults, or criticism). This style of anger expression is defined as anger-out as conceptualized by Funkenstein et al. (1954).

State Anger - The experience of anger as an emotional state which varies in intensity and may fluctuate over time as a function of the provoking circumstances. State anger indicates the intensity of the angry feelings "right now."

Trait Anger - In contrast to state anger, trait anger refers to a more stable, predisposition to respond to a wide variety of stimuli with an angry response. It describes an overriding personality style rather than a temporary emotional state (Spielberger, 1980).

State Anxiety - A transitory emotional state characterized by feelings of tension and apprehension accompanied by increased physiological arousal (Spielberger, 1972).

Trait Anxiety - In contrast to state anxiety, this refers to relatively stable individual differences in anxiety proneness, manifested in the frequency with which an individual experiences elevations in state anxiety in response to stresses in one's environment.

Stereotype - A structured set of beliefs about the personal attributes of a group of people (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1979).

Gender stereotypes - A structured set of beliefs that differentiate males and females along some dimension. Deaux and Lewis (1987) identify four components that are typically used to classify stereotypes: traits, role behaviors, physical characteristics, and occupations.

Sex differences - The relative differences in frequency, intensity, or context associated with the display of a particular behavior pattern (Goldfoot & Neff, 1987).

Sex role - The sense of a social position or status for which certain behaviors are socially expected or required.

Sexual Rejection - For the purposes of this study, sexual rejection will be defined using the components of Buss's (1989) sexual withholding factor: It involves upset about the partner's refusal to have sex, lack of interest in sex, and declining to follow through on initial apparent sexual interest.

Sexual Aggression - According to Buss (1989), this factor includes the acts of forcing and demanding sex as well as using the partner for sexual purposes. For the purpose of this study, sexual aggression will include demanding, persuading, or trying to verbally coerce a person into having sex.

Research Hypotheses

Based on the literature, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested at the .05 level of significance:

H1: There are no significant gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety under non-stimulus conditions.

H2: Females experience higher states of anger and anxiety when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually aggressive male than males when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually aggressive female. Specifically, females report significantly higher State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, State Anger, Anger-In, and Anger Control as measured by the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory and the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory under these conditions.

H3: Males experience higher states of anger when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually rejecting female than females when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually rejecting male. Specifically, males report significantly higher State Anger, Trait-Anger Reaction, and Anger-Out as measured by the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory under these conditions.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I has presented an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, definition of terms, limitations of the study, and hypotheses tested. Chapter II contains a literature review. The methodology and instrumentation used in this investigation are presented in Chapter III. Chapter IV presents the results of the study, and Chapter V includes a summary, conclusions, implications of the data, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History of Gender Differences

Speculation about the differences in female and male natures has deep historical roots. Greek philosophers, often considered to be the forerunners of modern psychology, had definite ideas on feminine and masculine natures. In his later writings, Plato described women as weaker than and inferior to men. Likewise, Aristotle suggested that women, because they had less intrinsic "soul heat" than men, could not process their menstrual blood to the "final stage" of semen. Women were viewed as "defective males." Thomas Aquinas, reflecting Aristotle's influence, pronounced woman as an "imperfect man" and an "incidental being" (de Beauvoir, 1952), helping set the stage for religious attitudes that relegated women to low status for centuries. These early ideas of female inferiority had a strong impact on subsequent personality theories by shaping the social milieu in which these theories developed.

The rise of functional psychology in the United States during the late 19th century added to the interest in the study of sex differences (Shields, 1975). Primarily

concerned with how an organism's behavior and consciousness contributed to its survival, men and women were thought to have different functions in the survival of the race. This notion prompted a number of generalizations about sex differences, including the notion of the "maternal instinct" in women. The behavioral sex differences thought to result from the differential presence of this instinct, however, went far beyond those associated specifically with infants.

Spencer (1891, as quoted in Shields, 1975) felt that women, devoting most of their energy to pregnancy and lactation, had little left for the development of other qualities. Edward Thorndike (1914) postulated that instincts relevant to the female's reproductive role were transferred to personality characteristics as well. For example, he argued that a nursing instinct was manifested in a strong tendency to nurture others. This he regarded as the source of women's general moral superiority to men. Thorndike also conceived of women as naturally both more nurturant and more submissive than men - a viewpoint that has gathered little empirical support but that lingers on in many people's assumptions about sex differences (Lips & Colwill, 1978).

At the beginning of the 20th century, Freud's psychoanalytic theory had a major impact on beliefs about the psychological differences in men and women. Freud believed that the divergence of the development of girls and boys during the phallic stage produced consequences profound

enough to produce significant psychological sex differences in adulthood. He suggested that as a result of the female's rage at not having a penis, a sense of inferiority and a contempt for her own sex developed. Karen Horney took issue with Freud's perspective on psychosexual development and suggested that looking at development from a strictly male point of view led to an overemphasis on the role played by the penis. She concluded that males were envious of the female's reproductive capacities, and in fact, men's desire to achieve and create was an overcompensation for their unconscious sense of inferiority in the creative process of reproduction.

More recent psychodynamic theories have also depicted female experience as sharply divergent from male experience. Erikson (1964) believed that female identity was predicated on "inner space," a somatic design that "harbors...a biological, psychological, and ethical commitment to take care of human infancy"(p. 586), while male identity was associated with "outer space," which involves intrusiveness, excitement and mobility, leading to achievement and adventure-seeking. These differences in "the ground plan of the human body" (Erikson, 1968) had a profound impact on their respective personality predispositions with women maintaining a caring and nurturing orientation regardless of vocational choice. Jung's idea of the anima and the animus

also placed males and females on opposite ends of the spectrum.

Parsons' sex role theory, dominant in the 1950s and 1960s, also exaggerated male/female differences. Parsons asserted that men were instrumental and women were expressive; that is, men were task-oriented and women were oriented toward feelings and relationships (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988). Lynn's theory on sex-role identification (1966) emphasized the learning of appropriate sex-role behavior through observation, imitation and reinforcement - the basics of social learning theory. Like Freud, Lynn suggested that males and females tend to devalue femininity as a result of child rearing practices and the structure of society.

Other theories went further than Lynn's hypothesis that gender differences were based primarily on sex role socialization. For example, Kagan and Moss (1962) proposed that the ways in which people deal with anger are highly socialized and different for the sexes: aggression in boys is permitted and encouraged while dependency and passivity in girls are permitted or encouraged. Many female therapists spoke to the issue of sex role socialization and women's anger. Harriet Lerner (1978) wrote, "Put simply, women tend to be overly inhibited, and men not inhibited enough, in the direct expression of anger and aggression" (p. 137). The subordinate status given to women's traditional roles

coupled with the cultural taboo against female anger were implicated in creating feelings of frustration, powerlessness, and chronic anger - internal stressors which many concluded explained a higher incidence of depression, anxiety, fatigue, and both repressed and overt anger in women. Having increased options did not necessarily eliminate these symptoms. Comparing the women she treated in the 1950s with those treated twenty years later, psychiatrist Ruth Moulton maintained that new freedoms for women brought new anxieties. "On entering new jobs, women experience anxiety about performance and self-assertion because they do not know how to fight in a man's world" (1977, p.1).

Recent psychodynamic theories have reaffirmed the early theories of Aristotle, Parsons, and Erikson that female nature is different from male nature, viewing women as relational and men as instrumental and rational (Gilligan, 1982). From these prevailing notions, one would expect to find significantly higher incidence of anxiety and repressed anger for women. Interestingly, however, the literature is inconclusive.

Gender Differences in Anxiety and Anger

A review of the literature reveals contradictory empirical support for the hypotheses that women are more likely than males to experience feelings of anxiety and

repressed anger. However, gender differences in anxiety have been more consistently confirmed. Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) review of the research on gender differences found some support for higher levels of anxiety in females. Barker and Barker (1977) suggested that women present an "anxiety proness." Spielberger (1979) found higher Trait-Anxiety Scores on the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for female subjects in comparison to male subjects. Simon and Thomas (1983) found females reported higher levels of both state and trait anxiety than males. Cameron and Hill (1989) report a higher proportion of DSM III-R defined anxiety disorders in women but caution that three methodologic issues should be considered in interpreting these sex differences: (1) possible differences in reporting patterns between clinic populations and community samples, (2) potential biases in reporting between the sexes, and (3) possible differences in results in dimensional versus categoric diagnostic ratings.

There is some evidence that women express higher levels of anxiety in situations that call for aggressive behavior. Frodi and colleagues (1977) concluded that women experience greater anxiety over aggressive behavior than do men as a result of worry over the propriety of such behavior. Eagly and Steffen's (1986) more recent meta-analytic review of the literature on gender and adult aggressive behavior supported Frodi's conclusion that women reported more guilt and

anxiety as a consequence of aggression. In a further questionnaire study conducted to examine sex differences in the beliefs about the consequences of aggression, Eagly and Steffen found that male respondents reported less guilt and anxiety about aggressive behaviors than the female respondents.

Some of the most surprising findings concerning gender differences on affective dimensions concern studies of the experience and expression of anger. Stereotypically, women have been regarded as more emotional than men. However, in the case of anger, women are thought to be less, not more. Two of the most prevailing arguments that have been advanced to support the notion that women are less prone to anger than men are the biological argument and the "feminist" argument based on sex role socialization. The biological argument that men by nature are the more aggressive members of the species and thus more liable to become angry when provoked is based on the biological fact that the male hormone testosterone triggers aggressive tendencies. The alternative argument is based on theories of sex-role socialization; that is, females have the same potential as males for aggressiveness but are discouraged from expressing it due to societal disapproval. Both arguments imply that there should be significant differences in the way men and women experience and/or express their anger. However, empirical studies regarding sex differences in the

experience and expression of anger provide contradictory findings.

In the well-known Framingham study of psychosocial factors and coronary heart disease, Haynes, Levine, Scotch, Feinleib, and Kannel (1978) report that women were significantly more likely to show signs of emotional lability, anger-in, tension, anxiety, and anger symptoms than men in all three age groups. Shope, Hedrick, and Green (1975) focused on sex differences with regard to the expression of anger and found that, while women appear unable to physically express anger, they can be verbally aggressive. Biaggio (1980) reported that men manifest greater overt expressions of anger, and McCann and Biaggio (1989) found sex differences on the Physical subscale of the Anger-Self-Report Score and the Total Score, with men showing greater physical and overall expressions of anger, respectively. Birnbaum and Croll (1984) found parents to be more accepting of anger in sons than in daughters and more tolerant of male television characters displaying significantly more anger than females. Eagly and Steffen (1986) concluded that men are more aggressive than women with this difference more pronounced in physical, rather than psychological, aggression.

In contrast, Allen and Haccoun (1976) gave an emotionality survey to 61 male and 61 female undergraduates and found that women reported a greater intensity of affect

in the case of fear, joy, and sadness but not in anger. Frodi (1977) concluded that the hypothesis that men are more physically aggressive while women are more indirect in their expression of anger has not been supported in the research. Frodi (1978) provoked male and female subjects in a "sex-appropriate fashion" (verbal aggression for males and condescension for females) and found that women and men became equally angry, showed parallel increases in physiological arousal, and displayed equal amounts of aggressive behavior. In addition, Averill (1983) found no significant gender differences in anger in his "Person in the street" studies. He found that women reported becoming angry as often as men, as intensely, for much the same reasons, and they expressed their anger as openly as did the men.

Blier and Blier-Wilson (1989) found no gender differences in the expression of anger but did find that men's and women's confidence in their ability to express anger was related to the gender of the target person with males reporting significantly less confidence and comfort than females in expressing anger to women than to men. Fischer, Smith, Leonard, Fuqua, Masters, and Campbell (in press) found no significant gender differences in male and female college students on the subscales of Anger Control and Anger-In on Spielberger's State-Trait Anger Inventory, the two dimensions that best define the repression of anger.

Thomas (1990) found that men and women in a mid-life sample did not differ in the likelihood of suppressing their anger (anger-in) nor were there gender differences in anger-out. They did vary in their willingness to discuss anger issues and in the expression of anger via physical symptoms. Investigating the relationship of sex and sex-role identification with the expression of anger, Kopper and Epperson (1991) found no significant gender differences in anger expression or the tendency to suppress anger, even in those females with a feminine sex-role orientation.

Historical Theories of Anger

Although there has been a recent focus on the construct of anger, it is not a new concept. Teachings on anger can be traced to ancient philosophical beliefs about the nature of emotion (Averill, 1982). Historically, teachings on anger were typically done within the framework of ethics or moral philosophy. Anger was considered a passion, the traditional term for what we now call emotion. Plato distinguished anger from baser appetites such as hunger, thirst, and sexual desire and allied anger with reason to protect the individual from wrongs perpetrated by others. Aristotle distinguished actions from passions linguistically by using active or passive voice, putting emotions in the category of passivity or the inability of a person to control his own behavior while angry. Anger was "as an impulse, accompanied

by pain, to a conspicuous revenge for a conspicuous slight directed without justification towards what concerns one's life or towards who concerns one's friends" (as quoted in Averill, 1982).

Lactantius redefined Aristotle's notion of anger as a desire to avenge injury or to return pain for pain as fury or rage. Just anger, by contrast, was a "movement of a mind arising to the restraint of offenses and is directed at those over whom we have authority to preserve discipline," (as quoted in Averill, 1982, p. 102). St. Thomas Aquinas defined anger as the desire to punish another by way of "just revenge," an action that was more than justified if the provocation to anger was unfounded.

Descartes explained emotional reactions in mechanistic terms, disregarding cognitive mediation. He rejected Aristotle's distinction between actions and passions by believing any event could be both. He defined emotions as passions of the soul which were triggered by the movement of the "animal spirits" rather than by some specific stimulus. Passions arose automatically from the perception of an "appropriate" object, primarily one which signified either potential benefit or harm.

From these historical teachings on anger, it is clear that anger was considered a highly complex emotion, often irrational but not non-cognitive, and involving a moral judgment. Further, it was an interpersonal emotion with

social implications as well. The instigation of anger involves the violation of socially acceptable standards of conduct whether willful or through negligence and the aim for anger is revenge or punishment which should be proportional to the provocation and rendered openly. To a great extent, historical teachings can be viewed as attempts to establish rules for the proper experience and expression of anger (Averill, 1982).

Freud & Psychoanalytic Theory of Anger

Freud defined anger as an aggressive drive and believed holding it back was unhealthy because it would eventually erupt in some form. The hydraulic model of classical psychoanalysis is the most familiar of this philosophy (Averill, 1982). Lorenz (1966) warned that an innate aggressive drive must be expressed in some way lest it "explode." Inhibited rage or unexpressed anger has been implicated by psychoanalysts in the etiology of rheumatoid arthritis, hives, acne, epilepsy, migraines etc. (Holt, 1970). The view of the cathartic value of anger expression is still prominent today, with therapists and self-help books who espouse the value of free expression of anger and aggression (Biaggio, 1987).

Contemporary Theories of Anger

More recent theorists have focused on the role of cognition in anger formulations (Lazarus, 1984; Meichenbaum & Turk, 1975; Novaco, 1975) arguing that one's response to threat is largely determined by cognitive appraisal of a situation. Some theories include the importance of physiological arousal, while others do not consider it important in anger expression. Novaco (1979, 1985) viewed anger as an emotional state defined by the presence of physiological arousal and "cognitions of antagonism". He postulated that there is no direct relationship between external events and anger. It is rather the subject's cognitive expectation and appraisal of an event that determine the occurrence of anger.

Harburg (1979) described a process of "reflective coping" which mediates the effect environmental events have on emotions and behavior. By using reflective coping, an individual appraises a situation as less anger-provoking and inhibits impulsive reactions. Harburg's model of anger is based on the idea that psychophysiologic responses of anger are induced in those social situations whereby the person perceives a loss of something due to unfair acts of others (Julius, Harburg, Cottington, & Johnson, 1986).

Leventhal's (1980) perceptual motor theory of emotion offered an analysis of the cognitive pathway to the emotional experience of anger. According to Leventhal, a

subject perceives the occurrence of an event, interprets it, and responds with an involuntary expressive motor reaction that is outside focal awareness. This motor reaction is spontaneous, often involving facial expression that can range from momentary narrowing of the eyes to a distinct frown. The reaction is fed back into the central nervous system and plays a primary role in generating the emotional feeling of anger.

Bandura focused on the consequences of anger expression as a determining factor of general emotional arousal. Based on his philosophy of reciprocal interchange, he maintained that a person may feel relieved or aroused after a response to provocation depending upon the counter response he receives. Further, whether a person experiences his emotional arousal as "fear, anger, euphoria or some other state depends not on somatic cues, but on a number of external defining influences" (1973, p. 55). Bandura's definition has been criticized by Rubin (1986) who maintains that situations sometimes elicit anger and, at other times, other emotions. Threat appraisal is the cognitive process through which internal and external events are evaluated in terms of potential harm and in turn may elicit aggression. When a person observes himself emitting aggressive responses, he feels angry.

Averill (1982) defined anger as a common emotion which, on a biological level, is related to aggressive systems. He

also defined it as a very interpersonal emotion and one that acts as a personal judiciary in the absence of a formal one. Averill proposed a social constructivist view of anger by viewing anger as a socially constituted syndrome rather than the product of biological or strictly intrapsychic processes. Similarly, Tavris (1982) asserted that angry episodes are social events that assume meaning only in terms of the social contact between the antagonists. "Our emotions may emerge and differ primarily because of the situations in which they occur and because of the interpretations that we give to our bodily states - psychological and social matters, not solely biological ones" (p. 73).

Measurement of Anger

Research on anger, hostility and aggression reveal a great deal of conceptual ambiguity and confusion. All three constructs have been used interchangeably in the literature. In an attempt to conceptualize and measure the components of anger, Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, and Crain (1983) provided the following distinctions. Anger is described as an elementary affective dimension associated with feeling states varying in intensity from annoyance to rage. Hostility is described as the attitudinal set that motivates aggressive behavior. Finally, aggression is explained as the destructive or punitive behavior directed at other persons or objects. Spielberger (1988) states, "Given these

definitional conventions, it follows that the emotion of anger is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the development of hostile attitudes and the manifestation of aggressive behavior" (p. 6).

A further distinction that must be made in studying the expression of anger is between the emotional component and the behavioral component of anger responses. The scales developed by Spielberger and his associates reflect this distinction. The State Anger Scale measures the emotional experience of anger while the Anger Expression Scale assesses the subject's typical behavior in terms of the extent to which the anger is typically expressed ("anger-out") or suppressed ("anger-in"). It is the construct of suppressed anger or "anger-in" that is postulated to be the typical style of anger expression in women (Averill, 1982).

Anxiety

The construct of anxiety has historically received more attention than anger. McReynolds (1975) indicates than an awareness of anxiety, at least as an emotional experience, can be found in the Epic of Gilgamesh, the oldest surviving piece of literature dating from Babylonia in the early second millennium. Several of the philosophical systems that emerged during the Greek period can be viewed as systems of thought designed in large measure to deal effectively with anxiety (Derogatis and Wise, 1989).

Christianity dealt with anxiety also, but in terms of guilt over an individual's failure to live up to his responsibilities. The realization of this possibility formed the basis for the early Christian concept of sin, as well as for anxiety (McReynolds, 1975).

In 1895, Freud published his famous paper on the concept of anxiety neurosis and described morbid anxiety as a distinct clinical entity (Freud, 1936). The theory of anxiety is central to Freud's theory of human behavior. Synonymous with fear, anxiety is a painful emotional experience produced by excitations in the internal organs of the body resulting from internal and external stimulation and governed by the central nervous system (Hall, 1982). Anxiety can come from three different sources, perceived threats from the external world, the id, and the conscience of the superego. Though an unpleasant emotion, anxiety not only warns an individual that something is wrong but goads him into seeking out the source of danger so that it can be eliminated (Lippincott, 1965).

Contemporary Theories of Anxiety

Most modern theories of anxiety can be divided into stimulus-oriented theories and theories that define anxiety as a response. Stimulus-oriented theories usually address anxiety in terms of the specific pattern of stimulus events that serve to initiate the emotional response, whereas the

latter focuses on the nature of the affective response itself. Response oriented theories maintain that anxiety is an innate human characteristic, but one that is highly conditioned through learning. They typically do not distinguish between anxiety and fear and distinguish pathological anxiety from normal anxiety by the intensity, frequency, and duration of the neuropsychological response ((Derogatis & Wise, 1989). Stimulus-oriented theorists differentiate between the constructs of anxiety and fear by characterizing fear as being tied to a tangible object while anxiety is diffuse and nonspecific (Goldstein, 1940).

Cognitive theories of anxiety recognize that events can affect the affective response. Both Lazarus (1984) and Averill (1982) maintain that cognitive appraisal is an essential part of the experience of anxiety. Averill (1980) contends that of all the emotions, anxiety appears to be the one least suited to an analysis in terms of social roles since severe anxiety may accompany a break down or disorganization of cognitive structures. According to Averill, when such a breakdown occurs, there can be no behavior, only passion. However, since cognitive structures are in large part a product of socialization, Averill admits that there can be culturally specific forms of anxiety.

Another major theoretical development among modern cognitive concepts of anxiety is based on the state-trait theory of anxiety. Though the distinction between state and

trait anxiety was first outlined by Cattell and Scheir (1961), Spielberger and his associates are usually credited with development of the concept. State anxiety theory recognizes that the stimuli perceived as threatening may arise either from intrapsychic or external sources, but it makes no distinction concerning the source of the stimuli and the magnitude of the response. Situations that address personal adequacy are more likely to threaten individuals with trait anxiety versus those with low trait anxiety. However, which situation will threaten a specific individual is theorized to be "a result of a complex interaction of past experiences, constitution, and the objective risk present in that situation" (Derogatis & Wise, 1989, p.15).

Stress and Anxiety

There is a strong tendency among researchers and clinicians to equate stress, anxiety, and anxiety disorders. Cameron and Hill (1989) suggest that this tendency seems to arise from the strong inclination of individuals under the influence of an environmental stressor to describe their experience as one of anxiety. The authors maintain that there is evidence that equating stress and anxiety disorders is incorrect due to the different physiological changes they produce. However, they do believe that stress does increase anxiety symptoms.

A higher rate of anxiety and anxiety disorders have been attributed to women for both physiological and social reasons. Hormonal changes in pregnancy and menstruation have been implicated in the etiology of anxiety. There is also speculation that, in handling intense emotional arousal, women are prone to become more anxious because of their greater propensity to process emotional arousal in verbal terms, which can intensify and prolong the duration of the emotional experience (Ben-Zur & Zeidner, 1988). Cameron and Hill, however, maintain that situational factors in all individuals, regardless of sex, cause substantial fluctuations in anxiety severity over hours, days, weeks, months, and years. Further, what is stressful for one person may not be stressful for another.

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety under the conditions of verbal sexual aggression and verbal sexual rejection by the opposite sex. The chapter begins by discussing the subjects employed in the study, and examines the instruments used to measure State Anger, Trait Anger-Temperament, Trait Anger-Reaction, Anger-In, Anger-Out, Anger Control, State Anxiety, and Trait Anxiety. The methodology used in conducting this study is also explained. Specifically, the demographic information and selection of subjects, experimental design, the treatment procedures, and the statistical analysis are discussed.

Subjects

The sample consisted of 91 male and 98 female college students enrolled in education and psychology classes in a large Midwestern university. The sample was predominately Caucasian (81%). Twelve subjects were Black, 12 were Native American, 5 were Asian, 4 were Hispanic, and 2 classified themselves as "other." Subjects were distributed across

grade levels as follows: 36 freshman, 21 sophomores, 22 juniors, 73 seniors, and 21 graduate students. Six subjects listed their grade level as "other." In regard to marital status, 116 subjects listed themselves as single, 52 as married, 19 as divorced, and 2 as widowed.

The majority of the sample (73%) was 30 years old or younger. Forty-five subjects reported they were 20 years or younger, 63 subjects were between 21 and 25 years old, 30 were between the ages of 26 and 30 years, 15 subjects reported they were between 31-35 years old, 15 were 36-40 years of age, 16 were 41-50 years of age, and 5 reported they were over 50 years old.

Seventy-three percent (136) of the subjects described themselves as being raised primarily in a two-parent family with both biological parents. Nineteen reported they were raised in a single-parent family headed by the mother, while only 2 subjects lived in a single-parent family headed by their father. Sixteen subjects were from blended families while 7 subjects were raised by relatives other than parents, and 6 subjects were raised by nonfamily members. Sixty-one subjects reported growing up in a suburban area of a large city, 59 subjects in a small town, 42 subjects in a rural area, and 23 in a large city.

Forty-three percent of the subjects (35 males and 45 females) reported they began dating during the age period of 14 - 16 years. Thirty-one percent (27 males and 31 females)

began dating during their 16th and 18th years while 7% of the subjects (6 males and 8 females) reported they began dating after the age of 18. Five subjects (4 males and 1 female) reported dating before the age of 12.

When asked the degree of openness in which the subject of sex was discussed in their homes, 38% of the sample reported it was rarely discussed. Twenty-five percent of the sample responded that the subject was never discussed while 23% reported that it was openly discussed. Fifteen percent reported that the subject of sex was discussed only in the context of education about biological maturity.

Nineteen subjects (4 males and 15 females) reported that they have often felt pressured into having sex on a date while 72 subjects (26 males and 46 females) have occasionally felt pressured into having sex. Ninety-six subjects (60 males and 36 females) reported they have never felt pressured into having sex. Twenty-seven subjects (6 males and 21 females) reported being physically coerced into having sex on a date, while 35 subjects (13 males and 22 females) reported being verbally coerced into having sex on a date. The largest portion of the sample (125 subjects) reported never having been either verbally or physically coerced into having sex on a date.

When asked if they had, on at least one occasion, engaged in unwanted sex, 63% of the female subjects answered yes. Of those that answered yes, 33% gave the reason that

they were physically afraid to resist or were raped. However, 34 female subjects (54%) reported they engaged in unwanted sex due to "not wanting to hurt my date's feelings," "feeling like I owed it to my date," or "not wanting to appear frigid or cold." One subject indicated engaging in unwanted sex because her partner threatened to have sex with someone else, and another subject had unwanted sex because her partner threatened to terminate the relationship. Seven subjects listed "other" as reasons for having unwanted sex.

Of 90 male subjects who responded to the question of engaging in unwanted sex on at least one occasion, 26 (29%) answered yes. Of these subjects, 13 (50%) reported they "didn't want to hurt my date's feelings" as the reason for engaging in unwanted sex. Two subjects indicated they wanted to get sexual experience, 2 wanted to build up confidence, 1 did not want to appear afraid or shy, and 7 checked "other" as reasons for engaging in unwanted sex.

When asked who should initiate sex under most circumstances, 161 of the subjects indicated that it is appropriate for either the man or woman to initiate sex. Nine subjects (2 males and 7 females) indicated the man should be the one to initiate sex, and 7 subjects (5 males and 2 females) felt it should be the woman's job to initiate sex.

When asked if nonconsensual sex was justified under any circumstance and asked to check all situations that apply, 160 out of 176 subjects responded that nonconsensual sex is never justified. Of the remaining subjects who felt that nonconsensual sex is justified under some conditions, 12 subjects selected the response "a woman engages in petting but refuses to go farther," 8 subjects selected the reason "a woman dresses provocatively," 7 subjects chose "a woman agrees to go to a man's apartment knowing no one else is there," 5 selected the reason "a woman invites a man to her apartment," 2 subjects selected the reason "a woman invites a man out on a date," and 1 subject felt that nonconsensual sex is justified when "a man pays the entire expenses for the evening rather than splitting the cost with his date."

Instrumentation

State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory

The State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI, Form HS) is a 44 item self-report measure of the experience and expression of anger. The theoretical basis for the STAXI has been well developed (Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, & Crane, 1983; Spielberger, Johnson, Russell, Crane, Jacobs, & Warden, 1985; Spielberger, Krasner, & Solomon, 1988). Six subscales from the STAXI were included in this study. These scales are identified and described in the manual for the STAXI (Spielberger, 1988, p.1) as follows:

a. State Anger - "The intensity of angry feelings at a particular time."
b. Trait Anger-Temperament - "a general propensity to experience and express anger without specific provocation."
c. Trait Anger-Reaction - "the disposition to express anger when criticized or treated unfairly."
d. Anger-In - "the frequency with which angry feelings are held in or suppressed."
e. Anger-Out -"how often an individual expresses anger toward other people or objects."
f. Anger-Control -"The frequency with which an individual attempts to control the expression of anger."

Coefficient alphas for the six scales range from .73 to .93 (Spielberger, 1988). The manual indicates that the test-retest reliability of the STAXI scales has been examined but these data are not yet published. Strong correlations between the Trait Anger scale and the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory ($r=.71$, $p < .001$) and the Hostility scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory ($r=.59$, $p < .001$) demonstrate the convergent validity of the STAXI. Zero correlations of Anger-In, Anger-Out, and Anger Expression scales with the Trait-Curiosity scale of the State-Trait Personality Inventory provide evidence of the STAXI's

divergent validity. Further, scores on the Anger-In scale have been positively and significantly associated with elevated systolic blood pressure ($r=.47$, $p < .001$).

In a recent examination of the factor structure of the STAXI, Fuqua and colleagues (1991) found further evidence of the structural validity of the instrument. Coefficient alphas ranged from .75 -.91 for all scales with the exception of the Anger Expression scale reported at .58. The relative independence of the State Anger and Trait Anger scales provide support for the theory that the two constructs may operate separately. Further, the nonsignificant correlations between the Anger-In Scale and Anger-Out/Anger Control Scales add substantial credibility to the measurement of anger along different dimensions.

State-Trait Anxiety Inventory:

Form Y of the State-Trait Anxiety inventory (STAI) consists of two twenty-item scales, one designed to measure anxiety as a situational experience (State) and the second measuring anxiety as a general disposition to respond with anxiety across situations (Trait). Spielberger (1983) reports a median coefficient alpha of .93 for State Anxiety and .90 for Trait Anxiety. Test-retest reliabilities for Trait Anxiety have been in the moderate to high range (.73 - .84), while test-retest reliabilities of .16 -.33 reported

for State Anxiety are significantly lower as would be expected given the situational nature of the construct.

The STAI manual (Spielberger, 1983) reviews a number of indicators of the validity of the STAI scales. For example, evidence of the concurrent validity of the Trait Anxiety scale has been demonstrated by high correlations with the IPAT Anxiety Scale (.75) and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (.80). Significant positive correlations between the Trait Anxiety scale and the Aggression and Impulsivity scales of the Personality Research Form (PRF) (.44 and .35 respectively, $p < .05$) and a significant negative correlation with the PFR Endurance Scale (-.21, $p < .05$) provide evidence of the convergent and divergent validity of the STAI. The scales of the STAXI have been used to measure anxiety in over 2,000 research studies (Spielberger, 1983).

Research Design

The design of this study was a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with six treatment conditions and eight measures of anger and anxiety. This method was employed to determine if an overall relationship existed between treatment and measures of anger and anxiety. Treatment conditions were defined by gender and intervention, including non-intervention control groups, on the assumption that treatment intervention alone would not influence measureable outcome. The MANOVA was followed by a series of

univariate tests to identify statistical differences in group means for each single independent variable (male sexual aggression, female sexual aggression, male sexual rejection, female sexual rejection, male controls, and female controls) and the dependent variables (State Anger, Trait Anger-Temperament, Trait Anger-Reaction, Anger-In, Anger-Out, Anger Control, State Anxiety, and Trait Anxiety).

Procedures

Instructors of undergraduate education and psychology courses in a large Midwestern university were approached for permission to use their class members to participate in the study. The examiner came to the permitted classes and asked for volunteers to participate in a study examining gender differences in emotional expression. Students who volunteered were instructed to come to the language laboratory during specific times. When the subjects arrived to participate in the study, each was given an informed consent form to sign and told that they were free to leave the study at any time. They were also assured that anonymity of all subjects would be maintained.

Subjects were randomly assigned to one of six groups: (1) a group of males who heard an audiotaped scenario of a sexually aggressive female, (2) a group of females who heard an audiotaped scenario of a sexually aggressive male, (3) a group of males who heard an audiotaped scenario of a

sexually rejecting female, (4) a group of females who heard an audiotaped scenario of a sexually rejecting male, (5) a male control group, and (6) a female control group.

Subjects receiving the treatment (n=129) were seated in separate cubicles in the language laboratory. All instructions and scripts were tape-recorded and played through headphones. Subjects initially heard a relaxation procedure based on a standard procedure for relaxation training involving the progressive relaxation of muscle groups, followed by a 1 - 10 count to increase relaxation further (Hadley & Staudacher, 1989). This procedure took approximately 10 minutes and was used to induce a "neutral" state and enhance the suggestibility of the subject. After the relaxation procedure, subjects were instructed to imagine the voice they were about to hear was someone they knew. They were told, "See, hear, and feel as completely as you can what it is like to be in this situation and hear the voice of someone you know." Following the scenarios, subjects were reoriented with the following instructions, "On the count of 3, open your eyes and taking all these feelings you are experiencing with you, complete these two questionnaires based on the way you feel "right now." They were then asked to fill out the demographics sheet.

Thirty of the subjects assigned to the control groups were given the two instruments and the demographics sheet to complete while in their classroom. The other 30 control

subjects came to the language laboratory and were seated in cubicles without headphones. The examiner instructed all control subjects to complete the instruments based on the way they felt "at that moment." They were then asked to complete the demographics sheet.

After completing the three instruments, all subjects were debriefed and dismissed. The demographics questionnaire was included to obtain subjects age, gender, marital status, grade level, ethnic background, and some family and dating history for the purpose of describing the sample.

Treatment Scenarios

After completing a survey of the literature on sexual aggression and sexual strategies in dating situations (Muehlenhard, 1988; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Muehlenhard, Friedman, & Thomas, 1985; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987) four different scenarios were created by the experimenter. Two included the theme of sexual aggression and two were designed to be sexually rejecting. Interchanging the pronouns he and she and the terms man and woman permitted identical scripts to be used for male and female subjects.

Five judges were selected and asked to read and rate each of the four different scenarios. The scenarios used for the treatment were chosen based on the highest overall ratings of anger provocation by the raters. The judges consisted of a male psychology professor who specializes in

couple therapy, two psychology graduate students (one male and one female) experienced in working with domestic violence cases, and three undergraduate college students (two males and one female) who were familiar with sexual strategies used in a dating situation.

Treatment of the Data

Data were managed in a Dbase IV Format on a 386SX IBM Compatible computer and then transformed into a StatPac Gold Analytical Package from Walonick Associates. Data were initially evaluated by developing descriptive statistics on each variable including, where appropriate, frequency analysis, means, standard deviations, and other appropriate measures of dispersion. Post hoc Scheffe' or independent *t* tests were employed to test for significance where appropriate.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the data to determine if there was a significant interaction effect between treatment groups on measures of outcome. The eight dependent variables were the group mean scores for State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, State Anger, Trait Anger-Temperament, Trait Anger-Reaction, Anger-In, Anger-Out, AngerControl. The independent variables for this study were six conditions: (1) Treatment 1: an audiotape of a sexually aggressive female, (2) Treatment 2: an audiotape of a sexually aggressive male, (3) Treatment 3:

an audiotape of a sexually rejecting female, (4) Treatment 4: an audiotape of sexually rejecting male, (5) Male control group (6) Female control group. Results of the evaluation of assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, linearity, and multicollinearity were satisfactory.

Univariate F tests of significance were conducted on each of the dependent variables at the .05 level of significance. The statistical package utitilized automatically controlled for an inflated error rate by implementing Bonferroni procedures as appropriate. Since there was overall statistical significance, a Scheffe's post hoc test was utilized to determine any individual group differences.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Statistical analysis utilized to test the three hypotheses and the results will be presented in this chapter. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the dependent variables, the six scales of the State-Trait Anger Inventory (STAXI) and the two scales of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), and the independent variables of male sexual aggression, female sexual aggression, male sexual rejection, female sexual rejection, male controls, and female controls.

A multivariate analysis of variance indicated a significant interaction effect between treatment and measures of anger and anxiety ($F(35)=2.131$, $p < .001$). (See Table 1) Subsequent univariate analysis indicated that the dependent variable State Anger was significantly affected by the treatment condition of male sexual aggression at the .05 level of significance ($F(5,183)=15.6275$, $p <.0001$). (See Table 2)

A Scheffe's Post hoc test determined the significance between the treatment group mean scores on State Anger.

Statistically significant differences were found between the mean scores of Group 2 females treated with male sexual aggression (M=22.000) and Group 1 males treated with female sexual aggression (M=11.516), p <.0002. Group 2 females also scored significantly higher on State Anger than Group 5 control males (M=12.033), and Group 6 control females (M=12.272).

Significant differences in group means on State Anger were also found in Group 4 females treated with male sexual rejection (M=19.548) and Group 1 males (M=11.516), p <.0003, Group 5 control males (M=12.033), p <.0001, and Group 6 control females (M=12.272), p <.0012. (See Table 3)

Table 1

Group Mean Scores for Dependent Variables by Treatment Groups

	State	Trait	SAng	TAngT	TAngR	AXIn	AXOut	AngCon
M[1]	55.71	48.55	11.52	6.19	9.58	16.65	15.39	23.87
F[2]	56.26	53.26	22.00	7.41	9.24	15.32	16.24	22.76
M[3]	55.33	45.87	16.10	7.00	10.03	16.37	15.77	23.03
F[4]	53.13	51.19	19.55	6.81	10.65	18.00	15.16	22.10
M[5]	54.17	45.63	12.03	6.47	9.30	16.10	16.37	23.47
F[6]	54.55	48.48	12.27	6.55	9.52	17.39	15.76	22.27

Male[1] - Female sexual aggression

Female[2] - Male sexual aggression

Male[3] - Female sexual rejection

Female[4] - Male sexual rejection

Male[5] - Controls

Female[6] - Controls

State: State Anxiety

Trait: Trait Anxiety

SAng: State Anger

TAngT: Trait-Anger Temperament

TAngR: Trait-Anger Reaction

AxIn: Anger-In

AXOut: Anger-Out

AXCon: Anger Control

Table 2

Multivariate Test of Significance

	DF	F	Probability
Treatment (1-6)	5	3.663	.0027
Outcome Measures (1-8)	7	1151.38	.0001
Treatment x Outcome	35	2.1314	.0002

Table 3

Univariate F-Ratios for Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	MS	F	Exact P
State	41.34	.917	.471
Trait	269.70	1.048	.390
Sang	629.34	15.628	.001 *
TAngT	6.05	.871	.501
TAngR	8.95	1.176	.323
AXIn	29.42	1.491	.194
AXOut	6.81	.397	.850
AXCon	14.60	.496	.779

df= 5,183, * p < .05

Table 4

Scheffe'Test for Groups with Significant Differences on State Anger

Treatment Groups		Mean Difference	Significance of F
Male[1]	Female[2]	-10.484	.0001
Male[1]	Female[4]	-8.032	.0003
Female[2]	Male[3]	5.900	.0200
Female[2]	Male[5]	9.967	.0001
Female[2]	Female[6]	9.727	.0001
Female[4]	Male[5]	7.515	.0011
Female[4]	Male[6]	7.276	.0012

Hypotheses

H1

H1 stated there would be no gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety under non-stimulus conditions. There were no significant differences between male and female self-report scores on any of the scales of the STAXI or the STAI.

H2

H2 stated that females treated with an audiotaped scenario of a sexually aggressive male would score significantly higher on State Anger, Anger-In, Anger Control, State Anxiety, and Trait Anxiety than males treated with an audiotaped scenario of a sexually aggressive female. Significant differences were found among group mean scores on the State Anger scale ($F(5,183)=15.675$, $p < .0001$). A Scheffe's test was run to determine the nature of the differences on this dependent variable. Females in Group 2 treated with an audiotape of a sexually aggressive male scored significantly higher on State Anger than male subjects treated with an audiotape of a sexually aggressive female ($p < .0001$).

There were no significant differences in the mean scores on Anger-In, Anger Control, State Anxiety, or Trait

Anxiety for Treatment Group 1 and Treatment Group 2 under these conditions.

H3

H3 stated that males treated with an audiotaped scenario of a sexually rejecting female would score significantly higher on State Anger, Trait-Anger Reaction, and Anger-Out than females treated with an audiotape of a sexually rejecting male. There were no significant differences between the mean scores of Treatment Group 3 males and Treatment Group 4 females on these three scales. Group 4 females scored higher on State Anger, but not significantly so (See Table 3).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS OF THE DATA, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety under the conditions of verbal sexual rejection and verbal sexual aggression by the opposite sex. The specific objectives were threefold: (1) to determine if females experienced higher anger and anxiety arousal than males when treated with sexual aggression, but suppressed or controlled their anger by reporting significantly higher scores on Anger-In and Anger Control, (2) to determine if males experienced higher anger arousal than females when sexually rejected by the opposite sex and outwardly expressed that anger significantly more than females, and (3) to determine if there were significant differences in male and female self-report scores of anger and anxiety under non-stimulus conditions.

The exploration of psychological differences between males and females has gained renewed interest by researchers

during the last 20 years, primarily with the intent of focusing on male-female differences. Both socialization theories and those that emphasize gender differences in "core-self structure" and relational style embody alpha bias, the tendency to focus on the differences in males and females. Hare-Mustin and Maracek (1988) maintain that until recently, "psychology accepted the cultural meaning of gender as difference, and psychological research offered scientific justification for gender inequality," (p.455).

An example of alpha bias can be found in the different way males and females are thought to experience and express anger and anxiety. Despite changes brought about by the feminist movement and diminished societal constraints towards the expression of anger by women, it remains a widely held belief that expressions of anger are considered masculine for men and unfeminine in women (Lerner, 1988). Further, it is assumed that women have a difficult time expressing anger and are more likely to deny their anger at a high cost to themselves (McGowen & Hart, 1990).

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested in this study:

H1. There are no significant differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety in males and females under non-stimulus conditions.

H2. Females experience higher levels of anger and anxiety when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of

a sexually aggressive male than males when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually aggressive female. Females report significantly higher State Anger, Anger-In, Anger Control, State Anxiety, and Trait Anxiety than males under these conditions.

H3. Males experience higher levels of anger when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually rejecting female than females do when exposed to an audiotaped scenario of a sexually rejecting male. Males report significantly higher State Anger, Trait-Anger Reaction, and Anger-Out than females under these conditions.

Data were collected from 189 subjects (college freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students) enrolled in education and psychology classes. The subjects were divided by sex into six groups and randomly assigned to six conditions defined by gender and treatment: (1) males treated with female sexual aggression, (2) females treated with male sexual aggression, (3) males treated with female sexual rejection, (4) females treated with male sexual rejection, (5) male controls (6) female controls. Each subject was administered the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, 1983), the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (Spielberger, 1988) and a demographic questionnaire.

Multiple and univariate analyses were used to analyze the data and test the three hypotheses. The six treatment conditions served as the independent variables. The dependent variables were the six scale scores of the STAXI and the two scale scores of the STAI.

This study found no significant differences in states of anger and anxiety, in an anger or anxiety proneness, or in the tendency to be expressive or inhibiting of anger in the male and female control groups. This study supports the recent findings of Fischer and colleagues (in press), Thomas, (1991), and Kopper and Epperson (1991) who found minimal gender differences in anger and anxiety in a non-patient population.

The situational context in which affective expression occurs was addressed in this study. The themes of verbal sexual aggression and verbal sexual rejection were chosen because they have been found to be anger-provoking for men and women. In studying sources of anger and upset that lead to conflict between men and women, Buss (1989) found the most significant anger elicitors to be in the area of sexuality for men and women. Women reported significantly more anger than men when sexually aggressed upon and men were significantly more angered than women when sexually rejected.

The results of this study support Buss's finding that women are made significantly more angry and upset than males

when sexually aggressed upon by a member of the opposite sex. The females who were exposed to a sexually aggressive male reported significantly higher State Anger than males who were exposed to a sexually aggressive female. Therefore, it appears that in the context of experiencing sexually aggressive behavior, women are provoked to more intense states of anger than men and do not feel the need to suppress or inhibit their angry feelings. Further, intense anger arousal is not necessarily accompanied by a significantly higher state of anxiety for females.

Conclusions

Analysis of the data showed that the dependent variable State Anger was significantly related to the treatment condition of male verbal sexual aggression in female subjects. It also showed that under non-treatment conditions, there were no significant differences in mean self-report scores of anger or anxiety in male and female groups.

On the basis of the results of this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Although the literature is inconclusive regarding gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety, this study indicates there are no significant differences in State Anger, Trait-Anger Temperament, Trait-Anger Reaction, Anger-In, Anger-Out, Anger Control, State

Anxiety, and Trait Anxiety in males and females under non-stimulus conditions. These findings are consistent with other recent research reporting minimal gender differences in anger and anxiety (Fischer et al, in press; Thomas, 1991; and Kopper & Epperson, 1991). Similar group mean scores on Trait Anxiety in both the treatment groups and control groups do not support the hypotheses that women exhibit a significantly higher anxiety proneness than males or that females experience significantly higher states of anxiety than males in anger-provoking situations.

These findings challenge the hypotheses that women have greater difficulty recognizing and expressing their anger. Males and females were found to have very similar mean scores on Anger Control and Anger-In, the two dimensions that best define the repression of anger, a trait stereotypically attributed to women. Males and females also had similar mean scores on Anger-Out and Trait-Anger Temperment, traits that have typically been considered masculine.

These findings do not disprove socialization theories that suggest that women are judged more harshly than males when anger is expressed or that women may be more relational in their thinking than men. They do, however, cause one to examine how constructs often become truths in society with little empirical validation. Cancian and Gordon (1988) suggest that the timing of the changes in emotional norms is

related to waves of political and cultural liberation verses oppression. Through the 1960's, the expression of anger by women was discouraged. However, since the women's movement, women have been encouraged to "get in touch with" and express their anger. Perhaps the results of this study, given the age range of the majority of the subjects, reflect a new kind of affective development and sensitivity made available by the feminist movement during the last 25 years.

Another explanation for the similar mean scores between males and females could be provided by the constructivist position which maintains that it is difficult to distinguish facts and values. In other words, if values and attitudes determine what are taken to be facts, then our assumptions about male-female differences become reality. Consequently, the fact that affective differences have been regularly proclaimed to exist may explain why they have become accepted as "truth" with little empirical support.

2. Group 2 females reported significantly higher State Anger than Group 1 males when exposed to verbal sexual aggression by the opposite sex ($p > .0001$). This finding supports the work of Buss who found that females report significantly more anger and upset about the male tendency for greater sexual assertiveness or aggressiveness than men do when sexually aggressed upon by a female.

The fact that females receiving the sexual aggression treatment scored significantly higher on State Anger may

help explain the anger that women, who have experienced some form of sexual harassment, report. The similar mean scores on State Anxiety do not support the hypotheses that women experience significantly higher state anxiety in situations that call for the expression of angry or aggressive feelings.

The mean score for Group 1 males treated with a sexually aggressive female was lower than the mean scores of the other 5 treatment groups. This finding suggests that men are not provoked to intense anger by female sexual aggression and lends support to the findings of Sirkin and Mosher (1985) who found that male subjects expressed increased surprise and joy and decreased fear and anger when exposed to female sexual assertiveness.

3. Group 3 males subjects treated with a sexually rejecting female did not report significantly higher State Anger, Trait-Anger Reaction, or Anger-Out than Group 4 female subjects treated with male sexual rejection. In fact, the Group 4 mean score on State Anger was higher than for the male group, but not significantly so. This finding does not lend support to Buss's hypothesis that men are made significantly more angry than women when sexually rejected. The higher State Anger scores reported by Group 2 and Group 4 females suggest that women may be more in tune with their feelings or that they experience greater affective arousal in situational contexts of a sexual nature.

4. The high percentage of the sample who reported engaging in unwanted sex on at least one occasion while on a date concurs with Muehlenhard and Cook's (1988) study that found high numbers of subjects in a college population who reported engaging in unwanted sex in a dating situation. The highest percentage of reasons given by both males and females for engaging in unwanted sex while on a date involved reasons other than physical coercion and involved issues of appearance and not wanting to hurt feelings.

This finding is interesting in light of the similar mean scores on Anger-Out for males and females. Apparently, both sexes are equally able to express anger, but a large number choose not to in a sexual situation. In spite of societal changes, these findings suggest that stereotypical gender behavior still exists to some degree in a dating situation, particularly for females. While women are encouraged to be assertive and expressive of their feelings, they are also taught to be nurturing, patient, sensitive, and concerned for others, all of which could easily lead a woman to put a man's sexual needs above her own. Males are also pressured by the sex-role expectation that "real men" would never refuse a sexual invitation. However, these findings suggest a high number of women engage in stereotypical gender behavior in a dating situation and an unexpectedly high number of men engage in non-stereotypical behavior.

Limitations

There were a number of limitations in this study which should be considered when interpreting the data. The population used for the study was limited to college students which prohibits generalization to non-academic populations. It is also geographically limited to people living in the midwestern United States. People in other parts of the country may react affectively different from those who live in the midwest. The sample was largely composed of Caucasians, and therefore does not allow for the variablity that ethnicity might introduce. Cross culture and ethnic differences have been found in attitudes toward date rape (Fischer, 1987) and sexual jealousy (Buunk & Hupka, 1987). Therefore, the use of a more heterogeneous sample could likely result in different anger and arousal states in the context of sexual aggression and sexual rejection.

Results of studies of affective arousal should be used cautiously. Because thresholds of arousal vary across individuals, it is possible that some subjects did not find the stimulus anger-provoking. For example, males treated with female sexual aggression may have found the scenario more seductive than aggressive. Further, the emotional states of the participants before receiving the treatment may have varied in that it is possible that a subject may have been aroused before beginning the study. Finally, the accuracy of self-reports in regard to emotional states

brings into question the reliability of the participant's response.

Implications of the Data

A number of findings derived from this study may have practical implications for both the researcher and the clinician. From the almost identical mean scores on scales measuring anger and anxiety in the female and male control groups, researchers studying gender should avoid stereotypical treatment of either male or female affective issues. The diversity that exists among men's and women's lives and experiences preclude the concept of a "universal" man or woman. The considerable within-group diversity among males and females must be addressed in research questions to provide adequate answers to questions of gender difference. One would expect changes in role obligations across the life-span to significantly influence affective response. For example, a woman who is experiencing many demands from multiple roles of wife, mother, and professional could experience very different levels of anxiety and/or anger than in other phases of life. Similarly, job status would likely influence whether a person expresses or inhibits anger.

Practitioners should avoid treatment interventions that are based on assumptions about men's and women's affective experiences that may be dated, flawed, or simply erroneous.

For instance, the assumption that all women need to get "in touch with" and express their anger could prove detrimental to those women who are already comfortable with affective expression. Likewise, to assume that all men are comfortable with anger expression could prove paradoxical as well.

The significantly higher State Anger expressed by the females who were sexually aggressed upon in comparison to the male group suggest that issues of sexuality may cause significant conflict and misunderstanding between men and women. Clinicans should be aware of the sensitivity of this issue in treating men, women, and couples and help develop strategies for successful resolution of intersexual conflict. The adolescent and young adult population particularly should be exposed to the potential conflict of these issues in a dating situation through psychoeducational interventions.

This study addressed gender differences in anger and anxiety in the context of verbal sexual aggression and verbal sexual rejection by the opposite sex. Future research should examine other situational determinants of men's and women's anger. This study suggests that the context in which anger is provoked significantly influences the kind of affective response given by both sexes. Therefore, the importance of addressing the situational variables in which affect is expressed cannot be overestimated.

The results reported in this study do not begin to answer the range of important questions that ought to be addressed in sex-oriented research. However, these results do provide a basis for challenging conventional beliefs about male-female affective issues and suggest that definitive statements about men's and women's affective experiences simply cannot be made. They also suggest that without attention to individual, situational, and social variables, gender research can only provide elusive answers.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are presented as a result of this study:

1. This study supported the premise that under non-stimulus conditions there are no significant differences in males' and females' experiences and expressions of anger and anxiety in a college population. Future research should test the hypothesis in a non-academic population.

2. Because of the homogeneous ethnic population used in this study, it is recommended that this study be duplicated with ethnicity as an independent variable.

3. The majority of the sample used for this study was under 30 years of age. Therefore, it is recommended that further research be done employing various age groups, especially those persons who are 40 years or older. This group, who reached late adolescence and early adulthood

during the beginning of the women's movement, may be less affected by feminist proposals than are younger persons and may react affectively in a very different manner.

4. This study examined gender differences in anger and anxiety in only two situational contexts. Other types of situations could trigger different affective arousal states and responses. It is recommended that other situational variables be used in this study to examine gender differences in the experience and expression of anger and anxiety.

5. This study used the same scenario for males and females by interchanging the pronouns in order to create "equal" treatments for each sex. However, what females and males consider sexually aggressive may be very different. It is recommended that the sexual aggression scenario for male subjects be changed to assess which behaviors men consider aggressive and which they consider seductive.

6. This study measured anger and anxiety using Spielberger's State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory and State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. It is recommended that this study be duplicated using more objective measures of anger and anxiety.

REFERENCES

Allen, J.C., & Haccoun, D.M. (1976), Sex differences in emotionality: A multidimensional approach, Human Relations,29, 711-722.

Ashmore, R.D., & Del Boca, F.K. (1979). Sex stereotypes and implicit personality theory: Toward a cognitive-social psychological conceptualization. Sex Roles, 5, 219-248.

Averill, J.R. (1980). A constructivist theory of emotion. In R. Plutchik & H. Kellerman, (Eds.) Theories of emotion. New York: Academic Press.

Averill, J.R. (1982). Anger and aggression: An essay on emotion, New York: Springer-Verlag.

Averill, J.R. (1983), Studies on anger and aggression: Implications for theories of emotions. American Psychologist, 1145-1160.

Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Barker, B.M., & Barker, H.A. (1977). Factor analysis of the items of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 450-455.

Belenkey, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: Development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Ben-Zur, H. & Zeidner, M. (1988). Sex differences in anxiety, curiosity, and anger: A cross-cultural study, Sex Roles, 19(5-6), 335-347.

Biaggio, M.K. (1980). Anger arousal and personality characteristics. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 352-356.

Biaggio, M.K. (1987). Assessment of anger arousal, Journal of Personality Assessment, 44, 289-298.

Biaggio, M.K. (1989). Sex differences in behavioral reactions to the provocation of anger. Psychological Reports, 64, 23-86.

Bray, J.H., & Maxwell, S.E. (1985). Multivariate Analysis of Variance. CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Buunk, B., & Hupka, R.B. (1987). Cross-cultural differences in the elicitation of sexual jealousy. Journal of Sex Research, 23(1), 12-22,

Birnbaum, D.W., & Croll, W.L. (1984). The etiology of children's stereotypes about sex differences in emotionality. Sex Roles,10, 677-691.

Blier, M.J., & Blier-Wilson, L.A. (1989). Gender differences in self-related emotional expressiveness. Sex Roles, 21, 287-295.

Buss, D.M. (1989). Conflict between the sexes: Strategic interference and the evocation of anger and upset. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56(5), 735-747.

Cameron, O.G., & Hill, E.M. (1989). Women and anxiety. Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 12, 175-186.

Cancian, F.M., & Gordon, S.L. (1988). Changing emotion norms in marriage: Love and anger in U.S. women's magazines since 1900. Gender & Society, 2, 308-342.

Cattell, R.B., & Scheir, I.H. (1961). The Meaning and Measurement of neuroticism and anxiety. New York: Ronald Press.

Chodorow, N. (1979). Feminism and difference: Gender, relations, and difference in psychoanalytic perspective. Socialist Review, 9(4), 51-70.

Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories: Analysis of a decade's research on gender. American Psychologist, 39, 105-116.

Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. (1987). Psychological constructions of masculinity and femininity. In J.M. Reinisch, L.A. Rosenblum, & S.A. Sanders (Eds.) Masculinity/Femininity. New York: Oxford University Press.

de Beauvoir, S. (1952). The second sex. New York: Alfred A. Knoph.

Derogatis, L.R., & Wise, T.N. (1989). Anxiety and depressive disorders in the medical patient. Washington D.C.: American Psychiatric Press, Inc.

Eagly, A., & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 309-330.

Eccles, J., & Jacobs, J. (1986). Social forces shape math participation. Signs, 11, 368-380.

Eichenbaum, L., & Orbach, S. (1983). Understanding Women: A feminist psychoanalytic approach. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Erikson, E. (1964). Inner and outer space: Reflections on womanhood. Daedelus, 93, 582-606.

Erikson, E. (1968). Identity, Youth, and Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Fischer, G.F. (1987). Hispanic and majority student attitudes toward forcible date rape as a function of differences in attitudes toward women. Sex Roles, 17, 93-101.

Fischer, P.C., Smith, R., Leonard, E., Fuqua, D., Masters, M., & Campbell, J. (In press) Gender differences on affective dimensions: A reexamination. Journal of Counseling and Development.

Freud, S. (1936). The Problem of Anxiety. New York: Psychoanalytic Quarterly and Norton & Co.

Frodi, A., (1978). Sex differences in perception of a provocation. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 44, 113-114.

Frodi, A., Macaulay, J., & Thome, P.R. (1977). Are women always less aggressive tham men? A review of the experimental literature.Psychological Bulletin, 84, 634-660.

Funkenstein, D.H., King, S.H., & Drolette, M.E. (1954). The direction of anger during a laboratory stress-inducing situation. Psychosomatic Medicine, 16, 404-413.

Fuqua, D.R., Leonard, E., Masters, M. A., Smith, R.J., Campbell, J.L., & Fischer, P.C. (1991). A structural analysis of the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory, Educational Research and Measurement, 51(2), 439-446.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goldfoot, D.A., & Neff, D.A. (1987). Assessment of behavioral sex differences in social contexts: Perspectives from Primatology. In J.M. Reinisch, L.A. Rosenblum, & S.A. Sanders (Eds.) Masculinity/Femininity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Goldstein, K. (1940). Human nature in the light of psychopathology: Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hadley, J., & Staudacher, C. (1989). Hypnosis for change: A practical manual of proven hypnotic techniques. (2nd ed.), California: New Harbinger Publications.

Hall, C.S. (1982). A primer of Freudian psychology. (rev. ed.) New York: Penguin Books, Inc.

Harburg, E., Blakelock, E. & Roper, P. (1979). Resentful and reflective coping with arbitrary authority and blood pressure. Psychosomatic Medicine, 41, 189-202.

Hare-Mustin, R.T., (1987). The problem of gender in family therapy theory, Family Process, 26, 16-25.

Hare-Mustin, R.T. & Marecek, J. (1988). The meaning of difference: Gender theory, postmodernism, and psychology. American Psychologist, 43, 455-464.

Haynes, S., Levine, S., Scotch, N., Feinleib, M., & Kannel, W.B. (1978). The relationship of psychosocial factors to coronary heart disease in the Framingham Study: Methods and risk factors. American Journal of Epidemiology, 107, 362-383.

Holt, R.T. (1970). On the interpersonal consequences of expressing or not expressing anger. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 35, 8-12.

Hyde, J.S. (1981). How large are cognitive gender differences? A meta-analysis using w2 and d. American Psyhologist, 36, 892-901.

Hyde, J.S. (1984). How large are gender differences in aggression? A developmental meta-analysis. Developmental Psychology, 20, 722-736.

Julius, M., Harburg, E., Cottington, E.M., & Johnson, E. (1986). Anger-coping types, blood pressure, and all-cause mortality: A follow-up study in Tecumseh, Michigan (1971-1983). American Journal of Epidemiology, 124, 220-233.

Kagan, J. & Moss, H.A. (1962). Birth to maturity. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Keller, E.F. (1985). Reflections on gender and science. New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press.

Kopper, B.A. & Epperson, D.L. (1991). Women and anger: Sex and sex-role comparisons in the expression of anger. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 7-14.

Lazarus, R.S. (1984). On the primacy of cognition. American Psychologist, 39(2), 124-129.

Lerner, H.G. (1978). Internal prohibitions against female anger. The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 40, 137-147.

Lerner, H.G. (1988). Women in Therapy. New York: Harper & Row.

Leventhal, H. (1980). Toward a comprehensive theory of emotion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 13, New York: Academic Press.

Lips, H. M., & Colwill, N.L. (1978). The Psychology of Sex Differences. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Lippincott, J.B. (1965). Aspects of anxiety. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co.

Lohr, J.M., & Nix, J. (1982). Relationship of assertiveness and the short form of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. A replication. Psychological Reports, 50, 114.

Lohr, J. M., Nix, J. Dunbar, D., & Mosesso, L. (1984). The relationship of assertive behavior in women and a validated measure of irrational beliefs. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 8, 287-297.

Lorenz, K. (1966). On Aggression. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Lynn, D.B. (1966). The process of learning parental and sex-role identification. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 466-471.

Maccoby, E.E., & Jacklin, C.N. (1974). The Psychology of Sex Differences. California: Standford University Press.

McCann, J.T., & Biaggio, M.K. (1989). Narcissistic personality features and self-reported anger. Psychological Reports, 64, 55-58.

McGowen, K.R., & Hart, L.E. (1990). Still different after all these years: Gender differences in professional identity formation. Professional Psychology, Research, and Practice, 21, 118-123.

McGuinness, D. (1987). Introduction. In M.A. Baker (Ed.) Sex Differences in Human Performance. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

McReynolds, P. (1975). Changing conceptions of anxiety: A historical review and proposed integration. In I.G. Sarason & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.) Stress and Anxiety 2, Washington D.C.: Hemisphere.

Miechenbaum, D., & Turk, D.C. (1975). The cognitive-behavioral management of anxiety, anger, and pain. In P.O. Davidson (Ed.) The behavioral management of anxiety, depression, and pain. New York: Bruner/Mazel.

Miller, J.B. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, J.B. (1986). Toward a new psychology of women. (2nd ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Moulton, R. (1977). Some effects of the new feminism. American Journal of Psychiatry, 134, 1-6.

Muehlenhard, C.L. (1988). "Nice women" don't say yes and "real men" don't say no: How miscommunication and the double standard can cause sexual problems. Women and Therapy, 7(2-3), 95-108.

Muehlenhard, C.L, & Cook, S.W. (1988). Men's self-reports of unwanted sexual activity, The Journal of Sex Research, 24, 58-72.

Muehlenhard, C.L., Friedman, D.E., & Thomas, C.M. (1985). Is date rape justifiable? The effects of dating activity, who initiated, who paid, and men's attitudes toward women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9(3), 297-310.

Muehlenhard, C.L., & Linton, M.A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34(2), 186-196.

Novaco, R. W. (1975). Anger control: The development and evaluation of an experimental treatment. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.

Novaco. R.W. (1979). The cognitive regulation of anger and stress. In P. Kendall & S. Hollon (Eds.) Cognitive-behavioral interventions: Theory, research, and procedures. New York: Academic Press.

Novaco, R. W. (1985). Anger and it's therapeutic regulation in M.A. Chesney & R.H. Rosenman (Eds.) Anger and Hostility in Cardiovascular and Behavioral Disorders. Washington: Hemisphere.

Park, B., & Rothbart, M. (1982). Perception of out-group homogeneity and levels of social categorization: Memory for the subordinate attributes of in-group and out-group members. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 1051-1068.

Rubbin, J. (1986). The emotions of anger: Some conceptual and theoretical issues. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 17, 115-124.

Shields, S. A. (1975). Functionalism, darwinism, and the psychology of women: A study in social myth. American Psychologist, 739-754.

Shope, G.L., Hedrick, T.E., & Green, R.G. (1975). Physical/verbal aggression: Sex differences in style. Journal of Personality 46, 32-41.

Simon, A., & Thomas, A. (1983). Test data for State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for British further education, certificate of education, and B.Ed. students. Personality and Individual Differences, 4, 199-200.

Sirkin, M.I., & Mosher, D.L. (1985). Guided imagery of female sexual assertiveness: Turn on or turn off? Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 11(1), 41-50.

Spielberger, C.D. (1972). Anxiety as an emotional state. In C.D. Spielberger (Ed.), Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research (Vol.1, pp.23-49), New York: Academic Press.

Spielberger, C.D. (1979). Preliminary manual for the State-Trait Personality Inventory (STPI). Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.

Spielberger, C.D. (1980). Preliminary manual for the State-Trait Anger Scale (STAS). Tampa, FL: University of South Florida Human Resources Institute.

Spielberger, C.D. (1983). Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Spielberger, C.D. (1988). State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory: Research edition professional manual. Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Spielberger, C.D., Barker, L., Russell, S., Silva de Crane, R., & Ozer, A.K. (1987). Preliminary manual for the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAIS). Tampa: University of Florida.

Spielberger, C.D., Jacobs, G., Russell, S., & Crane, R.S. (1983). Assessment of anger: The State-Trait Anger Scale. In J.N. Butcher & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.), Advances in personality assessment (Vol. 2, pp. 159-187). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Spielberger, C.D., Johnson, E.H., Russell, S.F., Crane, R.S., Jacobs, G.A., & Warden, T.J. (1985). The experience and expression of anger: Construction and validation of an anger expression scale. In M.A. Chesney & R.A. Rosenman (Eds.) Anger and hostility in cardiovascular and behavioral disorders (pp. 5-30). New York: Hemisphere/McGraw-Hill.

Spielberger, C.D., Krasner, S.S., & Solomon, E.P. (1988). The experience, expression, and control of anger. In M.P. Janisse (Ed.), Health psychology: Individual differences and stress. New York: Springer/Verlag.

Thomas. S.P. (1989). Gender differences in anger expression: Health implications. Research in Nursing & Health, 12, 389-398.

Tavris, C. (1989). Anger: The misunderstood emotion (rev. ed.) New York: Simon & Schuster.

Thorndike, E.L. (1914). Educational Psychology. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Tivers, R.L. (1972), Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.) Sexual selection and the descent of man: 1871-1971. Chicago: Adeline.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

ID#———

DEMOGRAPHICS

Directions: Circle the number that best answers the question

1. Gender: 1. Male 2. Female

2. Age: 1. 20 yrs or younger
2. 21-25 yrs
3. 26 - 30 yrs
4. 31-35 yrs
5. 36 - 40 yrs
6. 41- 50 yrs
7. Over 50 yrs

3. Marital Status: 1. Single
2. Married
3. Divorced
4. Widowed

If single go to question 4

4. I am: 1. Currently involved in a steady relationship
2. Casually dating
3. Not dating at this time

5. Ethnicity

1. Asian
2. Native American
3. Black
4. Caucasian
5. Hispanic
6. Other

6. Grade Level:

1. Freshman
2. Sophomore
3. Junior
4. Senior
5. Graduate
6. Other

7. Religious Preference: 1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Jewish
4. Other: _____

If Protestant go to question 8

8. Denomination is: 1. Fundamentalist 2. Nonfundamentalist

9. Father's educational level:

1. College graduate
2. Some college
3. High school graduate or GED
4. Did not graduate from high school

10. Mother's educational level:

1. College graduate
2. Some college
3. High school graduate or GED
4. Did not graduate from high school

11. I was raised primarily in a:

    1. Two parent family by my biological parents
    2. Single parent family headed by mother
    3. Single parent family headed by father
    4. Blended Family (Biological parent & step parent)
    5. By a relative other than a parent
    6. Other:_____

12. I grew up in a:

    1. rural area
    2. small town
    3. suburban area of a large city
    4. large city

13. Growing up, in my home the subject of sex was:

    1. openly discussed
    2. rarely discussed
    3. discussed only in the context of about biological maturity
    4. never discussed

14. I began dating at the age of:

    1. under 12 yrs
    2. 12 - 14 yrs
    3. 14 - 16 yrs
    4. 16 - 18 yrs
    5. over 18 yrs

15. On a date:

    1. I have often felt pressured into having sex sex
    2. I have occasionally felt pressured into having sex
    3. I have never felt pressured into having sex

16. On a date:

    1. I have been physically coerced into having sex
    2. I have been verbally coerced into having sex
    3. I have never been physically or verbally coerced into having sex

Questions 17, 18 & 19 are for females only. Questions 20, 21, & 22 are for males only. Please answer only the questions under the appropriate gender. Both males & females answer 23, 24, & 25.

FEMALES

17. I am most physically attracted to a man who could be described:

    1. Dominant and aggressive
    2. Adventurous & thrill-seeking
    3. Intelligent & imaginative
    4. Sensitive & kind
    5. Other: _____

18. On at least one occasion I have engaged in unwanted sex

    1. Yes 2. No

    If yes, go to question 19. If no, skip to question 23

19. I have engaged in unwanted sex because: Circle any that apply

    1. I did not want to appear frigid or cold
    2. I felt I owed it to my date
    3. My partner threatened to terminate the relationship
    4. My partner threatened to have sex with someone else
    5. I did not want to hurt my date's feelings
    6. I was physically afraid to resist
    7. Other: _____

MALES

20. I am most physically attracted to a woman who could be described:

    1. Submissive & yielding
    2. Assertive & independent
    3. Uninhibited & self-confident
    4. Dependent & passive
    5. Other: _____

21. On at least one occasion I have engaged in unwanted sex

    1. Yes 2. No

    If yes, go to question 22. If no, skip to question 23

22. I have engaged in unwanted sex because: Circle any that apply

    1. I wanted to get sexual experience
    2. I wanted to build up confidence
    3. I did not want to appear afraid or shy
    4. I was afraid of being labeled homosexual
    5. I did not want to appear unmasculine
    6. I did not want to hurt my date's feeling
    7. Other:_____

23. Under most circumstances, I feel that:

    1. The man should be the one to initiate sex
    2. The woman should be the one to initiate sex
    3. It is appropriate for either the man or the woman to initiate sex

24. If a man who has asked a woman on a date later resists her sexual advances, (turns down an opportunity for sex) it is most likely to be because:

    1. He doesn't find her attractive
    2. He has sexual problems
    3. He is homosexual
    4. He is unmasculine
    5. He is fearful of getting AIDS
    6. He is not in the mood for sex

25. I believe that forced or nonconsensual sex may be considered justified when: (Check all situations that apply:

    1. A woman dresses provocatively
    2. A woman invites a man out on a date
    3. A woman invites a man to her apartment
    4. A woman agrees to go to a man's apartment knowing no one else is there
    5. A woman engages in petting but refuses to go further
    6. A man pays the entire expenses for the evening rather than splitting the costs with his date.
    7. Under no condition is nonconsensual sex justified

APPENDIX B

STATE-TRAIT ANGER EXPRESSION INVENTORY

Self-Rating Questionnaire

STAXI Item Booklet (Form HS)

Name _____ Sex _____ Age _____ Date _____

Education _____ Occupation _____ Marital Status _____

Instructions

In addition to this Item Booklet you should have a STAXI Rating Sheet Before beginning, enter your name, sex, age, the date, your education and occupation, and your marital status in the spaces provided on this booklet and at the top of the Rating Sheet

This booklet is divided into three Parts Each Part contains a number of statements that people use to describe their feelings and behavior Please note that each Part has *different* directions Carefully read the directions for each Part before recording your responses on the Rating Sheet

There are no right or wrong answers In responding to each statement, give the answer that describes you best DO NOT ERASE! If you need to change your answer, make an "X" through the incorrect response and then fill in the correct one

Examples

1	①	⊠	●	④
2	①	●	③	④

Part 1 Directions

A number of statements that people use to describe themselves are given below Read each statement and then fill in the circle with the number which indicates how you feel *right now* Remember that there are no right or wrong answers Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer which seems to *best* describe your *present feelings*

Fill in ① for *Not at all*	Fill in ③ for *Moderately so*
Fill in ② for *Somewhat*	Fill in ④ for *Very much so*

How I Feel Right Now

1 I am furious
2 I feel irritated
3 I feel angry
4 I feel like yelling at somebody
5 I feel like breaking things
6 I am mad
7 I feel like banging on the table
8 I feel like hitting someone
9 I am burned up
10 I feel like swearing

Part 2 Directions

A number of statements that people use to describe themselves are given below Read each statement and then fill in the circle with the number which indicates how you *generally* feel Remember that there are no right or wrong answers Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer which seems to *best* describe how you *generally* feel

Fill in ① for *Almost never*	Fill in ③ for *Often*
Fill in ② for *Sometimes*	Fill in ④ for *Almost always*

How I Generally Feel

11 I am quick tempered
12 I have a fiery temper
13 I am a hotheaded person
14 I get angry when I'm slowed down by others' mistakes
15 I feel annoyed when I am not given recognition for doing good work
16 I fly off the handle
17 When I get mad, I say nasty things
18 It makes me furious when I am criticized in front of others
19 When I get frustrated, I feel like hitting someone
20 I feel infuriated when I do a good job and get a poor evaluation

---

Continued ▶

Part 1 Directions

A number of statements that people use to describe themselves are given below Read each statement and then fill in the circle with the number which indicates how you feel *right now* Remember that there are no right or wrong answers Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer which seems to *best* describe your *present feelings*

Fill in ① for *Not at all*	Fill in ③ for *Moderately so*
Fill in ② for *Somewhat*	Fill in ④ for *Very much so*

How I Feel Right Now

1 I am furious
2 I feel irritated
3 I feel angry
4 I feel like yelling at somebody
5 I feel like breaking things
6 I am mad
7 I feel like banging on the table
8 I feel like hitting someone
9 I am burned up
10 I feel like swearing

Part 2 Directions

A number of statements that people use to describe themselves are given below Read each statement and then fill in the circle with the number which indicates how you *generally* feel Remember that there are no right or wrong answers Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer which seems to *best* describe how you *generally* feel

Fill in ① for *Almost never*	Fill in ③ for *Often*
Fill in ② for *Sometimes*	Fill in ④ for *Almost always*

How I Generally Feel

11 I am quick tempered
12 I have a fiery temper
13 I am a hotheaded person
14 I get angry when I'm slowed down by others' mistakes
15 I feel annoyed when I am not given recognition for doing good work
16 I fly off the handle
17 When I get mad, I say nasty things
18 It makes me furious when I am criticized in front of others
19 When I get frustrated, I feel like hitting someone
20 I feel infuriated when I do a good job and get a poor evaluation

---

Continued ▶

APPENDIX C

STATE-TRAIT ANXIETY INVENTORY

SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by Charles D Spielberger
in collaboration with
R L Gorsuch, R Lushene, P R Vagg, and G A Jacobs

STAI Form Y-1

Name _____ Date _____ S ____

Age _____ Sex. M ____ F ____ T ____

DIRECTIONS A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below Read each statement and then blacken in the appropriate circle to the right of the statement to indicate how you feel *right* now, that is, *at this moment* There are no right or wrong answers Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe your present feelings best.

1	I feel calm	①	②	③	④
2	I feel secure	①	②	③	④
3	I am tense	①	②	③	④
4	I feel strained	①	②	③	④
5	I feel at ease	①	②	③	④
6	I feel upset	①	②	③	④
7	I am presently worrying over possible misfortunes	①	②	③	④
8	I feel satisfied	①	②	③	④
9	I feel frightened	①	②	③	④
10	I feel comfortable	①	②	③	④
11	I feel self-confident	①	②	③	④
12	I feel nervous	①	②	③	④
13	I am jittery	①	②	③	④
14	I feel indecisive	①	②	③	④
15	I am relaxed	①	②	③	④
16	I feel content	①	②	③	④
17	I am worried	①	②	③	④
18	I feel confused	①	②	③	④
19	I feel steady	①	②	③	④
20	I feel pleasant	①	②	③	④

Consulting Psychologists Press
577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94306

SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

STAI Form Y-2

Name _____ Date _____

DIRECTIONS: A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then blacken in the appropriate circle to the right of the statement to indicate how you *generally* feel. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe how you generally feel

		ALMOST NEVER	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALMOST ALWAYS
21	I feel pleasant	①	②	③	④
22	I feel nervous and restless	①	②	③	④
23	I feel satisfied with myself	①	②	③	④
24	I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be	①	②	③	④
25	I feel like a failure	①	②	③	④
26	I feel rested	①	②	③	④
27	I am "calm cool and collected"	①	②	③	④
28	I feel that difficulties are piling up so that I cannot overcome them	①	②	③	④
29	I worry too much over something that really doesn't matter	①	②	③	④
30	I am happy	①	②	③	④
31	I have disturbing thoughts	①	②	③	④
32	I lack self-confidence	①	②	③	④
33	I feel secure	①	②	③	④
34	I make decisions easily	①	②	③	④
35	I feel inadequate	①	②	③	④
36	I am content	①	②	③	④
37	Some unimportant thought runs through my mind and bothers me	①	②	③	④
38	I take disappointments so keenly that I can't put them out of my mind	①	②	③	④
39	I am a steady person	①	②	③	④
40	I get in a state of tension or turmoil as I think over my recent concerns and interests	①	②	③	④

APPENDIX D

SCRIPTS USED FOR TREATMENT SCENARIOS

Sexual Rejection Script

Imagine the voice you are about to hear is someone you know. You have just returned from your first date. You have had a good time and assume that your date has too. Just as you walk with (her, him) to the door of her apartment, (he, she) looks at you and says:

"I've enjoyed the evening with you. We went to a great restaurant and the movie was fun. But... we need to talk. Look....I can tell that you are romantically interested in me. I mean you've been making that clear all night....But you need to understand something. I am really not physically attracted to you at all. You just don't have what it takes to turn me on....What I am trying to say is that I wouldn't want you to touch me in a sexual way. In fact, I can't even imagine having a physical relationship with you. Sex is just not for me unless that special feeling is there and...with you...I'm afraid it just isn't there. You just aren't the kind of (man/woman) I'm looking for. Frankly.....I have to be honest with you... I don't find you attractive....sexy ....or appealing. In fact, the only reason I have any contact with you is because we have class together. I would never pick you out of a crowd as someone I'd like to get to know better. I mean...you're nice and all....and...I might even go out with you when I'm available....Just don't expect anything in return."

Sexual Aggression Script

Imagine the voice you are about to hear is someone you know. You have (him/her) in one of your classes and have just been assigned to work on a joint project by your professor. Wanting to get started on it as soon as possible, you ask him/her over for a casual dinner on evening to work on the project. After dinner is over, (he/she) looks at you and says:

Look....I think I've been really patient with you all evening. I didn't come on too strong when I first came over. I've been Mr./Miss Polite all through dinner and I've kept my hands to myself. But I've had enough of this "getting to know each other" crap. I really like you and I want to show it. Look.....don't play hard to get now. I mean....you asked me out, remember? You're the one who called up and invited me over to your apartment. Hey....I knew from the moment you called what you had on your mind. Come on...don't pretend this isn't what you want.....You know you can't ask a man/woman over to your apartment and look that sexy and not expect him/her to get turned on. I can't wait any longer....I am going to have sex with you and I'm not going to take no for an answer. I am going to show you what a real man/woman can do. Don't make me angry by pretending this isn't what you want. I've been patient long enough.... Even if you resist, I know you want this.

VITA

Pamela Correia Fischer

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE EXPERIENCE AND EXPRESSION OF ANGER AND ANXIETY IN A COLLEGE POPULATION

Major Field: Applied Behavioral Studies (Counseling Psychology)

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Chickasha, Oklahoma, November 13, 1950, the daughter of Edward W. and Lodema Correia. Married to John F. Fischer II; mother of Jennifer Leigh Fischer and Andrea Lynne Fischer.

Education: Graduated from Midwest City High School, Midwest City, Oklahoma, in May of 1968; received Bachelor of Arts degree with distinction from Oklahoma University, Norman, Oklahoma, in May of 1972; received Master of Education degree from Oklahoma University in July, of 1975; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1992.

Professional Experience: English Teacher, Moore Public Schools, August, 1972, to August, 1975. High school guidance counselor, Moore Public Schools, August, 1975, to January, 1986; Staff psychotherapist, HCA Presbyterian Hospital Center for Counseling & Psychotherapy, January, 1986, to July, 1988; Graduate Teaching Assistant and Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Applied Behavioral Studies, Oklahoma State University, August, 1989, to July, 1991; Psychology intern, University of Kansas School of Medicine-Wichita, August, 1991, to August, 1992.

Professional and Honorary Societies: Phi Beta Kappa; American Psychological Association (Divisions 17, 35, & 29) and American Psychological Association of Graduate Students, American Association of Applied & Preventive Psychology, Oklahoma Psychological Association, Licensed Marital and Family Therapist, Licensed Professional Counselor.