

## Abstract

Taylor, Tiffany. Defining Anger: Deconstructing the Experience and Expression of Anger by Race, Class, and Gender. (Under the direction of Barbara Risman.)

The research on anger in the sociology of emotions literature, however, categorizes anger as a negative emotion, a form of distress with negative consequences. In contrast, I see anger as a potential source of empowerment and expect it to be tied to attributes of stratification, to gender, race, and class. Unlike much of the prior research, the analysis in this paper looks at both the experience and expression of anger by race, class, and gender. Results indicate that race, class, and gender do not operate similarly for feeling and expressing anger. Men feel anger around social class while women feel anger around family status. While blacks do not feel more anger, black men are more likely to express their anger, however not more likely to express their anger directly. Having the subjective identification of lower class is the best predictor of expressing anger towards the person who made you angry. Across analyses and social statuses a common difference is lower status people are more likely to feel, express, and directly express anger, however this finding is not true for sex status.

**Defining Anger: Deconstructing the Experience and Expression of Anger  
by Race, Class, and Gender**

by

**Tiffany Taylor**

**Master's Thesis submitted to the Department of Anthropology and Sociology  
North Carolina State University**

June 2004

Approved By:

---

Barbara Risman, Chair

---

Donald Tomaskovic-Devey

---

Laura Severin, Representative for Women's and Gender Studies

## Biography

Tiffany Taylor was a military baby, so was born in Las Vegas Nevada on an Air Force base and moved all around before coming here to the Raleigh area to stay. Her father grew up a farmer in eastern North Carolina. Her mother grew up mostly in Arkansas. So she grew up in a family that believed in hard work and the possibility for upward mobility. Her mom wanted her to be a lawyer and her dad wanted her to be a schoolteacher, which interestingly is what they both had wanted to be growing up.

After she got her undergraduate degree in Political Science here at NC State, she did what many people with social science degrees do, went into sales. She worked for four years as a recruiter/staffing manager in both permanent and temporary placement, which was indeed called sales and not something more humane like “finding people jobs”. She was a good greedy capitalist and worked her way into management. Throughout her work life, it was always in the back of her mind that what she was doing was shady, but she always rationalized “selling” people as finding them jobs when she felt down. Until the breaking point when, after four years of being corrupted by a nice salary, quit her job. And after a year of screwing around and taking random classes, she ended up here in the Sociology department of NC State for graduate school. After school she intends on helping other current or would be greedy capitalists convert.

## Acknowledgments

This has been an interesting learning experience and a lot of people held my hand (metaphorically or literally) along the way. I want to thank Barbara Risman, my chair, for guiding me throughout the process, in which this thesis began as one paper and really ended up as another. Thanks to Don Tomaskovic-Devey for his mentoring and methodological assistance and for reading a final draft when he had jet lag and had just returned from being on the other side of the world for weeks. Also, I want to thank Laura Severin for being my minor representative for Women and Gender Studies, stepping up when another committee member had left the University. Thanks to my friends and colleagues Carissa Froyum and Christine Mallinson, among others who were very supportive in many ways. And a special thanks to Katrina Bloch who always unselfishly read draft after draft, offered her suggestions, and most importantly her support, making me believe I would actually defend this thing one day. This thesis benefited greatly from the input of many people, showing that Sociology should be done in collaboration and not in isolation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| LIST OF TABLES.....  | v    |
| 1. INTRODUCTION.....   | 1    |
| 2. THE SOCIOLOGY OF ANGER .....  | 3    |
| A. Doing Deference: Expectations and Suppressing Anger.....                | 4    |
| B. Controlling Anger: Moving From Norms of Anger to Individual Action..... | 5    |
| C. Speaking Up! Anger at Injustice, Anger at Inequality .....              | 6    |
| 3. RESEARCH DESIGN.....  | 8    |
| 4. METHODS.....  | 12   |
| A. Data.....   | 12   |
| B. Measures.....   | 12   |
| C. Analyses.....   | 13   |
| 5. DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS.....  | 16   |
| 6. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND HYPOTHESES.....                               | 20   |
| 7. CONCLUSIONS.....  | 26   |
| 8. REFERENCES.....   | 31   |
| 9. TABLES.....   | 36   |

## TABLES

Table 1 Descriptive Univariate and Bivariate Statistics for Explanatory Variables in Full Sample

Table 2a. Multiple Regression of Social Status Variables on Feeling Anger for Full Sample

Table 2b. Multiple Regression of Social Status Variables on Feeling Anger for Female and Male Samples

Table 3a. Logistic Regression Odd Ratio Estimates for the Expression of Anger for Full Sample

Table 3b. Logistic Regression Odd Ratio Estimates for the Expression of Anger for Female and Male Samples

Table 4a. Logistic Regression Odd Ratio Estimates for the Direct Expression of Anger for Full Sample

Table 4b. Logistic Regression Odd Ratio Estimates for the Direct Expression of Anger for Female and Male Samples

## **Defining Anger: Deconstructing the Experience and Expression of Anger by Race, Class, and Gender**

Many people will tell you “men get angry, women get depressed”. Early sociological theory dating back to Goffman’s theories of deference and demeanor (1959, 1967) supports the belief that the most powerful will express anger while less powerful individuals will “do deference” and maintain the interaction order. However, a counter belief is the popular image of black men as extremely aggressive and violent (Glassner 1999) and controlling images of black women as angry (Collins 1998, 2000 and Lugones 1995). These beliefs persist despite substantial research (Conger, Lorenz, Elder, Simons, and Ge 1993, Thomas 1993, Mirowsky and Ross 1995, Ross and Van Willigen 1996) that suggests that women are more likely to be depressed *and* angry. Black and lesbian feminists (Lorde 1977, Frye 1983, Smith 2000, hooks 1995 and 2000) have argued anger *can* be a useful response to injustice, an acknowledgement that one has been wrongfully treated or profoundly disrespected. Women’s anger may often be ignored or dismissed as invalid and unjustified.

I began this study with an interest in Black women’s anger as a potential form of resistance to inequality. There is little research on women’s anger in general and no empirical research that I am aware of that examines black women’s anger specifically. Black Feminist theory suggests that the suppression and internalization of anger causes anxiety and invisibility. “Anger functions to relieve this anxiety, allowing for feelings of increased empowerment in the interpersonal context” (Cox et al., 1999 p. 64). Interpersonal empowerment can lead to the courage to increase visibility.

bell hooks (1995) argues that speaking anger is necessary for black Americans to resist racism. She speaks of silencing anger, saying “all our silences in the face of racist assault are acts of complicity. What does our rage at injustice mean if it can be silenced, erased by individual material comfort? If aware black folks gladly trade in their critical political consciousness for opportunistic personal advancement then there is no place for rage and no hope that we can ever

live to see the end of white supremacy” (p.19). These expressions of anger are easier to discuss in theory than to take into practice. Some black women feel the expression of anger is stigmatizing and Black women have generally been stereotyped as angry. Embracing anger changes emotions from the social construct of being “receptive” to being “instrumental in creating a portion of the perceived reality” (Cox et al, 1999 p. 82). Anger becomes active instead of passive. Its motivation can occur for many reasons, whether you feel you are “tired of giving in” like Rosa Parks (2000 p. 61) or just feel that “this shit has got to be different, let me get out there” like Barbara Smith (2000 p. 288). Anger is important to study because self-defined and self-determined anger was a direct catalyst for activism and social change for these women and many others.

This conceptualization of anger as necessary for social change is quite different than the way most researchers define anger. In Black Feminist Thought, anger is seen as creating possibilities to ignite social change. In order for individuals to actively engage in social change they must feel passionate and angry about the issue. The research on anger in the sociology of emotions literature, however, categorizes anger with sadness, unhappiness, and depression, as a negative emotion, a form of distress with negative consequences. In contrast, I see anger as a potential source of empowerment and expect it to be tied to attributes of stratification, to gender, race, and class. Power and status obtained through the individual’s social hierarchical position in society should have an impact on whether or not an individual experience anger and how they express their emotions and to whom they are willing or able to express their anger.

I suggest cultural beliefs about men being angry and women being depressed persist (despite empirical evidence otherwise) because more powerful and higher status individuals possess *anger privilege*; that is, superordinates have the social and structural position that privileges them to openly express their anger. Their anger is often legitimated and seen as justified by society at large. Subordinates, on the other hand, are often accused of unjustified anger or irrationality if they express anger directly (meaning towards the person who made them angry). It is this history of injustice, as well as occupying a structural position as subordinate, that

perhaps leads those at the bottom of the social hierarchy to suppress anger and direct expression of anger towards someone other than the person who made them angry (indirectly). This leaves them without the opportunity to address the wrongdoer directly and the possibility of gratification that comes from a response to injustice (Ridgeway and Johnson 1990).

I believe the expression of anger is a potentially useful tool for everyday resistance, interactional resistance, or as an impetus for large-scale social change. Therefore, the central goal in this paper is to see how individuals in different social statuses experience and express anger. In doing this, I offer a distinct addition to the literature in three ways: 1) I problematize inequality in this research, 2) I make a distinction between *feeling* and *expressing* anger, and 3) I examine if anger is expressed directly or indirectly. My focus is how individuals of different races and classes, in addition to genders, experience and express anger. I predict those at the bottom of the social hierarchy feel more anger, but express it less directly.

In the next section I discuss relevant literature on anger. I then formulate hypotheses about how individuals who are less powerful in the social hierarchy compare to more powerful others on feeling anger, expressing anger, and whether anger may be expressed directly or indirectly. I test these hypotheses using the 1996 General Social Survey's "Emotion" module focusing on social status, which includes not only gender, but also race and class. Do less powerful individuals feel more anger? Do they express it more or do they suppress their anger? If they express their anger, do they confront the person who made them mad or direct their anger elsewhere? The following sections will answer these questions. I turn next to the literature on anger.

### **The Sociology of Anger**

In the 1960's through the 1980's, the sociology of emotions literature took on three distinct trajectories. The first trajectory argued emotions are universal physiological responses to similar stimuli (Kemper 1978, 1981, Nisbett and Schachter 1966). A second trajectory argues that power and status positions merely affect the stimuli and that there is an interaction between

biology and culture (Scheff 1983, 1986). The third trajectory takes this focus on culture a step further and argues that emotions have varying biological effects-not universal- that are shaped by social factors and somewhat dependent on norms (Shott 1979, Averill 1980). While this literature seems varied, it is consistent in its definition of anger as “negative emotions” and anger is often discussed as aggressive and debilitating. These trajectories do not help us understand group difference nor inequality, and so they will not be discussed further here.

This paper focuses on anger as a social construction and how individuals of varying social statuses may feel or express anger differently. The literature I discuss below focuses on how people experience and express anger does this and represents three frameworks for thinking about anger. The first framework, “doing deference”, focuses on anger in terms of how general interaction norms affect the expression of anger. The second framework, “controlling anger”, introduces individual agency into understanding of how people control the expression of anger. The third framework, “speaking up”, focuses more specifically on how individuals might react with anger to inequity.

#### *Doing Deference: Expectations and Suppressing Anger*

Goffman (1959, 1967) introduced the concept of everyday face-to-face interactions as an important unit of analysis. He suggested people maintain the *expressive order* (which Goffman called the interaction order in later work) by maintaining/saving face such expressions meet the expectation of others in the interaction. Goffman refers to interactions as games or as if one was on stage engaging in “performances”. So keeping poise, which is essential in maintaining the expressive order, refers to staying in the game or staying in role (1959). This game and keeping poise includes interactions between people of different “social standing” in which each adheres to the “discrepant roles” that are appropriate for his or her social position (Goffman 1959). In fact, persons with less or lower “social standing” will defer to higher standing persons, in other words, they are “doing deference”, a concept which West and Zimmerman later use in discussing women and men “doing gender” (1987) and West and Fenstermaker call “doing difference” (1995).

Therefore, based on Goffman (1959, 1967), West and Zimmerman (1987) and West and Fenstermaker (1995), we would expect persons of lower standing to not express their anger in interactions, because they will defer to more powerful others in ways that maintain both the gendered order and the expressive/interaction order.

Given Goffman's ideas of the presentations of self, we have reason to believe that others' expectations may matter more than our expectations of ourselves. Indeed, Troyer and Younts (1997) found that others' expectations, termed second-order expectations, are indeed more important in predicting behavior than first order-expectations, which are one's expectations of oneself. In fact, when the expectations disagree, an individual will usually act in a way that satisfies others' expectations. In summary, theories of doing deference, gender, or difference (Goffman 1959, 1967; West and Zimmerman 1987; and West and Fenstermaker 1995) suggest that women and/or people with less power will be less likely to express and more likely to suppress their anger.

#### *Controlling Anger: Moving from Norms of Anger to Individual Action*

Clinical psychology research focuses on women controlling their anger. This research assumes that gender socialization creates passive women (Lerner 1980, Halas 1981). In a clinical study of women, girls and anger, psychologists (Cox et al., 1999) found that many women and girls do not express their anger. Those studied had various ways of coping or not coping with their anger, but all of the respondents avoided expressing their anger due to a lifetime of being taught that anger is bad. The most common way for girls to "deal" with this anger is the "refusal to talk in some form... followed by some sort of withdrawal" (p. 177). This is a reaction learned through socialization. Cox et al. (1999) suggest we are socializing our daughters to suppress their anger, to be silent about their negative emotions, and to withdraw. This learned response is carried into adulthood where the internalization or suppression of anger over classism, racism and sexism leads to withdrawing from the cause of that anger, silence and invisibility.

Two very similar theories that provide empirical support for this suppression effect are emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983, Thoits 1985) and affect control theory (Heise 1977, Smith-Lovin and Heise 1988, Smith-Lovin 1990). In both theories, actors make judgments about an interaction and manage their emotions according to the situation. The theories differ in that affect control is more of a pure symbolic interactionist perspective, arguing that actors who cannot meet emotion expectations will redefine the situation in such a way that allows them to have appropriate emotional experiences. Emotion management theory suggests that instead of redefining the situation, individuals frequently use emotion management skills to manipulate their emotions. Hochschild's (1983) study of flight attendants illustrates how an individual might "bite their tongue" in front of a customer who made them angry, but vent to a co-worker about the experience. So while they might express anger, they do not express it towards the person who made them angry. Research on emotion management has been largely theoretical or case studies. Research on affect control theory has relied on experimental studies with samples of college students. Both theories suggest that the least powerful will adjust their behavior, control their anger, and may "do deference" in ways that are appropriate to the cultural expectations of the situation.

To summarize, clinical psychological literature, as well as affect control theory (Heise 1977, Smith-Lovin and Heise 1988, Smith-Lovin 1990) suggest that women and/or people with less power will be less likely to express and more likely to suppress their anger. Emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) theory would predict that women, and others with less power, are more likely to feel *and* express anger. However, emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) suggests that less powerful people may feel as much anger, but be less likely to express that anger directly.

### *Speaking Up! Anger at Injustice, Anger at Inequality*

Some research focuses specifically on inequality and how individuals might react to inequality, inequity and/or injustice. The first theory, equity theory, is derived from Homans

(1974) distributive justice argument. This theory suggests that people who receive fair rewards in an exchange will feel positive emotions (happy and/or satisfaction), while underrewarded individuals will feel resentment or anger, and overrewarded will feel guilt. Hegtvedt (1990) discusses the impact of inequity on emotions in intimate relations, describing equity theory as a calculation of fairness based on a rate of exchange between individuals, such that you get out of an exchange what you put in (local) and this input/output is the same for the partner in the exchange (referential). The fair rate of exchange (or “going rate”) is a referential comparison. This implies that we size up what the other person expects to put in or get out of the exchange, and then we attempt to meet that standard.

Power and status are important in exchanges, and some actors may be more dependent on others (see Emerson’s (1962) power dependency theory) to gain certain outcomes. In situations in which one person is highly dependent on the other to gain resources, they are unlikely to express negative emotion even when they are dissatisfied with the outcome (Johnson, Ford, and Kaufman 2000). Further, if the other actor has legitimacy, referring to the supervisor’s authority to reward and control gained through endorsement from others (Zelditch and Walker 1984), then less legitimate actors who interact with them will be more likely to feel resentment, but less likely to express emotion (Johnson, Ford, and Kaufman 2000). Here we see how power and status have different effects on feeling and expression. Less powerful actors *feel* more resentment, yet the more powerful are able to exert suppressive effects on emotional expression (Ridgeway and Johnson 1990, Lovaglia and Houser 1996). In these studies, power and status are measured through dependency and legitimacy of the actors in the exchange.

Another theory focusing on inequality is the gender inequality theory posited by Ross and Van Willigen (1996), which argues women are exposed to varying amounts of hardship and constraint depending on where they are in the social structure. That is, women have a position in family and work structures that lead to greater hardship and constraint due to greater burdens, demands, and limitations, which in turn leads to greater anger (Ross and Van Willigen 1996).

They find support for their theory and among their results they find mothers “have” twice the level of anger as fathers. “Level of anger” is determined by using a scale, which includes frequency of feeling annoyance, frequency of feeling anger, and expressing anger by yelling. Parents are more likely to yell, mothers are more likely to yell than fathers, and the likelihood of expressing anger by yelling increases as the number of children increases. It is important to note that the authors combine feeling and expression. This combination blurs issues of power and status in that the authors cannot really measure how expression may be impacted differently than feeling by power differentials. In other words, we might imagine that women who feel they take on too much of the burden would feel more anger and this could lead to expressing it through yelling. However, who are they yelling at and how might this anger at injustice be impacted if the social context changes to a worker being angry with an employer?

The theories in this last section lead to contrasting expectations about inequality than most of those in the prior two sections, with the exception of emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983). Equity (Hegtvedt 1990), gender inequality (Ross and Van Willigen 1996), and emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) theories predict that women, and by implication others with less power, are more likely to feel *and* express anger. However, emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) and legitimacy and dependency theories (Zelditch and Walker 1984; Ridgeway and Johnson 1990; Lovaglia and Houser 1996; Johnson, Ford, and Kaufman 2000) suggests that less powerful people may be less likely to express that anger directly. In the next section I will formulate hypotheses for feeling, expressing, and directly expressing anger based on this literature. Then in the following section, I will test these hypotheses and answer some of the questions posed in the beginning of this paper.

### **Research Design**

Despite cultural beliefs that men get angry and women get depressed, the literature is clear in that women do get angry. Determining what “getting angry” means is another issue and

determining if women are more or less angry than men is yet another issue. I agree with recent research (Simon and Nath 2004) that we must define anger in two ways, that feeling and expressing anger are conceptually and practically different things. In other words, “getting angry” must have a feeling component, but may also have an expression component. The literature is somewhat inconsistent on this, but any theory or research that looks to understand inequalities impact on any emotions must make this distinction. Therefore my hypotheses distinguish feeling and expression of anger distinctly. While much of the research has examined gender, very little has been done in terms of race and class. Finally, while differences in “getting angry” by gender have been researched, no research that I am aware of has examined the effect of gender ideology on feeling or expressing anger. I test the effects of a variety of inequalities on feeling and expressing anger.

My first hypotheses deal with women feeling anger. Following equity (Hegtvedt 1990), gender inequality (Ross and Van Willigen 1996), and emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) theories, I predict that women are more likely to feel anger. Following the underlying logic of these theories about inequity or inequality, racial minorities or people with economic disadvantages will also be more likely to feel anger. Further, consistent with Black Feminist Thought, we expect people with intersecting identities who are socially located on multiple axes of oppression (for instance black women or poor white women) will be more likely to feel anger. In sum, these hypothesis views feeling anger as a response to social injustice, the feeling that due to certain conditions largely outside of one’s control that they are not treated fairly. These theories suggest the following hypotheses:

*H<sub>1</sub>: Women are more likely than men to feel anger.*

*H<sub>2</sub>: Racial minorities and economically disadvantaged are also more likely than their higher status counterparts (whites and economically advantaged) to feel anger.*

*H<sub>3</sub>: Individuals located on multiple axes of oppression will be more likely to feel anger.*

Next I formulate several hypotheses about the expression of anger. I test alternative prediction of competing groups of theories, numbering the hypotheses such that the alternate predictions correspond. The first group includes theories of doing deference, gender, or difference (Goffman 1959, 1967; West and Zimmerman 1987; and West and Fenstermaker 1995), as well as affect control theory (Heise 1977, Smith-Lovin and Heise 1988, Smith-Lovin 1990), which suggest that women and/or people with less power will be less likely to express their anger. These theories suggest that people at the bottom of the social hierarchy will suppress their anger to maintain emotional norms based on their less powerful positions.

*H<sub>4a</sub>: Women are less likely than men to express anger.*

*H<sub>5a</sub>: Racial minorities and economically disadvantaged are less likely than whites or economically advantaged to express anger.*

*H<sub>6a</sub>: Individuals located on multiple axes of oppression will be less likely to express anger.*

In contrast to these theories, equity (Hegtvedt 1990), gender inequality (Ross and Van Willigen 1996), and emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) theories would predict that women are more likely to express anger. This second group of theories is consistent with Black Feminist Thought, and like feeling, we expect people who are socially located on multiple axes of oppression will be more likely to express anger. These theories predict less powerful will express anger more due to strong feelings of inequity due to the burdens of their social positions.

*H<sub>4b</sub>: Women are more likely than men to express anger.*

*H<sub>5b</sub>: Racial minorities and economically disadvantaged are more likely than whites or economically advantaged to express anger.*

*H<sub>6b</sub>: Individuals located on multiple axes of oppression will be more likely to express anger.*

While the literature is conflicting on women's expression of anger, the literature does not address gender ideology. Underlying the clinical psychological literature is the idea of women's

passivity due to socialization, which is consistent with the “doing deference, gender, and difference” theories (Goffman 1959, 1967; West and Zimmerman 1987; and West and Fenstermaker 1995). Combine this with Hochschild’s (1975, 1977, 1983) ideas of emotion management, as well as affect control theory, and we see norms concerning interaction that at times can be based on gender ideology. Therefore, we might expect that traditional women will be less likely to express anger, potentially viewing such expression as “unladylike”.

*H<sub>7</sub>: Traditional women will be less likely than others to express anger.*

The literature is clearly inconsistent in terms of expression, but what might we expect in terms of to whom anger is expressed? While individuals with less status (women, racial minorities, and economically disadvantaged) may be more likely to express anger, they may express it in different ways. Several theories have implications for the direct or indirect expression of anger. Based on emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) and equity theory, especially the legitimacy and dependency components (Zelditch and Walker 1984; Ridgeway and Johnson 1990; Lovaglia and Houser 1996; Johnson, Ford, and Kaufman 2000), we would predict that less powerful people will be less likely to express anger directly to the person who made them mad. Conversely, more powerful people will be more likely to express anger directly towards the person who made them angry. These hypotheses follow:

*H<sub>8</sub>: Women are less likely than men to express anger directly.*

*H<sub>9</sub>: Racial minorities and economically disadvantaged are less likely than their higher status counterparts to express anger directly.*

*H<sub>10</sub>: Individuals located on multiple axes of oppression will be less likely to express anger directly.*

In the following sections, I will discuss the data, measures, and analyses. Then I will provide the results of the analyses and offer interpretations and theoretical conclusions.

## Methods

### *Data*

The General Social Survey (GSS) is a national survey administered by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago and is funded by the National Science Foundation. The GSS is a survey administered to a large, modified, multi-stage probability sample in the United States to gather data on trends in attitudes and behavior, as well as typical demographic data. Data are collected by in person interviews averaging 90 minutes. Respondents are asked core survey questions, as well as “topical modules” in which questions are asked around a special issue or topic. I utilize the 1996 General Social Survey, since that survey included a topical “Emotions” module regarding attitudes and behavior with anger (NORC website 2003), which was administered to 1460 respondents. Missing data reduced the sample to 1160 respondents.<sup>1</sup> Descriptive statistics for the sample are reported in table 1. I perform several analyses with this module, which I discuss in depth below following discussion of the measures.

*[Insert table 1 about here]*

### *Measures*

*Feeling-* “Feeling anger” or experiencing anger is measured using an additive scale of three variables. These variables include how often in the last seven days a respondent has: felt angry at someone, mad at someone, and outraged at someone. These variables satisfy standards of measurement to become a scale with a Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  of .84.

*Expression-* In addition to measuring feeling, I measure expression of anger. This is done using a single variable in which respondents report their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement “when I am angry I let people know.” I dichotomize this variable, creating the variable “express”, which is coded “1” for agree and “0” for disagree indicating whether the respondent

---

<sup>1</sup> Questions in the gender ideology scale were not asked of the full sample and their use in the analyses reduced the sample to 1278. Also, recoding of the variable measuring the expression of anger to omit people who neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement further reduced the sample to 1160. Loss of cases did not impact the results of the analyses.

agreed or disagreed with the statement. My analysis then is set up such that I am determining the likelihood of agreeing with the statement.

*Direct Expression-* The emotion module has a series of questions concerning how the respondent coped with their anger. Direct expression is measured by the respondent recalling the last incident in which they were angry and then his/her agreement or disagreement with responding to/coping with anger by “talking to the person who made me angry”.

*Gender ideology-* Gender ideology is measured with the GSS “sex role” scale, which includes questions about working women’s ability to establish bonds with children, preschool children suffering from women working, women’s “roles” in helping her husband’s career versus focusing on her own career, and a more general question on men and women belonging to separate “spheres” of work and home respectively. The scale is structured so that higher scores indicate more liberal gender ideologies. I should note a weakness in the scale is that the questions are quite overt in that people scoring lower, that is people who fall in the more traditional range in the scale (answering strongly agree to all items on the scale) will be *very* traditional.

### **Analyses**

#### *Feeling analysis-*

Most prior research has combined feeling and expression when measuring anger. Conceptually, theoretically, and empirically these are two different things that need to be analyzed distinctly and recent research has made this distinction (Simon and Nath 2004). In the first analyses, I test the effects of sex, race, and class on feeling anger.

In this analysis I use the standard variables for sex and race, though I eliminate the “other” race category since combining every race other than white or black has no real substantive meaning. I add subjective social class to the model based on a rich history of labor movements in the United States which has the underlying perception of working and lower classes as angry and middle and upper classes as more submissive (Fantasia 1988, Ransford 1972,

Sennett and Cobb 1972, Tolchin 1996). In addition to subjective social class, I add household income in dollars to the model as a measure of class<sup>2</sup>.

I control for several variables based on prior research. Respondent's age is included in the analysis based on the idea of "angry youth" (Ransford 1972, Shiemann 1999). Therefore I add it to the analysis to control for the effects of age on feeling anger. Some research suggests that the more education, the less likely a person experiences negative emotions, which may include anger (Ross and Van Willigen 1997) so I control for education (measured by number of years of education). Also, some research suggests mothers are more likely to "be" angry than fathers or non-parents (Ross and Van Willigen 1996). The number of children impacts this, with the likelihood of anger increasing with each child, therefore I control for the interaction between sex and the number of children. In addition I control for the interaction between sex and marital status since research suggests that women who are not married are more likely to feel negative emotions including anger (Simon 2002).

The distribution of the dependent variable is skewed; therefore I take the log of the feeling anger scale in the analyses<sup>3</sup>. Bivariate results are also given in table 1, which illustrate differences in sex, race, and class on feeling anger. There are small differences by sex and race in the frequency of feeling anger; however, this frequency increases as class status decreases. In other words, it appears that, on average, lower status individuals feel anger more frequently. In this analysis, I use five log-linear models to regress feeling anger on the explanatory variables in full sample of 1160 respondents. My first model consists only of the control variables. The second model adds sex, race, and class to determine the effects of status on feeling anger. The third model adds gender ideology to explore the effects, if any gender ideology will have on feeling anger. In the fourth model, I add the interaction between sex and gender ideology to see if

---

<sup>2</sup> To lessen the number of missing cases I impute the means (\$37,500) for missing cases. Income was logged in another analysis, but the results were the same. For ease in interpretation I use the original version of the variable.

<sup>3</sup> Analyses were also done with the variable as a Poisson distribution. The results did not change significantly, so I use the log of the variable for ease in interpretation.

women with a more traditional gender ideology feel anger less frequently. Finally, in the fifth model I intended to add interactions for sex, race, and, class to model two to determine interacting effects of status on feeling anger. Sample size for black respondents was too small to run interaction between sex and race, race and class, or all three. Therefore, I split the sample by sex creating a sample of 638 females and a sample of 522 males. I then ran parallel models for both samples. The first model was with the familial status, age, and education control variables. The second model added the social status variables, and in the final model I add gender ideology. This is done to see if variables have different effects for men and women.

#### *Expression analysis-*

In the expression analysis, I use logistic regression in five models of expressing anger on the full sample of 1160 respondents. The analysis is similar to the one above in that I am concerned with the effects of sex, race, and class. Only in this analysis I am concerned with their effects on the likelihood of expressing anger. The distribution of the dependent variable (which is dichotomous) indicates that a majority of respondents agree that they express their anger when they are mad. The bivariate results suggest some differences based on sex, race, or class in expressing anger with women, working class, and black respondents reporting the highest percentages of agreement with the question.

The models are similar to the previous analysis, except I control for the frequency of feeling anger. In the first model, I also control for age, education, interactions between sex and marital status, as well as between sex and number of children as I do in the first analysis. In the second model, I add sex, race, and class to examine the effects of status. In the third model, I add gender ideology to the second model to determine the effects of gender ideology on the expression of anger. In the next model, I add the interaction between sex and gender ideology to see if women with traditional gender ideology are less likely to express anger. Again in the fifth model I intended to add interactions for sex, race, and, class to model two to determine interacting effects of status on expressing anger. Sample size for black respondents was too small

to run interactions. Therefore, I split the sample and regressed the three parallel models just as I did in the feeling analysis on the expression of anger. This way, it can be determined if variables have different effects for men and women.

#### *Direct Expression Analysis-*

Finally, I use logistic regression with five models of expressing anger directly, that is, toward the person who made you angry. This question was only asked of respondent's who could recall the last time they were angry in the last week. Therefore, the 260 respondents who had not felt anger in the last week were omitted. Despite this change, the analysis is similar to the prior analyses, but shifting the focus towards the direction of the respondent's anger expression. Unlike the prior analysis, the majority of respondents indicate that they do not agree with the question. That is, they do not express anger directly. Further, unlike the prior analysis, bivariate results suggest there are very little sex, race, and gender differences with the exception of a much lower percentage of upper class respondents reporting they express anger directly. I use the same control variables as in the prior analyses. Then I add in the inequality variables, then the gender ideology scale, then the interaction between gender ideology and sex. As in prior analyses, due to sample limitations, I split the sample and regressed the three parallel models just as I did in the feeling analysis on the expression of anger. Next I will report the results from the analyses and then discuss the whether or not the hypotheses are supported by the results.

### **Descriptive Results**

#### *Feeling analysis*<sup>4</sup>-

The results of this analysis are presented in Table 2. The models in this analysis are all statistically significant; however, adding variables to the original model does little to increase  $R^2$  values. Additional models are not significantly better at predicting feeling anger. However, the

---

<sup>4</sup> It was not possible to do interaction effects in these analyses due to sample size limitations; therefore the full sample was split by sex since much of the literature focuses on gender. This is done to determine if social status has different effects on experiencing and expressing anger for males and females.

question in this analysis is how feeling anger may differ by social status, so it is useful and indeed necessary to interpret the models further. Across the models the control variables age, education and having a terminated marital status (divorced, widowed, or separated) are all significant. There is an inverse relationship between respondent's age and feeling anger, meaning with each additional year, respondents are predicted to feel less anger (the slope coefficient is  $-.085$ ). The relationship between education and feeling anger, as well as being divorced, widowed or separated and feeling anger, is positive (coefficient for the former is  $.117$  and for the latter is  $1.284$ ) indicating with each unit increase in education there is a predicted increase in feeling anger and respondents with terminated marital statuses report to feeling more anger than respondents who have never been married.

In terms of social status variables, working or middle class subjective social status is significant across all models, while lower class is nearly significant ( $.06$ ). The relationship between these variables and the reference group, upper class, is positive indicating that lower, working, and middle class respondents are report feeling more anger than upper class respondents. Race is not statistically significant in any of the models. Further, neither gender ideology nor the interaction of sex and gender ideology is significant in predicting feeling anger.

All the models were statistically significant within the female sample. As in the full sample, adding variables measuring social status did not improve the power to predict feeling anger. For females, age, education, and the number of children are significant across all models. Age is the only variable that has an inverse relationship with feeling anger, as was the case in the full sample. In addition to these control variables, being married or divorced significantly increases feelings of anger in the first model, which only included control variables. However, marital status loses significance with the addition of social status and then gender ideology in later models. Race, class, household income, and gender ideology are not significant in any of the models.

The results are quite different for male respondents. Unlike the female sample, age is the only control variable that is significant in any of the models. As in the full sample, there is an inverse relationship between age and feeling anger. Also unlike the female sample, subjective social class is statistically significant. Lower, working, and middle class respondents are predicted to feel more anger than their upper class counterparts. Household income and gender ideology are not significant in predicting feeling anger for males. In sum, women with more education, more children and/or are married or divorced feel more anger while men in lower social classes feel more anger. Race is not associated with feeling anger.

*[insert table 2a and 2b about here]*

#### *Expression analysis-*

The results for the expression analysis are presented in Table 3. Again the models in this analysis are all statistically significant. Unlike the prior analysis, adding the social status variables to the original control model does increase the ability to predict the likelihood of expressing anger. Incremental  $\chi^2$  tests show increased prediction power when adding gender ideology. The final model in this analysis, which added the interaction between sex and gender ideology, did not improve prediction power and the interaction was not significant. Across all models, the controls for age and feeling anger are significant. As in the prior analysis, there is an inverse relationship between age and expressing anger. The relationship between feeling anger and expressing it is positive, meaning respondents who feel anger more frequently are predicted to be more likely to express it. Education is significant in the control model, but loses significance with the addition of race and class. Social status variables likely explain the effect of education on expressing anger. Social class and household income are not significant in any of the models, but race is with black respondents predicted to be approximately 1.6 times as likely as white respondents to express anger. Also, gender ideology is significant and has a positive relationship with expressing anger, meaning those with more liberal gender ideologies, irrespective of sex, are predicted to be more likely to express anger.

All the models in the analysis with the female sample are significant. Adding social status variables and gender ideology do not improve the prediction power. Across the models, age is the only variable that is significant and like the other analyses there is an inverse relationship. None of the variables measuring familial or social status or gender ideology are significant in predicting the likelihood that women express anger. While feeling anger is not significantly associated with expressing anger, the coefficient is nearly identical to the full sample and male coefficients.

The results, again, are quite different in the male sample. All models are significant at the .01 level and adding the social status and gender variables does increase the predictive power. Among men age is the only control variable that is significant and it is only significant in the control model. Age loses significance when the variables measuring social status and gender ideology are added to the models. None of the variables indicating familial status, social class, or household income are significant. Race is significant with black male respondents predicted to be approximately 2.5 times as likely as white males to express anger. Gender ideology is also significant with males with more liberal gender ideology predicted to be 1.26 times as likely as more traditional males to express anger. Feeling anger is not significant in predicting the expression of anger, but again the coefficients are nearly identical to the other samples.

*[insert table 3a and 3b about here]*

#### *Direct Expression Analysis-*

The results for the direct analysis are presented in Table 4. Each model is statistically significant, the control model at the .05 level and subsequent models at the .01 level. Again, incremental  $\chi^2$  tests were conducted to see if adding variables in subsequent models statistically improved the ability to predict the likelihood the respondent would express their anger directly. Adding social status variables improved the prediction power, but adding gender ideology and then the interaction between gender ideology and sex did not improve the ability to predict the direct expression of anger. As in previous analyses, age was significant across all the models and has an inverse relationship with the likelihood of expressing anger directly. Of the explanatory

variables both subjective social class and household income are significant<sup>5</sup>. Lower class respondents are predicted to be 3.5 times as likely as upper class respondents to express anger directly and higher income women are predicted to be more likely to express anger directly. Working and middle class respondents are predicted to be 2.5 times as likely as upper class respondents to predict anger directly. Race, gender ideology, and the interaction between sex and gender ideology were not significant in this analysis.

In the female sample, the control variables do little to help predict the direct expression of anger. In fact, the model and all of the control variables are not significant. The model adding the social status variables is significant. Adding gender ideology does not increase predictive power and the variable is not significant. However, higher household income and being lower class is significant with lower class female respondents predicted to be 4 times as likely as upper class females to express anger directly. It seems the extremes of social class are significant with higher income women and lower subjective social class women expressing anger more directly. None of the models with the male sample were statistically significant, which could be due to sample size limitations.

*[insert table 4a and 4b about here]*

### **Discussion of Results and Hypotheses**

*Feeling:* Do people at the bottom of the social hierarchy feel more anger? The literature only focuses on women, but this analysis tested the experience of anger by gender, race, and class. The first hypotheses predicted that lower social status individuals feel or experience anger. Hypothesis one was based on equity (Hegtvedt 1990), gender inequality (Ross and Van Willigen 1996), and emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) theories. I predicted that women are more

---

<sup>5</sup> Maximum likelihood estimates for household income in all direct expression analyses were so small the logged odds ratios cannot be computed.

likely to feel anger. This hypothesis was not supported in this sample as gender was not significant in any of the models.

The second hypothesis extended the underlying logic of inequity theories predicting that racial minorities and people with economic disadvantages will also be more likely to feel anger. This hypothesis was partially supported. Race was not significant in any of the models, however being working or middle class was significant and lower class was close to significance. The results indicate that lower, working, and middle class respondents are predicted to feel anger 1.5 to 1.75 times more in a seven days period than those who are upper class.

The third hypothesis, consistent with Black Feminist Thought, predicted that people who are socially located on multiple axes of oppression (for instance black women or poor white women) will be more likely to feel anger. While I could not do intersections with the full sample, comparing the results for the split sample are quite revealing. All of the control variables, which included familial status, number of children, age and education, were significant in the first model for women, but only age was significant for men. Familial status loses significance for women once social status variables are added suggesting that race, class, and household income inequality explains some of the effect of familial status on women's anger, despite none of these variables being significant. Class is strongly significant but only for men, with lower class men predicted to experience anger five times more a week than upper class men, and working and middle class men predicted to experience anger three times more a week than upper class men.

While gender was not significant in predicting feeling anger, these finding suggests that men and women experience anger for somewhat different reasons. Women feel anger more in terms of family matters (though the effect of marital status lessens when social status variables are added), which is consistent with gender inequality and equity theories. It would appear that men experience anger more in terms of social class, which is also consistent with equity and inequality theories. Clearly, there seem to be different effects by gender that need more research in the future. Significance comparisons of the slope coefficients reveals that education, number of

children, household income and gender ideology have different effects for men and women.

Interestingly race also a different effect for men and women, but only when gender ideology was added to the models.

*Expression:* Next I formulated several competing hypotheses about the expression of anger, which were tested in the second set of analyses. There are two contrasting groups of theories for the expression of anger. The first includes theories of doing deference, gender, or difference (Goffman 1959, 1967; West and Zimmerman 1987; and West and Fenstermaker 1995), as well as affect control theory (Heise 1977, Smith-Lovin and Heise 1988, Smith-Lovin 1990). These theories suggest that women and/or people with less power will be less likely to express their anger. The first hypothesis tested in this analysis, hypothesis 4a, was that women were less likely than men to express anger. As in the first analysis, gender was not significant in any of the models and therefore this hypothesis was not supported. Women and men are similarly likely to express anger, contrary to this group of theories. The second group of theories contrasts with the first group of theories. Equity (Hegtvedt 1990), gender inequality (Ross and Van Willigen 1996), and emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) theories predicted that women are more likely to express anger, hypothesis 4b. Again gender is not significant, this hypothesis is not supported. Women are no more or less likely to express anger than men.

Hypothesis 5a, predicted that racial minorities and economically disadvantaged individuals would be less likely than their higher status counterparts to express anger. This hypothesis was not supported as blacks are predicted to be 1.6 times as likely as whites to express anger and social class and household income are not significant. In hypothesis 5b, I predicted that based on equity (Hegtvedt 1990), gender inequality (Ross and Van Willigen 1996), and emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) theories, racial minorities and economically disadvantaged individuals would also be more likely to express anger, compared to their higher status counterparts. The findings support this hypothesis for blacks (1.6 times as likely as whites to express anger), but not for the economically disadvantaged.

The second group of theories is consistent with Black Feminist Thought, and predicts people who are socially located on multiple axes of oppression will be more likely to express anger, hypothesis 6b, while theories of doing deference would predict that individuals experiencing multiple oppressions would be less likely to express anger, hypothesis 6a. The split samples of men and women were used to test these hypotheses. Neither hypothesis was supported. For females, race, class, and household income were not significant. However, interestingly race was significant for men, despite a very small sample of black men (only 56). Black men are predicted to be 2.5 times as likely as white men to express anger when they are mad.

Finally, while the literature did not directly discuss gender ideology and anger, extending the logic of clinical psychological literature with women's passivity due to gender socialization, which is consistent with the "doing deference, gender, and difference" theories (Goffman 1959, 1967; West and Zimmerman 1987; and West and Fenstermaker 1995) and combining this with Hochschild's (1975, 1977, 1983) ideas of emotion management, as well as affect control theory, I expect norms concerning interaction to be based on gender ideology. Therefore, in hypothesis seven, I predicted that traditional women are less likely to express anger, perhaps viewing such expression as "unladylike".

In the full sample, gender ideology by itself was significant, with people with more liberal gender ideologies predicted to express anger more than people with less liberal ideologies. In the split samples, gender ideology was not significant for women, meaning the hypothesis was not supported that more traditional women are less likely to express anger. However, gender ideology was significant for men and men with more liberal ideology are predicted to express their anger more. There is no theory or hypothesis concerning this finding and in ways it seems counter-intuitive as we might expect more traditionally gendered men to express anger more. Future research should explore this and perhaps this finding could be biased as a result of limitations of the gender ideology scale used in this analysis, since the scale overestimates

liberalism in gender ideology. Questions in the GSS gender ideology scale concern working women and the effects of women's labor force participation on the family. Since women's labor force participation is becoming normative, a more adequate scale would address other ways in which individuals are traditional, such as the division of household labor and parenting.

Comparing the slope coefficients for statistical significant differences between men and women illustrates that certain variables do have different effects for men and women despite the odds ratios being similar. Consistent with prior research (Mirowsky and Ross 1995, Ross and Van Willigen 1996) I find that the number of children and marital status have different effects on the expression of anger for men and women. Also, middle class status (and working class status at the .10 level) has different effects for men and women. Again, this suggests that women may feel and express anger more in terms of inequities in the home while men feel and express anger in relation to social class status.

*Direct Expression:* The hypotheses tested in this analysis, eight and nine, were that women are less likely than men to express anger directly and racial and class minorities would be less likely than their higher status counterparts to express anger directly. These hypotheses were based on emotion management theory (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) and power and legitimacy theories coming out of equity theory (Zelditch and Walker 1984; Ridgeway and Johnson 1990; Lovaglia and Houser 1996; Johnson, Ford, and Kaufman 2000). Again, gender was not significant. Women are not more or less likely to express anger directly. Hypothesis eight and emotion management were not supported in these findings. Race was also not significant, but social class and household income were significant. However, this significance does not support hypothesis nine. In fact it supports the opposite, that is, lower class individuals are predicted to be more than 3.5 times as likely as upper class to express anger directly. Working and middle class individuals are predicted to be around 2.5 times as likely as upper class to express anger directly. This finding was surprising given much of the literature on anger really focuses on less powerful people

suppressing their emotions. Perhaps politeness norms exist among the upper class such that they do not express anger directly. Future research would have to examine this suggestion.

In hypothesis ten, consistent with emotion management theory (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) and power and legitimacy theories coming out of equity theory (Zelditch and Walker 1984; Ridgeway and Johnson 1990; Lovaglia and Houser 1996; Johnson, Ford, and Kaufman 2000), I predicted that people on multiple axes of oppression would be less likely to express anger directly. I regressed three models on the male and female samples. Models for the men were not significant, suggesting there is much to be learned about to whom men express their anger. Only a few models were significant for women. Unlike the prior analyses where the control variables were significant, the control model was not significant in this analysis. However, models that included social status variables were significant with lower class and household income variables significant. Lower class women, unexpectedly, were four times as likely as upper class women to express anger directly. In other words, contrary to the prediction from the sociological literature, (but perhaps pleasing to Black Feminists considering bell hooks plea for expressing anger) economically disadvantaged women do express their anger directly. This lends further evidence to my suggestion that there may be politeness norms at play here for upper class women. Again, future research should explore this.

Again comparing the coefficients for men and women is revealing. Age, number of children, having a interrupted marital status (divorced, separated, or widowed), and education have significantly differences on the direct expression of anger for men and women. Adding inequality (social status) variables to the models results in the difference in being married being nearly significant at the .05 level (but significant at the .10 level) and the effect of the control for feeling anger becoming significantly different for men and women. Perhaps the most interesting differences are in the effects of variables in the third model, which added gender ideology. Marital status, being middle class, and gender ideology are all significantly different for women and men. This suggests that politeness norms may indeed be in play and that married women with

higher social statuses, even if they appear more liberal in their gender ideology, are inhibited in their direct expression of anger. Future research should explore these interactions more.

### **Conclusions**

I began this paper with the belief that the expression of anger may be a potential useful tool for everyday resistance, interactional resistance, or as an impetus for large-scale social change. Therefore, the central goal in this paper was to see how individuals in different social statuses experience or express anger. Anger cannot be directed towards social change unless those who are oppressed feel it. The first question was do less powerful individuals feel more anger? The answer is more complicated than a simple yes or no. Equity, gender inequality, and emotion management theories would lead us to predict that less powerful people would feel more anger. These theories take the approach that for people at the bottom of the social hierarchy that anger is a response to inequity, inequality and/or injustice. Similar to Black Feminist Thought, these people will be “tired of giving in” like Rosa Parks (2000 p. 61) or just feel that “this shit has got to be different, let me get out there” like Barbara Smith (2000). The full sample results suggest that individuals with less class power feel more anger, but that this is not true for women or for racial minorities. The split sample and slope coefficient comparison results illustrate that this subjective social class significance is actually found among men, but not among women. Family size and structure and education are better predictors of women feeling anger, but inequality, per se, does not predict anger. However, class inequality does lead to angry men.

These gender differences represent how the home is an important site of women’s anger while social status is for men. Sociologists have been writing about inequity in the division of labor for years, this research suggests some women are getting angry at what used to be an accepted gender expectation, female domesticity. Future research should explore these findings, especially given more and more women are entering the labor force and this manifestation of gender inequality will only be exacerbated. In terms of men’s anger and social status, this may be

tied to gender and men's perceived role as provider, which may be harder and harder for men of the lower classes to achieve. Future research should explore male masculine identity and anger.

The second question was, do less powerful individuals express anger more or do they suppress their anger? The answer again is complex. There were two contradicting hypotheses for the expression of anger. Theories of doing deference, gender, or difference (Goffman 1959, 1967; West and Zimmerman 1987; and West and Fenstermaker 1995), as well as affect control theory (Heise 1977, Smith-Lovin and Heise 1988, Smith-Lovin 1990) suggest that women and/or people with less power will be less likely to express and more likely to suppress their anger. In contrast to these theories, equity (Hegtvedt 1990), gender inequality (Ross and Van Willigen 1996), and emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) theories predicted that women, and others with less power, are more likely to feel *and* express anger. Findings for the full sample and the male sample for race support the second group of theories, not the first. Blacks, particularly black males, are predicted to be more likely to express anger. Class and gender were not significant therefore neither group of theories was supported for these status groups. It does appear, however, that familial status and social status have different effects on the expression of anger for men and women, which was evident in the slope comparisons.

One finding is clear, there is still little we know about the expression of anger. I suspect that whether or not someone expresses anger is likely highly contextual and depends on why the person is angry and with whom they are angry. The current data is limited in exploring this, however recent research by Sloan (2004) suggests she has access qualitative data from the 1996 GSS Emotion module that could be used to increase our understanding of the expression of anger in certain contexts.

The last question was if lower status people express their anger do they confront the person who made them mad or direct their anger elsewhere? Emotion management (Hochschild 1975, 1977, 1983) and legitimacy and dependency theories (Zelditch and Walker 1984; Ridgeway and Johnson 1990; Lovaglia and Houser 1996; Johnson, Ford, and Kaufman 2000) suggested that

less powerful people may be more likely to express that anger indirectly. This was not supported in this analysis. In fact, just the opposite was true for subjective social class in the full sample where lower, working, and middle class respondents were predicted to be more likely than upper class respondents to express anger directly. For the female sample, surprisingly, lower class status was significant again with lower class women predicted to be more than four times as likely as upper class women to express anger directly (none of the models in this analysis were significant for the male sample). This result suggests the opposite of what was predicted in the hypotheses. Again, context likely matters and better data can help future research explore to whom anger is expressed and in what contexts.

Despite the lack of gender differences in men and women feeling or expressing anger, cultural beliefs persist. Perhaps these cultural beliefs are due to differences in how anger expression is perceived based on the individual who is expressing the anger. If anger is a privilege for more powerful people, the expression and justification of their anger is given credibility and worth (Ross and Van Willigen 1996 and Hegtvold and Killian 1999). For example, Hartfield (1995) observes a double standard applied in our judicial system. In cases where a man is angered by catching his wife in an adulterous act, anger is used as a justification for crime, a so-called “crime of passion”. In contrast, a woman who is angered by prolonged abuse in a domestic violence situation is not allowed to use her anger to be a justification for any crime against her abuser (Hartfield 1995). The only exception is if a woman acts in self-defense, her abuser must be assaulting her at the time of the crime, which allows her the ability to “fight back”.

Findings for women indicate that familial status and education are the best predictors of women feeling anger. Again, it is possible inequities in household division of labor and parenting responsibilities may be a source for this anger. Predicting women’s expression of anger proves more difficult. The only thing that was a significant predictor was age, while the slope comparisons suggests that familial status and social status have different effect on the

expression of anger for men and women. Perhaps the most surprising finding in all of the analyses was the extent to which lower class women were more likely to directly express anger compared to upper class women (more than four times as likely). Looking at the findings for females across analyses reveals an interesting avenue for future research. While familial size and structure was important for women feeling anger, it was not for expressing or directly expressing anger. However, the slope comparisons reveal these factors affect women and men differently in their direct expression of anger. I suspect that women's expression and direct expression of anger is highly contextual. This finding raises questions about family relationships and women's ability to express anger at home. Future research should explore more situational contexts such as inequities in the home including dependency on and legitimacy of spouses. Also, the finding of lower class women's direct expression of anger may also be both related and revealing. Since lower class women are more likely to be unmarried, it is possible they do not have the expectations regarding equity in household labor or childcare nor do they have dependency on a spouse. Therefore, women in these position may not have the same norms around family and directly expressing anger. Future research should explore this.

For males, it is clear that social class matters in feeling anger. This is not, however, the case for expressing anger. For expressing anger, only race was significant with black males predicted to be nearly two and a half times as likely as white males to express anger. It is possible there is an interaction between race and class, but I was unable to test this given limitations in the data (N=56 for the black male sample). This limitation repeated itself in the direct expression analysis where none of the models were statistically significant.

To further understand anger, future research should explore reactions to the expression of anger. A step in this direction could be as simple as asking questions such as "how did the person who made you mad react when you expressed your anger?" Future research should also address the perceptions of anger based on who is expressing it, thereby empirically testing this notion of anger privilege. Understanding anger privilege and how anger expression is perceived has many

implications. Research has shown that women are both angry and depressed, yet no research that I am aware of has really explored how the emotions relate. It could be women are depressed due to expressing anger that is not heard and their conflict is not resolved. Another implication in understanding anger privilege is for resisting inequality. Anger can only be a valuable tool in creating social change through redefinition, visibility, and social mobilization. Therefore, it is both necessary and crucial to any social justice movement to first increase our understanding of anger and then to examine the role of anger as a tool.

## References

- Averill, James. 1980. "A Constructivist View of Emotions." in *Theories of Emotion*. Plutchick, R and H Kellerman (eds.) Pp. 305-339. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Calloway, Carolyn. 1977. "Group Cohesiveness in the Black Panther Party." *Journal of Black Studies* 8: 55-74.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Conger, Rand, Frederick Lorenz, Glen Elder, Jr., Ronald Simons, and Xiaojia Ge. 1993. "Husband and Wife Differences in Response to Undesirable Life Events." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 34: 71-88.
- Cox, Debra, Sally Stabb, and Karin Bruckner. 1999. *Women's Anger: Clinical and Developmental Perspectives*. Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.
- Emerson, Richard. 1962. "Power Dependence Relations." *American Sociological Review* 27: 31-40.
- Fantasia, Rick. 1988. *Cultures of Solidarity: Consciousness, Action, and Contemporary American Workers*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fisher, Gene A. and Kyum Koo Chon. 1989. "Durkheim and the Social Construction of Emotions." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 52:1-9.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and Anna Leon-Guerrero. 2000. *Social Statistics for a Diverse Society*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Pine Forge Press.
- Frye, Marilyn. 1983. *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

- Glassner, Barry. 1999. *Culture of Fear: Why American are Afraid of the Wrong Things*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor.
- Goffman, Erving. 1967. *The Interaction Ritual*. New York: Pantheon.
- Halas, Celia. 1981. *Why Can't a Woman be More Like a Man?* New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Hartfield, Bernadette. 1995. "A Response to Maris Lugones's 'Hard-to-Handle Anger'." In L. Bell & D. Blumenfeld (Eds.), *Overcoming Racism and Sexism* (pp. 219-226). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Hegtvedt, Karen. 1990. "The Effects of Relationship Structure on Emotional Responses to Inequity." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 53: 214-228.
- Hegtvedt, Karen and Caitlin Killian. 1999. "Fairness and Emotions: Reactions to the Process and Outcomes of Negotiations." *Social Forces* 78: 269-302.
- Heise, David. 1977. "Social Action as the Control of Affect." *Behavioral Science* 22: 163-177.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1975. "The Sociology of feeling and emotion." In *Another Voice*, Milman, M and R. Kanter (eds.) pp. 280-307. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1977. "Emotion work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure." *American Journal of Sociology* 85: 551-575.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1983. *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, Ca: University of California Press.
- Homans, George. 1974. *Social Behavior: It's Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- hooks, bell. 1995. *Killing Rage: Ending Racism*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- hooks, bell. 2000. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Johnson, Cathryn, Rebecca Ford, and Joanne Kaufman. 2000. "Emotional Reactions to Conflict: Do Dependence and Legitimacy Matter?" *Social Forces* 79:107-137.

- Kemper, Theodore. 1978. "Toward a Sociological Theory of Emotions: Some Problems and Some Solutions." *The American Sociologist* 13: 30-41.
- Kemper, Theodore. 1981. "Social Constructionist and Positivist Approaches to the Sociology of Emotions." *American Journal of Sociology* 87: 336-362.
- Kochman, Thomas. *Black and White Styles in Conflict*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lerner, Harriet. 1980. "Internal Prohibitions Against Female Anger." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis* 40: 137-148.
- Lorde, Audre. 1977. *Sister Outsider*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.
- Lovaglia, Michael, and Jeffrey Houser. 1996. "Emotional reaction to Status in Groups." *American Sociological Review* 61: 867-883.
- Lugones, Maria. 1995. "Hard-to-Handle Anger". In L. Bell & D. Blumenfeld (Eds.), *Overcoming Racism and Sexism* (pp. 203-217). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Menard, Scott W. 1995. *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Mirowsky, John and Catherine Ross. 1995. "Sex Differences in Distress: Real or Artifact?" *American Sociological Review* 60: 449-468.
- National Opinion Research Center (NORC) Website. 2003.  
<http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/projects/gensoc1.asp>
- Parks, Rosa. 2000. "Tired of Giving In." In B. Collier-Thomas & V.P. Franklin (Eds.), *Sisters in the Struggle: African American Women in the Civil Rights- Black Power Movement* (pp. 61-74). New York: New York University Press.
- Ransford, H. Edward. 1972. "Blue Collar Anger: Reactions to Student and Black Protest." *American Sociological Review* 37:333-346.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia and Cathryn Johnson. 1990. "What is the Relationship Between Socioemotional Behavior and Status in Task Groups?" *The American Journal of Sociology* 95: 1189-1212.

- Ridgeway, Cecilia and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1999. "The Gender System and Interaction." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25: 191-216.
- Ross, Catherine and Joan Huber. 1985. "Hardship and Depression." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 26: 312-327.
- Ross, Catherine and Marieke Van Willigen. 1996. "Gender, Parenthood, and Anger." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58: 572-584.
- Scheff, Thomas. 1983. "Toward Integration in the Social Psychology of Emotions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9: 333-354.
- Scheff, Thomas. 1986. "Micro-Linguistics and Social Structure: A Theory of Social Action." *Sociological Theory* 4: 71-83.
- Sennett, Richard and Jonathan Cobb. 1972. *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Shott, Susan. 1979. "Emotion and Social Life: A symbolic Interactionists Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 84: 1317-1334.
- Simon, Robin W. 2002. Revisiting the Relationship between Gender, Marital Status and Mental Health." *American Journal of Sociology* 107:1065-96.
- Simon, Robin W. and Leda E. Nath. 2004. "Gender and Emotion in the United States: Do Men and Women Differ in Self-Reports of Feelings and Expressive Behavior?" *American Journal of Sociology* 109:1137-1176.
- Smith, Barbara. 2000. "Black Lesbian/Feminist Organizing: A Conversation". In *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology* (pp. 285- 311). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers.
- Smith-Lovin, Lynn and David Heise. 1988. *Analyzing Social Interaction: Advances in Affect Control Theory*. New York, NY: Gordon and Breach.
- Smith-Lovin, Lynn. "Emotion as the Confirmation and Disconfirmation of Identity: An Affect Control Model." In *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*. Theodore Kemper (ed.) pp. 238-270. New York: SUNY Press.

- Thoits, Peggy. 1985. "Self-labeling Processes in Mental Illness: The Role of Emotional Deviance." *American Journal of Sociology* 91: 221-49.
- Thoits, Peggy. 1989. "The Sociology of Emotions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 15: 317-342.
- Thomas, S.P. 1993, "Anger and its Manifestations in Women. In S.P. Thomas (ed.), *Women and Anger* (pp. 40-67). New York: Springer.
- Tolchin, S. 1996. *The Angry American: How Voter Rage is Changing the Nation*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Troyer, Lisa and Wesley Younts. 1997. "Whose Expectations Matter? The Relative Power of First- and Second-Order Expectations in Determining Social Influence." *American Journal of Sociology* 103:692-732.
- West, Candace and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing Difference." *Gender and Society* 9:8-37.
- West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1:125-151.
- Zelditch, Morris and Henry Walker. 1984. "Legitimacy and Stability of Authority." In *Advances in Group Processes: Theory and Research*. Vol. 1 pp. 1-27. Lawler, Edward (ed.) JAI Press.

Table 1: Descriptive Univariate and Bivariate Statistics for Explanatory Variables in Full Sample

| Independent Variables   | Descriptive Statistics |                     |                           |                                    |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                         | Univariate             | Feeling Anger Scale | Agree to Expressing Anger | Agree to Directly Expressing Anger |
| Sex                     |                        |                     |                           |                                    |
| Male                    | 45%                    | 4.84 (4.99)         | 65%                       | 36%                                |
| Female                  | 55%                    | 4.80 (4.95)         | 71%                       | 39%                                |
| Race                    |                        |                     |                           |                                    |
| White                   | 86.21%                 | 4.80 (4.98)         | 66%                       | 38%                                |
| Black                   | 13.79%                 | 4.93 (4.91)         | 79%                       | 37%                                |
| Subjective Social Class |                        |                     |                           |                                    |
| Lower                   | 6.12%                  | 5.27 (5.28)         | 68%                       | 40%                                |
| Working                 | 44.57%                 | 5.02 (5.03)         | 73%                       | 36%                                |
| Middle                  | 46.03%                 | 4.64 (4.90)         | 63%                       | 40%                                |
| Upper                   | 3.26%                  | 3.68 (4.19)         | 63%                       | 25%                                |
| Household Income        |                        |                     |                           |                                    |
|                         | 39,939 <sup>1</sup>    |                     |                           |                                    |
| Above/Equal to Mean     |                        | 4.80 (4.90)         | 69%                       | 43%                                |
| Below Mean              |                        | 4.84 (5.03)         | 67%                       | 32%                                |
| Gender Ideology         |                        |                     |                           |                                    |
|                         | 3.434 <sup>1</sup>     |                     |                           |                                    |
| Above/ Equal to Mean    |                        | 5.03 (5.02)         | 71%                       | 40%                                |
| Below Mean              |                        | 4.54 (4.88)         | 64%                       | 35%                                |

Note: N=1160. 1996 General Social Survey. Values are means unless in parentheses (standard deviations) or given in percentages. Descriptive Statistics for control variables available upon request.

<sup>1</sup>Values given are overall means in univariate column and category means for feeling anger in the feeling anger column. Standard deviations are in parentheses.

Table 2a: Multiple Regression of Social Status Variables on Feeling Anger for Full Sample

| Variable                     | Model 1 | Model 2            | Model 3            | Model 4            |
|------------------------------|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Model R <sup>2</sup>         | .0909*  | *.0961             | .0962*             | .0980*             |
| Age                          | -.0865* | -.0856*            | -.0847*            | -.0842*            |
| Number of Children           | .0966   | .1129              | .1132              | .0973              |
| Married                      | .4091   | .3097              | .3232              | .2277              |
| Divorced, Separated, Widowed | 1.337*  | 1.284*             | 1.282*             | 1.227*             |
| Number of Children* Female   | .1091   | -.6096             | .1256              | .1519              |
| Married*Sex                  | .5889   | .5285              | .5239              | .6730              |
| Div/Wid/Sep* Female          | -.5437  | -.6096             | -.6072             | -.4853             |
| Education                    | .1024*  | .1167*             | .1136*             | .1139*             |
| Female                       | -.3495  | -.2880             | -.3092             | -1.926             |
| Black                        |         | -.5347             | -.5495             | -.5429             |
| Subjective Social Class      |         |                    |                    |                    |
| Lower                        |         | 1.737 <sup>1</sup> | 1.761 <sup>1</sup> | 1.756 <sup>1</sup> |
| Working                      |         | 1.658*             | 1.669*             | 1.669*             |
| Middle                       |         | 1.494*             | 1.509*             | 1.497*             |
| Household Income             |         | .00157             | .00141             | .00151             |
| Gender Ideology              |         |                    | .0569              | -.1784             |
| Gender Ideology*Female       |         |                    |                    | .4295              |

Note: N= 1160. 1996 General Social Survey. All coefficients are non-standardized. \* indicates p< .05. <sup>1</sup>Lower class had a p=.0575 to .06 so was near significance.

Table 2b: Multiple Regression of Social Status Variables on Feeling Anger for Female and Male Samples

| Variable                     | Model 1<br>Female   | Males              | Model 2<br>Females | Males                | Model 3<br>Females | Males                |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Model R <sup>2</sup>         | .1129*              | .0686*             | .1155*             | .0918*               | .1165*             | .0919*               |
| Age                          | -.0901*             | -.0809*            | -.0895*            | -.0813*              | -.0865*            | -.0820*              |
| Number of Children           | .2387*              | .0628 <sup>1</sup> | .2571*             | .0944                | .2574*             | .0939                |
| Married                      | 1.038*              | .3683              | .9033              | .2181                | .9306              | .2054                |
| Divorced, Separated, Widowed | .9075*              | 1.230              | .8549              | 1.121                | .8548              | 1.123                |
| Education                    | .1024* <sup>1</sup> | .0357              | .1552*             | .0619 <sup>1</sup>   | .1453*             | .0649                |
| Black                        |                     |                    | -.2296             | -.8922               | -.2657             | -.8747 <sup>1</sup>  |
| Subjective Social Class      |                     |                    |                    |                      |                    |                      |
| Lower                        |                     |                    | -.1345             | 4.824*               | -.0881             | 4.790*               |
| Working                      |                     |                    | .5981              | 3.130*               | .6191              | 3.113*               |
| Middle                       |                     |                    | .3752              | 3.067*               | .4025              | 3.045                |
| Household Income             |                     |                    | .00198             | .000248 <sup>1</sup> | .00151             | .000408 <sup>1</sup> |
| Gender Ideology              |                     |                    |                    |                      | .1752              | -.0523 <sup>1</sup>  |

Note: N= 638 for females and 522 for males. 1996 General Social Survey. All coefficients are non-standardized. \* indicates  $p < .05$ . <sup>1</sup> The effect of this variable is significantly different for females and males.

Table 3a: Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimates for the Expression of Anger for Full Sample

| Variable                     | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Model $\chi^2$               | 37.95*  | 49.87*  | 53.65*  | 54.36*  |
| Age                          | .982*   | .985*   | .988*   | .987*   |
| Number of Children           | .988    | .971    | .972    | .977    |
| Married                      | 1.094   | 1.142   | 1.185   | 1.217   |
| Divorced, Separated, Widowed | 1.403   | 1.462   | 1.457   | 1.482   |
| Number of Children* Female   | 1.074   | 1.078   | 1.077   | 1.069   |
| Married*Sex                  | .697    | .739    | .730    | .700    |
| Div/Wid/Sep* Female          | .610    | .634    | .638    | .614    |
| Education                    | .950*   | .964    | .956    | .956    |
| Female                       | 1.541   | 1.443   | 1.368   | 2.152   |
| Feeling Anger(log)           | 1.031*  | 1.033*  | 1.032*  | 1.033*  |
| Black                        |         | 1.692*  | 1.622*  | 1.619*  |
| Subjective Social Class      |         |         |         |         |
| Lower                        |         | .976    | 1.042   | 1.042   |
| Working                      |         | 1.320   | 1.367   | 1.366   |
| Middle                       |         | .958    | .998    | 1.000   |
| Household Income             |         | 1.002   | 1.001   | 1.001   |
| Gender Ideology              |         |         | 1.162*  | 1.240*  |
| Gender Ideology*Female       |         |         |         | .886    |

Note: N= 1160. 1996 General Social Survey. All coefficients are non-standardized. \* indicates p<.05.

Table 3b: Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimates for the Expression of Anger for Female and Male Samples

| Variable                     | Model 1<br>Female | Males              | Model 2<br>Females | Males              | Model 3<br>Females | Males              |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Model $\chi^2$               | 18.24*            | 15.64*             | 22.47*             | 26.91*             | 23.07*             | 30.97*             |
| Age                          | .982*             | .983*              | .984*              | .986               | .985               | .989 <sup>2</sup>  |
| Number of Children           | 1.063             | .986 <sup>2</sup>  | 1.055              | .957 <sup>2</sup>  | 1.055              | .960 <sup>2</sup>  |
| Married                      | .767              | 1.089 <sup>2</sup> | .766               | 1.227 <sup>2</sup> | .777               | 1.306 <sup>2</sup> |
| Divorced, Separated, Widowed | .863              | 1.391 <sup>2</sup> | .887               | 1.498 <sup>2</sup> | .887               | 1.498 <sup>2</sup> |
| Education                    | .953              | .948               | .958               | .967               | .954               | .955               |
| Feeling Anger(log)           | 1.029             | 1.034              | 1.028              | 1.037              | 1.028              | 1.037              |
| Black                        |                   |                    | 1.324              | 2.515*             | 1.299              | 2.333*             |
| Subjective Social Class      |                   |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |
| Lower                        |                   |                    | .769               | 1.278              | .785               | 1.484              |
| Working                      |                   |                    | .929               | 2.029 <sup>3</sup> | .938               | 2.207 <sup>3</sup> |
| Middle                       |                   |                    | .686               | 1.460 <sup>2</sup> | .694               | 1.607 <sup>2</sup> |
| Household Income             |                   |                    | 1.003              | 1.00 <sup>1</sup>  | 1.002              | 1.00 <sup>1</sup>  |
| Gender Ideology              |                   |                    |                    |                    | 1.086              | 1.257*             |

Note: N= 638 females and 522 males. 1996 General Social Survey. All coefficients are non-standardized. \* indicates  $p < .05$ . <sup>1</sup>Maximum likelihood est. were so low odds ratios for household income were reported as 1.00. <sup>2</sup> This variable had significantly different effects by sex at the .05 level. <sup>3</sup> at the .10 level.

Table 4a: Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimates for the Direct Expression of Anger for Full Sample

| Variable                     | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Model $\chi^2$               | 20.07*  | 33.23*  | 33.23*  | 33.79*  |
| Age                          | .988*   | .988*   | .988*   | .988*   |
| Number of Children           | .973    | .984    | .984    | .989    |
| Married                      | 1.376   | 1.154   | 1.153   | 1.183   |
| Divorced, Separated, Widowed | 1.520   | 1.470   | 1.470   | 1.486   |
| Number of Children*Female    | .986    | .976    | .976    | .970    |
| Married*Sex                  | .927    | .920    | .920    | .882    |
| Div/Wid/Sep* Female          | .549    | .552    | .552    | .537    |
| Education                    | 1.031   | 1.013   | 1.013   | 1.013   |
| Female                       | 1.480   | 1.556   | 1.558   | 2.445   |
| Feeling Anger(log)           | 1.018   | 1.016   | 1.016   | 1.017   |
| Black                        |         | 1.027   | 1.028   | 1.026   |
| Subjective Social Class      |         |         |         |         |
| Lower                        |         | 3.571*  | 3.566*  | 3.550*  |
| Working                      |         | 2.421*  | 2.420*  | 2.400*  |
| Middle                       |         | 2.533*  | 2.531*  | 2.520*  |
| Household Income             |         | 1.009*  | 1.009*  | 1.009*  |
| Gender Ideology              |         |         | .997    | 1.063   |
| Gender Ideology*Female       |         |         |         | .888    |

Note: N= 900. 1996 General Social Survey. All coefficients are non-standardized. \* indicates p<.05.

Table 4b: Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimates for the Direct Expression of Anger for Female and Male Samples

| Variable                     | Model 1<br>Female | Males              | Model 2<br>Females | Males              | Model 3<br>Females | Males              |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Model $\chi^2$               | 11.74             | 9.056              | 25.45*             | 14.04              | 25.60*             | 14.24              |
| Age                          | .990              | .984 <sup>1</sup>  | .991               | .985 <sup>1</sup>  | .990               | .985 <sup>1</sup>  |
| Number of Children           | .945              | .991 <sup>1</sup>  | .939               | 1.003 <sup>1</sup> | .940               | 1.005 <sup>1</sup> |
| Married                      | 1.253             | 1.422              | .972               | 1.285 <sup>2</sup> | .962               | 1.306 <sup>1</sup> |
| Divorced, Separated, Widowed | .797              | 1.589 <sup>1</sup> | .768               | 1.567 <sup>1</sup> | .767               | 1.565 <sup>1</sup> |
| Education                    | 1.011             | 1.060 <sup>1</sup> | .982               | 1.056 <sup>1</sup> | .985               | 1.053 <sup>1</sup> |
| Feeling Anger(log)           | 1.009             | 1.037              | 1.008              | 1.034              | 1.009              | 1.034              |
| Black                        |                   |                    | 1.173              | .725 <sup>1</sup>  | 1.182              | .713 <sup>1</sup>  |
| Subjective Social Class      |                   |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |
| Lower                        |                   |                    | 4.089*             | 2.627              | 4.025*             | 2.730              |
| Working                      |                   |                    | 2.119              | 3.583              | 2.101              | 3.635              |
| Middle                       |                   |                    | 2.418              | 3.341              | 2.401              | 3.398 <sup>1</sup> |
| Household Income             |                   |                    | 1.013*             | 1.004              | 1.009*             | 1.004              |
| Gender Ideology              |                   |                    |                    |                    | .958               | 1.057 <sup>1</sup> |

Note: N= 504 females and 396 males. 1996 General Social Survey. All coefficients are non-standardized. \* indicates  $p < .05$ . <sup>1</sup> This variable had a significantly different effect for men and women at the .05 level. <sup>2</sup> at the .10 level.