

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.  
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
AUG 18 1993 141		
APR 18 1993		
MAY 17 1993 124		
MAR 15 1994 181		
SEP 25 1995		
NOV 05 1995		
MAY 18 1996		

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

**WOMEN AND ANGER: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
SEX ROLE, SELF-ESTEEM AND AWARENESS, EXPRESSION,  
AND CONDEMNATION OF ANGER**

**By**

**Cynthia Anne Hockett**

**A DISSERTATION**

**Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**Department of Counseling,  
Educational Psychology and Special Education**

**1988**

603 59660

**ABSTRACT**

**WOMEN AND ANGER:**  
**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX ROLE, SELF-ESTEEM**  
**AND AWARENESS, EXPRESSION, AND CONDEMNATION OF ANGER**

**By**  
**Cynthia Anne Hockett**

This descriptive study investigated the relationship between anger, sex role, and self-esteem in adult women university employees. Three of the four primary hypotheses were supported. The effects of demographic variables on the main variables were also investigated. The sample showed differences in anger in four areas: sex role, marital status, age, and educational level. Feminine women had the greatest awareness of anger, but masculine, and to a lesser extent androgynous, women were most likely to express their anger. Contrary to predictions, no differences between the sex role groups in physical expression of anger and condemnation of anger were found. Women who had never been married were more likely to express their anger than women who were or had previously been married. The youngest women in the sample were more aware of their anger than the oldest women. Women without a college degree felt more condemning of their anger, and were less likely to express it, than women with education beyond the master's level.

The relationship found between anger and self-esteem is complex. Self-esteem was negatively related to awareness of anger, but positively related to verbal expression of anger.

Sex role differences in self-esteem were consistent with earlier findings, with androgynous women having the highest self-esteem, followed by masculine women. Feminine and undifferentiated women reported the lowest self-esteem.

For masculine women, it was predicted that awareness and expression of anger would be positively related to self-esteem, and that condemnation of anger would be negatively related to self-esteem. The inverse of these relationships was predicted for feminine women. Self-esteem was not expected to vary with anger for androgynous and undifferentiated women. These predictions were not supported since the effect of anger in predicting self-esteem was the same for all sex role groups. Sex role was a more significant predictor of self-esteem than anger.

The results of this research suggest that cultural values prohibiting anger in women have a significant impact on self-esteem regardless of whether a woman perceives herself in a traditional or nontraditional role.



**Copyright by**  
**CYNTHIA ANNE HOCKETT**  
**1988**

**This dissertation is dedicated to my husband,  
David L. Froh**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I offer my appreciation and gratitude to the following individuals, each of whom has made important contributions to this project.

To Dr. John Powell, chairperson of my dissertation committee, who helped me begin the journey that has brought me to this milestone in my life, and has extended his unflagging support, encouragement, and trust in my judgment and professional development.

To Dr. Linda Forrest, dissertation committee member, who has served as a supportive role model and energized me with her interest in and excitement about my research.

To Dr. Richard Johnson, dissertation committee member, whose insights and probing questions helped me sharpen my thinking.

To Dr. Max Raines, dissertation committee member, whose fresh perspective and willingness to share himself personally helped me to broaden my thinking and integrate theory with humanistic applications.

To my dear friends and colleagues Linda Gold and Michael Ranieri, whose generosity, support and flexibility have provided a haven for me and enriched my life.

To Dr. David Wenger, whose gentle mentorship has given me reassurance and helped me develop resilience and strength.

To Tom Helma, coordinator of the Michigan State University Employee Assistance Program, whose enthusiasm for and commitment to this project were essential to its completion.

To the women of Michigan State University who made this project possible through their participation.

To David LaRoy Froh, my husband, who has given so much of himself, whose encouragement, nurturing, and light-heartedness have sustained me and helped make this dream a reality, and whose nimble fingers and agile mind solved the mysteries of word processing for the data collection and innumerable drafts of this dissertation.

And to my parents, Rosemary and Howard Hockett, who launched me on my quest for higher education and whose values have always inspired me to reach beyond.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	xi
--------------------------	----

### Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Need for Research on Anger in Women . . . . .	1
Purpose and Procedures . . . . .	6
Hypotheses . . . . .	7
Assumptions . . . . .	9
Delimitations . . . . .	9
Overview . . . . .	10
II. REVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL LITERATURE . . . . .	13
Relationship Between Anger and Aggression . . . . .	13
Traditional Theory of Female Psychological Development . . . . .	17
Challenge to the Traditional View . . . . .	17
Cultural Prohibitions on Women's Anger and Aggression . . . . .	19
Intrapsychic Inhibition of Anger in Women . . . . .	21
Cultural Sources of the Intrapsychic Inhibition of Anger . . . . .	22
Anger in the Mother-Daughter Relationship . . . . .	24
Loss of Self-Esteem Resulting from Inhibition of Anger . . . . .	28
Sex Roles as a Context for Women's Anger and Self- Esteem . . . . .	30
Summary . . . . .	33
III. REVIEW OF THE EMPIRICAL LITERATURE . . . . .	37
Studies on Sex Differences in Aggression . . . . .	38
Studies on Anger in Women . . . . .	54
Studies on Sex Role, Self-Esteem and/or Related Variables . . . . .	73
Relationship Between Sex Role and Self-Esteem . . . . .	74
Relationship Between Sex Role, Self-Esteem and Related Variables . . . . .	78
Relationship Between Sex Role and Variables Related to Psychological Adjustment . . . . .	81

Some Observations on Methodology . . . . .	93
Summary . . . . .	96
IV. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	99
Subjects . . . . .	99
Method of Data Collection . . . . .	100
Procedures to Ensure Confidentiality . . . . .	102
Instrumentation . . . . .	103
Anger Self-Report . . . . .	103
Personal Attributes Questionnaire . . . . .	108
Texas Social Behavior Inventory . . . . .	113
Hypotheses . . . . .	116
Statistical Procedures for Data Analysis . . . . .	121
Assumptions of Analysis of Variance . . . . .	122
Stepwise Multiple Regression . . . . .	123
Summary . . . . .	127
V. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	129
Main Variables . . . . .	129
Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	131
Normative Data . . . . .	131
Anger Self-Report . . . . .	131
Personal Attributes Questionnaire . . . . .	134
Texas Social Behavior Inventory . . . . .	135
Hypotheses Tested . . . . .	135
Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	135
Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	149
Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	151
Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	154
Summary . . . . .	157
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	160
Summary of the Study . . . . .	160
Conclusions . . . . .	163
Sex Role Differences in Anger . . . . .	163
Marital Status Differences in Anger . . . . .	165
Age Differences in Anger . . . . .	165
Differences in Anger by Educational Level . . . . .	165
Relationship of Anger to Self-Esteem . . . . .	165
Sex Role Differences in Self-Esteem . . . . .	166
Interaction of Sex Role and Anger in Predicting Self-Esteem . . . . .	166
Discussion of Findings . . . . .	167
Sex Role Differences in Anger . . . . .	167
Marital Status Differences in Anger . . . . .	170
Age Differences in Anger . . . . .	171
Differences in Anger by Educational Level . . . . .	172
Relationship of Anger to Self-Esteem . . . . .	173
Sex Role Differences in Self-Esteem . . . . .	174

Interaction of Sex Role and Anger in Predicting Self-Esteem . . . . .	176
Limitations . . . . .	180
External Validity . . . . .	181
Design and Methodology . . . . .	183
Instrumentation . . . . .	183
Implications for Future Research . . . . .	185
APPENDICES . . . . .	189
A. Initial Letter Requesting Subjects' Participation	189
B. Interest Card Enclosed in First Mailing . . . . .	190
C. Follow-up Mailing Sent One Week After Initial Letter . . . . .	191
D. Questionnaire . . . . .	192
E. Cover Letter Enclosed With Questionnaire . . . . .	205
F. Follow-up Mailing Sent One Week After Questionnaire . . . . .	206
G. Return Card Enclosed With Questionnaire . . . . .	207
H. Expanded Abstract Sent to Subjects Requesting Results Summary . . . . .	208
I. Cover Letter Enclosed With Results Summary . . . . .	211
REFERENCES . . . . .	212

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1 Pearson Correlations: Main Variables . . . . .	126
5.1 Reliabilities and Descriptive Statistics . . . . .	132
5.2 Demographic Characteristics of Sample . . . . .	133
5.3 Multivariate Tests of Significance . . . . .	136
5.4 Univariate F-Tests . . . . .	138
5.5 ASR Scores by Sex Role . . . . .	139
5.6 ASR Scores by Marital Status . . . . .	145
5.7 ASR Scores by Age . . . . .	146
5.8 ASR Scores by College Educational Level . . . . .	148
5.9 Regression of TSBI on ASR Scales Analysis of Variance . . . . .	150
5.10 Regression of TSBI on ASR Awareness of Anger, ASR Verbal Aggression & Household Income Analysis of Variance . . . . .	152
5.11 Analysis of Variance for Self-Esteem on Sex Role .	153
5.12 TSBI Scores by Sex Role . . . . .	154
5.13 Regression of TSBI on ASR Awareness of Anger, ASR Verbal Aggression & Sex Role Analysis of Variance . . . . .	156
6.1 Overall Results of Hypothesis Testing . . . . .	164



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### The Need for Research on Anger in Women

During the past ten years a body of theoretical literature on the psychological development of women has been growing (e.g., Chodorow, 1978; Cox, 1976; Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976). An important component of this developmental theory is the proposition that women have serious difficulties with anger in the form of intrapsychic inhibitions of anger as a result of two factors. First, it is proposed that anger has been prohibited in the feminine sex role, which prescribes that the primary role for women is caring for men and children. Theorists believe that this prohibition has resulted in powerful intrapsychic inhibitions of anger for women (Bernardez-Bonesatti, 1986; Miller, 1976; Miller, 1983; Symonds, 1976; Westkott, 1986). Second, theorists assert that developmental factors in the female child's relationship with her mother have also led to strong intrapsychic inhibitions of anger for women (Bernardez-Bonesatti, 1976; Chodorow, 1978; Lerner, 1980).

A central tenet of the theoretical literature on women's anger is that the inhibition of anger has negative consequences for their mental health. It is argued that when a woman does become aware of angry feelings, she experiences a severe loss of self-esteem for two reasons. First, the

experience of her own anger threatens her identity as a woman (Bernardez-Bonesatti, 1978; Kaplan, 1976; Miller, Nadelson, Notman, & Zilbach, 1981; Nadelson, Notman, Miller, & Zilbach, 1982; Notman, 1982). Second, because the anger is experienced as threatening, it is ultimately directed against the woman herself, resulting in self-hatred (Bernardez-Bonesatti, 1978; Westkott, 1986).

Helping women become aware of and learn to express their anger is assumed to be an essential aspect of psychotherapy with women (Barrett, Berg, Eaton, & Pomeroy, 1974; Bernardez-Bonesatti, 1978; Cline-Naffziger, 1974; Kaplan, Brooks, McComb, Shapiro, & Sodano, 1983; Lerner, 1980). Approaches to working with anger in therapy vary from beginning with "screaming, kicking, yelling sessions to release the excess and get the burden down to a manageable size" (Cline-Naffziger, p. 55) to controlling and channelling anger to bring about desired changes in circumstances (Lerner, 1985; Tavis, 1982).

In spite of the importance placed on anger in therapy with women, therapists appear to have considerable difficulty in working with women's anger. Barrett et al. (1974) maintain that the anger of women is often "diffused and rendered powerless" (p. 12) in therapy. Kaplan et al. (1983) argue that the developmental paradigm for women, in which the relational self is central, can prevent female therapists from recognizing and exploring anger in therapeutic relationships

with women. Bernardez attributes the difficulties which therapists have with women's anger to their unconscious fears of female destructiveness. These fears may lead therapists to discourage women from expressing their anger freely and openly, and to induce them to feel guilty instead (Bernardez, 1985a; Bernardez-Bonesatti, 1976 & 1978).

The importance of anger in psychotherapy becomes obvious when one considers the areas of emotional distress in which anger is presumed to play an important role. Freud (1957) maintained that melancholia was the result of reproaches against a lost love object shifting away from the object to the individual's own ego. This view is still espoused in the view that depression in women is the result of repressed anger (Bernardez, 1985b; Cline-Naffziger, 1974; Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1983). Kaplan (1986) explains that although depressed women are sometimes aware of their angry feelings, they experience these feelings as destructive and as confirming their badness and worthlessness. Given the hypothesized prohibition on anger in the feminine sex role, it is not surprising that depression is much more common among women than men and is considered a woman's disorder. A recent study indicates that twice as many women as men experience depressive episodes, with ten percent of all women having a serious depression during their lifetimes (Weissman & Klerman, 1979).

In addition to depression, anger is associated with another serious problem for women. It is thought to be an

important factor in suicide attempts. For example, Weissman, Fox and Klerman (1973) found that manifest hostility was an important factor in distinguishing women who attempted suicide from women who were acutely depressed. While repression of anger seems to result in depression, difficulties in its regulation and expression appear to be associated with attempted suicide. These findings underscore the importance both of addressing anger in therapy with women, and of handling anger skillfully in therapy. Failure to address anger issues may result in the anger remaining buried and the woman being depressed. Helping a woman become aware of her anger without also helping her use it constructively may pose a risk of suicide or other less dramatic self-destructive actions.

The importance of gaining greater understanding of anger in women is also evident when the range of physical disorders associated with anger is considered. Levitan (1981) cites studies which found that women with rheumatoid arthritis handle anger in the following ways: becoming especially concerned with controlling anger; glossing over frustrating situations or turning their hostility inward; restricting their expression of hostility; reacting to provocation by feeling hurt and upset rather than angry; or becoming more aggressive toward themselves and showing less overt aggression. Zealley (1971) found that women attending a hospital clinic for treatment of bronchial asthma had

psychological disturbances involving hostility. Greer and Morris (1978) found that women with breast cancer showed a persistent pattern throughout their adult lives of extreme suppression of their anger. This pattern was not found in women with benign breast disease. According to Pelletier (1977), difficulties with anger are associated with stress reactivity, cancer, rheumatoid arthritis, colitis, migraine headache, and asthma. The indirect expression of anger has shown significant correlations with psychosomatic symptoms in research conducted by Heiser and Gannon (1984). Most recently, several studies have reported significant relationships between difficulties with anger and hostility and the incidence of cardiovascular disease (Chesney & Rosenman, 1985).

In spite of the important role attributed to anger in mental and physical health, little empirical research has been conducted in this area. A growing body of theoretical literature proposes an important relationship between anger and two areas important to women's functioning and well-being: sex role and self-esteem. In spite of the important and central role which anger is assigned in developmental theory for women, virtually no empirical research investigating the relationship of anger to sex role and self-esteem has been found. In light of the theoretical emphasis placed upon anger, the need for such a study is obvious.

This study is significant because it provides empirical data in two important areas in which there are presently gaps in knowledge. First, this study explores the empirical foundations of an important aspect of female developmental theory regarding anger as a determinant of self-esteem. Given the crucial role which self-esteem plays in mental health, it is imperative that research be conducted to determine the accuracy of theory in this area. The results of this study point the way to areas in which further research is essential to deepen current understanding of factors which affect how women regard their own anger, and the resulting impact on their self-esteem. *qles /*

This study also makes a significant contribution in broadening knowledge which can be applied by practitioners working with women in psychotherapy. The empirical data regarding the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem provide mental health professionals with valuable insights and information regarding how, and to what extent, women are able to integrate anger with their sex roles and how anger affects self-esteem. Such insights and information are valuable to therapists working with women in becoming more skilled in working with anger and in becoming more sensitive to their own countertransference reactions to anger issues. *2/28*

#### Purpose and Procedures

The purpose of this descriptive study was to obtain and analyze empirical data on the relationship between anger, sex

role and self-esteem in a large sample of women. The study was conducted under the auspices of the Employee Assistance Program at Michigan State University. The sample was composed of voluntary female adult subjects employed at the University. Data were obtained by means of anonymous mail surveys. Relationships between the main variables were tested by analyses of variance, stepwise multiple regression analyses, and planned and post hoc contrasts.

The study addressed the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between sex role and these three anger variables: awareness of anger, expression of anger, and condemnation of anger?
2. What is the relationship between each of the three anger variables (awareness of anger, expression of anger, condemnation of anger) and self-esteem?
3. What are the differences in self-esteem between the sex roles groups in this sample of adult women?
4. Does the relationship between the three anger variables (awareness of anger, expression of anger, condemnation of anger) and self-esteem vary according to sex role?

### Hypotheses

The hypotheses which were tested in this study are:

1. Masculine and androgynous sex roles will be associated with higher levels of awareness and expression

of anger and lower levels of condemnation of anger than feminine and undifferentiated sex roles.

2. Awareness and expression of anger will negatively predict self-esteem, while condemnation of anger will positively predict self-esteem.

3. The women with androgynous sex roles will have the highest self-esteem, followed in descending order by the women with masculine, feminine and undifferentiated sex roles.

4. The relationship between anger and self-esteem will vary according to sex role in the following manner:

a. For women with masculine sex roles, awareness and expression of anger will be positively associated with self-esteem, and condemnation of anger will be negatively associated with self-esteem.

b. For women with feminine sex roles, awareness and expression of anger will be negatively associated with self-esteem, and condemnation of anger will be positively associated with self-esteem.

c. For women with androgynous or undifferentiated sex roles, self-esteem will not vary according to awareness, expression and condemnation of anger.



### Assumptions

This research is based on the following assumptions:

1. The role which is considered culturally appropriate for women is that of nurturing and caring for others. The active expression of aggression, including anger, by women is considered threatening to this role and is, therefore, culturally prohibited.
2. The cultural prohibition of aggression and anger in women has been a primary factor in the development of intrapsychic inhibitions of anger for women. Because of these intrapsychic inhibitions, women are prone to repress their awareness and experience of their own anger.
3. For women, self-esteem is based on their personal evaluation of their abilities to establish and maintain caring and nurturing relationships with others. The intrapsychic inhibition of anger in women results in their viewing anger as threatening to their relational abilities and thus to their identity and self-esteem.
4. Both the repression, and the awareness and expression of their own anger, affect self-esteem in women. The impact varies, however, according to the extent to which a woman perceives herself as adopting cultural prescriptions for her role and behavior.

### Delimitations

The conclusions which can be drawn on the basis of this research are applicable only to the main variables of anger,

sex role and self-esteem when conceptualized in a manner corresponding to that found in this study. Dorgan, Goebel, and House (1983) have pointed out that considerable confusion and difficulty surround the conceptualization and assessment of both sex role and self-esteem. The assessment of anger is a relatively new endeavor in the social sciences, and its operational definition varies considerably across different studies (Siegel, 1986). Each measure of a main variable used in this research was selected on the basis of the appropriateness of its conceptualization for the variable being assessed. The conceptualization of each of the main variables in this study is explained below.

Anger: An emotion experienced when an individual perceives that a wrong or injustice has occurred or that an expected or desired outcome has not been fulfilled. This emotion is usually accompanied by a desire to correct or avenge the situation. An individual can, however, be aware of feeling angry without expressing the anger verbally or behaviorally. Thus anger may or may not be accompanied or followed by action which has the goal of righting the wrong or injustice, obtaining the expected or desired outcome, or taking revenge. Individuals typically have an attitude expressing some degree of condemnation or acceptance of their own anger and that of others.

Sex role: Culturally sanctioned personality traits, attitudes, and behaviors for males and females which differ

between the sexes and are determined and reinforced by differential cultural values for masculinity and femininity. An individual's sex role is her subjective evaluation of the degree to which her personality reflects the traits, attitudes, and behaviors considered appropriate for males and females.

**Self-esteem:** An individual's subjective and positive evaluation of her/his own personal worth and value. This evaluation is based on the individual's perception of her competence in establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships. Self-esteem is evidenced by positive thoughts and feelings toward the self.

### Overview

The theoretical literature which has led to the development of the questions which will be addressed in this study is reviewed in Chapter II. The empirical literature on anger in women is reviewed in Chapter III. The literature reviewed in Chapter III also includes research in these three areas related to the study of anger, self-esteem and sex role: sex differences in aggression; the relationship between sex role and self-esteem, with some studies including related variables; and the relationship between sex role and variables related to psychological adjustment. The methodology which was used in conducting the research is explained in Chapter IV. The analysis of the data is reported in Chapter V. The study concludes with Chapter VI, in which the research is

summarized, some conclusions and possible explanations regarding the results are suggested, limitations of the findings are stated, and the need for future research is discussed. The theoretical propositions upon which this study is based are examined first.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL LITERATURE

#### The Relationship Between Anger and Aggression

There is no clear definition as to what constitutes the experience of anger. The research literature is characterized by ambiguous and often interchangeable use of the terms anger, hostility, and aggression, a phenomenon which has been labelled the AHA! Syndrome (Spielberger, Johnson, Russel, Crane, Jacobs, & Worden, 1985). Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, and Crane (cited in Spielberger et al.) have proposed working definitions of these three constructs.

Anger is generally considered to be a simpler concept than hostility or aggression. The concept of anger usually refers to an emotional state that consists of feelings that vary in intensity, from mild irritation or annoyance to fury and rage. Although hostility usually involves angry feelings, this concept has the connotation of a complex set of attitudes that motivate aggressive behavior directed toward destroying objects or injuring other people.

While anger and hostility refer to feelings and attitudes, the concept of aggression generally implies destructive or punitive behaviors directed towards other persons or objects. (p. 7)

It is generally recognized that anger is an important aspect of aggression. Berkowitz (1962) describes anger as an emotional state, resulting from frustration, which heightens the probability of aggression and is often considered the drive for aggression. Whether aggression occurs depends on the presence of a stimulus associated with the event which aroused anger.

Buss (1961) defines anger as an emotional response with facial-skeletal and autonomic components. Buss considers anger one of the drives which lead to aggression and views the energizing aspect of anger, which usually intensifies aggression, as one of its salient characteristics. Novaco (1975) defines anger as a strong emotional response to provocation which has autonomic and central nervous system components and cognitive determinants. Whether anger leads to aggression depends, in Novaco's view, on the nature of the provocation, situational constraints, and the individual's coping style.

The concept of aggression originated in psychoanalytic theory. Freud (1965) maintained that there are two primary classes of instincts underlying human behavior, the aggressive and the sexual. Dollard, Miller, Doob, Mowrer, and Sears (1939) hypothesized that aggression always occurs as a result of frustration in reaching a goal. They stated further that the existence of frustration will always lead to some form of aggression. Dollard et al. include anger among their list of the ways in which aggression may be manifested. According to Fenichel (1945), an important aspect of aggression is its reactive character in responding to and attempting to overcome frustrations. To the object relations theorists, aggression is not a primary motivating force for behavior, but occurs as a reaction to the thwarting of, or failure in, the search for relationship to an object (Greenberg & Mitchell, 1983).

It is necessary to have a view of how aggression is manifested to be able to study an aspect of aggression such as anger. While there is no agreement among different theories as to the source of aggression, it is possible to define and classify aggressive behaviors. The definition of aggression by Buss (1971) is generally accepted as describing aggressive behaviors. According to Buss (1971), aggression involves three factors: the delivery of noxious stimuli, an interpersonal context, and an intention to act aggressively.

Aggressive behaviors may be classified in several different ways. Buss (1971) divides aggression into two classes: angry aggression and instrumental aggression. Buss (1961) also distinguishes between verbal and physical aggression, direct and indirect aggression, and active and passive aggression. Edmunds (1980) also indicates that it is important to classify the motivation involved (hostile or instrumental) and to distinguish between reactive and initiatory aggression. On the basis of these distinctions, Edmunds has defined four classes of aggressive behavior: initiatory instrumental, reactive instrumental, reactive hostile, and initiatory hostile. An attempt to hurt the victim is involved in all four classes. With the two instrumental types, however, injury to the victim is secondary to reaching an extrinsic goal. No extrinsic rewards are involved in hostile aggression.

Anger and aggression are, then, intimately related to each other. Kaplan (1976) defines anger as the emotional

component of aggression. Although anger does not always lead to aggression, anger may be considered a necessary precondition for aggression motivated by anger and as such may be considered to be one aspect of aggression. The common definition of anger found in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary (1983) is "a strong feeling excited by a real or supposed injury: often accompanied by a desire to take vengeance, or to obtain satisfaction from the offending party" (p. 69). Miller (1983) elaborates on the function of appropriate anger when she says that

It tells us that something is wrong--something hurts--and needs changing. Thus, anger provides a powerful (and useful) recognition of discomfort and motivation for action to bring about a change in immediate conditions. It is a statement to oneself and to others. If it can be recognized and expressed, it has done its work. And, most importantly, others can respond. (p. 5)

The desire to take action on one's own behalf appears to be an important aspect of anger. Anger thus defined may be viewed as an aspect of aggression, as can be seen in this definition of aggression:

Those actions and impulses toward action and assertion that give expression to the individual's own aims and/or have an effect on others . . . . Individual striving toward autonomous action and self-assertion is included in this definition. (Nadelson, Notman, Miller & Zilbach, 1982, p. 19)

Because anger and aggression are so intimately linked, much of the theoretical and empirical work on aggression in women speaks to the questions about women and anger which will be addressed in this study. This theoretical work on aggression



provides the base for the study of anger in women and is, therefore, summarized here.

### Traditional Theory of Female Psychological Development

During the past decade there have been major developments in the theory regarding the psychological development of women. Until that time, the traditional psychoanalytic view of women formed the basis of most psychological theory about female development. According to this view, women were considered to be inherently passive, narcissistic and masochistic - - the psychoanalytic triad (Miller, 1985).

According to this traditional view, a key task of female development involved the conversion of aggression into masochism and passivity (Deutsch, 1930). Deutsch considered masochism "the most elementary force in feminine mental life" (p. 60) and saw motherhood as the strongest form of gratification of masochism and thus as the main goal of existence for women. It was assumed that men and women possessed the same quantity of aggression at birth, and that the lifelong developmental task of women was to rid themselves of their direct aggression in order to achieve femininity (Nadelson, et al., 1982).

### A Challenge to the Traditional View

Recent work has challenged this traditional view. The traditional view of women as passive and masochistic results not from their inherent nature, but from their subordinate position in society, according to Miller (1976).

Miller has pointed out that what has been considered masochism in women actually results from their objectification in our culture. Being considered an object, according to Miller, leaves women with an inner sense of being bad and evil. This sense of self is confirmed when others who occupy more important positions in society appear to believe that women deserve to be treated as objects. The result of this process is that women have come to believe there are valid reasons why they are regarded as evil, and thus accept the subordinate roles and abuse assigned to them.

Miller (1976) has also clarified that women are, in contrast to the traditional psychoanalytic view, very active. Their work is not recognized as activity, however, because it is concerned to a large extent with helping others develop rather than being directed toward their own goals. Miller contends that this type of activity is not recognized as such because "it is not activity in the male definition of it" (p. 53).

Caplan (1985) explains that the behavior of women that has been considered to result from innate masochism actually results from the limited options which society has made available to women. Caplan believes that women's apparently masochistic behavior can be understood as the consequence of attempting to avoid punishment or guilt, putting the needs of others first, delaying gratification, or having (or, as a result of poor self-esteem, perceiving that one has) few or no alternatives.

### Cultural Prohibitions on Women's Anger and Aggression

Developmental theorists are now asserting that the inhibition of aggression in women has resulted from powerful cultural prohibitions on its experience and expression rather than from the inherent psychology and physiology of women. This cultural prohibition on aggression in women originated because of their mothering role (Bernadez-Bonesatti, 1978). The prohibition arose to protect the human species by assuring that in their capacity to bear children and in their assigned role of socializing the young, women were assigned tender and caring functions rather than aggressive ones. The inhibition of women's anger, then, results from a very old and powerful injunction against aggression in women.

Westkott (1986) traces this injunction against aggression in women to the development of the "nurturing imperative" (p. 215) which arose with the shift from a mercantile to a capitalist economy at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. As a result of this shift, the role of women changed from producing household commodities, such as soap and cloth, to consuming them. Changes for men moved their work from the home to offices, shops and factories. In the midst of these major social changes, the role of women became the preservation of traditional moral values and the creation of a haven and refuge in the home from the corruption of the marketplace. Westkott contends that the "nurturing imperative" has now evolved into a "male entitlement to female care" (p. 215). Women are expected to

nurture and care for men, their husbands and fathers, as well as for their children. Thus the prohibition of women's anger and aggression continues.

Miller (1976) analyzes the expectation that women will be the caretakers of men and children in terms of the subordinate position women hold relative to the dominant position of men in society. Miller believes that women are taught that their primary life goal is to serve others - men and, later, children. As a result, women believe that they can use all their attributes for others, but not for themselves.

Miller (1983) has pointed out that the cultural difficulty with anger extends to men as well as women. Constraints, which are different for both sexes, are placed on the experience and expression of anger by both men and women. The hierarchical structure of society places men in subordinate roles to other men in which anger must be suppressed. Miller believes this hierarchical structure is replicated within the family so that male children are not permitted to express anger to their fathers. At the same time, however, boys are encouraged to act aggressively. Early in life males are discouraged from experiencing the emotion of anger and are encouraged instead to act aggressively. Men, as well as women, are not able to experience their anger in a healthy way that allows them to communicate their hurt in a nonaggressive manner.

Our conception of anger is based, according to Miller (1983), on the manner in which its expression has been allowed in men. Constraints placed on its direct expression by men has resulted in a distorted conception of anger. Miller argues further that since men have not been assigned responsibilities for the care and development of others, anger is seen as incompatible with the ability to attend to and care for others that is central to the role of women.

Symonds (1976) explains that women are forced to suppress their anger and to accept the "dependent solution to conflict" (p. 195). Rather than experiencing feelings of anger, or acting aggressively, women report that they feel hurt, and are afraid to hurt others' feelings. Symonds labels this behavior "horizontal aggression" which he defines as "emotionally lying-down behavior where the person on the ground dramatically indicates how and where the other has injured him. He intends this behavior to move his listener to comply through guilt" (p. 197). Symonds emphasizes that horizontal aggression is not a sex-linked trait, but results from the dependent position of those using it (primarily women). Because the dependent person is fearful of being on her own, she represses direct expressions of hostility that might threaten relationships with those upon whom she depends (Symonds, 1974).

#### The Intrapsychic Inhibition of Anger in Women

The cultural prohibition of anger in the sex-role assigned to women has resulted in profound intrapsychic

inhibitions of anger in women. These inhibitions have three primary sources: the subordinate status of women in society, the importance of relationships to women's identity and self-esteem, and external perceptions of women's agency. In addition to these cultural factors, several aspects of the mother-daughter relationship play an important role in the intrapsychic inhibition of female anger. The cultural sources are discussed first.

#### Cultural Sources of the Intrapsychic Inhibition of Anger

Miller (1983) maintains that although anger in women is considered pathological, the subordinate status of women constantly generates anger. Force, in the form of physical violence or economic and social deprivation, is available to keep women in their subordinate positions (Mueller & Leidig, 1976). In addition, because men are dominant, it can usually be made to appear that there is no legitimate cause for a woman's anger. As a consequence, when a woman feels angry, she is likely to feel that there is something wrong with her. The result, according to Miller, is:

that women generally have been led to believe that their identity, as women, is that of persons who should be almost totally without anger and without the need for anger. Therefore, anger feels like a threat to women's central sense of identity, which has been called femininity. (p. 3).

Intrapsychic inhibitions of women's anger also arise from the importance of the ability to form and maintain relationships to women's identity and self-esteem. Miller (1983) explains that to protect themselves in the subordinate role assigned to them, women have developed the ability to be

sensitive and attuned to the needs of others and to maintain and enhance their relationships with others. Because of this necessity to develop relational abilities, and because women are primarily responsible for the care and development of men and children, the "relational self" (Kaplan, Brooks, McComb, Shapiro & Sodano, 1983 p. 30) is a central aspect of women's identity (Bernardez-Bonesatti, 1978; Gilligan, 1982; Kaplan, 1986; Kaplan et al., 1983; Miller, 1976; Surrey, 1984).

The intrapsychic inhibition of women's anger develops when women inhibit their own anger because they fear that it will disrupt relationships that are central to their identity as women (Kaplan, 1986). Bernardez-Bonesatti (1978) also argues that because the experience and expression of anger is inimical to the way in which women's role has been defined, feeling angry constitutes a serious threat to a woman's sense of identity, to her "relational self."

The way in which others perceive a woman's ability to act on her own behalf, her agency, becomes another source of the intrapsychic inhibition of women's anger when these perceptions are internalized by women. Kaplan et al. (1983) maintain that others see a woman's capacity for agency as threatening to relationships. Women then internalize this threatening response, experience their own agency as threatening to their relational self, and lose their ability to experience and express anger.

Miller (1976) has pointed out that there are two additional mechanisms of the intrapsychic inhibition of

women's anger which result from their focus on the emotional life of others and efforts to avoid threatening important relationships. First, women are diverted and cut off from their own emotional experiences and needs. Second, rather than recognizing their own needs, women "transform" them and come to see their own needs as identical to those of others (p. 19). By meeting the needs they perceive others to have, women then believe that they will also feel fulfilled.

#### Anger in the Mother-Daughter Relationship

Developmental factors in the female child's relationship with her mother also result in strong intrapsychic inhibitions of anger for women. According to Chodorow (1978), there are important differences in pre-oedipal and oedipal experiences of boys and girls due to the fact that girls are mothered by an individual of their own sex. The preoedipal period is longer for girls and their preoccupation with preoedipal issues of primary identification and lack of separateness or differentiation is carried into their subsequent development and relationships. Girls continue their attachment to their mothers during the oedipal period and, according to Chodorow, never give up their mothers as a love object. Chodorow believes that these developmental factors result in women having a sense of self that is continuous with, rather than separate from, others. As a result, women define and experience themselves in terms of their relationships. Men, in contrast, have a more differentiated sense of self as a result of being mothered by



an individual of the opposite sex.

Chodorow (1978) also points out that women who are mothers form intense identifications with their daughters through which the mother may try to recreate herself, and/or provide for her daughter the type of mothering she, herself, would like to have had. Over time, a sense of mutuality and responsiveness to each other develops between the mother and daughter. The daughter has her first experiences with anger within this intense bond with her mother (Kaplan et al., 1983), as she begins to differentiate from her mother and experience her own competence. Kaplan et al. maintain that these moves away from the mother by the daughter are met with anger by the mother, who fears abandonment. Since a sense of connectedness to her mother is central to the daughter's sense of herself, she is especially vulnerable to her own abandonment fears that are provoked by her mother's anger. The daughter's response is to correct her behavior to prevent upsetting her mother. According to Kaplan and her associates, it is likely that any experience of anger or rage by the daughter will be curtailed in this process to avoid displeasing the mother since her sense of attachment to her mother is so crucial to the daughter's sense of herself.

Lerner (1980) maintains that there are two intrapsychic determinants of women's fear of their own anger. First, she believes that women have irrational fears of their own destructiveness. During the process of attempting to separate and individuate from her mother, the female child projects

onto her mother her own rage and aggression at her mother, her object of dependency. These projections, along with the punishments and narcissistic injuries caused by the mother, result in the girl's internalized maternal imago containing elements of the "bad, omnipotent, destructive mother" (p. 140). The girl's fear of identifying with this internalization causes a defensive shift to experiencing herself as powerless and helpless, which masks the girl's experience of being destructive. Lerner points out that women's fears of their own destructiveness are reinforced by cultural stereotypes that encourage women to act as if they are weaker than men and thus convey a message about how destructive women might be if they were to be themselves.

Difficulties that daughters experience in the separation-individuation process from their mothers account for the second intrapsychic determinant of women's fear of their own anger, according to Lerner (1980). These difficulties result from the daughter's assimilation of sameness to her mother, in contrast to a son's assimilation of difference from his mother. The daughter must identify with her mother at the same time she separates from her. This process may be complicated by the mother's difficulties in encouraging her daughter to become independent when the mother may be attempting to live vicariously through her daughter. For this reason, the mother may subtly undermine her daughter's attempts to become more autonomous. The daughter, in turn, may adopt feminine qualities, including the inhibition of her

anger, to protect her mother, whom she unconsciously perceives as too fragile to tolerate her separation.

The result of these difficulties in separation-individuation is that women have difficulty tolerating the sense of being separate from others (Lerner, 1980). The experience of anger, therefore, is quite problematic since it "involves the feeling of being separate, different, and alone . . . . and apart from a relational context" (p. 140). Women are likely to experience hurt, either instead of or in the midst of, feeling anger. Whereas anger leaves a woman feeling separate and alone, the expression of hurt emphasizes the significance of the relationship rather than the woman's autonomy. Lerner thus summarizes the dilemma that anger poses for women:

The expression of legitimate anger and protest is more than a statement of dignity and self-respect. It is also a statement that one will risk standing alone, even in the face of disapproval or the potential loss of love from others....Not only have women been taught that their value, if not their very identity, rests largely on their loving and being loved, but also, even more to the point, many women have not achieved the degree of autonomous functioning that would permit them to stand separate and alone in the experience of their anger. (pp. 145-146)

Bernardez-Bonesatti (1976) argues that the fear of omnipotent female destructiveness is shared by members of both sexes as a result of their experience of female power in their early relationships with their mothers. She also maintains that these fears are perpetuated in our society by the inequalities that keep women in subordinate positions and roles (Bernardez, 1985). Because women see themselves as

powerfully destructive and men see themselves as totally vulnerable to this destruction, men and women work in concert to prevent the expression of anger by women (Bernardez-Bonesatti, 1978). According to Miller et al. (1981) our cultural tendency to ignore and deny women's aggression is directly related to this deeply-rooted fear of "the powerful life-sustaining and potentially life-destroying woman" (p. 165).

#### Loss of Self-Esteem Resulting from Inhibition of Anger

The inhibition of anger in women has serious consequences for their mental health. Theorists contend that a drastic loss of self-esteem results when a woman does become aware of angry feelings. There are two factors involved in a woman's self-esteem being threatened and destroyed by her experience of her own anger.

Central to the first factor is the contention that a key aspect of self-esteem for women is the ability to engage in and maintain mutually empathic, caring relationships (Surrey, 1985). Because of the cultural prohibition against anger associated with their caretaking role, the expression of anger by women is equated with the loss of the relationships that are central to their self-esteem (Kaplan et al., 1983). Kaplan and her associates state:

The expression of anger can come to be equated with precipitating loss, not just of another person, but more importantly of a key component of one's self-esteem - one's capacity to maintain relational ties. (p. 31)

The experience of anger directly contradicts the woman's ego ideal, which has developed throughout her life as an individual who is not aggressive (Miller et al., 1981., Nadelson et al., 1982). Notman (1982) maintains that direct expressions of aggression or assertion by women are accompanied by their feeling guilty or unfeminine. The awareness of being aggressive reduces the woman's self-esteem, leaving her with a sense of worthlessness or wrongdoing.

Bernardez-Bonesatti (1978) argues that women who express anger openly risk the loss of "one of their most valued characteristics--their loving regard for mankind" (p. 216), as well as their sexual identity and attractiveness. In a later work, Bernardez (1985) states that the definition of femininity, in which active or angry behavior by women is considered inappropriate, seriously impacts the confidence of women, who believe that there is something wrong with them when they are angry. When a woman does feel angry, she "sees herself as a failure, inadequate and inferior, and her already low self-esteem is diminished further" (Nadelson et al., 1982).

Kaplan (1976) describes the dilemma a woman faces as a "a conflict between anger clearly expressed and her self-image as a woman" (p. 357). The result of this dilemma has been labelled "spiraling phenomena" by Miller (1983, p. 3). Small degrees of anger are repeatedly suppressed, leading to the woman repeatedly experiencing frustration and inaction and resulting feelings of weakness and lack of self-esteem. These

feelings generate more anger and the cycle continues, with the woman developing a distorted sense of herself and her anger, which seems to fill her completely and which she then judges as irrational and unwarranted. Miller et al. (1981) point out that spiraling phenomena result in women experiencing their own aggression as unorganized, destructive, and overwhelming to their personality. Thus, women's fears and self-condemnation regarding their own anger are increased and their difficulty with aggression is intensified.

The second factor in the loss of self-esteem associated with the inhibition of anger in women is the turning inward of the anger, where it is directed against the self. Westkott (1986) asserts that the difficulties and fears which surround anger for women ultimately lead, as a result of reaction formation, to the anger being deflected and turned back upon the woman herself, resulting in self-hatred. Because anger sabotages the "nurturing imperative" and the idealized self, which sustains relationships by pleasing others, it is directed against the woman herself and thus maintains self-contempt. Bernardez-Bonesatti (1978) maintains that women redirect their anger against themselves rather than risk losing their own self-esteem and the support and approval of men.

#### **Sex Roles as a Context for Women's Anger and Self-Esteem**

This examination of the theoretical literature on anger in women suggests the existence of a relationship between a

woman's acceptance and expression of her anger and her sex role. The construct of sex role is an important aspect of the theoretical literature on women and anger. An examination of recent advances in theory and research on sex roles is necessary to understand the relationships between anger, sex role and self-esteem hypothesized in this study.

Sex roles are generally conceptualized as "behaviors individuals exhibit and feel are appropriate for them by virtue of their being male or female" (Orlofsky, 1980, p. 656). Those traits and behaviors that a culture values for males make up the masculine sex role, while traits and behaviors valued for females make up the feminine sex role. Masculinity has been described as an instrumental orientation, giving priority to getting the job done, in contrast to the expressive orientation of femininity that gives priority to feelings, relationships, the welfare of others, and the harmony of the group (Parsons & Bales, 1955). Bakan (1966) has characterized masculinity as an agentic orientation, in which one is concerned with oneself as an individual, and femininity as a communal orientation, in which one is concerned with relationships between oneself and others.

Historically masculinity and femininity have been considered to constitute a single, bipolar dimension that differentiated males and females (Orlofsky, 1980). This assumption began to be challenged in the early 1970s by researchers who proposed that masculinity and femininity comprised two separate dimensions and that individuals could

possess both masculine and feminine traits (e.g., Block, 1973; Constantinople, 1973). This challenge was quickly followed by the development of new measures of sex role, predominantly the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974). Empirical use of these new measures demonstrated that masculinity and femininity are two separate, independent dimensions and that approximately one-third of college students described themselves as androgynous, i. e. having equal levels of both masculine and feminine traits (Kaplan & Bean, 1976; Orlofsky, 1980). The term androgyny began to be used to describe the sex role characterized as an integration of both masculinity and femininity (Bem, 1974; Block, 1973). Before this research was undertaken, Bakan (1966) had conceptualized the moral imperative as "to try to mitigate agency with communion" (p. 14).

The theoretical notion that anger has been prohibited in the feminine sex role has been supported by sex role researchers who claim that androgyny provides a model for mental health. Bem (1978) argues that an androgynous personality represents the best of masculinity and femininity and is necessary for fully effective and healthy human functioning. In discussing the ways in which both men and women have been constrained by their respective sex roles, Bem points out that women are becoming aware of their fear of expressing their own anger.



Kaplan (1976) believes that androgyny provides a model of mental health that should be the goal of psychotherapy for women. One of the most prominent implications of the androgynous model of mental health for women, according to Kaplan, is that women must become comfortable with and in control of their own anger. Kaplan argues that becoming aware and accepting of their anger is important for women moving toward androgyny because female children learn to dismiss or suppress their anger in accordance with a nonaggressive feminine sex role.

Kaplan states:

And not every woman one sees in a clinical practice will have trouble dealing with her anger. But...the literature on sex-role socialization suggests that with women one should be especially alert to difficulties in this area. Within an androgynous model of mental health, problems with anger are a major potential mental health hazard. (p. 358)

Since anger is considered to be an important element of the androgynous model of mental health for women, it is surprising that there is a dearth of empirical literature on the relationship between anger and sex role in women. The few existing studies on anger in women, and related research exploring the relationship between sex role, self-esteem and/or related variables, are reviewed next.

### Summary

The theoretical literature on women and anger which forms the foundation of this study is reviewed in this chapter. Anger can be understood best when it is viewed within the larger context of work on aggression. Anger is considered the

emotional component of aggression. While anger may not always lead to aggressive behavior, it does provide a motive for changing negative conditions.

That anger has not been considered an appropriate form of emotional expression for women is cogently expressed in traditional psychoanalytic theory, which views women as inherently passive, narcissistic and masochistic. According to this view, the lifelong developmental task of women is ridding themselves of aggression to attain femininity. Recent theoretical work on female development challenges the traditional psychoanalytic view and argues that women's apparent passivity and lack of anger and aggression are not inherent in their makeup but result from their subordinate status in society.

Current theorists assert that strong cultural prohibitions on women's anger and aggression exist because women have traditionally filled the mothering role, have functioned as caretakers for children and men, and have been taught that their primary goal in life is to serve others. The conception of anger in this culture is based on its expression by men, who have been socialized to act aggressively rather than express their anger directly.

The cultural prohibition on anger in women has resulted in intrapsychic inhibitions of anger that have three sources. First, the subordinate status of women is reinforced by economic, social and physical forces that make anger in women appear pathological and threatening to their feminine

identity. Second, women fear that their anger will disrupt relationships which are central to the identity they have developed in the caretaking role assigned to them. Third, women have internalized the perceptions of others, who see the ability of women to act on their own behalf as threatening.

Intrapsychic inhibitions of anger in women also arise from developmental factors in the mother-daughter relationship. Because girls are mothered by an individual of their own sex, they experience greater difficulty than boys in the separation-individuation process from their mothers. As a result, girls learn to inhibit their anger to avoid threatening their relationships with their mothers. The problematic separation-individuation process leaves women unable to tolerate the sense of separateness and differentiation from others that accompanies the expression of anger. In addition, women have irrational fears of their own destructiveness arising from fears of identifying with their own projected rage and aggression which has been incorporated in their internalized image of their mothers.

There are serious consequences for women's mental health which result from the inhibition of their anger. Women experience a severe loss of self-esteem when they become angry because the anger conflicts with the cultural ideal for women and thus threatens their identity. The anger is turned inward and directed against the self, which results in self-hatred and loss of self-esteem.

Recent developments in sex role theory suggest that the prohibition on, and intrapsychic inhibition of, anger in women is an element of the feminine sex role which prescribes culturally-valued female characteristics. The conceptualization of masculinity and femininity has shifted from the historical view of a single, bipolar dimension differentiating males and females to two separate dimensions, both of which may be present in both males and females. The androgynous sex role, in which masculinity and femininity are integrated within individuals of either sex, is considered by sex role researchers to provide a model for mental health. It is argued that for women, the androgynous model necessitates becoming aware and accepting of, and able to express, their own anger.

## CHAPTER III

### REVIEW OF THE EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

The developmental theory reviewed in Chapter III posits a relationship between the prescribed sex role for women, the awareness and expression of anger by women, and their level of self-esteem.

In reviewing the existing literature, no studies were found of the relationship between anger, sex role, and self-esteem, the three variables discussed in the theoretical literature. Only a small number of studies addressing questions regarding women's anger were found. The findings and conclusions of researchers who have studied this question are reviewed below.

Several investigations have been conducted of the relationship between sex role and self-esteem, and some have included other related variables. A small number of studies have explored the relationship between sex role and variables related to psychological adjustment which may have some bearing on one's awareness of and attitude toward their own anger. The existing literature in these areas is reviewed following the examination of studies of anger in women.

Because aggression and anger are intimately linked, it is important to provide a context for a study of anger in women by examining the literature on aggression. To provide the background necessary for understanding the literature on

anger, several major studies of sex differences in aggression are summarized below. Also included in this section are studies which demonstrate that both aggressive and nonaggressive responses can be conditioned and can provide cathartic effects. Two studies which address the relationship between aggression and sex role are included. The literature on aggression is summarized prior to reviewing the literature on anger in women and the relationship between sex role and self-esteem, as well as studies including other related variables.

#### Studies on Sex Differences in Aggression

There appears to be widespread agreement that females display significantly less aggression than males (e.g., Bardwick, 1971; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Terman & Tyler, 1954). Several investigators, however, have questioned whether such differences are the result of differential socialization of males and females or are the result of innate biological differences between the sexes.

There is considerable debate as to whether males have a greater biological predisposition to aggression than females. For example, on the basis of an extensive review of the literature regarding psychological differences between the sexes, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) concluded that, in general, there is little difference between parental treatment of sons and daughters. In the area of aggression, they claim there

is no support for the belief that aggressive behavior is reinforced for boys but not for girls. It may be, instead, that boys are punished more than girls for aggressive behavior. Maccoby and Jacklin argue that the greater propensity for aggressive behavior among males is due to a biological predisposition rather than resulting from a learned fear of aggression among girls, or from a tendency for girls to reinforce aggression in boys.

In refuting the argument that girls have a learned fear of aggression, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) note that the studies they reviewed did indicate that boys do more spontaneous copying of modeled aggressive behaviors than girls do. Previous researchers have attributed this difference to aggressive responses in girls being inhibited due to fear resulting from negative socialization experiences. Maccoby and Jacklin reject this explanation and argue that there are differences between the sexes in the acquisition of aggressive behaviors. To support this argument, they cite findings that girls do not notice and retain the details of modeled aggression to the same extent that boys do.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) also reject the argument that boys are more aggressive because their aggressive behaviors are reinforced by passivity in girls. They state that the studies they reviewed found that girls provided the same contingencies for the aggressor's behavior as boys and "were no more and no less likely than boys to cry or yield in

response to an aggressive attack" (p. 240). Interestingly, these studies also showed that women and girls were the object of aggression less often than men and boys.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) state that the findings of the studies they reviewed were conflicting regarding the question of sex differences in preferences for verbal or physical forms of aggression. They conclude that "if there is a sex difference in the forms aggression takes, the verbal-physical distinction does not accurately describe the difference" (p. 235).

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) argue that males have a greater biological predisposition to aggression than females, which results in higher levels of preparedness to learn aggressive behaviors. They base their argument in favor of the biological foundation of sex differences in aggression on these four factors:

- (a) In all societies for which evidence is available, males are more aggressive than females.
- (b) Sex differences in aggression appear early in life, when differential socialization pressures do not appear to exist. Maccoby and Jacklin reviewed many studies of parent-child interactions which did not show that parents are more permissive toward aggression in boys than in girls.



- (c) Similar sex differences are found in subhuman primates.
- (d) Aggression is related to levels of sex hormones and can be changed by experimental administration of hormones.

Block (1978) studied the literature reviewed by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) and concluded that their conclusions were unwarranted. Block argues that existing theories of parent-child socialization do not permit the development of hypotheses which are sufficiently differentiated to detect important sex differences in socialization. She also claims that methodological problems in the studies reviewed by Maccoby and Jacklin prevent the finding of significant differences which may actually exist. Block maintains that the questions posed by Maccoby and Jacklin could not be answered on the basis of existing research.

To address the question of sex differences in parent-child socialization practices, Block (1978) administered a standardized instrument on child-rearing practices to 696 mothers, 548 fathers, and 1,227 young adults in 17 independent samples. This study found major differences in parental treatment of male and female children. In the area of aggression, Block found that there was a greater discouragement of aggression in girls than in boys by their parents. Both mothers and fathers expected ladylike behavior from their daughters and discouraged them more than their

sons from rough-and-tumble games and fighting. For male children, in contrast, aggression was encouraged through competition, greater acceptance of participation in rough games and fighting, and tolerance of teasing and expressions of sibling rivalry.

Chodorow (1978) has also taken issue with the conclusions of Maccoby and Jacklin (1974). She argues that the findings of the studies which they reviewed are inconsistent and could support almost any hypothesis regarding differences in treatment of male and female children. Chodorow also states that the studies which did find differences between the treatment of boys and girls consistently reported differences in the same direction. Chodorow cites the proceedings of a panel on the psychology of women of the American Psychoanalytic Association, which reported growing evidence that mothers show differences in attitude and handling toward male and female children from early in the child's life (Galenson, 1976). Chodorow contends that there are subtle differences, consisting of nuance, tone, and quality, in maternal treatment of boys and girls, with different developmental results for the sexes.

Whether there are innate biological differences that result in greater aggression in males than in females has not been definitively answered. Several researchers have concluded, however, that regardless of whether biological differences are present, different socialization practices

for male and female children appear to play a major role in the lower levels of aggressive behavior in females than in males. Three of these studies are summarized here.

Kagan and Moss (1962) concluded that socialization appears to be the major factor in determining differences in aggression between males and females. In a major longitudinal study of the continuity between childhood and adult behavior, and the influences on the goals and behaviors of children, they found that female children displayed greater conflict over aggression than male children. In adulthood, aggressive behavior was more stable for men, while dependency was more stable for women. Kagan and Moss also state that the female child's conflict over aggression stays with her into adulthood in the form of repression of anger and inhibition of aggression.

Kagan and Moss (1962) maintain that girls are subject to more severe socialization of aggression than boys as the result of two forces: rewards and punishments from parents, teachers and friends; and the influence of the cultural definition of the ideal female. They emphasize the role of socialization in the difference between males and females in aggression and dependency, concluding that sex role identification plays a central role in the selection and maintenance of aggression, passivity and dependency. Kagan and Moss also suggest, however, that constitutional

variables, which are supported by different cultural expectations for the sexes, may play a role.

On the basis of their review of the experimental literature on aggression in adult males and females, Frodi, Macaulay and Thome (1977) assert that aggressive behavior is shaped primarily by social forces, which may either strengthen or weaken any existing biological differences. They state that there was not sufficient evidence in existing studies to support any hypothesis regarding sex differences in preferences for either verbal or physical modes of aggression. The sex differences in aggression that can be predicted by sex role stereotypes were found only in self-reports of general hostility or aggressiveness.

Frodi et al. (1977) found that in studies of a single physical or verbal aggressive response, women did not show lower tendencies than men toward physical or verbal aggression. They also did not find that women demonstrated more indirect, prosocial, or displaced aggression than men. They did find, however, that women have a tendency to avoid physical and face-to-face verbal aggression.

Frodi et al. (1977) did find some differences in aggression between men and women which they believe are accounted for by three factors consistent with sex role expectations. First, they found that the sex of the instigator or the victim appears to be a factor in behavior which conforms to sex role guidelines. For example, women

who received feedback on the pain caused by their aggressive actions, displayed less aggression toward female victims than either of the following two groups:

- (a) women who did not receive feedback
- (b) women or men with male victims, regardless of whether they received feedback.

Second, women were found to be more anxious and guilty about aggression and, as a result, to be more defensive against perceptions of aggression or to avoid or inhibit their expression of aggression. Less evidence was found to support the third possible explanation for women being less aggressive than men--that women are more likely to be empathic with victims of aggression, and thus less likely to act aggressively.

Based on existing data which they reviewed, Frodi and her associates (1977) concluded that aggression is a trait possessed by both men and women. Sex role expectations influence behavior and are likely to account for some of the sex differences found in adulthood, but can be negated by either situational factors or relearning.

A subsequent investigation by Frodi (1977) suggests that differences between men and women in perceptions of experimental manipulations may confound findings of sex differences in aggressive behavior. Following the review of the literature on sex differences in aggression with her colleagues (Frodi et al. 1977), Frodi conducted a survey to

investigate whether what constitutes provocation differs for men and women. She hypothesized that exposure to an aggressive event may have different consequences for men and women, and that a provocation to aggression may be perceived differently by the two sexes.

In this investigation (Frodi, 1977), 60 male and 70 female psychology students were asked seven open-ended questions. The results indicated that there are differences in what men and women perceive as provocation. Male subjects reported that they were most angered by physical or verbal aggression by another male, and by a condescending attitude on the part of a woman. For women, the most anger-provoking behavior was being treated in a condescending manner, regardless of the provoker's sex. On the basis of these results, Frodi points out that the use of identical provocations for men and women may be a problem in experimental studies of aggression. Observed sex differences in aggression may result not from differences in aggressive behavior, but from different emotional states mediating the overt behavior.

Following these findings of sex differences in what constitutes provocation to aggression, Frodi (1978) investigated sex differences in responses to sex-appropriate provocations devised on the basis of the above results. In a study of 48 male and female college students, subjects given sex-appropriate provocations were compared to non-

provoked subjects on heart rate, blood pressure, and electrodermal responses as physiological measures of provocation. A stream of consciousness technique was also given to half the subjects to examine emotional and cognitive processes associated with response to provocation.

Subjects in this study were paired with a confederate, who talked to the subject in either a negative (provocation condition) or neutral (no provocation condition) manner. Provocations consisted of directly hostile remarks for male subjects and the expression of a condescending attitude for female subjects. The dependent aggression measure was the delivery by the subject of noxious sounds to the confederate in a subsequent learning trial (Frodi, 1978).

Frodi (1978) found that when given sex-appropriate provocations to aggression, there were no significant differences between males and females in their responses, "suggesting that provoked men and women alike were more angry, disliked their partner more, and aggressed more against their partner than did their non-provoked counterparts" (p. 347). There were also no significant sex differences in physiological measures among the provoked subjects.

The stream of consciousness data indicated that the provoked men were more angry, were more negative toward their partner, and became more behaviorally aggressive than the provoked women, who were preoccupied with nonaggressive

thoughts in coping with their anger. This difference between the sexes was not found among provoked subjects who were not given the stream of consciousness technique. Frodi concludes that this sex difference was the result of the verbalization of feelings and thoughts. She also states that this difference between men and women suggests that women may perceive aggression less readily, or may wish to give the provoker the benefit of the doubt (Frodi, 1978).

Bardwick (1971) reviewed the literature which suggests that males are more aggressive than females and concluded that, while females may have lower levels of aggression, males and females may have similar aggressive needs. Bardwick argues that women possess greater hostility and aggression than can be demonstrated by experimental procedures. She supports her contention by citing a study in which women displayed aggressive behavior when the aggressor and victim could not see each other (Rapoport and Chammah, cited in Bardwick, 1971). Aggression can be expressed more directly and without guilt by males, and females feel more guilt and conflict and inhibit the direct expression of aggression. Bardwick believes that true levels of aggression should be measured by examining not only fighting, hitting and biting, but also verbal aggression, interpersonal rejection, academic competitiveness, gossip, deviation from sexual standards, passive aggression, and



manipulation with power, withdrawal, tears and somatic complaints.

A series of experiments which suggest that the lack of aggressive behavior in women may be the result of instrumental learning has been conducted by Hokanson and his associates (Hokanson & Edelman, 1966; Hokanson, Willers, & Koropsak, 1968). The results of these studies support the contention of many investigators regarding the centrality of socialization in determining sex differences in aggression. The studies were designed to test the catharsis hypothesis "that the carrying out of aggressive behavior, either directly towards a frustrator or in a displaced fashion towards a substitute target, is physically tension-reducing; and, that this overt aggression serves, in a sense, to 'drain the person's reservoir of aggressive motivation'" (Hokanson, 1970, p. 74).

The earlier study (Hokanson & Edelman, 1966) compared the effects of aggressive and nonaggressive counter-responses to aggression on systolic blood pressure, which was used as a measure of tension, in 12 male and 16 female undergraduate volunteers between the ages of 18 and 24. The subjects had the option of responding to electric shock which they received by giving, in response, a shock, a reward, or no response. For the male subjects, Hokanson and Edelman found that a shock counter-response was apparently cathartic since the subject's blood pressure dropped significantly following

this counter-response, but not after giving either a reward or no response. The results for females, however, were dramatically different. The catharsis effect of lowered blood pressure was observed when females gave a friendly counter-response, i.e. reward, but not when they gave either an aggressive counter-response or no response. The investigators hypothesized that this difference could be due to females not being trained in or rewarded by aggression, with the result that aggression for females is not instrumental in terminating noxious events.

An experiment was then designed to test whether aggressive counter-responses would be cathartic for females and friendly counter-responses would be cathartic for males under conditions in which these responses were reinforced (Hokanson et al., 1968). For the ten female volunteers, reward and punishment contingencies which favored the development of aggressive counter-responses were used. For the 11 male volunteers, the contingencies favored the friendly counter-responses. Hokanson and his associates found that the use of aggressive counter-responses by the females increased significantly and demonstrated a cathartic effect in lowered blood pressure. For the males, use of friendly counter-responses increased only negligibly but did show the cathartic effect of lowered blood pressure.

In evaluating the results of these studies, Hokanson (1970) proposed an alternative to the catharsis hypothesis

based on a learning model, in which individuals learn ways of behaving which reduce aggression from others. These learned behaviors result in a sense of relief, accompanied by physical relaxation, when the aggression ceases. Significantly, Hokanson points out that women respond to aggression with friendliness because friendly behavior has been effective in terminating hostility from others.

The obvious implication of the work of Hokanson and his associates is that both aggression and nonaggression can be learned by both males and females. These studies appear to provide support for the view that aggression is learned and rewarded as part of the masculine sex role, while nonaggression is learned and rewarded as part of the feminine sex role.

Two additional studies are noteworthy since their findings are relevant to the relationship between aggression and sex role. In a study involving only female subjects, Richardson, Vinsel and Taylor (1980) investigated the relationship between either liberal or traditional beliefs regarding the role of women and aggressive behaviors. In a laboratory setting, they studied the aggressive behavior of 40 female introductory psychology students, half of whom had liberal attitudes toward the role of women and half of whom had traditional attitudes. The female subjects were paired with male opponents and were instructed that they could avoid being shocked by the opponent if they were faster than the

opponent in delivering shock. They found that women with traditional attitudes were more aggressive in shocking their opponents than those with liberal attitudes.

The findings of Hoppe (1978) more directly address the question of the relationship between aggression and sex role. In a study of 96 college undergraduates, she investigated interpersonal aggression as a function of subject's sex, subject's sex role, opponent's sex, and degree of provocation. Half the subjects of each sex were told their opponent was male, and half were told their opponent was female. In a purported test of reaction time, the degree of shock subjects believed they were administering to their opponents was compared in unprovoked and provoked conditions. In both conditions, masculine subjects (male and female) with male opponents administered significantly higher levels of shock than any of the other groups, which did not differ from each other. Subjects in all groups increased the level of shock in response to increasing provocation from their opponents.

Hoppe (1978) points out that these results do not support predictions of traditional sex roles that males will be more aggressive than females. Only those males identifying with the masculine sex role were more aggressive than other males or females, while a high level of aggression was also found among masculine females. Hoppe concludes that masculine females do not differ from masculine males when

aggressing against a male opponent. She also suggests that the lack of aggressive tendencies in androgynous individuals may result from balancing masculine characteristics with feminine qualities. She hypothesizes that aggression anxiety may mediate responses in all sex roles except the masculine, whose instrumental and agentic qualities may be antithetical to such anxiety. The expressive, communal domain of femininity, however, may facilitate anxious reactions.

It is clear that no definitive conclusions can be drawn regarding the debate over biology vs. socialization in determining sex differences in aggression. Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) conclusions that the difference has a biological basis has been challenged by Block (1978) and Chodorow (1978). Kagan and Moss (1962) and Frodi et al. (1977) argue that socialization plays a major role in the development of aggressive behaviors. Studies by Frodi (1977, 1978) have demonstrated that the provocation to aggression differs for males and females and that, when appropriately provoked, men and women display similar levels of aggressive behaviors. Findings by Hokanson and his colleagues (Hokanson & Edelman, 1966; Hokanson, Willers, & Koropsak, 1968) provide evidence that socialization is a major factor in determining sex differences in aggression. Finally, two investigations suggest a strong link between sex roles and differences in aggression (Richardson et al., 1980; Hoppe, 1978).

Regardless of whether biological factors contribute to sex differences in aggression, it is clear that most investigators in this field believe that socialization practices play a determining role in the higher levels of aggression displayed by males. Their conclusions lend crucial support to theoretical propositions that strong cultural prohibitions, expressed in the feminine sex role, exist and result in prohibitions against the experience and expression of aggression and anger by women.

#### Studies on Anger in Women

In reviewing the literature on women and anger, studies involving hostility were also reviewed. Although hostility is not equivalent to anger, it is a closely related state which occurs as a result of the arousal of anger. Buss (1961) defines hostility as an enduring attitudinal response involving negative feelings and evaluations of people and events. According to Buss, hostility occurs when stimuli are identified and categorized during the arousal of anger, with the labeling and identification enduring after anger subsides. Hostility may be considered a conditioned anger response.

Hostility has also been defined as an attitudinal set, or even a personality trait, developing from a lack of trust in the goodness of others and centered on the belief that others are "generally mean, selfish and undependable"

(Williams, Barefoot, & Shekelle, 1985, p.173). These researchers clearly differentiate hostility from anger, which they define as "an emotional state made up of feelings ranging in intensity from minor irritation to fury and rage." They point out that anger and hostility are clearly related and that individuals with hostile attitudes are likely to experience anger more frequently and intensively than those low in hostility.

Only a small number of studies involving either anger or hostility in women were found. These studies are considered in three groups. First, those studies which suggest that anger or hostility is incompatible with the traditional feminine sex role are reviewed. Second, two studies which raise questions about the relationship between anger or hostility, age, and sex role are examined. Finally, a single study of the psychological settings associated with anger is summarized. This section concludes with a description of findings that do not appear consistent with the theorized prohibition against anger in the feminine sex role.

A total of eight studies were found which lend support to the theoretical proposition that anger is prohibited by, and incompatible with, the feminine sex role. Four of these studies address this issue rather directly. The remaining four studies may be regarded as suggesting support for this theoretical proposition through examining the following relationships: anger arousal and irrational beliefs;

hostility and educational level; hostility and career vs. family-role commitment; and dogmatism, hostility, aggression, and social desirability. The four studies which are more direct in approach are reviewed first, followed by the remaining four studies.

The four studies which provide the most direct examination of the incompatibility of anger with the feminine sex role took very different approaches. Biaggio (1988) has studied sex differences in anger provocation and experience in a field study in which 72 college students recorded all incidents which aroused anger and their behavioral reactions over a two-week period. Men reported more anger-arousing events and more reactions of physical and verbal antagonism than women. Conversely, the women reported more incidents of criticism or rejection, and of feeling hurt, and responded with more reactions of passive consent.

Biaggio (1988) also conducted two laboratory studies of anger provocation and experience. In the first investigation, 51 college students reported the extent to which they experienced anger in response to imagined anger-provoking scenes. The only sex difference found involved males reporting more hostility and hate than females in response to a criticism incident, while females reported greater hurt. In the second laboratory study, 101 subjects reported their behavioral responses after being exposed to an insulting



letter. No sex differences were found in degree of anger reported.

Biaggio (1988) has pointed out that the difference in research designs may help explain the findings of sex differences in anger in the field studies, and the lack of such findings in the laboratory studies. She states that the pressures of real life present in the field studies may reflect a greater likelihood for men to respond with anger, to be subjected to anger-provoking situations, and/or to have a lower threshold for recognizing aggression. The field studies also may demonstrate that women are more likely to inhibit anger when provoked in real life. In the absence of real life pressures in the laboratory, Biaggio believes that women may have viewed anger as a reasonable or expected response.

The relationship between sex role and hostility guilt has been investigated by Evans (1984) in 101 males and 135 female college undergraduates. Females reported significantly more guilt over hostility than males. Masculine sex-typed males reported feeling significantly less guilt over hostility than feminine sex-typed males, and androgynous males fell between the two sex-typed groups. For the females, there were no differences between the sex role groups on guilt over hostility. Although the difference was nonsignificant, feminine sex-typed females did score higher than other females on hostility guilt. Evans' study provides

support for the theoretical predictions that socialization in the feminine caretaking role has resulted in women perceiving anger as incompatible with their identity as females.

Holahan and Spence (1980) compared the relationship between socially desirable and undesirable aspects of masculinity and femininity and anger in 60 male and 94 female college counseling clients. Undesirable aspects of masculinity were measured by the following items on the M scale: arrogant, boastful, egotistical, greedy, dictatorial, cynical, looks out only for self, and hostile. Undesirable aspects of femininity consisted of two components, one indicating lack of sense of self (Fc-) and one indicating verbal aggressive qualities (Fva-). Significant positive relationships between anger and undesirable aspects of both masculinity and femininity were found among females. There were no significant relationships between anger and desirable aspects of either masculinity or femininity for females. For the males in the study, no significant relationships were found between anger and either desirable or undesirable aspects of masculinity and femininity. These results also lend support to theoretical notions that women have learned to suppress anger and regard it as incompatible with their role and identity as women.

Atkinson and Polivy (1976) studied the effects of delay, attack, and retaliation on depression and hostility. Forty-three male and 43 female undergraduates were subjected to a

waiting condition and then received either a verbal attack (high anger condition) or an apology (low anger condition). Half the subjects in each group were given an opportunity to retaliate through a written evaluation of the experimenter. They found that subjects in the high-anger condition became more hostile and more depressed than those in the low anger condition, and devalued the experimenter more when given an opportunity to retaliate. This retaliation, however, did not decrease either the anger or depression.

In terms of sex differences, Atkinson and Polivy (1976) found that males and females felt the same degree of hostility after being attacked but males were more likely to express their hostility outwardly. Females, however, were more likely to retaliate against the experimenter, but felt less hostile than males when they received an apology. Females were also more likely to become depressed in the high anger condition. In commenting on these findings, the researchers hypothesize that a more direct physical expression of hostility may be required to alleviate the discomfort. If so, females may not feel free to express themselves in this manner. Males, however, are not subject to the same social restrictions and thus need not internalize their anger.

Biaggio's (1988) work illustrates the greater tendency of women to inhibit their anger, while men are more likely to respond with angry behavior. The study by Atkinson and

Polivy (1976) demonstrates that women are as likely as men to feel angry, but less likely to express their angry feelings outwardly. Both the study by Evans (1984) and the work of Holahan and Spence (1980) suggest that anger may be associated with negative aspects of the self-concept for women, regardless of their sex roles. These findings obviously have significant implications for the proposition that anger is prohibited by, and incompatible with, the feminine sex role. Although their findings are important, they do not provide the direct examination of the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem that is posited in the theoretical literature. Four studies of anger or hostility in women were found whose conclusions, when examined in depth, suggest support for the prohibition of anger in the traditional feminine sex role. Hazaleus and Deffenbacher (1985) studied the relationship between specific irrational beliefs and anger arousal in 113 male and 229 female introductory psychology students. No differences were found between the sexes in anger arousal, which Hazaleus and Deffenbacher suggest demonstrates the necessity of separating concepts of anger and aggression since studies have consistently found men to be more aggressive than women. The researchers also state that this finding suggests that anger arousal in women may be followed by behaviors other than aggression since aggression is discouraged in role expectations for women.

The question of the incompatibility of anger with the feminine sex role is raised in Hazaleus and Deffenbacher's (1985) findings regarding the irrational beliefs that discriminate between women in high and low anger groups. The four beliefs that discriminated between the two groups were anxious overconcern, emotional irresponsibility, helplessness, and dependency, which was inversely related to high anger. Hazaleus and Deffenbacher conclude that the finding that women high in anger arousal endorse the need to be dependent on others less often than those low in anger arousal suggests that high anger may be inconsistent with traditional sex role socialization.

Martin and Light (1984) examined the differences in anxiety, depression, hostility, perceived control over one's own life, and attitudes toward autonomy in women with varying levels of education ranging in age from 21 to over 63. In their sample of 416 midwestern women who were members of the National Organization for Women, the Catholic Guild, home economics teachers, or nurses, they found significant differences between hostility scores of women with varying educational levels. Hostility was highest among women with a high school education. Hostility decreased as educational level increased, up to postgraduate educational levels, when women with advanced degrees were higher on hostility than women with four year degrees. Martin and Light also found that the women's attitudes toward autonomy became

increasingly liberal with higher levels of education. In discussing this finding they suggest that "college education, and particularly advanced degrees, can be assumed to be a non-traditional role for women" (p. 404). When considered from this perspective, it appears that higher levels of hostility may be associated with nontraditional roles, i.e., either masculine or androgynous sex roles, for women.

Martin and Light's (1984) findings regarding the relationship between hostility and educational level were not supported in another investigation of 760 midwestern farm women with an average age of 44 (Hertsgaard & Light, 1984). In this study, hostility was not related to the women's educational level.

In a study of 284 midwestern women ranging in age from 21 to 63 who were employed full-time, Light (1984) examined levels of anxiety, depression, and hostility according to their perceived career and family-role commitment. She found that women who stated that they placed their career over their families scored highest on all three variables, while those who reported that their families had priority over their careers scored lowest on all three variables. Women who gave their families and careers equal priority scored between these two groups. Light argues that her findings support the hypothesis that deviating from the traditional feminine sex role results in emotional turmoil and stress for women. It is also apparent from these findings that women in

less traditional roles report feeling greater hostility than women in more traditional, feminine sex roles.

Heyman (1977) investigated the relationships between dogmatism, hostility, aggression, and social desirability in 74 male and 109 female college students. He found that increasing dogmatism was accompanied by increasing feelings of hostility in both males and females, and by increasing aggression only in males. He also found that, for females, both hostility and aggression were inversely related to social desirability, while only aggression showed this relationship for males. Heyman believes that these findings suggest that hostility and aggression are more readily integrated with the male role than the female role since both are alien to the prescribed female role.

Although the number of studies is small, these four studies demonstrated consistent findings of higher levels of hostility, anger, and/or aggression in women whose circumstances suggest that they have moved out of a traditional feminine sex role into a less traditional, possibly masculine or androgynous, role. The findings are consistent with both college students (Hazaleus & Deffenbacher, 1985; Heyman, 1977) and women ranging in age from 21 to over 63, thus representing many levels of development in adulthood (Martin & Light, 1984; Light, 1984).

This conclusion, however, is based on an extrapolation of life circumstances such as priority given to career vs.

family (Light, 1984) or educational level (Martin & Light, 1984) rather than on an actual measurement of sex role identification. The conclusion is, therefore, tentative and needs to be tested in further research on the relationship between anger and sex role in women.

Contradictory findings of the relationship between anger or hostility and age have been reported in two studies. These findings are instructive, however, when examined for their implications for the relationship between anger or hostility and the feminine sex role. In a study of 760 midwestern farm women with an average age of 44, Hertsgaard and Light (1984) found that younger women scored higher on hostility than older women. In a ten year longitudinal study of 60 middle-class divorcing families, however, Wallerstein (1986) found that anger increased incrementally with age for the divorced women. Specifically, of the women who were at least 34 years old at the time of divorce, over half continued to be angry ten years later. In contrast, of women who were in their twenties at the time of divorce, less than 15 percent continued to be angry ten years later.

In both of these studies, anger was also associated with factors other than age in the women's lives. An examination of these additional factors suggests a tentative hypothesis regarding the relationship between the women's level of anger or hostility, their age, and their sex role. For the midwestern farm women, higher levels of hostility were also



associated with having more than two children under the age of 14, lack of involvement in decision-making regarding the farming operation, and visiting friends less than once a month (Hertsgaard & Light, 1984). These factors suggest that the women were involved in a more traditional feminine sex role. The younger women in this study had higher levels of hostility, and it can be conjectured that they had both greater exposure to ideas about more flexible roles for women, and greater openness to these ideas, than older women. It may be that their hostility expresses their dissatisfaction with their traditional roles and their preference for less traditional and more flexible androgynous roles.

Among the divorced women, anger also occurred in conjunction with loneliness, being a single parent, anxiety about living alone, and economic worries (Wallerstein, 1986). These factors can be viewed as indicating discomfort with displacement from the traditional feminine sex role. It is interesting to consider this possibility in the light of the findings that more older women than younger women reported feeling angry, and that anger was more prevalent among women who did not remarry. It can be hypothesized that the older women were more angry as a result of being in less traditional sex roles for which they may not have been prepared adequately as a result of less opportunity for

exposure to ideas about more flexible roles for women, and/or less openness to such ideas.

A single study which explored the psychological settings associated with a variety of emotions, including anger, was found (Gormly & Gormly, 1984). The subjects, 32 college women between the ages of 18 and 25, described their emotional experiences on a daily basis for three weeks. At the end of that time, they were interviewed by the investigators and asked to describe events, feelings, and behavior which preceded and followed their experience of particular emotions. The situations which were reported to be associated with anger, in order of decreasing frequency, were as follows:

1. The perception that her expectations for success were not fulfilled.
2. The perception that she was being treated disrespectfully by someone who was significant to her.
3. The perception of social rejections.
4. The perception that someone was disagreeing with her.

Gormly and Gormly (1984) state that their results suggest that a psychological situation in which one perceives that an expected and desired outcome is not attained is "the sufficient condition for experiencing anger" (p. 76). The subjects in this study also reported that the behavior in which they engaged most frequently while angry was "screaming

and hollering" (p. 77). In addition, they reported three acts of physical aggression while they were angry. Gormly and Gormly also found that while anger was the focus of the emotional state labeled anger, other emotions occurred along with it, most prominently frustration, guilt, disappointment, and anxiety.

This small number of studies of anger in women appears to provide some support for the hypothesized relationship between sex role and anger: that anger has been prohibited in the traditional feminine sex role. The most direct support is evidenced in findings that females feel significantly more guilty over hostility than males (Evans, 1984), anger is significantly related to negative aspects of both masculinity and femininity for females (Holahan & Spence, 1980), that women are less likely than men to react with anger when provoked (Biaggio, 1988), or to express anger they feel at the same intensity as men (Atkinson & Polivy 1976). Some support for the hypothesized relationship is found in the inverse relationship between high anger arousal and the need to be dependent (Hazaleus & Deffenbacher, 1985); the higher levels of hostility in women with postgraduate levels of education (Martin & Light, 1984) and in women with greater commitment to their careers than to their family role (Light, 1984); and in Heyman's (1977) findings that hostility and aggression are not readily integrated into the female role.

Less direct support for the theoretical notion that anger is prohibited in the feminine sex role is demonstrated in findings that younger farm women report more hostility than older farm women (Hertsgaard & Light, 1984), and that more older divorced women report being angry than younger divorced women (Wallerstein, 1986).

The conclusion that these findings provide support for the prohibition against anger in the feminine sex role must be tempered, however, by findings which do not appear to be consistent with those above. Three findings directly related to studies reviewed above will be discussed first. This section then concludes with a review of three additional studies whose findings seem not to support the hypothesized prohibition of anger in the feminine sex role. Their study of farm women, Martin and Light (1984) did not find the relationship between hostility and educational level which lends support to the hypothesis regarding sex role and anger. More significantly, the finding that the most common behavior of women while they are angry is "screaming and hollering" indicates that many women do feel and express anger (Gormly & Gormly, 1984).

On the basis of the finding of Atkinson and Polivy (1976) that females become more depressed than males after being provoked to anger, Biaggio (1980a) hypothesized that females who were low in anger arousal would score lower on self-acceptance and sense of well-being than low-arousal

males. She studied anger arousal and personality characteristics in 72 male and 78 female introductory psychology students. The results of this study did not support the hypothesis above regarding low anger females. In addition, the hypothesis that low anger subjects of both sexes would score lower on dominance and sense of well-being, and higher on femininity, was not confirmed. Biaggio found instead that the low anger subjects scored higher on well-being. She suggests that a low anger arousal score may be evidence not of repression of anger, but of a high threshold for anger arousal.

The review of studies on anger in women concludes with three studies of sex differences in anger whose findings do not appear to support the hypothesis regarding anger and sex role. Sex differences in emotionality have been investigated in two studies. Allen and Haccoun (1976) studied sex differences in anger, fear, joy, and sadness in the areas of covert responsiveness, interpersonal expressiveness, orientation (attitudes toward responses and expressions), and situational determinants. In a sample of 61 male and 61 female undergraduate psychology students, they found that in covert responsiveness, females reported a greater overall experience of emotion but not in the experience of anger. Females also scored higher than males on the interpersonal expressiveness of all four emotions; the smallest sex difference, however, was for anger. There was no significant

sex difference in orientation toward anger. Females gave more interpersonal responses in the area of situational determinants of anger.

Allen and Haccoun (1976) conclude that of the four emotions studied, the sexes are least different in anger, which is likely to be associated with the agentic qualities of masculinity. They point out that although it has been documented that males are more aggressive than females, expressing anger is not the same as intentionally harmful aggression. Furthermore, some researchers have found no difference between the sexes in verbal aggression.

A finding of Balswick and Avertt (1977) in a study of 523 social science undergraduates is relevant to the findings of Allen and Haccoun (1976) regarding sex differences in anger. Balswick and Avertt studied gender, interpersonal orientation, and perceived parental expressiveness as contributing factors to sex differences in emotional expressiveness. They measured emotional expressiveness on four scales: hate, love, sadness, and happiness. Anger was a component of the hate scale, along with hate, resentment, and rage. The rationale upon which their study was based did not result in an expectation that there would be sex differences in the expression of hate. The hate scale was, therefore, considered irrelevant. They did report finding no difference between males and females in this area.

In a series of four studies of the everyday experience of anger, Averill (1982) found only a small number of differences between the sexes. His findings are based on written surveys in which 288 students or community residents described either experiences of their own anger or as the target of another person's anger, or kept records of their experiences of anger and annoyance. The sample contained equal numbers of men and women.

In Study I, which examined the subject's own experience of anger, significant differences between the sexes were found in nine of the 87 tests performed. These differences occurred in four areas. First, women described their anger as more intense and more out of proportion to the situation than the men did. Second, women reported more often than men that they would like to talk the incident over with the instigator or a neutral party, and that they would deny the instigator some customary benefit. Third, women were more likely to cry (38% vs. 8%), have a shaky, cracking voice and experience greater tension than men. Finally, Averill found that men were more likely to be the targets of anger than women.

These differences were largely confirmed in Study III, which found differences between the sexes in the same areas and the same direction as in Study I. The only exception was that men reported that their anger was more intense than the intensity reported by the women (Averill, 1982).

In Study II significant differences were found between the sexes in the experience of another person's anger. More women than men (80% vs. 50%) reacted with hurt feelings, while more men than women (45% vs. 28%) denied responsibility for instigating the incident. Women reported believing that violation of an expectation on the part of the angry person was a greater factor in the instigation of anger than men did. Women were also more likely than men to believe that the intensity of the other person's anger was greater than called for. Averill acknowledges that these findings are consistent with the feminine stereotype, but points out that the number of significant sex differences was quite small compared to the total number of variables tested.

In Study IV, concerning the temporal dimension of anger, Averill (1982) again found that women were four times more likely than men to report crying while angry. Action which violated the expectation of an interpersonal relationship was an important factor in arousing their anger for 91% of the women, compared to 79% of the men. The correlation between intensity and duration of anger was strong for women ( $r = .54$ ), but was significantly weaker for men ( $r = .20$ ). Averill's interpretation of this finding is that men may place more emphasis on their behavior when judging the intensity of an episode of anger, while women may emphasize the duration.



In a later report of the same study, Averill (1983) concludes that women's experience of anger is quite similar to that of men. Averill states that the women in his studies became angry as often, as intensely, and for the same reasons as men, and expressed their anger as openly as men. He believes that the only major difference between the sexes found in his studies was that women reported crying when angry about four times more often than men.

The majority of the small number of studies on anger in women appears to provide some support for the prohibition on women's anger proposed in the theoretical literature. This support is, however, of an indirect nature and must be extrapolated by integrating diverse findings. In addition, findings in six studies do not appear to support the theoretical construct. When both these factors are considered, it becomes quite clear that there is a compelling need to test, directly and empirically, the hypothesized relationship between anger and sex role. The present research carried out a test of this nature.

#### Studies on Sex Role, Self Esteem, and/or Related Variables

Several investigations have been conducted on the relationship between sex role and self-esteem, and some have included other related variables. Although none of these studies addresses issues regarding anger, this literature provides the empirical foundation for a study of the

relationship between sex role, self-esteem, and anger. One of the issues raised by the proposed study is whether anger has a significant effect on the relationship between sex role and self-esteem. For this reason, the literature on sex role and self-esteem, including those studies which incorporated related variables, is reviewed here.

Most of the studies in this section explored the relationship between sex role and self-esteem and found consistently that androgyny and masculinity show the strongest relationships with self-esteem. Other variables whose relationship to sex role and self-esteem has been studied are satisfaction with one's own body and sexual satisfaction, sex type of occupational field, and achievement motivation. The review of these studies follows those examining sex role and self-esteem. This section concludes with a review of studies of the relationship between sex role and variables related to psychological adjustment.

#### The Relationship between Sex Role and Self-Esteem

Several researchers have examined the relationship between sex role and self-esteem. Spence and Helmreich (1978) found that in a sample of 715 college students, the highest self-esteem was found in those with androgynous sex roles, followed in descending order by masculine, feminine and undifferentiated individuals. These relationships were the same for males and females. The same relationships between self-esteem and sex role were also reported for a

sample of 752 high school students. For both of these samples, Spence and Helmreich also found that within each of the sex role categories, individuals who scored above the median on the M-F scale, indicating the existence of masculine characteristics, scored higher on self-esteem.

In a study of 248 male and 282 female college undergraduates, Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1975) found significant positive correlations between both masculinity and femininity and self-esteem in both men and women. The correlation between masculinity and self-esteem was stronger in both sexes ( $r = .77$  and  $.83$  for males and females respectively, compared to  $.42$  and  $.30$  for femininity). When these subjects were classified into the four sex role categories, those classified as androgynous were highest in self-esteem, followed in descending order by those classified as masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated. Spence et al. hypothesize that the strong positive individual correlations between both masculinity and femininity and self-esteem suggest that the two dimensions may contribute additively to determine self-esteem.

Following these initial investigations, Spence, Helmreich and Holahan (1979) expanded their sex role measure to include scales for negative aspects of masculinity and femininity. Use of this measure (EPAQ) in a study of the relationship between sex role and self-esteem replicated their earlier findings of positive relationships between

self-esteem and positive aspects of both masculinity and femininity. They found that for both males and females, the correlations between self-esteem and negative masculinity approached zero. They also reported significant negative relationships between self-esteem and the negative femininity scales.

Orlofsky (1977) also studied the relationship between sex role and self-esteem. The results of his study of 111 college men and women showed that high levels of self-esteem were associated equally with androgyny and masculinity. Students with a feminine sex role had low to moderate scores on the self-esteem scales, with the exception of the attractiveness scale. Those with an undifferentiated sex role had the lowest self-esteem score. Masculinity was positively related to most dimensions of self-esteem for both men and women. Taken together, these findings indicate that high masculinity, with or without femininity, is associated with high levels of self-esteem.

The relationship between sex role and self-esteem in graduate nursing students has also been explored. In a study of 96 female graduate nursing students between the ages of 20 and 50, Gautheir and Kjervik (1982) found that women with masculine or androgynous sex roles had higher self-esteem than those with feminine or undifferentiated sex roles. There were no significant differences in self-esteem between

either the masculine and androgynous women, or the feminine and undifferentiated women.

Two studies have investigated the relationship between sex role and self-esteem in samples of adults with more diverse ages and lifestyles than samples limited to college students. Spence et al.'s 1975 study of sex role and self-esteem was later replicated using a sample of middle-aged, upper middle class Caucasian adults (O'Connor, Mann & Bardwick, 1978). The 43 men and 48 women in this sample were between the ages of 40 and 50 and had annual incomes ranging from \$50,000 to over \$100,000. The results obtained by O'Connor et al. were identical to those of Spence et al. Self-esteem was highest among androgynous men and women, followed by the masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated groups for both sexes. O'Connor et al. concluded that their data extends the generalizability of the work of Spence et al. (1975).

Puglisi and Jackson (1980-81) studied the relationship between sex role and self-esteem in 1029 males and 1040 females between the age of 17 and 89. Like O'Connor et al. (1978), they found that for both sexes, self-esteem was highest among those with androgynous sex roles, followed by the masculine, feminine and undifferentiated sex role groups. Further analyses conducted by Puglisi and Jackson, however, showed that masculinity is a far better predictor of self-esteem than femininity.

The results of these seven studies indicate that self-esteem is strongly associated with androgynous and masculine sex roles for both men and women. Although femininity is also positively related to self-esteem, the relationship is weaker than that shown by androgyny and masculinity. These findings suggest that androgyny and masculinity may be more important contributors to emotional well-being than femininity. Since no studies have been conducted of the relationship between sex role, self-esteem, and anger, no conclusions can be drawn regarding the relationship of anger to emotional well-being viewed from this perspective.

#### Sex Role, Self-Esteem and Related Variables

Other researchers have explored the relationship between sex role, self-esteem, and a variety of related variables. Three studies which explored the relationship between sex role, self-esteem, and the following variables are reviewed next: satisfaction with one's own body and sexual satisfaction, sex type of occupational field, and achievement motivation.

In a study of 204 unmarried college undergraduate women, Kimlicka, Cross and Tarnai (1983) found that women with androgynous or masculine sex roles scored higher on self-esteem, satisfaction with one's own body, and sexual satisfaction than women with feminine or undifferentiated sex roles. Kimlicka et al. based their analysis on two, rather than four, sex role categories, combining androgynous and

masculinity scores into a single group, and doing the same with femininity and undifferentiated scores. Results of their initial analysis before their data was grouped in this manner, however, showed that a positive self-concept was strongly associated with masculinity and was not greatly increased by the addition of femininity in the androgynous role.

Jones and Lamke (1985) studied the relationship between sex role and self-esteem in 144 college women in a feminine-typed occupational field of study and 143 college women in a masculine-typed occupational field of study. In contrast to the above research, their results indicate that femininity has an important adaptive function. They found that women in the feminine occupational group had higher self-esteem than women in the masculine occupational group. When they examined the relationship between sex role and self-esteem in each occupational group, they found that androgynous and masculine women in both occupational groups had higher self-esteem than the feminine and undifferentiated women in both groups. There were no differences in self-esteem between androgynous and masculine women in the feminine occupational group. In the masculine occupational group, however, masculine women had lower self-esteem than androgynous women in both occupational groups, and than masculine women in the feminine occupational group. Jones and Lamke conclude that social prejudices that masculine

women in masculine occupations experience from their male peers may account for their lower self-esteem. They point out that although androgynous women in masculine occupations experience the same prejudices, they have greater flexibility in responding and adapting since they have feminine as well as masculine characteristics.

The relationship between sex role, achievement motivation, and self-esteem was explored in a study by Stericker and Johnson (1977). In a sample of 312 male and female college students, they found that achievement motivation and self-esteem were associated with a masculine sex role in both males and females. On the basis of these findings, they suggest that high self-esteem may give individuals, particularly women, the psychological strength and freedom to deviate from the traditional feminine role. They conclude that the relationship between optimal self-esteem and appropriate sex role identification is not direct and may, in fact, be inverse.

The findings of these three studies are inconsistent regarding the role which femininity may play in emotional well-being. The results of the study by Kimlicka et al. (1983) are consistent with studies reviewed above which showed that androgyny and masculinity are more strongly related to self-esteem than femininity. The findings of Stericker and Johnson (1977) support the importance of masculinity to self-esteem. The findings of Jones and Lamke



(1985), however, suggest that femininity may make a significant contribution to the greater well-being attributed to androgyny.

#### Sex Role and Variables Related to Psychological Adjustment

Studies of the relationship between sex role and these variables related to psychological adjustment are reviewed below: identity formation, self-image, and adjustment.

In his study of 111 college men and women, Orlofsky (1977) found that an androgynous sex role orientation was associated with higher levels of identity formation for both men and women. Masculinity was an important aspect of this achievement, as evidenced in Orlofsky's findings that cross-sex-typed women and sex-typed men (both having a masculine sex role) had high levels of identity formation. For women, a feminine sex role was associated with intermediate levels of identity formation. The lowest level of identity formation was associated with an undifferentiated sex role for both men and women. Orlofsky states that:

Thus, rather than leading to difficulties in integration and identity confusion, high levels of both masculinity and femininity are highly conducive to identity achievement. Although both types of characteristics are important, however, it appears that masculine characteristics such as autonomy, independence, and assertiveness are more crucial to identity formation than feminine characteristics such as understanding, warmth, and tenderness. (p. 571)

Because men in the foreclosure stage of identity formation also had high levels of masculinity, however, Orlofsky

concluded that a strong masculine orientation is not always sufficient for the achievement of identity formation.

The findings in a study of the relationship between androgyny and self-image parallel Orlofsky's (1977) findings regarding identity formation. Lee and Scheurer (1983) tested their hypothesis that the superior adaptability believed to characterize androgynous individuals would be manifested in a self-image characterized by high self-monitoring, internal locus of control, and positive expectations of achievement and affiliation success. In their study of 243 college students in introductory psychology, they found that masculinity was more strongly associated with greater adaptiveness in self-image than the combination of masculinity and femininity in the androgynous sex role. Androgyny had a stronger relationship to adaptiveness in self-image only for expectations for affiliation success and only among female subjects. Lee and Scheurer conclude that their findings lend support to the view that it is advantageous for men and women to have masculine characteristics because of the value placed on instrumentality in this culture.

In a number of studies of the relationship between sex role and psychological adjustment, investigators have found that although masculinity and androgyny are both associated with adjustment, masculinity is more important than femininity in determining favorable adjustment.

Silvern and Ryan (1979) studied the relationship between adjustment and sex role in two groups of undergraduate men and women. They found that superior adjustment was associated with androgyny in women, but that a traditional masculine sex role was sufficient for men to achieve superior adjustment. The least favorable levels of adjustment for both men and women were associated with an undifferentiated sex role. While their results did not indicate any negative relationships between positive adjustment and femininity, they do emphasize masculinity as a predictor of favorable adjustment. Silvern and Ryan indicate, however, that

This should not be interpreted...as an indication that traditionally masculine traits are inherently more valuable than feminine traits. While masculine traits may be more associated with personal comfort or adjustment, self-reported feminine traits such as 'compassionate,' may be highly valuable for different reasons. (p. 761)

Hoffman and Fidell (1979) studied the relationships between sex role and several characteristics, including self-esteem and adjustment, of 369 middle-class women. They found that women with masculine or androgynous sex roles had higher self-esteem than feminine women, and that undifferentiated women scored lowest on self-esteem. In terms of overall adjustment, however, androgynous women did not show a markedly stronger pattern of adjustment than the feminine women. Their results did show that women with strong traits, either masculine or feminine or both, indicate better adjustment than undifferentiated women without strong traits of either kind.

Rendely, Holmstrom and Karp (1984) studied the relationship between sex role, life style and mental health in 97 white, suburban mothers. They found that masculine and androgynous women reported symptoms much less frequently than feminine and undifferentiated women on seven of the nine dimensions of psychological distress. Their results suggest, moreover, that it is the absence of masculine traits which is associated with psychological distress.

The relationship between sex role and the following measures of psychological adjustment has been studied in 45 male and 56 female introductory psychology students: The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule, and the Self-Efficacy Scale (Adams and Sherer, 1985). Adams and Sherer found that masculine subjects (both males and females) scored significantly higher on self-efficacy and assertiveness, and significantly lower on depression and social introversion as measured by the MMPI, than androgynous, feminine or undifferentiated subjects.

Whitley (1984) conducted a meta-analysis of 32 studies of the relationship between sex role and either psychological depression or a more general measure of adjustment. The overall results of his study provide support for the masculinity model, which suggests that the relationship between androgyny and psychological well-being is primarily attributable to the masculinity component of androgyny, with the influence of femininity being negligible. Whitley

suggests that the relationships between masculinity and both low depression and high general adjustment reflect a strong belief in self-efficacy attributable to masculinity.

In contrast to these findings regarding masculinity and psychological adjustment, a smaller number of studies have found that femininity also plays an important role in the higher levels of adjustment associated with androgyny. Glazer and Dusek (1985) investigated the relationship between sex role and resolution of Eriksonian developmental crises in 139 female and 133 male undergraduates. Their results showed that androgynous subjects had resolved the crises of trust versus mistrust, initiative versus guilt, identity versus identity diffusion, and intimacy versus isolation more successfully than masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated subjects . Glazer and Dusek argue that these results indicate that the androgynous sex role is associated with better adjustment than the masculine, feminine or undifferentiated roles. Both masculinity and femininity were significant predictors of adjustment in this study. The lowest levels of adjustment were generally associated with an undifferentiated sex role. The researchers concluded that their results do not support the argument that adjustment results from higher masculinity scores.

Burchardt and Serbin (1982) found that an androgynous sex role was related to better personality adjustment for women in normal and psychiatric groups. They investigated

the relationship between sex role and personality adjustment as measured by an abbreviated version of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) in two studies of 106 female and 84 male undergraduate introductory psychology students and 48 female and 48 male psychiatric inpatients. In the college student sample, they found that androgynous females showed better adjustment on the Depression and Social Introversion Scales when compared to feminine females, and on the Schizophrenia and Mania Scales when compared to masculine females. The findings were similar for female psychiatric inpatients. In general, individuals with an undifferentiated sex role had the poorest adjustment. Among females in both the college student sample and the psychiatric sample, androgynous individuals were the most symptom-free. Burchardt and Serbin conclude that their findings provide support for the notion that role flexibility is related to mental health for women in normal and psychiatric groups.

Orlofsky and Windle (1978) have found that femininity is strongly related to personal adjustment for females. They studied the relationship between sex role orientation, behavioral adaptability and personal adjustment in 58 male and 53 female introductory psychology students. They found the highest levels of personal adjustment among subjects whose sex roles were consistent with their gender, i.e., masculine and androgynous males and feminine and androgynous females. For males, personal adjustment, as measured by the personal

integration scale of the Omnibus Personality Inventory, was positively related to masculinity but unrelated to femininity. For females, personal adjustment was positively related to femininity but unrelated to masculinity. Orlofsky and Windle also found that androgynous individuals displayed greater behavioral adaptability, conceptualized as emotional expressivity and interpersonal assertiveness, than sex-typed or cross sex-typed individuals. It is clear that for females in this study, femininity was the primary contributor to high levels of adjustment.

Recent studies of the relationship between women's involvement in multiple roles and psychological well-being also address the question of the relationship between sex role and psychological adjustment.

As part of a longitudinal study of life situations, Gore and Mangione (1983) examined the relationships between social roles, sex roles and psychological distress in a sample of 464 adult males and 647 adult females. Psychological distress was measured by psychophysiologic symptoms and depressed mood. They found that there were no differences in depression between men and women who occupied the same social roles.

Among married persons who have children, however, women who were not employed showed the highest level of depression, which was significantly higher than working married men and working women (Gore & Mangione, 1983). On the measure of psychophysiologic symptoms, women who had children living at

home reported significantly more symptoms than men in the same role. This discrepancy existed for women who were employed as well as for those who were not. Gore and Mangione conclude that working appears to play a protective role against depression for women who are also mothers. They also point out that being employed does not provide this protection against psychophysiological symptoms, suggesting that having children increases the psychological distress of married working women and homemakers.

A later study of the stressfulness of daily social roles for women was conducted by Kandel, Davies, and Raveis (1985), who interviewed 197 women between the ages of 18 and 54. Psychological distress was measured by the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, a psychosomaticism scale, and a measure of role-specific stress. The lowest level of distress was found among women who occupy the most complex set of roles (those who are married, employed, and parents), while higher levels of distress were reported by single women and housewives. In addition, the occupancy of multiple roles decreased stress within the marital role but increased stress within the occupational role. Kandel et al. conclude that while multiple roles clearly are associated with higher levels of well-being for women, the net benefit results from two opposing forces. These forces are evident in the positive, buffering effect work has on marital stress, and the



negative, exacerbating effect parenting has on work-related stress.

On the basis of previous research which suggested that the role of paid worker was less stressful for women than more traditional female roles, Barnett and Baruch (1985) hypothesized that the particular roles a woman occupies, and her quality of experience within each role, would be stronger predictors of role strain and distress than the number of roles occupied.

In a study of 238 Caucasian women between 35 and 55 years of age, Barnett and Baruch (1985) examined the relationship between role overload, role conflict, and anxiety, which were considered stress indices, and the following aspects of multiple role involvement: the number of roles occupied, the particular roles occupied, and the quality of experience within each role. They found that the major source of stress for women in this age group was the role of parent, not the role of paid worker. The quality of experience within the roles a woman occupied significantly predicted psychological distress, while the role of paid worker did not. Barnett and Baruch also found that role conflict and role overload were strongly related to anxiety for nonemployed women, but not for those who were employed. They point out that qualitative data suggest this finding may be due to the lack of structure and legitimacy which nonemployed women experience in their commitments.

In a later analysis of this data set, Baruch and Barnett (1986) explored the relationship between women's occupancy and quality of experience in the roles of paid worker, wife, and mother, and psychological well-being as measured by self-esteem, depression, and pleasure. Contrary to popular beliefs that entering the work force is impairing well-being for women, Baruch and Barnett found no evidence that involvement in multiple roles had a negative impact on well-being. They found instead that the number of roles occupied was significantly correlated with all three measures of well-being. Occupancy of a particular role was associated with well-being in only one case: the role of paid worker predicted self-esteem. The quality of experience in all three roles, however, was significantly related to well-being. They also point out that there was one significant exception to this finding: the role of mother did not predict pleasure. Their findings in this analysis appear to confirm that it is the quality of women's experience in their roles, not the number of roles they occupy, which determines psychological well-being.

Although sex role was not formally included in these investigations of involvement in multiple roles and psychological well-being, the findings of the four studies reviewed above are quite relevant to the relationship between sex role and psychological adjustment. Their overall results demonstrate that women experience less psychological distress,

and greater psychological well-being, when their commitments include the nontraditional role of paid worker. Of equal significance is the finding that being a mother is a major source of stress for women, while being employed is not. The work of these researchers strongly suggests that a nontraditional sex role, i.e., androgynous or masculine, is associated with greater levels of psychological adjustment in women than the traditional feminine sex role. These findings may indicate that femininity alone may not be a sufficient condition for well-being.

The results of the above studies indicate that higher levels of identity formation and a more positive, and thus adaptive, self-image are both positively related to masculinity (Lee & Scheurer, 1983; Orlofsky, 1977). Findings regarding favorable adjustment are equivocal; it is associated with masculinity in five studies (Adams & Sherer, 1985; Hoffman & Fidell, 1979; Rendely et al., 1984; Silvern & Ryan, 1979; Whitley, 1984) and with androgyny in three studies (Burchardt & Serbin, 1982; Glazer & Dusek, 1985; Orlofsky & Windle, 1978). Recent investigations of the relationship between involvement in multiple roles and women's psychological well-being suggest that femininity alone is not strongly associated with favorable adjustment (Barnett & Baruch, 1985; Baruch & Barnett, 1986; Gore & Mangione, 1983; Kandel et al., 1985). It appears that masculinity alone and, to a lesser extent, femininity in conjunction with

masculinity, are much more strongly associated with adjustment than femininity alone. None of these investigators, however, included any anger variable in their measures of adjustment. It is, therefore, difficult to conjecture what the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem is.

The studies reviewed in this section suggest that masculinity is more strongly associated with measures of emotional well-being than femininity. Masculinity has been found to be more strongly associated than femininity with self-esteem (Hoffman & Fidell, 1974; Puglisi & Jackson, 1980-81; Spence et al., 1975; Spence et al., 1979), sexual satisfaction and satisfaction with one's own body (Kimlicka et al., 1983), higher levels of identity formation (Orlofsy, 1977), more positive self-image (Lee and Scheurer 1983), and adjustment (Adams & Sherer, 1985; Hoffman & Fidell, 1979; Rendely et al., 1984; Silvern & Ryan, 1979; Whitley, 1984). Other findings, however, demonstrate that femininity may be an important component of emotional well-being for women (Hoffman & Fidell, 1979; Jones & Lamke, 1985; Orlofsy & Windle, 1978). Androgyny is also associated with measures of self-esteem (Hoffman & Fidell, 1979; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and personality adjustment (Burchardt & Serbin, 1982; Glazer & Dusek, 1985). Those studies which show masculinity to be more strongly related to self-esteem and adjustment than femininity, and recent findings that employment enhances well-being for women, while parenting is a major source of stress,

suggest that masculinity plays a more important role than femininity in determining a global sense of well-being.

While these findings are not directly related to the relationship between anger, sex role, and self-esteem, they have important implications for the study of this relationship. If the theoretical proposition that anger has been prohibited in the feminine sex role is accurate, it may help to explain why femininity appears to be less important than masculinity in determining emotional well-being. Theorists argue, however, that anger has also been distorted in the masculine role. No empirical work has been found that investigates the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem in women. In light of the importance placed on the suppression of anger in the psychological development of women, and the crucial relationship which the theoretical literature hypothesizes exists between anger and self-esteem in women as a result of developmental factors, an empirical study of these relationships was clearly needed.

#### Some Observations On Methodology

Most of the empirical literature reviewed above reported the findings of descriptive studies. A variety of measures was used to assess the variables of interest in this study: anger, sex role and self-esteem. In this section some observations are made regarding the instrumentation used to measure these variables in the empirical studies reviewed.

### Anger

A variety of measures was used in the 14 studies on anger in women that were reviewed. Six of these studies used measures of hostility or hostility guilt (Atkinson & Polivy, 1976; Evans, 1984; Hertsgaard & Light, 1984; Heyman, 1977; light, 1984; Martin & Light, 1984). In only two studies did the researchers specify that they used an inventory designed particularly to assess anger (Biaggio, 1980a; Hazaleus & Deffenbacher, 1985). Biaggio used the Anger Self-Report and Hazaleus and Deffenbacher used the Anger Inventory. The remaining studies used questionnaires or instruments developed by the researchers (Allen & Haccoun, 1976; Averill, 1982; Holahan & Spence, 1980), in-depth interviews (Wallerstein, 1986), self-descriptions (Gormly & Gormly, 1984), and a diary recorded over a two-week period (Biaggio, 1988). The Anger Self-Report used by Biaggio (1980a) was selected for use in the present study.

### Sex Role

Sixteen individual studies on the relationship between sex role, self-esteem, and/or related variables have been reviewed. All except one (Stericker & Johnson, 1977) used either the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) or the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) as a measure of sex role. Of the 41 studies

included in the meta-analysis by Whitley (1984), only five did not use either the BSRI or the PAQ to measure sex role.

The method of scoring most commonly used with both the BSRI and the PAQ is based on the median split for the masculinity and femininity scales (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975). The median-split method was used in all but one of the 14 individual studies reviewed. Although scores on the BSRI were originally calculated on the basis of the difference between Femininity and Masculinity scores (Bem, 1974), Bem subsequently adopted the median-split method of scoring advocated by Spence, et al. The median-split method is preferable because it differentiates between individuals who score high on both masculinity and femininity, and those who score low on both dimensions. The BSRI does not differentiate between these two groups.

A hybrid scoring method which combines the two scoring methods has been advocated (Orlofsky, 1977; Orlofsky, Aslin, & Ginsburg, 1977; Tesch, 1984). Of the 14 individual studies reviewed here, the hybrid method was used in only one. Spence and Helmreich (1979) have demonstrated that the median-split method is a more useful and accurate method of scoring than the hybrid method. The median-split method was used in the present study.

#### Self-Esteem

Self-esteem was included as a variable and measured directly in 10 of the 16 studies noted above. The Texas

Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI) was used as a measure of self-esteem in the majority of these studies and was selected for use in the present research.

#### Summary

No studies were found of the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem in women. The literature on sex differences in aggression is summarized to provide the necessary context for understanding existing research on women's anger. Although there is considerable controversy regarding whether sex differences in aggression are innate or learned, there is widespread agreement that males exhibit higher levels of aggression than females and that socialization plays a major role in determining this difference. Studies which demonstrate that both aggression and nonaggression can be learned by, and can be cathartic for, both males and females support the role socialization plays in determining sex differences in aggression. These conclusions support theoretical propositions that the feminine sex role contains strong prohibitions on anger in women.

Of the small number of studies on anger in women, the majority provide support for the hypothesized prohibition on anger in the feminine sex role. For example, women have been found to express more guilt over hostility than men. Positive relationships have been found between anger and negative aspects of masculinity and femininity among women. It appears



to be more difficult for women than for men to integrate hostility and aggression into their roles. Several studies found that women in less traditional roles report higher levels of hostility, anger, and/or aggression. The nontraditional roles of these women were suggested by their higher levels of education, lower need for dependency, more liberal beliefs about autonomy, or greater commitment to career than family.

The support provided by the empirical literature for the hypothesized prohibition of women's anger is indirect and extrapolated from diverse findings. In addition, six studies were found whose findings are not consistent with the supportive findings. These two factors underscored the need for an empirical test of the hypothesized prohibition of anger in the feminine sex role.

Studies of the relationship between sex role, self-esteem and related variables show that masculinity is strongly associated with self-esteem and other factors important to psychological well-being, such as identity formation, self-image, and adjustment. Androgyny has also been associated, to a lesser extent, with self-esteem and adjustment. There is limited empirical support for femininity being an important aspect of psychological well-being for women. This lack of support for femininity, in conjunction with recent findings that the role of mother is the major source of stress for

women in mid-life, suggests that femininity alone is not strongly associated with a global sense of well-being.

The hypothesized prohibition of anger in the feminine sex role may help explain the strength of the relationship between masculinity and well-being. Since no anger variables were included in studies of adjustment or well-being, an empirical exploration of the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem was needed to help clarify questions raised by existing research.

## CHAPTER IV

### DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the procedures used in conducting the research are described. Methods used to select the sample, collect the data, and ensure confidentiality are set forth. The instrumentation used for the data collection is then described, followed by a statement of the research hypotheses. The chapter concludes with an explanation of the statistical procedures used in the data analysis.

#### Subjects

The subjects for this study were obtained from a systematic sample of women employees listed in the 1987-88 Michigan State University Faculty-Staff Directory. Systematic samples are generally considered to be representative samples and provide less opportunity than random samples for sampling error to occur (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). The findings of both systematic and random samples are generalizable (Glass & Hopkins). With random populations, systematic sampling is equivalent to random sampling and either design can be used (Scheaffer, Mendenhall, & Ott, 1979). Since the listing of employees in the Faculty-Staff Directory was random with respect to the variables considered in this study, a systematic sample was acceptable and results of the study may be generalized to the population of women employees of

Michigan State University from which it is drawn.

The initial sample of 689 women who were asked to participate in the study was drawn from the approximately 4,300 women employed at Michigan State University in the following categories: faculty, academic staff, administrative-professional, supervisory administrative-professional, police, and clerical-technical. Women who were employed off the main campus of Michigan State University were not included in the sample.

#### Method of Data Collection

The data for this study were collected as a survey of women employees conducted by the Employee Assistance Program at Michigan State University using procedures recommended by Dillman (1978). The 689 women identified in the systematic sample received a letter through interdepartmental mail at their work place describing the planned research and requesting their participation (Appendix A). This mailing included a post card which women who were willing to participate in the survey were asked to return to the Employee Assistance Program with their names and home addresses (Appendix B). An informational brochure explaining the services of the Employee Assistance Program was also enclosed. A follow-up mailing was sent one week later, thanking those who had responded and urging those who had not to do so immediately. (Appendix C).

Of the 689 women who were identified in the initial sample and asked to participate in the study, 396 indicated that they were willing to do so. These subjects were sent a questionnaire through United States mail to their home addresses (Appendix D). A cover letter thanking them for their interest and emphasizing the importance of their participation was included in this mailing with the questionnaire (Appendix E). A stamped, addressed return envelope was also included.

The researcher had originally planned to send a follow-up mailing to each of the 396 women one week after the questionnaire was mailed. The purpose of this mailing was to have been to thank those who had returned their questionnaire and urge those who had not to do so. This procedure was modified as a result of the response to a similar follow-up mailing to the initial letter explaining the study and requesting the subjects' participation. Many of the women who had responded to this initial mailing were confused as to why they received the follow-up mailing, and were concerned that their response had not been received. As a result of the disruption caused by this misunderstanding, it was decided that only those subjects who had not returned their questionnaires within ten days of the date it was mailed would receive a follow-up post card.

Of the 396 potential subjects who expressed willingness to participate in the study, 52 did not return their

questionnaires. A total of 344 questionnaires were returned. Of these, two were blank. Of the remaining 342 questionnaire, 70 subjects omitted one or more responses. Data from the 342 questionnaires which were partially or fully complete were included in the data analysis.

#### Procedures to Ensure Confidentiality

All questionnaires were returned to the researcher anonymously with the exception of those from three subjects who requested information from the Employee Assistance Program. When the questionnaire was mailed, subjects received a post card which they were asked to return separately, indicating that they had returned their questionnaire (Appendix G). Use of the return post card made it possible to remove the names of subjects who had returned the questionnaire from the mailing list for follow-up mailings. This assurance of anonymity was necessary since the subjects were asked to provide personal information about their feelings and self-perceptions to an agency which was part of the organization employing them. This return card also allowed respondents to indicate whether they wished to receive a summary of the results of the study. Those who wanted this information were mailed a expanded copy of the Abstract (Appendix H) with a cover letter thanking them for their participation in the research (Appendix I).

### Instrumentation

The questionnaire had three parts. First, subjects were asked questions regarding their use and perception of services offered by the Employee Assistance Program. This data was compiled and forwarded to the Employee Assistance Program for use in planning future programs. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of the following psychological inventories described below which measured the variables of anger, sex role and self-esteem: the Anger Self-Report, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, and the Texas Social Behavior Inventory. The third part of the questionnaire consisted of questions designed to gather the following demographic information: marital status, age, years of education completed by the respondent and her parents, educational level, employee group, type of work, most important work activities, and before-tax household income.

#### Anger Self-Report (ASR)

Subjects were administered five scales of the ASR (Zelin, Adler, & Myerson, 1972) to measure the three anger variables (awareness of anger, expression of anger, condemnation of anger). The ASR was developed to discriminate between the awareness of anger and its expression, and the five scales selected for this research reflected the areas of concern in this study. The following scales were administered; Awareness of Anger, General Expression of Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Physical Aggression, and Condemnation of Anger. The

researcher had originally planned to use the Total Expression of Anger score, which is a composite of the scores on the general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, and physical aggression scales. During the analysis of the data, however, it became obvious that more useful information would be obtained by analyzing and reporting scores on the three scales separately. For this reason it was decided that the three separate expression scales, rather than the composite Total Expression of Anger score, would be used to measure the expression of anger variable.

The ASR gives the respondent a series of self-descriptive statements such as "I get mad easily," "It's right for people to express themselves when they are mad," and "If I don't like somebody, I will tell him so." The respondent is asked to indicate how each statement applies to her on a six point scale ranging from "strong disagreement" (1) to "strong agreement" (6).

The authors conducted validation studies of the ASR on samples of 82 psychiatric patients and 67 college students (Zelin et al., 1972). ASR scores of the psychiatric patients were correlated with psychiatrists' ratings on 16 of the Problem Appraisal Scales (PAS) (Endicott & Spitzer, 1972) considered most relevant to the assessment of anger. On the basis of their analysis of these correlations, Zelin and his associates found that the ASR scales show substantial convergent and discriminant validity.



Regarding convergent validity, awareness of anger correlates positively with PAS anti-social attitudes and acts ( $r = .24$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and negatively with PAS obsessive-compulsiveness ( $r = -.37$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The physical aggression scale correlates most highly with Assaultive Acts on the PAS ( $r = .41$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The highest correlation for ASR general expression is with PAS antisocial attitudes and acts ( $r = .25$ ,  $p < .05$ ). ASR verbal aggression has a significant negative correlation of  $-.36$  ( $p < .01$ ) with PAS dependency, and positive correlations of  $.31$  ( $p < .01$ ) with PAS anger-belligerent negativism and  $.28$  ( $p < .01$ ) with anti-social attitudes and acts. ASR condemnation of anger has significant correlations with PAS suicidal thoughts, anxiety-phobias, and obsessive-compulsiveness ( $r = -.22$ ,  $.23$ ,  $.22$ ,  $p < .05$ , respectively).

Discriminant validity of the ASR has also been demonstrated by its correlations with the 16 PAS scales. For example, ASR physical aggression is the only ASR scale which correlates significantly with PAS assaultive acts. Significant negative correlations were found between the dependency scales of the PAS and ASR general expression and verbal aggression, but not with ASR awareness of anger. The authors believe that this indicates that highly dependent people can be aware of anger but feel compelled to inhibit its expression. This finding provides support for the validity of the distinction between awareness of anger and its

expression. Discriminant validity is further demonstrated in the significant positive correlations found between PAS antisocial attitudes-acts and both ASR awareness ( $r = .24$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and all the ASR expression scales, with general expression showing a correlation of .25 ( $p < .05$ ) and physical aggression and verbal aggression both showing correlations of .28 ( $p < .01$ ) (Zelin, et al., 1972).

Peer ratings were used to assess the validity of the ASR scores for the college student sample. The 67 students completing the ASR were rated on six scales by three students who lived nearby in the students' dormitories (Zelin et al., 1972). For example, ASR verbal aggression correlates positively only with "To what extent does this person provoke arguments?" on the peer rating scale ( $r = .29$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The highest positive correlation for ASR awareness of anger is with "To what extent does this person feel anger?" on the peer rating scale ( $r = .29$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Split-half reliabilities for the ASR reported by Zelin et al. (1972) range from .64 to .83. Reliabilities for the scales used in this study are as follows:

Awareness of Anger	.82
General Expression of Aggression	.66
Physical Expression of Aggression	.64
Verbal Expression of Aggression	.78
Condemnation of Anger	.81

Biaggio (1980b) administered four anger scales, including the ASR, to 150 college undergraduates. The results of her study indicate that the ASR shows concurrent validity with the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (BDHI). In a later study, Biaggio, Supplee and Curtis (1981) administered the four anger inventories to 60 college undergraduates, who also filled out a personal incidents record and participated in imaginal and role-playing laboratory situations designed to provoke anger. Significant correlations between ASR scales and the laboratory self-report data and the subjects' personal incidents records established good predictive validity for ASR awareness of anger, general expression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger.

Means and standard deviations for the ASR have been reported for psychiatric inpatients and college students (Zelin et al. 1972; Biaggio, 1980b). Neither set of data appears to provide appropriate norms for this study. There are large differences between the scores for psychiatric inpatients and college students in Zelin et al.'s study. In addition, Biaggio used a different method of scoring than Zelin and his associates, making it impossible to compare the scores for college students in the two studies. The means for the research sample were used to provide the norms for the current study.

Each of the items on the ASR is scored in either the agree or disagree direction. All items scored in the disagree

direction are given a negative value in scoring. As a result, the raw scores on the scales can have negative values. Biaggio recommends adding a constant of 40 to the raw score for each scale to eliminate the negative values (M. K. Biaggio, personal communication, June 8, 1988). Raw scores were modified in this manner in the present research in accordance with Biaggio's recommendations.

#### Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ)

The sex role attitudes of the respondents in this study were measured by the short form of the PAQ (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The short form of the PAQ consists of 24 bipolar trait characteristics such as "Not at all aggressive--Very aggressive" and "Not at all independent--Very independent." For each characteristic the respondent rated herself on a five point scale to indicate where she fell between the two extremes.

The PAQ contains three scales, masculinity (M), femininity (F), and masculinity-femininity (M-F). The M and F scales each contain eight items which are considered socially desirable characteristics for both sexes. Those items on the M scale are believed to be possessed by males to a greater degree than by females. The F scale contains items which are believed to be possessed by females to a greater extent than by males. The content of the scales reflects the instrumental, agentic orientation of masculinity and the expressive, communal orientation of femininity as

conceptualized by Parsons and Bales (1955) and Bakan (1966). The M-F Scale contains eight characteristics whose social desirability differs for the two sexes (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

The full version of the PAQ contains 55 bipolar items derived from a pool of 122 items developed by Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman and Broverman (1968) in studies of characteristics believed to differentiate men and women. The existence of sex role stereotypes was confirmed by Rosenkrantz et al., who asked their subjects to rate the typical adult male, the typical adult female, and the ideal individual (sex unspecified) on each item. In developing the PAQ, introductory psychology students were asked to rate the typical adult of each sex, the typical college student of each sex, or the ideal individual of each sex for each of the items in the pool used by Rosenkrantz et al. Each student was also asked to rate him/herself (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

The 55 items for the original version of the PAQ were selected from those items on which male and female ratings differed significantly for the typical adult, typical college student, and ideal individual. These significant differences indicate the existence of consistent stereotypes regarding differences between the sexes (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

The short form of the PAQ which was used in this study is highly correlated with the original 55 item PAQ. Correlations between the scales of the original and short

versions of the PAQ in a sample of the college students are .93, .93, and .91 for the M, F, and M-F scales respectively. Scales for the short form have Cronbach alpha reliabilities of .85, .82, and .78 for the M, F, and M-F scales respectively (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

Each item on the PAQ is scored from 0 to 4, with high scores indicating either an extreme masculine or extreme feminine response. Respondents were classified into one of four sex role groups on the basis of whether their scores fell above or below the sample median on the M and F scales. The following fourfold classification was used: androgynous (high masculine, high feminine); masculine (high masculine, low feminine); feminine (high feminine, low masculine); and undifferentiated (low masculine, low feminine) (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The sample medians were used in classifying the subjects in accordance with the suggestion of Spence and Helmreich that this procedure allows relationships within the population to be revealed more clearly.

In a sample of 248 male and 282 female introductory psychology students, the internal consistency of the PAQ has been demonstrated in alpha coefficients of .92 and .90 for men and women respectively on the stereotype ratings, and .73 and .91 on self ratings (Spence et al., 1974). Later analyses using data from several thousand high school and college students and parents resulted in alpha coefficients in the mid .70s for the M, F, and M-F scales (Helmreich, Spence &

Wilhelm, 1981). Test-retest reliabilities for 31 subjects in Spence et al.'s (1974) original study who retook the PAQ after 13 weeks were .92 and .98 for men and women respectively on stereotype ratings, and .80 and .91 on self ratings.

Factor analyses of the PAQ M and F scales result in two factors which consist of masculinity and femininity and show a mean intercorrelation of  $-.04$  (Helmreich, Spence & Wilhelm, 1981). Studies conducted during the development of the PAQ show that the male-valued and female-valued items correlated negatively for both sexes (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974).

The validity of the PAQ has been established in several different contexts. Spence et al. (1974) performed a cross validation study of the use of the PAQ to measure sex role stereotypes by giving the PAQ to a second sample of introductory psychology students of 56 males and 108 females. They found significant stereotypes for both sexes on all items. In a study of two independent samples of college students, significant differences were found between men and women on every item, with men scoring higher on the M and M-F items scored in a masculine direction, and lower on the F items, scored in a feminine direction (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975).

Construct validity for the PAQ has been demonstrated in a variety of studies. In a study of 248 male and 282 female introductory psychology students, self and peer ratings on the PAQ of the ideal male and female fell toward the same pole,

supporting the conceptualization of masculinity and femininity as a dualism. The content of the male-valued and female-valued items was also consistent with the agency-communion (Bakan, 1966) and instrumental-expressive (Parsons & Bales, 1955) distinctions drawn between masculinity and femininity (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp 1975). In a study of 123 female introductory psychology students, Klein and Willerman (1979) found that undifferentiated and feminine women were significantly less dominant than masculine and androgynous women in laboratory settings and on the Dominance scale of the California Psychological Inventory.

The findings of two additional studies are relevant to the construct validity of the PAQ. PAQ scores which indicate the perception of large differences between the sexes have been found to correlate with traditional sex role attitudes on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The power strategies which 50 male and 50 female heterosexual college students reported that they use in romantic/sexual relationships were found to be consistent with sex roles as measured by the PAQ. For example, women and males and females with feminine sex roles reported using indirect and unilateral power strategies. In contrast, men and masculine males and females used direct and bilateral strategies (Falbo, 1982).



Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI)

The short form of the TSBI was used to measure the self-esteem of respondents in this study (Helmreich, Stapp & Ervin, 1974; Helmreich & Stapp, 1974). The short form of the TSBI consists of 16 statements which were designed to assess self-confidence and competence in social situations (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). For each item the respondent rated herself on a five point scale ranging from "Not at all characteristic of me" to "Very much characteristic of me" (Helmreich et al.).

The TSBI was developed from a pool of 60 items dealing with aspects of personal worth and social interaction which were administered to over 1000 introductory psychology students. The 32 items on the original form of the TSBI were selected from this pool on the basis of factor analysis. The correlation between the long and short forms of the TSBI is .97 (Helmreich & Stapp 1974). Use of the TSBI has demonstrated test-retest reliabilities of .94 for males and .93 for females. All correlations between individual items and the whole TSBI are significant, with mean correlations of .53 for males and .55 for females (Helmreich et al., 1974).

The validity of the TSBI has been demonstrated in a number of contexts. In studies of variables thought to have an important relationship to self-esteem, experimental hypotheses have been confirmed using the TSBI. For example, on the basis of previous research, Helmreich et al. (1970) predicted that individuals with moderate self-esteem would

perceive a competent person who blundered as attractive, while individuals with high or low self-esteem would not. The findings of their study, using the TSBI, supported their hypothesis. Kimble and Helmreich (1972) conducted another study based on previous findings that high and low self-esteem individuals have a greater tendency to evaluate themselves on the basis of how others view them than do individuals with moderate self-esteem. Kimble and Helmreich hypothesized that individuals with high and low self-esteem would demonstrate a greater need for social approval than individuals with moderate self-esteem. The findings of their study, using the TSBI, supported this hypothesis.

The validity of the TSBI has also been demonstrated through its correlations with other psychological measures. Correlations of .50 for males and .52 for females with the self-esteem scale of the California Personality Inventory support the construct validity of the TSBI (Helmreich et al., 1974). The TSBI is strongly correlated with the masculinity and femininity scales of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). Correlations with the masculinity scale are .81 and .83 for males and females, respectively; correlations with the femininity scales are .42 and .44 respectively (Helmreich & Stapp, 1974). Discriminant validity is illustrated in the small and nonsignificant correlations between the TSBI and intelligence, as measured by the Scholastic Aptitude Test (Helmreich et al.).

In selecting a measure of self-esteem for use in this study, it was important to consider whether the conceptualization of self-esteem in the inventory was consistent with the theoretical base of the study which argues that, for women, self-esteem is derived from relationships. It was important, therefore, that the inventory chosen to measure self-esteem reflect this conceptualization of self-esteem as being rooted in one's interactions with others. Stake and Orlofsky (1981) have addressed this issue in pointing out that measures of self-esteem used with female populations must have the capacity to measure communal as well as agentic aspects of self-esteem. They contend that since a communal orientation is central to the feminine sex role, measures of self-esteem which tap only the agentic qualities more characteristic of the masculine sex role lack predictive validity when used with female subjects.

Since the TSBI is a measure of social competence, its conceptualization of self-esteem is consistent with the communal, relationship-based nature of self-esteem defined in the theoretical base of this study. Evidence of this consistency is found in research reported by Stake and Orlofsky (1981). They examined the relationship between the TSBI and specific measures of agentic and communal self-esteem and found that the TSBI has three factors, one of which measures both agentic and communal aspects of self-esteem. Seven items loaded on this factor, while only four loaded on

each of the other two factors. Thus, the philosophical and theoretical appropriateness of the TSBI for this study is evident.

### Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. There will be differences between women who have masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ, and women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ, with respect to scores on the ASR awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger scales. More specifically:

a. Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the ASR awareness of anger scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

b. Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the ASR general expression of aggression scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

c. Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the ASR verbal aggression scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

d. Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the ASR physical aggression scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

e. Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score lower on the ASR condemnation of anger scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

2. Scores on the ASR scales will play a role in predicting the self-esteem of individual women as measured by the TSBI. More specifically:

a. ASR awareness of anger scores will negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

b. ASR general expression of aggression scores will negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

c. ASR verbal aggression scores will negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

d. ASR physical aggression scores will negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

e. ASR condemnation of anger scores will positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

3. There will be differences in TSBI self-esteem scores between the four groups of women having masculine, androgynous, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ. More specifically:

a. Women having androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the TSBI than women having masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

b. Women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the TSBI than women having feminine or undifferentiated sex roles on the PAQ.

c. Women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the TSBI than women having undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

4. There will be an interaction between sex roles as measured by the PAQ and ASR awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression and condemnation of anger scores in predicting TSBI self-esteem scores. More specifically:

a. ASR awareness of anger scores will:

- (1) positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
- (2) negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
- (3) not predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having androgynous or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

b. ASR general expression of aggression scores will:

- (1) positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
- (2) negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
- (3) not predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having androgynous or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

c. ASR verbal aggression scores will:

- (1) positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
- (2) negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
- (3) not predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having androgynous or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

d. ASR physical aggression scores will:

- (1) positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
- (2) negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

- (3) not predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having androgynous or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
- e. ASR condemnation of anger scores will:
- (1) negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
  - (2) positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
  - (3) not predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having androgynous or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

In reviewing the literature, very little empirical data were found that suggest the existence of relationships between sex role, anger, self-esteem, and demographic variables such as age, educational level, and occupational classification. It was not feasible, therefore, to formulate hypotheses which addressed the effects of demographic variables on the variables of interest in this study. There was reason to believe, however, that such demographic variables might affect the other variables being investigated in this study. For this reason, information on several demographic variables was gathered and used to explore relationships between the primary variables of sex role, anger and self-esteem. These variables



were marital status, age, educational level, employee classification, and household income. Data were also gathered for use in a future study of the impact of socioeconomic status on anger in women.

### Statistical Procedures for Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed for each of the main variables: awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, condemnation of anger, self-esteem, and sex role.

The following statistical procedures were used to analyze the data for this study:

1. A multi-variate analysis of variance was used to test hypothesis 1, which stated the expected differences in awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger, between women with masculine or androgynous sex roles, and women with feminine or undifferentiated sex roles. Planned and post hoc contrasts were used to test the specific parts of the hypotheses. The effects of the demographic variables were explored for each of the anger variables using a multi-variate analysis of variance and post hoc contrasts.
2. A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to test hypothesis 2, which described the manner in which awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger were expected

to predict self-esteem. Stepwise multiple regression analyses were used to test the effects of the demographic variables in predicting self-esteem.

3. A one-way analysis of variance was used to test hypothesis 3, which stated the expected differences in self-esteem between the four sex role groups. The specific parts of the hypothesis were tested by pairwise contrasts using the Tukey procedure, and by pairwise contrasts using a less conservative contrast-based alpha level.

4. A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to test hypothesis 4, which described the expected variability, according to sex role, of the manner in which awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger were anticipated to predict self-esteem.

#### Assumptions of Analysis of Variance

Analysis of variance was used to test hypotheses 1 and

3. The assumptions of analysis of variance are:

1. The observations are sampled from normally distributed populations.

2. The variances of the populations from which the observations are drawn are homogeneous.

3. The observations are independent.

An examination of the frequency distributions and descriptive statistics for the data confirmed that these assumptions were met in this study. The homogeneity of variance assumption was

also tested by the Bartlett test (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). The results confirmed that the assumption had been met by the data.

### Stepwise Multiple Regression

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were used to test hypotheses 2 and 4. In this type of analysis the best predictor of the dependent variable is entered into the regression equation in step one. The variable which accounts for the greatest amount of variance, in conjunction with variables already in the equation, is selected and added in each successive step. Stepwise multiple regression was employed because it shows the change in the variance of the outcome variable which is accounted for by the inclusion of each independent variable in the regression equation. This quality was desirable in the present research because there was no empirical base for predicting the relative importance of the ASR variables in predicting self-esteem.

### Assumptions of Regression Analysis

Regression analyses are based on the following three assumptions: normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals. The normality assumption was tested by histogram and normal probability plots of the residuals, which proved to be normally distributed. The linearity assumption was tested by plotting the actual TSBI scores against the predicted TSBI scores. The resulting plot demonstrated that

the actual and predicted scores were linearly related. According to Berenson, Levine, & Goldstein (1983), the homoscedasticity assumption may be tested by plotting the residuals against the scores on the independent variables. When no pattern emerges in the scatterplot, the homoscedasticity assumption has been met. Accordingly, the residuals for the TSBI scores were plotted against the scores on each of the five ASR scales. Random scatterplots indicated that the assumption was met for those ASR scales which proved to be significant predictors of TSBI self-esteem scores.

In addition to testing the three assumptions of regression analysis described above, the residuals were also examined to determine whether the observations were independent. Independence may be tested by plotting the residuals against each case (Berenson et al., 1983). The casewise plots were random, indicating that the observations were independent.

### Multicollinearity and Singularity

In performing regression analyses it is important to inspect relationships between the independent variables for the existence of multicollinearity or singularity. Multicollinearity occurs when independent variables are highly correlated with each other. Singularity refers to linear dependency among the independent variables, i.e., one variable is a linear combination of other variables. Pedhazur (1982)

has demonstrated that these conditions can result in a lack of precision in the results of the regression analysis.

Correlation coefficients were computed between all the main variables to detect the possibility of multicollinearity. Some significant correlations were found between the ASR scales, most notably a correlation of .65 between verbal aggression and general expression of anger, and a correlation of .51 between general expression of anger and awareness of anger. Other correlations between ASR scales ranged from -.16 to .42. Zelin et al. (1972) reported the existence of correlations between the scales and addressed the question of whether the scales were sufficiently independent to result in differential diagnostic information on the basis of the difference between scores on the scales. Zelin et al. concluded that there was more than adequate reliable, independent variance between the scales.

Correlations between the PAQ scales and the ASR scales did not pose problems of multicollinearity. The highest correlation was found between PAQ masculinity and ASR verbal aggression (.31). Table 4.1 contains the complete correlations matrix for all main variables in this study.

The problem of singularity was not found in the present research. None of the independent variables were linearly dependent.

Table 4.1: Pearson Correlations: Main Variables

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	AWARENESS OF ANGER	CONDEMNATION OF ANGER	VERBAL AGGRESSION	PHYSICAL AGGRESSION	GENERAL EXPRESSION OF ANGER	TSBI
MASCULINE	--	.09	-.19**	-.20***	.31***	-.03	.16**	.72***
FEMININE	.09	--	-.07	-.06	-.01	.00	-.11	.23***
AWARENESS OF ANGER	-.19**	-.07	--	-.24***	.40***	.42***	.51***	-.17**
CONDEMNATION OF ANGER	-.20***	-.06	-.24***	--	-.35***	-.16**	-.35***	-.19**
VERBAL AGGRESSION	.31***	-.07	-.40***	-.35**	--	.40***	.65***	.28***
PHYSICAL AGGRESSION	-.03	.00	.42***	-.16**	.40***	--	.40***	-.04**
GEN.EXPRESSION OF ANGER	.16**	-.11	.51***	-.35***	.65***	.40**	--	.12*
TSBI	.72***	.23***	-.17**	.19**	.28***	-.04	.12*	--

\* p &lt; .05

\*\* p &lt; .01

\*\*\* p &lt; .001

### Summary

Subjects for this study were obtained from a systematic sample of women employed by Michigan State University and listed in the 1987-88 Faculty-Staff Directory. Data were collected by a questionnaire mailed to the subjects as a research survey conducted by the Employee Assistance Program at Michigan State University. The questionnaire included the Anger Self-Report, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, and the Texas Social Behavior Inventory. Demographic data and information regarding the respondents' perceptions and use of the services of the Employee Assistance Program were also gathered. Confidentiality was assured since all questionnaires were returned anonymously.

Four hypotheses were tested in this study. The first hypothesis stated the expected differences in awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger between women with masculine or androgynous sex roles, and women with feminine or undifferentiated sex roles. The second hypothesis described the manner in which awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger were expected to predict self-esteem. Hypothesis 3 stated the expected differences in self-esteem between the four sex role groups. The fourth hypothesis described the expected variability, according to sex role, of the manner in which awareness of anger, general

expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger were expected to predict self-esteem. Multi-variate analyses of variance, stepwise multiple regression analyses, one-way analyses of variance, and planned and post hoc contrasts were used to test these hypotheses.



## CHAPTER V

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The analysis of the data collected for this research is presented in Chapter V. The main variables in the study are discussed first, followed by a report of the reliabilities and descriptive statistics for each of the scales used in measuring the variables. The demographic characteristics of the sample are then described, followed by normative data on the sample for each instrument. The main body of the chapter is devoted to formal tests of the hypotheses. The chapter concludes with an overall summary of the data analysis.

#### Main Variables

The main variables of interest in this study were sex role, measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), self-esteem, measured by the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI), and awareness of anger, expression of anger, and condemnation of anger, measured by the Anger Self-Report (ASR). The ASR total expression of anger score is computed by adding the scores of these three subscales: general expression of anger, verbal aggression, and physical aggression. Preliminary analyses indicated that more useful information was available by analyzing the three subscales separately, rather than as a composite score. The hypotheses as they are stated and tested in this chapter reflect this

more precise measurement of expression of anger.

The primary dependent variable in this study was self-esteem. The effects of the primary independent variables, sex role and anger, in predicting self-esteem were explored both separately and in interaction with each other. Anger was also used as a dependent variable in the first analysis, in which the differences in anger between women in the four sex role groups were explored. Five demographic variables were of interest in this research: marital status, age, college degree, employee group classification, and household income. These variables were used as independent variables in two analyses. Their effects on anger were explored both separately and in interaction with sex role in the first analysis. The effects of the demographic variables on self-esteem were explored in conjunction with anger in the second analysis.

Reliabilities and descriptive statistics were computed for each of the scales used in this study. Reliability was tested by Cronbach's alpha, a measure of internal consistency. Due to the manner in which the ASR scales are constructed, two separate alpha statistics are reported for each of the ASR scales. Each ASR item is answered with either an agree or a disagree response. All items scored in the disagree direction are given a negative value in scoring. Because of these negative values, it was necessary to compute separate alphas for the agree and disagree items. Alphas ranged from a high of .89 for the TSBI and .77 for the PAQ M

scale to lows of .32 for the agree items on the ASR physical aggression scale and .37 for the disagree items on the ASR general expression of anger scale. Reliabilities and descriptive statistics are reported in Table 5.1. The alphas for the agree items are designated with a +, those for the disagree items with a -.

#### Demographic Characteristics

The sample for this study consisted of 342 women employed at a large midwestern university and ranging in age from 20 to 68, with a mean age of 39.6 years. The majority of the women (60.5%) reported that they were currently married, 24% indicated that they were formerly married (separated, divorced, or widowed), and 15.2% stated that they had never been married. The sample consisted primarily of well-educated, middle class women, with an average educational level of 15.4 years and a median household income of \$30,000 to \$34,999. Approximately half (51.1%) of the women were employed in clerical or technical positions. Slightly over one-quarter (29.1%) held administrative and/or supervisory positions. Women in faculty or academic staff positions made up 19.8% of the sample. Demographic characteristics of the sample are summarized in Table 5.2.

#### Normative Data

##### Anger Self-Report

The women in this sample scored considerably lower on the ASR awareness of anger scale than the introductory

**Table 5.1: Reliabilities and Descriptive Statistics**

<b>Measure/Scale</b>	<b>Alpha</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std.Dev.</b>	<b>Range</b>
<b>PAQ M Scale</b>	<b>.77</b>	<b>22.17</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>0-32</b>
<b>PAQ F Scale</b>	<b>.72</b>	<b>24.59</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>13-32</b>
<b>PAQ M-F Scale</b>	<b>.53</b>	<b>14.13</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>0-27</b>
<b>TSBI</b>	<b>.89</b>	<b>42.68</b>	<b>9.37</b>	<b>15-63</b>
<b>ASR Awareness</b>	<b>.58+ *</b> <b>.68- **</b>	<b>28.86</b>	<b>9.92</b>	<b>-1-57</b>
<b>ASR Gen.Expression</b>	<b>.43+ *</b> <b>.37- **</b>	<b>39.65</b>	<b>6.47</b>	<b>23-57</b>
<b>ASR Ver.Agression</b>	<b>.55+ *</b> <b>.46- **</b>	<b>41.47</b>	<b>7.23</b>	<b>23-61</b>
<b>ASR Phy.Agression</b>	<b>.32+ *</b> <b>.53- **</b>	<b>36.23</b>	<b>4.35</b>	<b>31-51</b>
<b>ASR Condemnation</b>	<b>.75+ *</b> <b>.61- **</b>	<b>41.60</b>	<b>6.01</b>	<b>33-62</b>

**\* Cronbach's alpha for agree items**

**\*\* Cronbach's alpha for disagree items**

Table 5.2: Demographic Characteristics of Sample

	N	%*
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Never Married	52	15.2
Married	202	59.1
Formerly Married	80	23.4
<b>Age</b>		
20-29	57	16.8
30-39	130	37.9
40-49	92	27.0
50 & above	58	17.3
<b>Educational Level</b>		
No degree	165	48.2
Bachelor's	81	23.7
Master's	53	15.5
Above Master's	38	11.2
<b>Employee Classification</b>		
Clerical-Technical	170	49.7
Administrative/Supervisory	97	28.4
Faculty/Academic	66	19.3
<b>Household Income</b>		
Below \$20,000	52	15.2
20,000-29,000	84	24.5
30,000-39,000	51	15.0
40,000-49,000	42	12.3
50,000 & above	104	30.4

\* May not total 100% due to some subjects omitting item.

psychology students studied by Biaggio (1980b), with a mean score of 28.86 (s.d. 9.92) compared to 39.12 (s.d. 13.11) for Biaggio's subjects. Consistent with this result, the subjects in this study scored considerably higher on the ASR condemnation of anger scale than the college student sample, with a mean score of 41.601 (s.d. 6.0) compared to 32.92 (s.d. 6.93).

The scores for the university employees in this study were similar to those of the college students (Biaggio, 1980b) on the ASR general expression of anger, verbal aggression, and physical aggression scales. The subjects in this study had a mean score of 39.65 (s.d. 6.47) on general expression of anger, compared to 36.61 (s.d. 9.48) for Biaggio's sample. On verbal aggression the university employees in this study had a mean score of 41.47 (s.d. 7.23) compared to 37.25 (s.d. 9.44) for the college student sample. The subjects in this study had a mean score of 36.23 (s.d. 4.35) on the physical aggression scale, while Biaggio's subjects had a mean of 34.27 (s.d. 6.11)

#### Personal Attributes Questionnaire

The medians for the PAQ masculinity (M), femininity (F), and M-F scales for this sample were slightly different than those reported by Spence and Helmreich (1978) for a sample of college students. The M and F scale medians were 22 and 24 respectively, compared to the college student sample medians of 21 and 23. On the M-F scale the median was 14, compared to 15 in Spence and Helmreich's sample. These discrepancies

may be accounted for by the fact that the college student sample was composed of both males and females, while the current sample was females only. Due to this fact, and to the restricted age range of the college student sample, the medians for the university employee sample were used in scoring the PAQ for this study.

### Texas Social Behavior Inventory

The TSBI self-esteem scores of the women in this study were somewhat higher than the scores for college students reported by Spence and Helmreich (1978). The mean TSBI score for the female university employees was 42.68 (s.d. 9.37) compared to 38.74 (s.d. 7.86) for the female college students and 38.88 (s.d. 7.27) for the male college students.

### Hypotheses Tested

Multivariate analyses of variance, bivariate regression analyses, analysis of variance, multiple regression analyses, and planned and post hoc contrasts were used to test the main hypotheses. The particular type of analysis used for each hypothesis is given with the description of the results for each hypothesis.

#### Hypothesis 1

There will be differences between women who have masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ, and women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ, with respect to scores on the ASR awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger scales.

**Null hypothesis:**

There will be no difference between women who have androgynous, masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ with respect to scores on the ASR awareness of anger, general expression of anger, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger scales.

A multivariate analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. The Wilks multivariate test of significance indicated that differences existed between the sex role groups on the 5 ASR scales ( $p = .000$ ). The univariate F-tests revealed that the sex role groups differed significantly on the ASR awareness of aggression ( $p = .017$ ), general expression of anger ( $p = .001$ ), and verbal aggression ( $p = .000$ ) scales. The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected. Table 5.3 contains the multivariate test of significance and Table 5.4 contains the univariate F-tests for sex role on the ASR scales.

**Table 5.3: Multivariate Tests of Significance**

Test	F-Value	Sig. of F
<b>Sex Role on ASR Scales</b>		
Wilks	4.33	.000
<b>Marital Status on ASR Scales</b>		
Wilks	2.15	.019
<b>Age on ASR Scales</b>		
Wilks	1.76	.036
<b>Educational Level on ASR Scales</b>		
Wilks	1.91	.020



To test the specific parts of hypothesis one which are stated below, the mean of the masculine and androgynous groups was compared to the mean of the feminine and undifferentiated groups on each of the five ASR scales. These planned contrasts were tested at the .05 level. Post hoc pairwise contrasts were then performed to determine whether additional differences existed between individual sex role groups on ASR awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, and verbal aggression. Because post hoc contrasts require the use of a family-based alpha level, the contrasts of individual groups were tested at the .008 level of significance. The results of both the planned and post hoc analyses are explained for each specific portion of the hypothesis. Table 5.5 contains the means and standard deviations of the four sex role groups on the five ASR scales.

Hypothesis 1(a):

Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the ASR awareness of anger scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

Null hypothesis:

There will be no difference between women who have androgynous, masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ on the ASR awareness of anger scale.

The post hoc pairwise contrasts revealed that women having a feminine sex role on the PAQ scored significantly. The planned contrast indicated that no significant difference was found between the mean of the masculine and

Table 5.4: Univariate F-Tests

Group	Hypoth MS	Error MS	F	Sig.
<b>Sex Role on ASR Scales (DF 3, 278)</b>				
Awareness	330.45	95.16	3.47	.017
Gen Expression	235.92	40.71	5.80	.001
Verb Aggression	398.36	49.93	7.98	.000
Phys Aggression	5.57	18.93	.29	.829
Condemnation	63.66	35.63	1.79	.150
<b>Marital Status on ASR Scales (DF 2, 279)</b>				
Awareness	157.26	96.58	1.63	.198
Gen Expression	131.95	41.81	3.16	.044
Verb Aggression	188.55	51.57	3.66	.027
Phys Aggression	13.73	18.95	.73	.485
Condemnation	37.92	35.37	1.07	.344
<b>Age on ASR Scales (DF 3, 281)</b>				
Awareness	646.88	91.50	7.07	.000
Gen Expression	131.71	45.20	3.12	.026
Verb Aggression	74.57	52.86	1.41	.240
Phys Aggression	13.37	18.92	.71	.549
Condemnation	53.31	35.75	1.49	.217
<b>Educational Level on ASR Scales</b>				
Awareness	137.60	97.28	1.41	.239
Gen Expression	178.72	41.60	4.30	.006
Verb Aggression	93.81	52.65	1.78	.151
Phys Aggression	8.47	19.02	.45	.721
Condemnation	138.48	34.96	3.96	.009

Table 5.5: ASR Scores by Sex Role

Sex Role	Mean	Std.Dev.	N
<b>Awareness of Anger*</b>			
Undifferentiated	28.40	9.57	50
Feminine	32.00	10.35	60
Masculine	29.77	9.50	56
Androgynous	27.14	9.63	116
Total	28.92	9.88	282
<b>General Expression of Anger*</b>			
Undifferentiated	38.52	5.79	50
Feminine	38.02	6.35	60
Masculine	42.59	6.63	56
Androgynous	39.61	6.51	116
Total Sample	39.67	6.54	282
<b>Verbal Aggression*</b>			
Undifferentiated	38.76	6.68	50
Feminine	40.12	7.65	60
Masculine	40.93	7.76	56
Androgynous	42.20	6.55	116
Total Sample	41.69	7.33	282
<b>Physical Aggression</b>			
Undifferentiated	36.46	3.51	50
Feminine	36.30	4.28	60
Masculine	36.75	4.83	56
Androgynous	36.10	4.47	116
Total Sample	36.34	4.33	282
<b>Condemnation of Anger</b>			
Undifferentiated	43.32	5.73	50
Feminine	41.65	6.64	60
Masculine	41.71	5.04	56
Androgynous	40.98	6.11	116
Total Sample	41.68	5.99	282

\* Significant differences between the groups were found on this scale.

androgynous groups and the mean of the feminine and undifferentiated groups ( $t = -1.43$ ,  $p = .155$ ).

The planned contrast indicated that no significant difference was found between the mean of the masculine and androgynous groups and the mean of the feminine and undifferentiated groups ( $t = -1.43$ ,  $p = .155$ ).

The post hoc pairwise contrasts revealed that women having a feminine sex role on the PAQ scored significantly higher on the ASR awareness of anger scale (mean = 32.00) than women having an androgynous sex role (mean = 27.14,  $p = .002$ ). It should be noted that this difference was in the opposite direction of that predicted in hypothesis 1(a). No other significant differences between the sex role groups were found on the ASR awareness of anger scale.

#### Hypothesis 1(b):

Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the ASR general expression of aggression scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

#### Null hypothesis:

There will be no difference between women who have androgynous, masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ on the ASR general expression of aggression scale.

The planned contrast indicated that the masculine and androgynous groups (mean = 41.10) scored significantly higher than the feminine and undifferentiated groups (38.27,  $t = 3.53$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The post hoc pairwise contrasts between individual sex role groups indicated that women with a masculine sex role scored higher (mean = 42.59) on the ASR

general expression of aggression scale than women with undifferentiated (mean = 38.52), feminine (mean = 38.02), and androgynous (mean = 39.61) sex roles ( $p = .001, .000, .004$  respectively). These results were consistent with predictions, with the exception that no difference was expected between the masculine and androgynous groups. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 1(c):

Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the ASR verbal aggression scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

**Null Hypothesis:**

There will be no difference between women who have androgynous, masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ on the ASR verbal aggression scale.

The planned contrast for verbal aggression showed that the masculine and androgynous groups (mean = 43.56) scored significantly higher than the feminine and undifferentiated groups (mean = 39.44,  $t = 4.64, p = .000$ ).

The post hoc contrasts revealed that women in both the masculine (mean = 44.93) and androgynous (mean = 42.20) groups scored significantly higher on the ASR verbal aggression scale than women in the undifferentiated group (mean = 38.76) at the  $p = .001$  and  $.004$  levels of significance, respectively. Women in the masculine sex role group also scored higher than women in the feminine sex role group (mean = 40.12,  $p = .000$ ). The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected.

The results of the contrasts will not be reported for the last two parts of hypothesis 1 pertaining to the ASR physical aggression and condemnation of anger scales since the univariate F-tests indicated no significant differences between the sex role groups on these scales. These two parts of hypothesis 1 are stated below, with the significance level of the F-test.

Hypothesis 1 (d):

Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the ASR physical aggression scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

Null Hypothesis:

There will be no difference between women who have androgynous, masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ on the ASR physical aggression scale.

The univariate F-tests showed no significant differences between the sex role groups on ASR physical aggression ( $F = .29, p = .829$ ). The null hypothesis was, therefore, retained.

Hypothesis 1 (e):

Women with masculine or androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score lower on the ASR condemnation of anger scale than women who have feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

Null Hypothesis:

There will be no difference between women who have androgynous, masculine, feminine or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ on the ASR condemnation of anger scale.

The univariate F-tests showed no significant differences between the sex role groups on ASR condemnation of anger ( $F$

= 1.79,  $p = .150$ ). The null hypothesis was, therefore, retained.

#### Effects of demographic variables

The effects of the five demographic variables of interest in this study were explored for each of the ASR scales. A multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the five ASR scales for the interaction of each of these variables with sex role: marital status, age, educational level, employee classification, and household income. There were no significant interactions between sex role and any of these variables on the five ASR scales. Multivariate analyses of variance were performed for each of the demographic variables alone on the ASR scales. Significant effects were found for marital status, age and college degree. These results are reported below.

Marital Status. Subjects were classified in three groups according to marital status: never married, married, and formerly married, including women who were separated, divorced or widowed. The Wilks multivariate test of significance showed significant differences between these groups on the ASR scales ( $p = .019$ ). The univariate F-tests showed significant differences between the groups on the ASR general expression of aggression and verbal aggression scales ( $p = .044, .027$  respectively). Table 5.3 contains the multivariate test of significance and Table 5.4 contains the univariate F-tests for marital status on the ASR scales. Pairwise comparisons were

performed with a family-based alpha level of .05, with each comparison tested at the .016 level of significance.

On the ASR general expression of aggression scale, women who had never been married scored higher (mean = 41.67) than those who were formerly married (mean = 38.61,  $p = .013$ ). On the ASR verbal aggression scale, women who had never been married scored higher (mean = 44.17) than married women (mean = 40.95,  $p = .007$ ). Table 5.6 contains the means and standard deviations of the three marital status groups on each of the ASR scales.

Age. Subjects were classified in four groups according to age: 20-29 years, 30-39 years, 40-49 years, and 50 years or above. The Wilks multivariate test of significance showed differences between the age groups on the five ASR scales ( $p = .036$ ). The univariate F-tests indicated that there were significant differences according to age on the ASR awareness of anger ( $p = .000$ ) and general expression of aggression scales ( $p = .026$ ). Table 5.3 contains the multivariate test of significance and Table 5.4 contains the univariate F-tests for age on the ASR scales.

Pairwise comparisons were performed with a family-based alpha level of .05, with each comparison tested at the .008 level of significance. On the ASR awareness of anger scale, women in the youngest age group (20-29 years) scored higher (mean = 31.29) than women in the oldest age group (mean = 23.79,  $p = .000$ ). Because the contrasts were tested at the .008 level of significance, no significant differences were found on the ASR general expression of aggression scale. Table



## 5.6: ASR Scores by Marital Status

	Mean	Std.Dev.	N
<b>Awareness of Anger</b>			
Never Married	31.26	9.23	46
Married	28.79	9.71	166
Formerly Married	27.99	10.47	70
Total Sample	28.99	9.85	282
<b>General Expression of Anger*</b>			
Never Married	41.67	6.34	46
Married	39.58	6.63	166
Formerly Married	38.61	6.14	70
Total Sample	39.68	6.52	282
<b>Verbal Aggression*</b>			
Never Married	44.17	7.79	46
Married	40.95	7.01	166
Formerly Married	41.83	7.17	70
Total Sample	41.69	7.25	282
<b>Physical Aggression</b>			
Never Married	35.70	4.01	46
Married	36.56	4.49	166
Formerly Married	36.27	4.24	70
Total Sample	36.35	4.35	282
<b>Condemnation of Anger</b>			
Never Married	40.63	5.51	46
Married	41.49	6.02	166
Formerly Married	42.27	6.04	70
Total Sample	41.55	5.95	282

\* Significant differences between the groups were found on this scale.

**Table 5.7: ASR Scores by Age**

Age	Mean	Std.Dev.	N
<b>Awareness of Anger*</b>			
20 - 29	31.29	10.10	51
30 - 39	30.74	9.23	110
40 - 49	28.09	10.03	77
50 or Above	23.79	8.94	47
Total Sample	28.98	9.87	285
<b>General Expression of Anger</b>			
20 - 29	40.33	6.47	51
30 - 39	40.35	6.46	110
40 - 49	40.01	6.70	77
50 or Above	37.09	6.28	47
Total Sample	39.72	6.57	285
<b>Verbal Aggression</b>			
20 - 29	41.84	7.74	51
30 - 39	42.25	7.39	110
40 - 49	41.99	7.57	77
50 or Above	39.72	5.80	47
Total Sample	41.69	7.29	285
<b>Physical Aggression</b>			
20 - 29	36.94	4.57	51
30 - 39	36.20	4.20	110
40 - 49	36.43	4.93	77
50 or Above	35.70	3.30	47
Total Sample	36.31	4.34	285
<b>Condemnation of Anger</b>			
20 - 29	41.35	5.79	51
30 - 39	40.97	5.60	110
40 - 49	41.70	6.16	77
50 or Above	43.15	6.70	47
Total Sample	41.60	5.99	285

\* Significant differences between the groups were found on this scale.

Table 5.7 contains the means and standard deviations of each of the five age groups on the ASR scales.

Educational Level.

Subjects were classified in four groups according to educational level: no college degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, and above master's degree. The "no college degree" group included those with two-year associate's degrees. The "above master's" group consisted of women who had completed all requirements for a Ph.D except the dissertation, or who had earned a Ph.D., M.D., D.O., or D.V.M. degree. The Wilks multivariate test of significance indicated the existence of significant differences between the educational level groups on the ASR scales ( $p = .020$ ). The univariate F-tests revealed significant differences on the ASR general expression and condemnation of anger scales ( $p = .009$ ,  $.006$  respectively). Table 5.3 contains the multivariate test of significance and Table 5.4 contains the univariate F-tests for educational level on the ASR scales.

Pairwise contrasts were performed with a family-based alpha level of .05, with individual contrasts tested at the .008 level of significance. On the general expression of aggression scale, women in the "no college degree" group scored lower (mean = 38.36) than women in the "above master's" group (mean = 42.19,  $p = .000$ ). On the condemnation of anger scale, women in the "no college degree" group scored higher (mean = 42.82) than those in the "above master's" group (mean = 40.67,  $p = .001$ ). Table 5.8 contains the means and standard

Table 5.8: ASR Scores by Educational Level

	Mean	Std.Dev.	N
<b>Awareness of Anger</b>			
No degree	27.84	10.51	140
Bachelor's	30.52	9.36	69
Master's	30.15	8.81	48
Above Master's	28.89	9.34	27
Total Sample	28.98	9.89	284
<b>General Expression of Anger*</b>			
No degree	38.36	6.73	140
Bachelor's	40.86	5.91	69
Master's	40.46	6.44	48
Above Master's	42.19	6.31	27
Total Sample	39.69	6.56	284
<b>Verbal Aggression</b>			
No degree	40.99	7.53	140
Bachelor's	42.20	7.37	69
Master's	41.35	7.14	48
Above Master's	44.33	5.41	27
Total Sample	41.66	7.29	284
<b>Physical Aggression</b>			
No degree	36.27	4.48	140
Bachelor's	36.77	4.09	69
Master's	35.96	4.61	48
Above Master's	35.89	3.91	27
Total Sample	36.30	4.35	284
<b>Condemnation of Anger*</b>			
No degree	42.82	5.90	140
Bachelor's	40.30	6.15	69
Master's	40.42	5.58	48
Above Master's	40.67	5.94	27
Total Sample	41.60	6.01	284

\* Significant differences between the groups were found on this scale.

deviations of each of the educational level groups on the ASR scales.

### Hypothesis 2

Scores on the ASR scales will play a role in predicting the self-esteem of individual women as measured by the TSBI. More specifically:

(a). ASR awareness of anger scores will negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

(b). ASR general expression of anger scores will negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

(c). ASR verbal aggression scores will negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

(d). ASR physical aggression scores will negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

(e). ASR condemnation of anger scores will positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores.

#### Null Hypothesis:

There will be no relationship between scores on the ASR scales and the self-esteem of individual women as measured by the TSBI.

### Test of Hypothesis 2

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to test Hypothesis 2. When the analysis was run with all five ASR scales as independent variables, only ASR awareness of anger and verbal aggression proved to be significant predictors of self-esteem as measured by the TSBI. Together, these two variables accounted for 17.15% of the variance in self-esteem ( $R^2 = .1715$ ), and had a multiple R value of .4141. The correlation coefficients, t-values and significance levels, and the analysis of variance for the regression equation are reported in Table 5.9.

Table 5.9: Regression of TSBI on ASR Scales

Variable	B	t-value	Sig. t	
Verbal Aggression	.56	7.02	.000	
Awareness of Anger	-.30	-5.12	.000	
(Constant)	28.47	9.14	.000	
Analysis of Variance				
Source of Variance	DF	MS	F	Sig. F
Regression	2	2092.49	27.95	.000
Residual	270	74.87		

Because ASR awareness of anger and verbal aggression were significant in the regression equation, the overall null hypothesis was rejected. The results were consistent with the prediction of part (a) of hypothesis 2, that awareness of anger would negatively predict self-esteem. The finding that ASR verbal aggression predicted self-esteem in a positive direction was the opposite of the negative relationship predicted in part (b) of the hypothesis.

#### Effects of demographic variables

The effects of the five demographic variables of interest in this study were explored to determine whether they played a significant role, along with the ASR scales, in predicting self-esteem. Multiple regression analyses were performed for each of these demographic variables with ASR awareness of anger and verbal aggression: marital status, age, educational level, employee classification, and household income. The remaining ASR scales were not included in these analyses since it had previously been determined that only awareness of anger

and verbal aggression were significant predictors of self-esteem.

Of the five demographic variables studied, only household income was a significant predictor of self-esteem when tested with ASR awareness of anger and verbal aggression. Subjects were classified according to five categories of household income as follows: below \$20,000; \$20,000 - \$29,999; \$30,000 - \$39,999; \$40,000 - \$49,999; \$50,000 and above. When household income was added to the regression equation with awareness of anger and verbal aggression,  $R^2$  increased from .1813 to .2217, a significant increment of .0405 ( $p = .005$ ). Multiple R increased from .4257 to .4709. Because a family-based alpha level was used, the significance of individual groups was tested at the .005 level. An examination of the individual groups revealed that membership in group 1 (below \$20,000) was a negative predictor of self-esteem. Household income did not interact significantly with either awareness of anger or verbal aggression. The correlation coefficients, t-values and significance levels, and the analysis of variance for the regression equation are reported in Table 5.10.

### Hypothesis 3

There will be differences in TSBI self-esteem scores between the four groups of women having masculine, androgynous, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ. More specifically:

(a). Women having androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the TSBI than women having masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

**Table 5.10: Regression of TSBI on ASR Awareness of Anger, ASR Verbal Aggression, and Household Income**

Variable	B	t-value	Sig.t	
Awareness of Anger	-.31	-5.55	.000	
Verbal Aggression	.55	7.24	.000	
X3	-1.33	-1.21	.227	
X2	1.97	2.14	.033	
X1	-3.36	-2.97	.003	
X4	1.27	1.07	.284	
(Constant)	28.52	9.54	.000	
Analysis of Variance				
Source of Variance	DF	MS	F	Sig.F
Regression	6	967.07	13.58	.000
Residual	286	71.29		

(b). Women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score higher on the TSBI than women having feminine or undifferentiated sex roles on the PAQ.

(c). Women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ will score significantly higher on the TSBI than women having undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

**Null Hypothesis:**

There will be no difference in TSBI self-esteem scores between women having masculine, androgynous, feminine, or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test hypothesis 3. The analysis of variance indicated that significant differences in self-esteem existed between the sex role groups ( $F = 71.688$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected. Table 5.11 contains the analysis of variance.



**Table 5.11: Analysis of Variance for Self-Esteem on Sex Role**

Source of Variance	DF	MS	F	Sig. F
Between Groups	3	3676.21	71.69	.000
Within Groups	312	51.28		
Total	315			

The specific parts of hypothesis 3 pertaining to the actual differences in self-esteem between the sex role groups were tested at the .05 level of significance by pairwise contrasts using the Tukey procedure. These contrasts indicated that women in the masculine and androgynous sex role groups scored higher on the TSBI than women in the feminine and undifferentiated sex role groups. In addition, women in the androgynous group scored higher than women in the masculine group. These results were consistent with predictions made in parts (a) and (b) of Hypothesis 3. Contrary to the prediction made in part (c) of Hypothesis 3, no significant difference was found between women in the feminine sex role group and women in the undifferentiated sex role group.

The above contrasts were performed using the family-based alpha level employed in the Tukey procedure. Pairwise contrasts using a less conservative contrast-based alpha level were subsequently performed to determine whether a significant difference in self-esteem existed between the feminine and undifferentiated sex role groups. No significant difference

was found ( $t = -1.79$ ,  $p = .075$ ). Table 5.12 contains the means and standard deviations for each of the sex role groups on the TSBI.

**Table 5.12: TSBI Scores by Sex Role**

<b>Sex Role</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std.Dev.</b>
Undifferentiated	57	34.54	7.02
Feminine	71	36.82	7.80
Masculine	61	45.33	6.86
Androgynous	127	48.56	6.99
Total Sample	316	42.77	9.26

#### **Hypothesis 4**

There will be an interaction between sex roles as measured by the PAQ and ASR awareness of anger, expression of anger, and condemnation of anger scores in predicting TSBI self-esteem scores. More specifically:

- (a) ASR awareness of anger scores will:
  - (1) positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
  - (2) negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
  - (3) not predict self-esteem scores for women having androgynous or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
- (b) ASR general expression of aggression verbal aggression, and physical aggression scores will:
  - (1) positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.
  - (2) negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

(3) not predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having androgynous or undifferentiated sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

(c) ASR condemnation of anger scores will:

(1) negatively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having masculine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

(2) positively predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having feminine sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

(3) not predict TSBI self-esteem scores for women having androgynous sex roles as measured by the PAQ.

#### Null Hypothesis:

There will be no interaction between sex role as measured by the PAQ and ASR awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger scores in predicting TSBI self-esteem scores.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to test hypothesis 4. The analysis was performed twice. In the first analysis, all five ASR scales were entered into the regression equation along with the four sex role categories and interactions of sex role with all the ASR scales. This analysis was performed to determine whether the addition of sex role to the equation would change relationships between the ASR scales and the TSBI scores found in testing hypothesis 2. In that test, ASR awareness of anger and verbal aggression were found to be significant predictors of self-esteem.

The results of this first analysis confirmed the findings of the test of hypothesis 2 regarding the prediction of TSBI scores by ASR scores. Awareness of anger and verbal aggression again appeared to be the only ASR scales which

predicted self-esteem. The first analysis also showed that sex role is a stronger predictor of self-esteem than any of the ASR scales and does not interact with any of the ASR scales.

Table 5.13: Regression of TSBI on ASR Awareness of Anger, ASR Verbal Aggression, and Sex Role

Variable	B	t-value	Sig. t
X3	3.2739	3.76	.000
X2	-3.4518	-4.15	.000
X1	-6.2124	-7.04	.000
Verbal Aggression	.3271	4.68	.000
Awareness of Anger	-.1728	-3.43	.001
(Constant)	33.0442	12.34	.000

#### Analysis of Variance

Source of Variance	DF	MS	F	Sig. F
Regression	5	2159.09	42.37	.000
Residual	267	50.96		

A second analysis was then performed in which TSBI scores were regressed on ASR awareness of anger and verbal aggression, sex role, and the interaction of sex role with the two ASR scales. This regression analysis showed that sex role was the most important predictor of self-esteem, accounting for 39.14% of the variance ( $R^2 = .3914$ ). ASR verbal aggression and awareness of anger increased  $R^2$  by .03 and .02, respectively. Sex role did not interact with either ASR awareness of anger or verbal aggression in predicting

self-esteem. It was, therefore, not possible to reject the null hypothesis.

The final regression equation contained sex role, awareness of anger, and verbal aggression, with a multiple R of .67 and  $R^2 = .44$ . The correlation coefficients, t-values and significance levels, and the analysis of variance are contained in Table 5.13.

### Summary

The results of the analysis of the data gathered in this study are presented in Chapter 5. Reliabilities, computed by Cronbach's alpha, and descriptive statistics were computed for each of the scales used to measure the variables in the study. Reliabilities ranged from highs of .89 for the TSBI and .77 for the PAQ M scale, to lows of .32 for the agree items on the ASR physical aggression scale and .37 for the disagree items on the ASR general expression of anger scale. Demographic characteristics and normative data were reported for the sample.

The first hypothesis was tested using a multivariate analysis of variance. The main null hypothesis was rejected since differences between the sex role groups on the ASR scales were indicated. Significant differences between the groups were found on the ASR awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, and verbal aggression scales. Sub-hypotheses were tested by planned contrasts, which showed that the masculine and androgynous groups differed from the feminine and undifferentiated groups on the general expression

of aggression and verbal aggression scales. Post hoc contrasts were also performed to identify differences between individual sex role groups on these two ASR scales and on ASR awareness of anger.

The effects of five demographic variables were also explored in the analysis of differences between the sex role groups on ASR scores. These demographic variables were not found to interact with sex role. Significant effects on the ASR scores were found, however, for marital status, age, and college degree.

The second hypothesis was tested by a stepwise multiple regression analysis. ASR awareness of anger and verbal aggression were found to be significant predictors of self-esteem, allowing the null hypothesis to be rejected. The effects of the five demographic variables, in conjunction with ASR awareness of anger and verbal aggression, were explored using multiple regression analyses. Only household income was found to be a significant predictor of self-esteem. Income did not interact with either ASR scale in predicting TSBI scores.

Hypothesis 3 was tested using a one-way analysis of variance. The null hypothesis was rejected since significant differences between the sex role groups were found on self-esteem. The sub-hypotheses pertaining to the specific differences between the groups were tested by pairwise contrasts using the Tukey procedure. As predicted, self-esteem was found to be highest among the androgynous group,

followed in descending order by the masculine and feminine groups. Contrary to predictions, there was no difference in self-esteem between the feminine and undifferentiated groups.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to test Hypothesis 4. The null hypothesis could not be rejected since sex role did not evidence a significant interaction with any of the ASR scales in predicting self-esteem. Sex role was the most important predictor of self-esteem, with ASR awareness of anger and verbal aggression accounting for only small increments in the proportion of variance in self-esteem accounted for by the regression equation.

The findings of the study are summarized and discussed, and some conclusions suggested in Chapter VI.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Summary of the Study

This study investigated the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem in a large sample of women. The study is rooted in a growing body of theoretical literature on the psychological development of women which challenges the traditional psychoanalytic view of women as inherently passive, narcissistic, and masochistic. Theorists argue that powerful prohibitions against anger in the culturally prescribed feminine sex role have resulted in intrapsychic inhibitions of anger in women. Difficulties in the separation-individuation process also leave women unable to tolerate the sense of separateness accompanying anger and fearful of their own destructiveness. This inhibition of anger is thought to have serious negative consequences for the mental health of women in drastic losses of self-esteem when women become aware of angry feelings, threatening their female identity, or when anger is repressed, becoming a source of self-hatred.

Difficulty in handling anger is thought to be an important factor in psychological difficulties such as depression and attempted suicide, and in a wide range of physical disorders. Although anger is considered an important issue in psychotherapy with women, some researchers argue that



many therapists have difficulty in working with women's anger. The purpose of this study was to obtain and analyze empirical data on the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem in order to explore the empirical foundations of one aspect of female developmental theory, and provide insight into how women integrate anger with sex role, and how anger affects self-esteem.

In spite of the importance placed on anger by theoreticians and practitioners, there have been few empirical investigations of anger in women. Existing literature provides limited support for the theoretical notion that anger has been prohibited in the feminine sex role. Empirical investigations of the relationship between sex role, self-esteem and psychological well-being show that masculinity and, to a lesser extent, androgyny, are more strongly associated with self-esteem and adjustment than femininity. This study addressed the question of whether the hypothesized prohibition of anger in the feminine sex role helps explain the strength of the relationship between masculinity and self-esteem.

The primary dependent variable in this study was self-esteem. The main independent variables were sex role and anger. Anger was also treated as a dependent variable. In addition, the effects of these five demographic variables were explored: marital status, age, educational level, employee classification and household income.

Self-esteem was measured by the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI). Sex role was measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). Awareness of anger, expression of anger and condemnation of anger were the dimensions of anger of interest in this research, and were measured by five scales of the Anger Self-Report (ASR). Cronbach's alpha was used to compute the reliability of the TSBI, the PAQ, and the ASR. Correlations computed for all the main variables showed substantial correlations between the five ASR scales.

The sample for the study consisted of 342 women with a mean age of 39.6 years employed at Michigan State University. Subjects were generally well-educated and predominantly middle-class. Half were employed in clerical-technical positions, 30% held administrative positions, and 20% were classified as faculty or academic staff. Participation was voluntary and data were collected by an anonymous mail survey.

There were four main hypotheses in this study. The null forms of hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were rejected. For hypothesis 1, which examined the differences in anger between the sex role groups, significant differences were found between the groups on awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, and verbal aggression. Significant effects on anger were also found for marital status, age, and educational level. For hypothesis 2, which tested the ability of anger to predict self-esteem, awareness of anger and verbal

aggression were found to be significant predictors of self-esteem. Household income also predicted self-esteem.

Self-esteem was found to vary according to sex role, as predicted by hypothesis 3. Self-esteem was highest among androgynous women, followed by masculine women, and was lowest among feminine and undifferentiated women. Hypothesis 4 could not be rejected since sex role did not interact significantly with any of the anger variables in predicting self-esteem. Sex role was found to be the most important predictor of self-esteem. The overall results of the hypothesis testing are summarized in Table 6.1.

## Conclusions

### Sex Role Differences in Anger

It was hypothesized that the masculine and androgynous groups would be higher than the feminine and undifferentiated groups on awareness of anger, general expression anger, verbal aggression, and physical aggression. Women in the masculine and androgynous groups were expected to be lower than feminine and undifferentiated women on condemnation of anger.

The masculine and androgynous groups together did not differ from the feminine and undifferentiated groups on awareness of anger. Feminine women had greater awareness of anger than androgynous women.

The masculine and androgynous groups together were higher on general expression of anger than the feminine and

**Table 6.1: Overall Results of Hypothesis Testing**

---

**Hypothesis 1**

There will be differences between masculine or and androgynous women and feminine or undifferentiated women, with respect to awareness of anger, general expression of aggression, verbal aggression, physical aggression, and condemnation of anger.

**Result:** Significant differences on awareness of anger, general expression of anger, and verbal aggression.

---

**Hypothesis 2**

Anger will play a role in predicting self-esteem.

**Result:** Significant for awareness of anger and verbal aggression.

---

**Hypothesis 3**

There will be differences in self-esteem between the sex role groups.

**Result:** Significant, with androgynous group scoring highest and feminine and undifferentiated groups scoring lowest.

---

**Hypothesis 4**

There will be an interaction between sex role and anger in predicting self-esteem.

**Result:** Not significant.

---

undifferentiated groups. Women with masculine sex roles had greater general expression of anger than women in all other sex role groups.

The masculine and androgynous women together were more verbally aggressive than the feminine and undifferentiated women. Both masculine and androgynous women were higher on verbal aggression than undifferentiated women. Only masculine women, however, perceived themselves as more verbally aggressive than feminine women.

The women in this study reported equal levels of physical aggression and condemnation of anger, regardless of their sex roles.

#### Marital Status Differences in Anger

Women who had never been married showed greater general expression of aggression than formerly married women, and greater verbal aggression than married women.

#### Age Differences in Anger

Women in the youngest age group, 20-29, were more aware of anger than women in the oldest age group, 50 and above.

#### Differences in Anger by Education Level

Women who did not have a college degree were less expressive, and more condemning, of anger than women who had attained education beyond a master's degree.

#### Relationship of Anger to Self-Esteem

It was hypothesized that awareness and expression of anger would be inversely related to self-esteem, and that

condemnation of anger would be positively associated with self-esteem.

Being aware of anger was negatively related to self-esteem for the women in this study. Verbal aggression, however, was positively associated with self-esteem.

In conjunction with the above relationships of awareness of anger and verbal aggression with self-esteem, the lowest level of household income (below \$20,000) was associated negatively with self-esteem.

#### Sex Role Differences in Self-Esteem

It was hypothesized that women with androgynous sex roles would have the highest self-esteem, followed in descending order by masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated women.

Androgynous women had higher self-esteem than women in the other sex role groups. Masculine women had higher self-esteem than feminine and undifferentiated women. The self-esteem of feminine women, however, was equivalent to that of undifferentiated women.

#### Interaction of Sex Role and Anger in Predicting Self-Esteem

For masculine women it was hypothesized that awareness and expression of anger would be positively related to self-esteem, and that condemnation of anger would be negatively related to self-esteem. For feminine women, the predictions were the inverse of those for masculine women. Self-esteem was not expected to vary with differences in anger for androgynous or undifferentiated women.

The effect of anger in predicting self-esteem was the same for all sex role groups. Sex role was found to be a more important factor than anger in predicting self-esteem.

### Discussion of Findings

In this section the findings of this research are discussed and observations are made regarding their implications. The discussion is organized by headings which correspond to those describing the major areas of conclusions in the preceding section.

#### Sex Role Differences in Anger

The finding that masculine and androgynous women were more expressive of anger generally, and more verbally aggressive, is supportive of the theoretical framework on which this study is based. Theorists contend that expression of anger and other forms of aggression, are more acceptable as a masculine quality than as a feminine quality. Empirical data (Atkinson & Polivy, 1976; Biaggio, 1988; Evans, 1984; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974) support this notion, which is also confirmed in the present findings. The fact that androgynous women were not found to be more verbally aggressive than feminine women, while masculine women were, illustrates a further aspect of this differentiation between the sex roles. Apparently, the feminine elements of androgyny are sufficiently strong to balance the aggressive quality of the masculine role.

The finding that feminine women are more aware of anger than androgynous women is, at first glance, contrary to the theoretical proposition that there are powerful intrapsychic inhibitions on anger for the traditional female role. There are two interesting possibilities which suggest themselves, however, when this finding is contemplated. First, it may be conjectured that it is the expression of anger which is more powerfully inhibited intrapsychically than the awareness of anger. This possibility is certainly consistent with the powerful cultural prohibitions against the expression of anger by women in caretaking roles (Bernadez-Bonesatti, 1978; Westkott, 1986). It may be that feminine women are more aware of their anger than women in a less traditional androgynous role, but feel compelled to keep its expression under wraps in order to conform to the cultural ideal for the feminine woman.

Second, the finding of greater awareness of anger among feminine than androgynous women may reflect the societal conditions which some theorists argue are responsible for women feeling they must conform to the traditional feminine sex role. Miller (1983) has pointed out that the subordinate status of women constantly generates anger. The subordination is maintained, according to Miller and others (e.g., Mueller & Leidig, 1976), by economic and social deprivation and/or physical force, and by the appearance that there is no legitimate cause for a woman's anger. The overall



result, according to the theorists, is that when a woman feels angry, she concludes that there is something wrong with her and feels that her identity as a woman is threatened. The finding of low self-esteem for feminine women, coupled with their higher awareness of anger, is consistent with this theoretical position.

The lack of difference between the sex role groups on physical aggression and condemnation of anger appears to be consistent with the theoretical notion that there are strong sanctions against anger for women. Although masculine and androgynous women are more expressive of their anger, and more verbally aggressive, they are as unlikely to be physically aggressive as feminine and undifferentiated women, and are equally condemning of anger. These findings suggest that there are strong prohibitions against physical aggression in women across all sex role groups.

The lack of difference between the sex role groups on condemnation of anger also clearly implies that although masculine and androgynous women may be more expressive of anger, they may not feel positively toward and accepting of their anger. One potential explanation is that the ability to engage in and maintain empathic relationships may be central to the identity of all women (Surrey, 1985), regardless of sex role, and the experience and expression of anger is threatening to this aspect of self and is thus condemned. Thus, even masculine and androgynous women who

express their anger as part of the agency characteristic of masculinity, may feel conflict between their more instrumental orientation and that aspect of their identity as women in which relationships are central. It is important to note that the mean score of 36.23 on the ASR Physical Aggression scale is less than six points above the lowest possible score on the scale of 31, and that 31 was the modal response in this sample. Thus, not only were there no sex role differences on physical aggression, but the scores on the scale were remarkably low.

#### Marital Status Differences in Anger

When considering the centrality of the relational self to women's identity, it is also instructive to examine the finding that women who had never been married showed greater expressiveness of anger than both married and formerly married women. Several possible explanations suggest themselves. Perhaps the "never-married" women were less traditional than women in the other two groups, and correspondingly more likely to express their anger. A second hypothesis is that women who are or have been married are less likely to express anger as a result of experiencing the negative impact of anger in an intimate relationship. This conjecture seems consistent with the idea that anger may threaten the relational self for women.

Yet another potential explanation is that women who have never been married do not just express more anger, but are

actually more angry than currently or previously married women. Possible reasons they could feel more anger include the strong societal expectations for marriage, the loneliness and social isolation of not having an intimate partner, and/or the hardships of being the sole source of economic support for oneself. The group of "never-married" women may also include those who do not seek fulfillment of their need for intimacy through marriage. Some of these women may be lesbians who establish primary relationships with other women. Regardless of their sexual orientation, however, there may be women in the "never-married" group who are angry at men and not interested in primary relationships with them. The greater expression of anger by these women may be due to their lack of conformity with the traditional female role and/or their anger at men.

#### Age Differences in Anger

The possible explanations for the youngest women having greater awareness of anger than the oldest women parallel the areas of conjecture regarding marital status. The youngest women could be more aware of their anger as a result of less experience in relationships than the oldest women, who may have learned to repress awareness of their anger because they found it threatened their identity as caretakers in relationships. A more likely explanation, however, is that the impact of the women's movement has been felt by the

youngest women, who may be less likely to feel constrained by traditional role expectations than the oldest women.

A third alternative to consider is that perhaps the youngest women feel cheated by the loss of the traditional role and the accompanying ambiguity of current role expectations for women in professional and family life. Research focused on the areas in which anger is experienced by women in various age groups would help to clarify these possibilities. The finding that the youngest women had greater awareness of anger than the oldest women is consistent with the findings of Hertsgaard and Light (1984) in a study of midwestern farm women.

#### Differences in Anger by Educational Level

The impact of the women's movement may also help to account for the finding that women without college degrees were less expressive and more condemning of anger than women with education beyond a master's degree. Women with higher levels of education would be more likely to have been exposed to feminist ideas and more androgynous role models. This finding in the present research is consistent, in part, with findings of Martin and Light (1984), who found a curvilinear relationship between educational level and hostility. In their study, hostility was highest among women with a high school education, and then decreased with educational levels, up to postgraduate levels of education. Women with advanced

degrees were higher on hostility than those with four year degrees.

It is also possible that the differences found in anger by educational level may be more strongly related to socioeconomic status than to education. Women with the lowest level of education and no college degree are also likely to occupy a lower socioeconomic position than the women with education beyond the master's level. The women in the lower socioeconomic levels may be less critical of their status, and correspondingly less expressive of anger, than those at higher socioeconomic levels.

#### Relationship of Anger to Self-Esteem

The finding that awareness of anger negatively predicted self-esteem appears to be consistent with theoretical arguments that anger is threatening to those relationships which are a central factor in self-esteem for women (Kaplan et al., 1983). Several other theorists have argued that the experience of anger contradicts the woman's ego ideal (Bernardez-Bonesatti, 1978; Miller, et al., 1981; Nadelson et al. 1982; Norman, 1982), creating obvious difficulties in self-esteem. The negative relationship between awareness of anger and self-esteem found in this study appears to support that theoretical position.

The finding in the present research that verbal aggression was positively related to self-esteem does not

appear to be consistent with the theoretical argument described above. It is important to remember, however, that theorists also argue that anger which comes to awareness and is then suppressed becomes a source of self-hatred and results in a distorted sense of self (Kaplan, 1976; Miller, 1983; Westkott, 1986). It may be that anger which comes to awareness but is not expressed has a negative impact on self-esteem, but that once anger comes to awareness its expression enhances self-esteem because it is externalized rather than directed inward against the self. The present findings, that awareness of anger negatively predicted self-esteem while verbal aggression positively predicted self-esteem, appear to support a formulation of this nature. When viewed as a whole, then, the present findings regarding the relationship between awareness of anger, verbal aggression and self-esteem, appear to be consistent with the theoretical foundations of this research.

#### Sex Role Differences in Self-Esteem

The findings regarding sex role differences in self-esteem were, for the most part, consistent with previous research. In the majority of studies reviewed, self-esteem was highest among androgynous subjects, followed by masculine and feminine subjects (O'Connor, Mann & Bardwick, 1978; Puglisi & Jackson, 1980-81; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Spence, Helmreich & Holahan, 1978; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975). Unlike the present study, however, these researchers also

found that feminine subjects were higher on self-esteem than undifferentiated subjects.

Two possible explanations may be suggested for the finding that feminine and undifferentiated women did not differ on self-esteem. First, the women in the present research scored higher on masculinity than subjects in previous research. The mean M scale score for the subjects in this study was about 2.5 points higher than the female subjects in Spence and Helmreich's (1978) research. The median M scale score in the present study was 22, one point higher than the median score reported by Spence and Helmreich. Several studies have found a strong correlation between self-esteem and masculinity (Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Spence, Helmreich & Holahan, 1979; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975). The higher degree of masculinity found in the women in the present study may have accounted for the lack of difference in self-esteem between feminine and undifferentiated women. Even though women in both groups scored below the median on the M scale, the masculinity scores may have been sufficiently strong to correlate with self-esteem at equivalent levels.

The lack of difference in self-esteem scores between feminine and undifferentiated subjects may also be explained by the fact that the present research utilized only female subjects, while the studies noted above used both males and females. The inclusion of male subjects in the feminine and undifferentiated groups may result in a greater differenti-

ation between the two groups. The lack of difference in self-esteem between feminine and undifferentiated women was also found by Gautheir and Kjervik (1982) in their study of female graduate nursing students.

#### Interaction of Sex Role and Anger in Predicting Self-esteem

Contrary to predictions, the effect of anger in predicting self-esteem was not found to vary according to sex role. Sex role, in effect, was found to be more important than anger in predicting self-esteem as it was conceptualized and measured in this study. An obvious explanation for this finding is that the degree to which one identifies with socially accepted sex roles is a primary determinant of self-esteem and as such is more important than anger in determining self-esteem. Since self-esteem was measured by the TSBI in this study and is, therefore, conceptualized as a measure of social competence, this explanation appears to have some validity. One's social competence is obviously strongly related to one's conformity to cultural standards for sex role.

When the lack of interaction between sex role and anger in predicting self-esteem is considered in depth, however, the above explanation may be simplistic. This finding clearly suggests that the socialization of women regarding anger is sufficiently strong so that its impact on self-esteem as measured in this study is equivalent whether a woman sees



herself as more traditional, i.e., feminine, or less traditional, i.e. masculine or androgynous. The link between anger and self-esteem seems to be deeply rooted and not easily changed by recent movements away from traditional roles for women, and toward less traditional and more androgynous roles. This explanation is clearly consistent with the centrality of the relational self to women's self-esteem, and the threat which anger is thought to pose to the nurturing and caretaking roles assigned to women.

Another possible explanation exists for both the weak relationship found between anger as an independent variable and self-esteem as a dependent variable, and for the lack of interaction between sex role and anger in predicting self-esteem. It may be that a woman's self-esteem determines how she deals with anger, rather than anger being a determinant of self-esteem as hypothesized in this study.

In considering this explanation, it is important to remember two of the core theoretical propositions upon which this study is based. Theory suggests that the relational self is a crucial factor in self-esteem for women, and that anger has been prohibited in the nurturing and caretaking roles which form the core of the relational self. If relational qualities are a major component of self-esteem for women, the possibility that self-esteem as currently measured by psychological inventories may be a predictor of anger for women appears quite likely. Thus the theoretical base of this

study supports the possibility that the relationship between anger and self-esteem is the inverse of that explored in this research.

Finally, consideration must be given to the possibility that the measurement of anger in this study did not address its relationship with self-esteem. It may be that there are aspects of anger other than awareness, expression and condemnation which have not been quantified for measurement and which are strong predictors of self-esteem. Since theory predicts that how anger is handled, and whether it is allowed into awareness, are crucial factors in determining self-esteem, consideration must be given to the possibility that the measurement of anger in the current research was not valid. The assessment of anger is relatively recent in psychology, and it is true that existing instruments may be considered somewhat crude compared to those utilized in measuring more easily quantified attributes such as sex role and self-esteem. In considering the validity of the assessment of anger in this and other research involving women, it must be remembered that the experience of anger for women is exceedingly complex. Several aspects of anger which may confound its accurate measurement are delineated in theory.

First, consideration must be given to the theoretical proposition that the cultural conception of anger is based on the manner in which its expression is allowed in men (Miller,

1983). Cultural constraints have been placed upon the expression of anger by men, resulting in a distorted conception of anger which is linked to aggressive acting out rather than direct expressions of anger. The attempt to measure anger in this and other research may be contaminated to an unknown extent by an overriding cultural distortion in the understanding of the experience of anger. If subjects consider anger equivalent to aggressive behavior, their perceptions of their own anger may be similarly distorted.

A second distortion of anger, in which it is expressed indirectly as "horizontal aggression" (Symonds, 1976, p. 197), may also confound attempts to measure anger. Symonds explains that women accept this indirect solution to conflict out of fear of threatening relationships with those upon whom they depend. The goal of this indirect means of expressing anger, according to Symonds, is to effect compliance through guilt. Attempts to measure anger directly, such as that made in this research, would not tap this potentially important means of expressing anger.

Finally, Lerner (1980) has argued that because women have difficulty tolerating the sense of separateness which accompanies anger, they may feel hurt instead of, or in conjunction with, anger. Feeling hurt rather than angry serves a function similar to horizontal aggression in attempting to protect the woman's relationships with important others. Existing measures of anger, including that used in

this research, do not include the experience of hurt as a possible expression of anger.

In summary, the findings of this research appear to be generally supportive of recent theoretical work on the role of anger in the psychological development of women. The study confirms the existence of a relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem which is important in achieving a full understanding of factors which are crucial in female psychological development. The empirical data also provide information valuable to mental health practitioners, such as the different relationships awareness of anger and verbal aggression have to self-esteem. Such insights could be important to therapists working with women toward the establishment and maintenance of self-esteem. The findings also raise compelling questions about the nature of anger, and the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem which call for further exploration to clarify these important issues.

#### Limitations

In this section the limitations of the findings and the problems encountered in this research are discussed. Threats to and limitations on external validity are presented first, followed by difficulties with design and methodology, and instrumentation.

### External Validity

The external validity of this study is limited by the characteristics of the sample which was studied. The sample consisted of well-educated, middle-class women employed at a large university. Because of the method by which the sample was obtained, no women employed below the clerical-technical level were included. Groups which were excluded include skilled trades, grounds and maintenance workers, housekeeping staff, and food service workers. As a result, the findings of this research can be generalized only to women who are employed in clerical-technical, administrative, or faculty positions in a university setting.

Generalization of the findings of this research is also limited to women who would be likely to participate in a voluntary research study conducted by a mail questionnaire. Such women might be more committed to research or academic freedom, more altruistic, more organized, or might have more time for such pursuits because of favorable life circumstances. Women choosing not to participate, on the other hand, may have difficult life circumstances which would cause them to feel more anger. If this were the case, the sample would reflect a lower level of anger than that found in the general population.

Additional limitations on the generalizability of the findings and threats to this study's external validity may exist in possible interactions between self-selection of

subjects to participate in the study, and the outcome of the research. Because the study was conducted by an agency of the university by which all the subjects were employed, the women's feelings toward their employer may have influenced their willingness to participate. It may be conjectured that women who felt angry toward the university or their work situation would be less likely to agree to participate in the study.

In the same manner, any previous contact which the women had with the university's Employee Assistance Program under whose aegis the study was conducted may also have influenced their willingness to complete the questionnaire. It seems likely that women who had an unsatisfactory experience with that agency would be less likely to agree to participate in the study than those who had positive feelings toward the agency.

Conversely, it is also possible that women who felt angry about either their employment or the Employee Assistance Program may have viewed participation in the study as an opportunity to ventilate or take revenge for their feelings. If this were the case, these women would have probably been more likely to complete the questionnaire. Any strong feelings which the subjects had toward either their employment or the agency involved in conducting the research could potentially have affected the responses.

### Design and Methodology

Two potential problems with the study's design and methodology may have affected the outcome of the research. First, subjects were initially contacted through a letter sent through the university's interdepartmental mail to their work place. Being solicited while in their work setting to participate in a research study may have affected the response of the subjects to the initial letter and their subsequent willingness to cooperate in completing the questionnaire.

The collection of the data in this study through a mail questionnaire posed an additional difficulty with the design and methodology. Subjects who agreed to participate in the study received the questionnaire at their home address. A few women, however, requested that the questionnaire be sent to their work place. The conditions under which subjects completed the questionnaire were obviously outside the researcher's control. Whether questionnaires were completed at home, or in some other setting, the conditions probably varied widely and had an undetermined effect on the results obtained.

### Instrumentation

Difficulties with the instrumentation used in this research exist in four areas: distortions due to the use of self-report measures, questions regarding what is measured by the PAQ, the low reliabilities of some of the ASR scales for this sample, and the use of male pronouns in some ASR items.

All three psychological inventories used in the study are based on the use of self-report in responding. Distortions and inaccuracies may result from subjects deliberately falsifying their answers, engaging in unconscious self-deception, lacking self-awareness, or being influenced by social desirability. In addition, the ASR contains items which refer to the subject's childhood, responses to which may be inaccurate due to faulty memory.

The results obtained in the present research may have been influenced by the use of the PAQ to measure the sex role of the subjects. Questions have been raised in the literature regarding whether the masculine and feminine dimensions assessed by the PAQ and other sex role inventories are related only to personality attributes, or to sex-related behaviors as well as personality traits. On the basis of their findings in a study of psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility, Helmreich, Spence, and Holahan (1979) have argued that the traits measured by the PAQ are not significantly associated with sex-related behaviors. If their contention is correct, the correlations between sex role and awareness, expression, and condemnation of anger obtained in the present study may be weaker than the actual relationships between the variables.

The findings in this research may also have been affected by the low reliabilities obtained for three of the ASR scales. For ASR verbal aggression and physical aggression, reliabil-



ities for either the agree or disagree items were below .50. For ASR general expression, reliabilities were below .50 for both disagree and agree items. These reliabilities were computed by Cronbach's alpha and reflect the internal consistency of the subjects' responses. These results suggest that the likelihood of obtaining equivalent results in a later study may be questionable. The accuracy of the present results may, therefore, be subject to some degree of question.

Finally, responses to the ASR may have been skewed due to the use of male pronouns in some items. Some subjects commented that they found the use of male pronouns in a questionnaire for women offensive. Others questioned whether the items were intended to apply only to their interactions with and feelings about men. It seems clear that male pronouns did have some impact on the subjects' responses to the ASR items. The nature and extent of this impact, however, is unknown.

#### Implications for Future Research

The present research has not demonstrated the strong relationship between anger and self-esteem which is expected on the basis of the theoretical literature. The exploration of possible explanations for these results leads to the consideration of implications for future research involving the relationships between anger, sex role, and self-esteem. Three aspects of the research which could be addressed

profitably in future research are the choice of instrumentation to measure the main variables, the direction of the relationship between anger and self-esteem, and the study of a more diverse population of women.

For a number of reasons, consideration needs to be given to the use of different measures for all three main variables. In the area of self-esteem, Dorgan, Goebel and House (1983) have pointed out that self-esteem is a complex concept, making it problematic to conceptualize and measure appropriately. These researchers obtained very different results in a study of the relationship between sex role and self-esteem using two different measures of self-esteem. More could be learned about the relationship between anger and self-esteem if various measures of self-esteem which conceptualize it differently than the TSBI were used in future studies.

Problems with the reliabilities of the ASR scales discussed above may also play a role in the lack of strength in the relationship between anger and self-esteem found in this study. The attempt to measure several dimensions of anger in this study may have resulted in less precise and more diffuse results. More could be learned about the relationship between anger, sex role, and self-esteem in future studies by using a more narrowly focused trait measure of anger.

The contention of Helmreich et al. (1979) and Spence (1983) that the PAQ and other sex role inventories measure personality traits which are not strongly related to sex-

related behaviors also has implications for the instrumentation in future studies of the relationship between sex role and anger. In their study of psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility, Helmreich et al. found that scores on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, a measure of general sex role attitudes, were more strongly related to behavioral preferences than scores on the PAQ. Consideration could be given to use of this inventory in future research.

In addition to the need for research using different measures of anger, sex role and self-esteem, attention could also be given to further exploration of the direction of the relationship between anger and self-esteem. As noted previously, it may be that the manner in which an individual deals with anger is dependent on self-esteem, rather than the opposite relationship which was tested in this study. Establishing the nature and direction of the relationship between anger and self-esteem has important implications for the treatment of difficulties with anger in psychotherapy as well as the understanding of female psychological development, and is, therefore, an important avenue for future research. If the handling of anger is dependent on self-esteem, working toward awareness and expression of anger before healthy self-esteem has been developed could result in clients being inadequately prepared for the risks inherent in acknowledging, experiencing, and expressing anger.

The findings of the present research are based on a sample of well-educated, middle-class women holding clerical and professional positions in a large university. The relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem may be very different among women having lower levels of education and income, and either employed in service, maintenance, or unskilled positions, or not employed outside the home. More can be learned in future studies of women in lower educational, socioeconomic, and occupational levels.

In conclusion, much remains to be learned about the relationship between anger, sex role and self-esteem. The findings of the current study suggest that additional exploration of the nature of the relationship between anger and self-esteem may have important implications for the treatment of difficulties with anger in psychotherapy with women, and the understanding of the psychological development of women. Avenues for future research include the use of different measures of anger, sex role and self-esteem, a different conceptualization of the direction of the relationship between anger and self-esteem, and the study of subjects from lower socioeconomic, educational and occupational levels.

## **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A**  
**INITIAL LETTER REQUESTING SUBJECTS' PARTICIPATION**

## APPENDIX A

### INITIAL LETTER REQUESTING SUBJECTS' PARTICIPATION

Dear (name of respondent):

We need your help! You are part of a fascinating and diverse group of women employed by Michigan State University. You are probably very busy juggling the demands of your work and your personal life. We at the EAP would like to know how you feel about yourself and the things that upset and frustrate you. As a woman working at MSU, you may face a variety of complex challenges. We would like to provide services that will help MSU women deal with these challenges more effectively and enjoy their jobs and lives more.

You are one of a small number of women working at the University who are being asked to fill out a questionnaire about your feelings and attitudes toward yourself. It will take only about 20 minutes to complete. We need to find out what problems and challenges are shared by most women and how these issues change with differences in such areas as age, marital status, and job classification. Your participation is important in helping us understand these differences. We can improve our services for women only if we have this information.

Your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or not to answer certain questions on the questionnaire without recrimination. Should you participate, your response to the questionnaire will be completely anonymous. Please let us know that you will help by filling out the enclosed card and returning it by campus mail. We will send a questionnaire and a return envelope to your home address. There is no way we can identify you from the questionnaire you return. Instead, we will send you a post card which you can return to us separately, letting us know that you have returned your questionnaire. We can then remove your name from our mailing list for this study.

We will be happy to provide you with a summary of the results of this research at your request. If you have any questions, please call us at 355-4506.

We're looking forward to learning what you have to teach us! Please complete the enclosed card and return it to us in campus mail as soon as possible. Thank you so much for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,  
Tom Helma  
Program Coordinator

Cynthia Hockett  
Staff Counselor

**APPENDIX B**

**INTEREST CARD ENCLOSED IN FIRST MAILING**



**APPENDIX B**

**INTEREST CARD ENCLOSED IN FIRST MAILING**

**Yes! I will help the EAP learn more about MSU's women employees. Please send the questionnaire to me at this address.**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Home Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX C**

**FOLLOW-UP MAILING SENT ONE WEEK AFTER INITIAL LETTER**

## APPENDIX C

### FOLLOW-UP MAILING SENT ONE WEEK AFTER INITIAL LETTER

Last week a letter asking you to help us learn more about the needs of MSU's women employees was sent to you. Your name was selected in a random sample of women working at MSU.

If you have already returned the card telling us you are willing to help, please accept our sincere thanks. You will receive your questionnaire very soon.

If you have not yet returned the card, please do so today. Because we have contacted only a small, but representative, sample of MSU's women employees, it is essential that we be able to include your views in our study.

If by some chance you did not receive the first letter, or have misplaced the return card, please call us immediately at 355-4506.

Tom Helma  
Coordinator  
Employee Assistance Program

Cynthia Hockett  
Staff Counselor  
Employee Assistance Program

**APPENDIX D**  
**QUESTIONNAIRE**

## APPENDIX D

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### MSU WOMEN - AN ASSESSMENT OF YOUR FEELINGS, CONCERNS AND NEEDS

Your answers to this questionnaire will help us to better understand the needs of women working at Michigan State University. Please take the few minutes needed to answer the questions. Your answers will enable us to provide more effective services to assist you in meeting the complex challenges you face.

Employee Assistance Program  
205 Olds Hall  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
  
Telephone (517) 355-4506

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

193-204

U·M·I

Please answer the following questions about your knowledge and use of the Employee Assistance Program (EAP). Select the answer for each question which is most accurate for you and circle the number to the left of that answer.

1. Did you know about the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) before you received the letter about this needs assessment research?

1 NO

2 YES

2. Have you ever been to the EAP for help?

1 NO

2 YES

3. If yes, how helpful was your visit to the EAP? .

1 NOT AT ALL HELPFUL

2 SOMEWHAT HELPFUL

3 VERY HELPFUL

4. Have you ever attended a program or workshop presented by the EAP?

1 NO

2 YES

5. If yes, how helpful was the program or workshop?

1 NOT AT ALL HELPFUL

2 SOMEWHAT HELPFUL

3 VERY HELPFUL

6. Would you consider going to the EAP for help now?

1 NO

2 YES

7. If no, why not?

1 CONCERN ABOUT CONFIDENTIALITY

2 EAP HAS NOT BEEN HELPFUL IN THE PAST

3 CANNOT COME BETWEEN 8 AM &amp; 5 PM

4 LACK OF PARKING

5 OTHER \_\_\_\_\_

8. What type of additional services would you like the EAP to provide?

1 LONG TERM COUNSELING

2 MORE SUPPORT AND COUNSELING  
GROUPS

3 MORE WORKSHOPS WITH CO-WORKERS

4 MORE EDUCATIONAL PRESENTATIONS

5 OTHER \_\_\_\_\_

The following items ask you to describe your reactions and feelings when you are around other people. Each item has a scale, marked with the letters A, B, C, D, and E, with (A) indicating "not at all characteristic of me" and (E) "very characteristic of me," and the other letters, points in between.

For each item, please circle the letter which best describes how characteristic the item is of you.

1. I am not likely to speak to people until they speak to me.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

2. I would describe myself as self confident.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME



3. I feel confident of my appearance.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

4. I am a good mixer.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

5. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right thing to say.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

6. When in a group of people, I usually do what the others want rather than make suggestions.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

7. When I am in disagreement with other people, my opinion usually prevails.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

8. I would describe myself as one who attempts to master situations.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

9. Other people look up to me.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

10. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

11. I make a point of looking other people in the eye.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

12. I cannot seem to get others to notice me.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

13. I would rather not have very much responsibility for other people.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

14. I feel comfortable being approached by someone in a position of authority.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

15. I would describe myself as indecisive.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

16. I have no doubts about my social competence.

A	B	C	D	E
NOT AT ALL CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME	NOT VERY	SLIGHTLY	FAIRLY	VERY MUCH CHARACTER- ISTIC OF ME

The items below inquire about what kind of a person you think you are. Each item consists of a pair of characteristics with the letters A-E in between. For example:

Not at all Artistic    A....B....C....D....E    Very Artistic

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics—that is, you cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic.

The letters form a scale between the two extremes. Please circle the letter which describes where you fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would circle A. If you think you are pretty good, you might circle D. If you are only medium, you might circle C, and so forth.

1. Not at all aggressive    A....B....C....D....E    Very aggressive

2. Not at all independent    A....B....C....D....E    Very independent

3. Not at all emotional    A....B....C....D....E    Very emotional

4. Very submissive    A....B....C....D....E    Very dominant

5. Not at all excitable  
in a major crisis    A....B....C....D....E    Very excitable in  
a major crisis

6. Very passive	A....B....C....D....E	Very active
7. Not at all able to devote self completely to others	A....B....C....D....E	Able to devote self completely to others
8. Very rough	A....B....C....D....E	Very gentle
9. Not at all helpful to others	A....B....C....D....E	Very helpful to others
10. Not at all competitive	A....B....C....D....E	Very competitive
11. Very home oriented	A....B....C....D....E	Very worldly
12. Not at all kind	A....B....C....D....E	Very kind
13. Indifferent to others' approval	A....B....C....D....E	Highly needful of others' approval
14. Feelings not easily hurt	A....B....C....D....E	Feelings easily hurt
15. Not at all aware of feelings of others	A....B....C....D....E	Very aware of feelings of others
16. Can make decisions easily	A....B....C....D....E	Has difficulty making decisions
17. Gives up very easily	A....B....C....D....E	Never gives up easily
18. Never cries	A....B....C....D....E	Cries very easily
19. Not at all self-confident	A....B....C....D....E	Very self-confident
20. Feels very inferior	A....B....C....D....E	Feels very superior

- |  |                       |                                    |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| 21. Not at all understanding of others | A....B....C....D....E | Very understanding of others       |
| 22. Very cold in relations with others | A....B....C....D....E | Very warm in relations with others |
| 23. Very little need for security      | A....B....C....D....E | Very strong need for security      |
| 24. Goes to pieces under pressure      | A....B....C....D....E | Stands up well under pressure      |

We would like you to consider carefully the following statements and indicate as accurately as you can how it applies to you. There are no right or wrong answers, we just want to know how you feel.

Please mark next to each statement according to the amount of your agreement or disagreement by using the following scale:

- |                         |                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 STRONG DISAGREEMENT   | 4 SLIGHT AGREEMENT   |
| 2 MODERATE DISAGREEMENT | 5 MODERATE AGREEMENT |
| 3 SLIGHT DISAGREEMENT   | 6 STRONG AGREEMENT   |

Please mark all statements!

If a statement is unclear to you place an "X" next to it in the margin but mark it anyway. If a statement somehow does not apply to you, place a "?" next to it in the margin but mark it anyway.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I get mad easily.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. I am often inclined to go out of my way to win a point with someone who has opposed me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. I never feel hate towards members of my family.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. People should never get angry.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. It's right for people to express themselves when they are mad.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Some of my family have habits that bother and annoy me very much.

- |                         |                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 STRONG DISAGREEMENT   | 4 SLIGHT AGREEMENT   |
| 2 MODERATE DISAGREEMENT | 5 MODERATE AGREEMENT |
| 3 SLIGHT DISAGREEMENT   | 6 STRONG AGREEMENT   |

- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. When I get mad, I say nasty things.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Even when my anger is aroused, I don't use strong language.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. If I am mad, I really let people know it.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Sometimes I feel that I could injure someone.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. I will criticize someone to his face if he deserves it.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. I get into fist fights about as often as the next person.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. People should never get irritated.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. I find that I cannot express anger at someone until they have really hurt me badly.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Even when people yell at me, I don't yell back.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. At times I have a strong urge to do something harmful or shocking.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. I have many quarrels with members of my family.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. Feeling angry is terrible.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. I wouldn't feel ashamed if people knew I was angry.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. I never do anything right.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. It doesn't make me angry to have people hurry me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. If I don't like somebody, I will tell him so.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. I have physically hurt someone in a fight.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. At times I feel like smashing things.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. Whatever else may be my faults, I never knowingly hurt another person's feelings.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. I find it easy to express anger at people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27. My parents never made me angry.

- |                         |                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 STRONG DISAGREEMENT   | 4 SLIGHT AGREEMENT   |
| 2 MODERATE DISAGREEMENT | 5 MODERATE AGREEMENT |
| 3 SLIGHT DISAGREEMENT   | 6 STRONG AGREEMENT   |

- \_\_\_\_\_ 28. Even when someone does something mean to me, I don't let him know I'm upset.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 29. At times I hurt a person I love.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30. I hardly ever feel like swearing.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 31. I couldn't hit anyone even if I were extremely angry.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 32. I hardly ever get angry.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 33. Even though I disapprove of my friend's behavior, I just can't let them know.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 34. I find it hard to think badly of anyone.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 35. I can think of no good reason for ever hitting anyone.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 36. When people are angry, they should let it out.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 37. I am rarely cross and grouchy.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 38. In spite of how my parents treated me, I didn't get angry.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 39. I could not put someone in his place even if he needed it.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 40. When I really lose my temper, I am capable of slapping someone.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 41. It's easy for me not to fight with those I love.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 42. If someone annoys me, I am apt to tell him what I think of him.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 43. It's useless to get angry.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 44. If someone crosses me, I tend to get back at him.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 45. I think little of people who get angry.

Finally - please answer the following questions.

What is your present marital status? Please circle the appropriate number.

- 1 NEVER MARRIED
- 2 MARRIED
- 3 DIVORCED
- 4 SEPARATED
- 5 WIDOWED

What is your present age? \_\_\_\_\_

How many years of education have you completed? \_\_\_\_\_  
(For example - completed elementary education equals 8 years - high school equals 12 years - 2 years of college equals 14 years, etc.)

If you have a college degree, please indicate level. \_\_\_\_\_

How many years of education have your parents completed?  
(For example - completed elementary education equals 8 years - high school equals 12 years - 2 years of college equals 14 years, etc.)

Father \_\_\_\_\_ years

Mother \_\_\_\_\_ years

Please circle the number next to your employee group.

- 1 CLERICAL-TECHNICAL UNION (CTU)
- 2 ADMINISTRATIVE-PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION (APA)
- 3 ADMINISTRATIVE-PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION (APSA)
- 4 FACULTY
- 5 ACADEMIC STAFF
- 6 FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE (FOP)



What kind of work do you do?

---

Example - secretary, office manger, advisor, professor, manager, administrator.

What are your most important activities or duties?

---

Example - typing and filing, supervision, research, teaching.

What is your before-tax household income? Please circle the appropriate number.

- 1    Below \$10,000
- 2    \$10,000 - 14,999
- 3    \$15,000 - 19,999
- 4    \$20,000 - 24,999
- 5    \$25,000 - 29,999
- 6    \$30,000 - 34,999
- 7    \$35,000 - 39,999
- 8    \$40,000 - 44,999
- 9    \$45,000 - 49,999
- 10   \$50,000 or above

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!!

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about yourself or the services of the Employee Assistance Program? If so please use this space for that purpose.

Any comments you wish to make that you think might help us in future efforts to understand the feelings and needs of women working at MSU would be appreciated either here or in a separate letter.

Your contribution to this study is greatly appreciated. If you would like to receive a summary of the results please check the box on the enclosed return post card.

**APPENDIX E**

**COVER LETTER ENCLOSED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE**

## APPENDIX E

### COVER LETTER ENCLOSED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear (name of respondent):

Thank you for agreeing to help us learn more about MSU's women employees! We appreciate your taking time in your busy life to help us with this important project.

You are one of a small number of women we have contacted. It is very important that we receive input from women employed in many types of positions. Your response is essential to the success of our efforts to learn about the feelings and attitudes of MSU's women employees so that we can tailor our programs to the challenges facing this unique group.

It will only take about 20 minutes of your time to fill out the questionnaire. Please return your completed questionnaire to us in the postage-paid envelope we have provided. Your responses will be completely anonymous. When we receive the questionnaire, we will have no way of identifying who completed it.

We have also enclosed a post card which we are asking you to return to us separately from the questionnaire. Please print your name on this card to let us know you have returned your questionnaire. Receiving this card will allow us to remove your name from the mailing list for this research so that you won't receive follow-up mailings. You can also check the box on this card if you would like to receive a summary of the research results.

Your participation is voluntary. If for any reason you are unable to complete the questionnaire, please return it in the enclosed envelope and send the post card with your name on it separately.

If you have any questions, please call us at 355-4506.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Tom Helma  
Program Coordinator

Cynthia Hockett  
Staff Counselor

**APPENDIX F**

**FOLLOW-UP MAILING SENT ONE WEEK AFTER QUESTIONNAIRE**

## APPENDIX F

### FOLLOW-UP MAILING SENT ONE WEEK AFTER QUESTIONNAIRE

Last week a questionnaire was sent to you asking you to help us learn more about MSU's women employees in order to improve our services. Your name was selected in a random sample of women working at MSU.

If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of MSU's women employees, it is extremely important that we have your input. Your participation will help us improve our services for all women employees at MSU.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it has been misplaced, please call us immediately at 355-4506. We will send you another one today.

Tom Helma  
Coordinator  
Employee Assistance Program

Cynthia Hockett  
Staff Counselor  
Employee Assistance Program

**APPENDIX G**

**RETURN POST CARD ENCLOSED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE**

APPENDIX G

RETURN POST CARD ENCLOSED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE

I have returned my questionnaire separately.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Your Name  
(Please Print)

☐

I would like to receive a summary of  
the result of this survey.

Thanks again for your help.



## **APPENDIX H**

### **EXPANDED ABSTRACT SET TO SUBJECTS REQUESTING RESULTS SUMMARY**

## APPENDIX H

### EXPANDED ABSTRACT SENT TO SUBJECTS REQUESTING RESULTS SUMMARY

This descriptive study investigated the relationship between anger, sex role, and self-esteem in adult women university employees. Three of the four primary hypotheses were supported. The effects of demographic variables on the main variables were also investigated. The sample showed differences in anger in four areas: sex role, marital status, age, and educational level. Feminine women had the greatest awareness of anger, but masculine, and to a lesser extent androgynous, women were most likely to express their anger. Contrary to predictions, no differences between the sex role groups in physical expression of anger and condemnation of anger were found. Women who had never been married were more likely to express their anger than women who were or had previously been married. The youngest women in the sample were more aware of their anger than the oldest women. Women without a college degree felt more condemning of their anger, and were less likely to express it, than women with education beyond the master's level.

The relationship found between anger and self-esteem is complex. Self-esteem was negatively related to awareness of anger, but positively related to verbal expression of anger. Sex role differences in self-esteem were consistent with earlier findings, with androgynous women having the highest

self-esteem, followed by masculine women. Feminine and undifferentiated women reported the lowest self-esteem.

For masculine women, it was predicted that awareness and expression of anger would be positively related to self-esteem, and that condemnation of anger would be negatively related to self-esteem. The inverse of these relationships was predicted for feminine women. Self-esteem was not expected to vary with anger for androgynous and undifferentiated women. These predictions were not supported since the effect of anger in predicting self-esteem was the same for all sex role groups. Sex role was a more significant predictor of self-esteem than anger.

The results of this research suggest that cultural values prohibiting anger in women have a significant impact on self-esteem regardless of whether a woman perceives herself in a traditional or nontraditional role.

The findings of this research have important implications for women who are employed in a university setting. Self-esteem is an important factor contributing to one's sense of fulfillment resulting from work endeavors. As such, it is important that self-esteem be developed and emphasized within the work setting. This research indicates that an important element in the promotion of self-esteem may be for supervisors and managers to allow and encourage the expression of frustration and anger by employees. It is important that this expression be viewed as a means of enhancing self-esteem and

the sense of empowerment and autonomy in one's work experience rather than as a formalized system of complaining. Such opportunities should be available to women (and men) in all employment classifications, and are particularly crucial in the university setting in which the values of equity and personal growth are espoused.

**APPENDIX I**

**COVER LETTER ENCLOSED WITH RESULTS SUMMARY**

## APPENDIX I

### COVER LETTER ENCLOSED WITH RESULTS SUMMARY

Dear Survey Respondent:

About six months ago you were asked to participate in a survey of MSU women employees conducted by the Employee Assistance Program. You were a volunteer for this research and indicated that you would like to receive a summary of the study's results.

We greatly appreciate the time and effort you invested in this effort. You played an important part in helping us learn more about women who work at MSU. The results of this research will be helpful to the Employee Assistance Program in developing future programs for women.

The study has now been completed. We are enclosing a summary of the results for your information. In addition, data regarding the use of the Employee Assistance Program have been compiled and will be used by the staff in planning future programs. If you have any questions, please contact one of us at the phone numbers below.

Again, thank you for your assistance with this important project.

Sincerely,

Tom Helma  
Program Coordinator  
355-4506

Cynthia Hockett  
Consultant  
(616) 454-0112

## **LIST OF REFERENCES**

## References

- Adams, C. H., & Sherer, M. (1985). Sex-role orientation and psychological adjustment: Implications for the masculinity model. Sex Roles, 12, 1211-1218.
- Allen, J. G., & Haccoun, D. M. (1976). Sex differences in emotionality: A multidimensional approach. Human Relations, 29, 711-722.
- Atkinson, C., & Polivy, J. (1976). Effects of delay, attack, and retaliation on state depression and hostility. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 85, 570-576.
- 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 emotion. American Psychologist, 38, 1145-1160.
- Bakan, D. (1966). The duality of human existence: Isolation and communion in western man. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Balswick, J., & Avertt, C. P. (1977). Differences in expressiveness: Gender, interpersonal orientation, and perceived parental expressiveness as contributing factors. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 121-127.
- Bardwick, J. M. (1971). Psychology of women: A study of bio-cultural conflicts. New York: Harper & Row.
- Barnett, R. C., & Baruch, G. K. (1985). Women's involvement in multiple roles and psychological distress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 135-145.
- Barrett, C. J., Berg, P. I., Eaton, E. M., & Pomeroy, E. L. (1974). Implications of women's liberation and the future of psychotherapy. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, II, 11-15.



- Baruch, G. K., & Barnett, R. (1986). Role quality, multiple role involvement, and psychological well-being in midlife women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 578-585.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1978). Beyond androgyny: Some presumptuous prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. In J. A. Sherman & F. L. Denmark (Eds.), The psychology of women: Future directions in research (pp. 1-23). New York: Psychological Dimensions.
- Berenson, M. L., Levine, D. M., & Goldstein, M. (1983). Intermediate statistical methods and applications. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Berkowitz, L. (1962). Aggression: A social psychological analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bernardez, T. (1985, June). A psychosocial approach to psychotherapy: Understanding society's bias against women. Radcliffe Quarterly, pp. 3-4.
- Bernardez, T. (1985). Prevalent disorders of women: Attempts toward a different understanding and treatment. In C. T. Mowbrey, S. Lanir, & M. Hulce (Eds.), Women & mental health: New directions for change (Special double issue of Women and Therapy, 3(3/4)). New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Bernardez-Bonesatti, T. (1976). Unconscious beliefs about women affecting psychotherapy. North Carolina Journal of Mental Health, 7(5), 63-66.
- Bernardez-Bonesatti, T. (1978). Women and anger: Conflicts with aggression in contemporary women. Journal of American Medical Women's Association, 33, 215-219.
- Biaggio, M. K. (1980a). Anger arousal and personality characteristics. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 352-356.
- Biaggio, M. K. (1980b). Assessment of anger arousal. Journal of Personality Assessment, 44, 289-298.
- Biaggio, M. K. (1988, August). Sex differences in anger: Are they real? Paper presented at American Psychological Association Convention, Atlanta, GA.

- Biaggio, M. K., Supplee, K., & Curtis, N. (1981). Reliability and validity of four anger scales. Journal of Personality Assessment, 45, 639-648.
- Block, J. H. (1973). Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 28(6), 512-526.
- Block, J. H. (1978). Another look at sex differentiation in the socialization behaviors of mothers and fathers. In J. A. Sherman & F. L. Denmark (Eds.), The psychology of women: Future directions in research (pp. 29-87). New York: Psychological Dimensions.
- Burchardt, C. J. (1982). Psychological androgyny and personality adjustment in college and psychiatric populations. Sex Roles, 8, 835-851.
- Buss, A. H. (1971). Aggression pays. In J. L. Singer (Ed.), The control of aggression and violence: Cognitive and psychological factors. (pp 7-18). New York: Academic Press.
- Caplan, P. J. (1985). The myth of women's masochism. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Chesney, M. A. & Rosenman, R. A. (Eds.). (1985). Anger and hostility in cardiovascular and behavioral disorders. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Publishing.
- Chodorow, N. The reproduction of mothering. Berkley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Cline-Naffziger, C. (1974). Women's lives and frustration, oppression, and anger: Some alternatives. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21, 51-56.
- Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 80, 389-407.
- Cox, S. (1976). Female psychology: The emerging self. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc.
- Deutsch, H. (1930). The significance of masochism in the mental life of women. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 11, 48-60.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Dollard, J., Miller, N. E., Doob, L. W., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). Frustration and aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dorgan, M., Goebel, B. L., & House, A. E. (1983). Generalizing about sex role and self-esteem: Results or effects? Sex Roles, 2, 719-724.
- Edmunds, G. (1980). Aggression (psychological). In R. H. Wood (Ed.), Encyclopedia of clinical assessment (Vol. 1, pp. 551-558). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Eichenbaum, L., & Orbach, S. (1983). Understanding women: A feminist psychoanalytic approach. New York: Basic Books.
- Evans, R. G. (1984). Hostility and sex guilt: Perceptions of self and others as a function of gender and sex-role orientation. Sex Roles, 10, 207-215.
- Falbo, T. (1982). PAQ types and power strategies used in intimate relationships. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 6, 399-405.
- Fenichel, O. (1945). Psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Freud, S. (1957). Mourning and melancholia. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 14, pp. 239-238). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1917).
- Freud, S. (1961a). The economic problem of masochism. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 19, pp. 157-170). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1924).
- Freud, S. (1961b). Some psychical consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 19, pp. 243-258). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1925).
- Freud, S. (1965). New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis. In James Strachey (Ed. and Trans.). New York: W. W. Norton Company.

- Frodi, A., (1977). Sex differences in perception of a provocation, a survey. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 44, 113-114.
- Frodi, A., (1978). Experiential and psychological responses associated with anger and aggression in women and men. Journal of Research in Personality, 12, 335-349.
- Frodi, A., Macaulay, J., & Thome, P. R. (1977). Are women always less aggressive than men? A review of the experimental literature. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 634-660.
- Galenson, E. (1976). Scientific proceedings - panel reports: Psychology of women. American Psychoanalytic Association Journal, 24, 141-160.
- Gauthier, J., & Kjervik, D. (1982). Sex-role identity and self-esteem in female graduate nursing students. Sex Roles, 8, 45-55.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1984). Statistical methods in education and psychology (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Glazer, C. A., & Dusek, J. B. (1985). The relationship between sex-role orientation and resolution of Eriksonian developmental crises. Sex Roles, 13, 653-661.
- Gore, S., & Mangione, T. W. (1983). Social roles, sex roles and psychological distress: Additive and interactive models of sex differences. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24, 300-312.
- Gormly, A. V., & Gormly, J. B. (1984). Research studies: A psychological study of emotions. Transactional Analysis Journal, 14, 74-79.
- Greenberg, J. R., & Mitchell, S. A. (1983). Object relations in psychoanalytic theory. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greer, S., & Morris, T. (1978). The study of psychological factors in breast cancer: Problems of method. Social Science & Medicine, 12, 129-134.

- Hazaleus, S. L., & Deffenbacher, J. L. (1985). Irrational beliefs and anger arousal. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 47-52.
- Heiser, P., & Gannon, L. (1984). The relationship of sex-role sterotypy to anger expression and the report of psychosomatic symptoms. Sex Roles, 10, 601-611.
- Helmreich, R., Aronson, E., & LeFan, J. (1970). To err is humanizing--sometimes: Effects of self-esteem, competence, and a pratfall on interpersonal attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 259-264.
- Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1631-1644.
- Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Wilhelm, J. A. (1981). A psychometric analysis of the personal attributes questionnaire. Sex Roles, 7, 1097-1108.
- Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). Short forms of the Texas social behavior inventory (TSBI), an objective measure of self-esteem. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 4, 473-475.
- Helmreich, R., Stapp, J. & Ervin, C. (1974). The Texas social behavior inventory (TSBI): An objective measure of self-esteem or social competence. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4, 79.
- Hertsgaard, D., & Light, H. (1984). Anxiety, depression, and hostility in rural women. Psychological Reports, 55, 673-674.
- Heyman, S. R. (1977). Dogmatism, hostility, aggression, and gender roles. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 694-698.
- Hoffman, D. M., & Linda S. Fidell (1979). Characteristics of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine middle-class women. Sex Roles, 5, 765-781.
- Hokanson, J. E., & Edelman, R. (1966). Effects of three social responses on vascular processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 442-447.
- Hokanson, J. E., Willers, K. R., & Koropsak, E. (1968). The modification of autonomic responses during aggressive interchange. Journal of Personality, 36, 386-404.

- Holahan, C. K., & Spence, J. T. (1980). Desirable and undesirable masculine and feminine traits in counseling clients and unselected students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48, 300-302.
- Hoppe, C. M. (1979). Interpersonal aggression as a function of subject's sex, subject's sex role identification, opponent's sex, and degree of provocation. Journal of Personality, 47, 317-329.
- Jones, S. L., & Lamke, L. K. (1985). The relationship between sex role orientation, self esteem, and sex-typed occupational choice of college women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 145-152.
- Kagan, J. & Moss, H. A. (1962). Birth to maturity: A study in psychological development. New York: Wiley.
- Kandel, D. B., Davies, M., & Raveis, V. H. (1985). The stressfulness of daily social roles for women: Marital, occupational and household roles. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 26, 64-78.
- Kaplan, A. (1986). The "self-in-relation": Implications for depression in women. Psychotherapy, 23, 234-242.
- Kaplan, A. G. (1976). Androgyny as a model of mental health for women: From theory to therapy. In A. G. Kaplan & J. P. Bean (Eds.). Beyond sex-role stereotypes. (pp. 353-362). Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Kaplan, A. G., Brooks, B., McComb, A. L., Shapiro, E. R., & Sodano, A. (1983). Women and anger in psychotherapy. Women and Therapy, 2, 29-40.
- Kimble, C., & Helmreich, R. (1972). Self-esteem and the need for social approval. Psychonomic Science, 26(6), 339-342.
- Kimlicka, T., Cross, H., & Tarnai, J. (1983). A comparison of androgynous, feminine, masculine, and undifferentiated women on self-esteem, body satisfaction, and sexual satisfaction. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 7, 291-294.
- Klein, H. M., & Willerman, L. (1979). Psychological masculinity and femininity and typical and maximal dominance expression in women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1059-2070.
- Lee, A. G., & Scheurer, V. L. (1983). Psychological androgyny and aspects of self-image in women and men. Sex Roles, 9, 289-306.

- Lenney, E. (1979). Concluding comments on androgyny: Some intimations of its mature development. Sex Roles, 5, 829-840.
- Lerner, H. (1977). Taboos against female anger. The Menninger Perspective, 8, 4-11.
- Lerner, H. E. (1980). Internal prohibitions against female anger. The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 40, 137-148.
- Lerner, H. G. (1985). The dance of anger: A woman's guide to changing the patterns of intimate relationships. New York: Harper & Row.
- Levitan, H. L. (1981). Patterns of hostility revealed in the fantasies and dreams of women with rheumatoid arthritis. Psychotherapy & Psychosomatics, 35, 34-43.
- Light, H. K. (1984). Differences in employed women's anxiety, depression, and hostility levels according to their career and family role commitment. Psychological Reports, 55, 290.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Martin, R. E., & Light, H. K. (1984). Education: Its positive impact on women. College Student Journal 18, 401-405.
- Megargee, E. I., & Hokanson, J. E. (1970). The dynamics of aggression: individual, group, and international analyses. New York: Harper & Row.
- Miller, J. B. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Miller, J. B. (1983). The construction of anger in women and men. Work In Progress 83(01). Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.
- Miller, J. B. (1985). Women's mental health issues: moving forward with awareness and program alternatives. In C. T. Mowbray, S. Lanir, & M. Hulce (Eds.), Women and mental health: New directions for change. (pp. 29-35). New York: Harrington Park Press.

- Miller, J. B., Nadelson, C. C., Notman, M. T., & Zilbach, J. (1981). Aggression in women: A reexamination. In S. Klebanow, (Ed.), Changing concepts in psychoanalysis (pp. 157-167). New York: Gardner Press.
- Mueller, K., & Leidig, M. W. (1976). Women's anger and feminist therapy. Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies, 1(3), 23-30.
- Nadelson, C. C., Notman, M. T., Miller, J. B., & Zilbach, J. (1982). Aggression in women: Conceptual issues and clinical implications. In M. T. Notman, & C. C. Nadelson (Eds.), The woman patient (Vol 3), (pp. 17-28). New York: Plenum Press.
- Notman, M. T. (1982). Feminine development: Changes in psychoanalytic theory. In C. C. Nadelson, & M. T. Notman (Eds.). The woman patient (Vol. 1, pp 3-29). New York: Plenum Press.
- O'Conner, K., Mann, D. W., & Bardwick, J. M. (1978). Androgyny and self-esteem in the upper-middle class: A replication of Spence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1168-1169.
- \* Orlofsky, J. L. (1977). Sex-role orientation, identity formation, and self-esteem in college men and women. Sex Roles, 3, 561-575.
- Orlofsky, J. L. (1980). Sex-role orientation. In R. H. Wood (Ed.). Encyclopedia of clinical assessment (Vol. 2, pp. 656-672). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Orlofsky, J. L., & Windle, M. T. (1978). Sex-role orientation, behavioral adaptability and personal adjustment. Sex Roles, 4, 801-811.
- Parsons, T. & Bales, R. F. (1955). Family, socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1973). Multiple regression in behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Pelletier, K. R. (1981). Mind as healer, mind as slayer: A holistic approach to preventing stress disorders. New York: Dell.
- Puglisi, J. T., & Jackson, D. W. (1981). Sex-role identity and self esteem in adulthood. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 12(2), 129-138.



- Rendely, J. G., Holmstrom, R. M., & Karp, S. A. (1984). The relationship of sex-role identity, life style, and mental health in suburban American homemakers: 1. Sex role, employment and adjustment. Sex Roles, 11, 839-848.
- Richardson, D., Visel, A., & Taylor, S. P. (1980). Female aggression as a function of attitudes toward women. Sex Roles, 6, 265-271.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Bee, H., Vogel, S., & Broverman, I. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 287-295.
- Rubin, J. A., Provenzano, F. J., & Luria, Z. (1974). The eye of the beholder: Parents' views on sex of newborns. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 44, 179-186.
- Scheaffer, R. L., Mendenhall, W., & Ott, L. (1979). Elementary survey sampling (2nd ed.). North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.
- Siegel, J. M. (1986). The multidimensional anger inventory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 191-200.
- Silvern, L. E., & Ryan, V. L. (1979). Self-rated adjustment and sex-typing on the Bem sex-role inventory: Is masculinity the primary predictor of adjustment? Sex Roles, 5, 739-763.
- Spence, J. T. (1983). Comment on Lubinski, Tellegen, and Butcher's "Masculinity, femininity, and androgyny viewed and assessed as distinct concepts". Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 44, 440-446.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity & femininity. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1979). On assessing androgyny. Sex Roles, 5, 721-738.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1673-1682.

- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). The personal attributes questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4, 127.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 29-39.
- Spielberger, C. D., Johnson, E. H., Russell, S. F., Crane, R. J., Jacobs, G. A., & Worden, T. J. (1985). The experience of anger: Construction and validation of an anger expression scale. In M. A. Chesney, & R. H. Rosenman (Eds.), Anger and hostility in cardiovascular and behavioral disorders (pp. 5-30). Washington, DC: Hemisphere Publishing.
- Stake, J. E., & Orlofsky, J. L. (1981). On the use of global and specific measures in assessing the self-esteem of males and females. Sex Roles, 7, 653-662.
- Stericker, A. B., & Johnson, J. E. (1977). Sex-role identification and self-esteem in college students: Do men and women differ? Sex Roles, 3, 19-26.
- Surrey, J. L. (1984). Self-in-relation: A theory of women's development. Work in progress 84(02). Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.
- Symonds, M. (1974). The liberated woman: Healthy and neurotic. The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 34, 177-183.
- Symonds, M. (1976). Psychodynamics of aggression in women. The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 36, 195-203.
- Tavris, C. (1982). Anger: The misunderstood emotion. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Terman, L. M., & Tyler, L. E. (1954). Psychological sex differences. In H. S. Langfeld (Ed), Manual of child psychology (pp. 1064-1114). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tesch, S. A. (1984). Sex-role orientation and intimacy status in men and women. Sex Roles, 11, 451-465.
- Wallerstein, J. S. (1986). Women after divorce: Preliminary report from a ten-year follow-up. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 56, 65-77.

- Webster's new twentieth century dictionary. (1979). New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Weissman, M., Fox, K., & Klerman, G. L. (1973). Hostility and depression associated with suicide attempts. American Journal of Psychiatry, 130, 450-455.
- Weissman, M. M., & Klerman, G. L. (1977). Sex differences and the epidemiology of depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 34, 98-111.
- Westkott, M. (1986). Historical and developmental roots of female dependency. Psychotherapy, 23, 213-220.
- Whitley, B. E. (1984). Sex-role orientation and psychological well-being: Two meta-analyses. Sex Roles, 12, 207-225.
- Williams, R. B., Barefoot, J. C., & Shekelle, R. B. (1985). The health consequences of hostility. In M. A. Chesney & R. H. Rosenman (Eds.), Anger and hostility in cardiovascular and behavioral disorders (pp. 173-185). Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing.
- Yoder, J. D., Rice, R. W., Adams, J., Priest, R. F., & Prince, H. T. (1982). Reliability of the attitudes toward women scale (AWS) and the personal attributes questionnaire (PAQ). Sex Roles, 8, 651-657.
- Zealley, A. K. (1971). Bronchial asthma: A problem attributable to sampling when establishing its psychopathology. Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 19, 37-46.
- Zelin, M. L., Adler, G., & Myerson, P. G. (1971). Anger self-report: An objective questionnaire for the measurement of aggression. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39, 340.