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ABSTRACT

Dating violence is a significant and prevalent problem facing college students (Harned, 2002). There are many factors associated with such violence and among these factors, maladaptive anger management skills are significant (Dye & Eckhardt, 2002). A variety of personality traits are strongly associated with the use of maladaptive anger management skills, and a thorough understanding of such traits is essential for effective treatment and prevention of dating violence.

In the present study, the relationship between narcissism, Masculine Gender Role Stress (MGRS), and anger management skills is explored. These personality variables were selected due to their strong association with aggression and the perpetration of violence (Twenge & Campbell, 2003; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002). A latent class analysis (LCA) (Dayton, 1999), is employed to uncover latent or “hidden” subgroups of participants, classified according to their similarities regarding narcissism, MGRS, and anger management skills. LCA (similar to factor analysis) is used to determine the optimal number of hidden (latent) subgroups that best describe the relationship between these three variables for participants in the study. MGRS was excluded from the analysis of female data.
For men, it was predicted that a high MGRS/high narcissism group endorsing high levels of maladaptive anger management strategies would emerge, and that a low MGRS/low narcissism group endorsing high levels of adaptive anger management strategies would emerge. For women, it was predicted that a high narcissism group endorsing high levels of maladaptive anger management strategies would emerge, and that a low narcissism group endorsing high levels of adaptive anger management strategies would emerge.

A 3-class (or 3-group) solution best fit the data for both men and women in this study. For men, Class 1 was categorized by moderate MGRS/low Narcissism; Class 2 was categorized by moderate MGRS/high narcissism; and class three was categorized by high MGRS/moderate narcissism. Only Class 1 and Class 2 differed with regard to anger management skills; the more narcissistic group of men in Class 2 was more likely to endorse maladaptive anger management strategies than the less narcissistic group of men in Class 1. MGRS did not affect the endorsement of anger management skills for men in this study.

For women, Class 1 was categorized by moderate levels of narcissism; Class 2 was categorized by low levels of narcissism; and, Class 3 was categorized by high levels of narcissism. The more narcissistic group in Class 3 was more likely to endorse higher levels of maladaptive anger management strategies than the less narcissistic group in Class 2. For both men and women, high levels of narcissism were associated with the endorsement of maladaptive anger management skills. Implications for these findings are discussed in terms of clinical and dating violence prevention work, and suggestions for future research are made.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

College Dating Violence

Violence in college dating relationships may come in the form of sexual, psychological, and/or physical abuse, and such violence seems to be widespread. For example, DeKeseredy & Kelly (1993) found that in Canada, 27.8% of female students claimed to have been sexually abused in the past year. Harned (2002) found that 87% of men and 82% of women report being the victim of psychological aggression from a dating partner in college, and Neufeld, McNamara, & Ertl, (1999) found that more than 3 in 4 women report being the victim of abuse in a college relationship. Recognizing that many factors may be associated with college dating violence, this study focuses on anger management skills and the personality traits that may be associated with such skills. As will be discussed in Chapter II, anger management skills are an important variable in the study of dating violence for college students (Dye & Eckhardt, 2002). Treatment and prevention of dating violence requires an accurate understanding of the factors that contribute to such violence. Therefore, it is important to understanding the personal traits and characteristics that contribute to poor anger management skills.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to further understand the personality traits that contribute to poor anger management skills in college students. Specifically, this study will explore the relationship and interaction between anger management skills, and the personality traits of narcissism and Masculine Gender Role Stress (MGRS). Both narcissism and MGRS are known
to be highly associated with maladaptive anger and aggression (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; Twenge & Campbell, 2003), but to date there has been only limited research investigating the relationship and interaction between these two constructs with regard to anger management skills. Narcissism is related to anger, aggression, and anger management skills for both men and women (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Twenge and Campbell, 2003; McCann & Biaggio, 1989) and both men and women were surveyed for this study. However, because MGRS is a theoretical construct pertaining to men only (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) it will be included only in the analysis of male subjects.

Statement of Problem

The results of this study should not only help further identify and clarify key factors affecting dating violence, but may also help strengthen efforts to treat and prevent such violence. Indeed, efforts to treat and prevent violence in romantic relationships may benefit from a greater understanding of the variables being explored in the present study (Twenge & Campbell, 2003; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002). Although other variables—notably self-esteem—have received great attention from researchers and clinicians with regard to anger management and dating/spousal violence prevention and treatment (Bradbury & Clarke, 2006; Walker & Bright, 2009), there is increasing evidence that traits such as narcissism may be far more important to the study of anger management and dating violence (Twenge & Campbell, 2003). As clinicians and clients struggle to resolve violence related concerns, such evidence may be crucial to the development and provision of effective treatment.

In many respects, self-esteem seems to have been a critical variable in the treatment and remediation of anger management problems in the literature. For example, Bradbury & Clarke (2006) evaluate the implementation and outcome of a manualized cognitive behavioral anger
management program that emphasizes arousal control, assertiveness training, empathy training, and cognitive restructuring. As will be discussed in more detail below, these authors and others note that individuals who dropped out of the program had significantly lower self-esteem than those who stayed in; also, clients who stayed in the group had significantly higher self-esteem scores after successfully completing the program than when they entered the group. Bradbury and Clarke noted significant increase in anger control and self-esteem; they suggested that either learning to successfully manage anger may increase a person’s self-esteem, or increasing a person’s self-esteem may in fact motivate clients to work harder on resolving their issues with anger.

However, such results may not provide a comprehensive picture of aggression and violence perpetration. Baumeister, Bushman, Campbell, (2000), & Twenge & Campbell, (2003), investigated the relationship between narcissism, self-esteem, and the perpetration of violence against another person. These authors found: (1) That individuals who score high on narcissism are more likely to respond aggressively to social rejection than non-narcissistic individuals; (2) That narcissists were also more likely to respond aggressively to an “innocent third party” after being socially rejected; (3) That an individual’s level of narcissism is the critical variable in terms of predicting aggression whereas; (4) An individual’s level of self-esteem is not related to their propensity to perpetrate violence against another person. As will be further discussed later, such evidence would suggest that the relationship between self-esteem and the perpetration of violence is not as simple as it may seem. Again, treatment and prevention efforts for violence perpetration must take such complexity into account if successful outcomes are to be expected.

In the literature, many factors are identified as contributing to aggression and problems with anger management. Important to the current study, Eisler & Skidmore (1987) found that
certain men feel intense stress when they perceive that their ability to adhere to traditional masculine gender roles is threatened, and that this stress is highly associated with anger and potential aggression. In Chapter 2, literature documenting the association between such gender role stress and the perpetration of violence will be explored more thoroughly, as will the similarities between MGRS and narcissism. Indeed, much of Chapter 2 will explore the striking way in which narcissism and traditional masculine gender roles function similarly with regard to anger management skills. For example, both traditional masculine gender roles and personal narcissism are characterized by feelings of superiority, entitlement, and grandiosity, and in both cases, when those feelings are challenged, threatened, or put under stress (hence the term, *Masculine Gender Role Stress*), some men may react with anger and aggression toward the source of the challenge or threat. Since both narcissism and MGRS seem to function similarly with regard to anger and violence, and since there is a dearth of literature exploring the relationship between these two constructs, it invites the question: “In what way do these variables influence each other regarding anger management for men?” Answering this question, as well as further understanding the relationship between narcissism and anger management skills in women, may help researchers and clinicians more effectively address the problem of college dating violence, and may help provide more effective treatment and prevention efforts.

**Hypotheses**

The present study is exploratory by nature. It employs Latent Class Analysis (LCA), a statistical technique used to determine the likelihood that a research subject belongs to a certain latent group by identifying those latent (unknown) classes of individuals in a sample population, and determining the probability that respondents fall into one of these classes (Dayton, 1999). In other words, this technique will be used in the present study to determine the number and types
of “hidden groups” (or latent classes) of individuals in the sample that best summarize the data on narcissism, MGRS, and anger management.

In the present study, LCA will be the basis for developing a model which will enable the researcher to say that there appears to be “x” number of classes, or distinct groups, of individuals who differ significantly with regard to their scores on the observed characteristics. The study will then describe the personality characteristics of whatever “hidden groups” are revealed in the data. The goal of this study is to describe the characteristics of people who possess poor anger management skills in terms of the independent variables—specifically, narcissism and MGRS for men, and narcissism only for women. Based on the review of the literature on narcissism, MGRS, and anger management covered in Chapter 2, the following hypotheses are proposed regarding the outcome of this analysis:

**Hypothesis 1:** It is predicted that a distinct cluster of men will emerge from the data who will endorse a high level of both narcissism and MGRS, and a high level of maladaptive anger management strategies.

**Hypothesis 2:** It is predicted that a distinct cluster of men will emerge from the data who will endorse a low level of both narcissism and MGRS, and a high level of adaptive anger management strategies.

**Hypothesis 3:** It is predicted that a distinct cluster or women will emerge from the data who will endorse a high level of narcissism and a high level of maladaptive anger management strategies.

**Hypothesis 4:** It is predicted that a distinct cluster of women will emerge from the data who will endorse a low level of narcissism and a high level of adaptive anger management strategies.
Definition and Operationalization of Terms

**Dating Violence**

Dating violence refers to aggressive actions by one member of a dating couple toward the other member of the couple. Such actions may take the form of a verbal or emotional attack, physical aggression, sexual abuse or assault, or some combination of the three. Such violence is not exclusive to college couples; however, the current study is designed to assess such violence in college dating relationships. Anderson and Danis, (2007), proposed the following useful definition of dating violence: “[T]he threat or actual use of physical, sexual, or verbal abuse by one member of an unmarried couple on the other member within the context of a dating relationship” (p. 88). The present study incorporates this definition for college dating relationships.

**Anger Management Skills**

Anger management skills are the tactics and strategies people utilize to cope with and deal with their own anger. Such skills may lead either to the escalation or the de-escalation of anger and potential violence, and thus, the 36-item Anger Management Scale (AMS: Stith & Hamby, 2002) was designed to evaluate specific cognitions and behaviors related to increases and decreases in anger within relationships that may influence respondents’ levels of interpersonal violence. The scale contains four subscales. Two of these subscales measure cognitions or behaviors generally thought of as maladaptive coping strategies that may increase the likelihood of violence—the Escalating Strategies subscale which includes behaviors that tend to increase the level or intensity of anger aimed at a romantic partner, and the Negative Attributions subscale which measures the implementation of cognitions such as blame or intentionality regarding a partner’s actions. The other two subscales measure cognitions and
behaviors generally thought of as adaptive coping strategies that may decrease the likelihood of violence—the *Self-Awareness of Rising Anger* subscale measures a respondent’s level of awareness of increasing anger, and the *Calming Strategies* subscale measures the use of tactics to de-escalate rising anger in potential conflict situations.

*Narcissism*

Narcissism is a multifaceted construct and will be explored more thoroughly in Chapter 2. The Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI: Raskin & Hall, 1979, 1981; Raskin & Terry, 1988) is based upon diagnostic criteria but is not used to diagnose Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD). The NPI is a 40 item, forced-choice assessment on which participants choose either a narcissistic response or a non-narcissistic response. The scale provides an index of narcissism categorizing both benign and pathological levels of narcissism. The NPI is comprised of seven component factors of narcissism: *Authority*, which generally measures the degree to which people desire power over other; *Self-Sufficiency*, which generally measures the degree to which a person relies on others vs. relying on themselves; *Superiority*, which generally measures the degree to which an individual feels superior to others; *Exhibitionism*, which generally measures the degree to which a person desires to be “the center of attention”; *Vanity*, which measures the degree to which one finds themselves attractive; *Entitlement*, which measures the degree to which one believes that they should be treated as special and given favorable treatment; and *Exploitativeness*, which measures the degree to which one is willing to exploit others to meet their own needs.

*Masculine Gender Role Stress*

The study of gender roles and gender role socialization has led to the notion that the violation or perceived violation of gender role norms may be accompanied by a great deal of
stress and anxiety for individuals who highly endorse those norms and values (Jakupcak, et al. 2002). The Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) is a 40 item scale designed to measure the stress men feel in situations that are associated with the violation of traditional male gender role. The scale contains five subscales: Physical Inadequacy, which measures a man’s stress associated with the inability to meet perceived standards of prowess, fitness, and appearance; Emotional Inexpressiveness, which measures stress associated with situations that may call for emotional sensitivity, tenderness, or vulnerability; Subordination to Women, which measures stress associated with being put in situations in which a man feels outperformed or inferior to a woman or women; Intellectual Inferiority, which measures stress associated with situations in which indecisiveness is perceived or mental acuity is challenged; and Performance Failures, which measures stress associated with failures in two distinct domains—sex and work.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

College Dating Violence: Definition and Research

Murray & Kardatzke (2007) define *dating* as “a relationship in which two individuals share an emotional, romantic, and/or sexual connection beyond friendship, but they are not married, engaged, or in a similarly committed relationship” (p 79). Sugarman & Hotaling (1989) define *dating violence* as “the use or threat of physical force or restraint carried out with the intent of causing pain or injury to another” (p. 5) in the dating relationship. Anderson and Danis, (2007), utilized a broader definition of dating violence: “[T]he threat or actual use of physical, sexual, or verbal abuse by one member of an unmarried couple on the other member within the context of a dating relationship” (p. 88). The following will review research on dating violence, both in general and as it relates to anger management. In a subsequent section, I will discuss the prevalence of dating violence and the relationship between this study’s variable of interest, (anger management) and dating violence.

College dating violence is a common problem (Murray & Kardatzke, 2007). Straus (2004) conducted an international survey of college students across 16 countries and over 30 universities showing that, across these schools, when asked if they had been physically violent toward dating partners within the last year, 17% to 45% of students (depending on the school) indicated that, indeed, they had. This indicates a stark variance from school to school in the endorsement of dating violence. Harned (2002) found that 87% of men and 82% of women report being the victim of psychological aggression from a dating partner in college. Such
aggression may take the form of verbal abuse, humiliation, or degradation. Neufeld, McNamara, & Ertl, (1999) found that more than 3 in 4 women report being the victim of psychological abuse in a college relationship. DeKeseredy & Kelly (1993) investigated sexual abuse among college women in Canada and found that 27.8% of female students claimed to have been sexually abused in the past year. Although college dating violence may be psychological, physical, sexual, or some combination of the three, Murray & Kardatzke (2007) concluded that for college students, psychological abuse is more common than sexual and physical abuse in dating relationships.

Many different factors have been associated with the perpetration of college dating violence. They include but are not limited to the perpetrator’s perception of the partner’s use of aggression, relationship satisfaction, duration of the relationship, the use of alcohol, jealousy, witnessing aggression in childhood, and inferior communication skills (Baker & Stith, 2008; Shorey, Cornelius, & Bell, 2008). Another major contributor to dating violence is the presence, and mismanagement, of anger.

Anger and Anger Management: Definition and Research

Violence in romantic relationships is a pervasive problem, and among the many factors associated with dating/spousal violence and abuse, the mismanagement of anger is a common one. With regard to married couples, Holtzworth-Munroe, Rehman & Herron (2000) found that across subtypes of violent spouses, the most aggressive and violent men also reported the highest levels of anger and hostility. Similarly, Margolin, John & Foo (1998) found that intensely abusive men score much higher on measures of anger than both nonviolent and less abusive men. These studies documented the way the presence of anger itself is associated with aggression and abuse. However, it is not only the presence of anger, but also the mismanagement of that anger which contributes to the perpetration of violence against a partner.
Turcotte-Seabury (2010) found that men and women with limited anger management skills are significantly more likely to perpetrate minor and severe violence against their romantic partners. Further, these authors found that witnessing inter-parental violence increased a student’s likelihood of developing poor anger management skills, which, in turn, increased a student’s likelihood of physically assaulting dating partners. This study suggested that the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and committing acts of partner violence may be mediated by limited anger management skills.

Baker & Stith (2008) found that men’s perpetration of dating violence was associated with low anger management skills. Similarly, Dye & Eckhardt, (2002), found that both male and female college students who perpetrated violence against their partners demonstrated less control over their anger than students who did not perpetrate violence. Stith & Hamby (2002) conclude that high levels of hostility and out-of-control anger increases the risk that violence will be perpetrated and that cognitive strategies designed to escalate anger are predictive of the frequency of violence in relationships. Further, Exkhardt, Barbour, & Davidson, (1998) found that during anger arousal, men who perpetrate the most aggression and violence on their spouses are also men who actively misconstrue and assign irrational and negative attributions to interpersonal situations. These authors reveal that the presence of negative attributions (“He meant to bump into me”) and low levels of anger control strategies contribute to the escalation of anger with the potential for violence.

The attributions that people make when they are angry and the skills they employ to manage anger, all contribute to the escalation of anger and the perpetration of partner violence (Stith & Hamby, 2002). These authors further state that although a person may use violence as a
means of control in a relationship without antecedent anger, high levels of hostility and out-of-control anger increases the risk that dating and partner violence will be perpetrated.

Because anger management skills and the perpetration of violence are related, if we can better understand factors that predispose someone to poor anger management skills, we may be better able to work towards the prevention of violence. Below I will briefly outline factors associated with anger and anger management in the literature. I will then move into a discussion of the two main independent variables in this study: Masculine Gender Role Stress and Narcissism.

One factor already covered that seems to predispose individuals to poor anger management skills is having witnessed violence between ones parents. Turcotte-Seabury (2010) demonstrated that witnessing inter-parental violence was associated with decreased anger management skills. Additionally, personality traits such as self-esteem and empathy may predispose individuals to anger depending on the situation (Kuppens & Tuerlinckx, 2006). Further, the tendency to identify another as an antagonist, the tendency to readily assign blame to that antagonist, and the tendency to construe events as relevant to the self are cognitive appraisals typical of individuals prone to high levels of trait anger (Hazebroek, Howells, & Day, 2001).

Two other distinct factors related to anger and anger management are narcissism and Masculine Gender Role Stress. In the next section, I will discuss the relationship between Masculine Gender Role Stress and anger management. In the section after that, I will discuss narcissism and its relationship to anger and anger management.
Masculine Gender Role Stress: Definition and Research

In past decades, the study of masculinity led some researchers to the conclusion that certain aspects of having been socialized into traditional male gender roles could have negative consequences for men (Pleck, 1981; Deutch & Gilbert, 1976). O’Neil (1981) provided a synopsis of “The Masculine Mystique and Value System” (p. 205) that summarized the myths of ideal masculinity in our society. Many assumptions comprise this value system. Characteristic of the Masculine Mystique are the assumptions that: vulnerability and intimacy with other men is a form of weakness; feelings and emotions are signs of weakness; masculinity rather than femininity is the preferred gender identity; logical communication is preferred to emotional communication; sex is a means to prove manhood; and success and power are a measure of a man’s worth.

Some men may be prone to feel a certain amount of anxiety or stress if they cannot conform to the edicts of this broad masculine mystique. With this in mind, Eisler & Skidmore (1987) developed a scale to measure what they referred to as Masculine Gender Role Stress (MGRS). This scale measures men’s cognitive appraisal of stressful, gender-sensitive situations. Men who rigidly adhere to certain aspects of traditional masculine ideology may have a restricted range of ‘gender-approved’ coping strategies at their disposal to deal with stress (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). This limited range of coping strategies may predispose these men to utilize other coping behaviors (e.g. violence) that are potentially dysfunctional (Eisler & Blalock, 1991). MGRS is a term developed by Eisler & Skidmore specifically to define the stress that men experience when they are unable to meet the expectations and imperatives of the traditional male role, or when certain situations are viewed as requiring stereotypically “feminine” behavior. Indeed, Eisler & Skidmore (1987) found that MGRS was highly correlated with anger in men.
As the study of masculinity and gender roles has progressed over the years, it has become increasingly clear that endorsing traditional masculine roles alone does not predispose a man to increased anger and violence (Bassoff & Glass, 1982; Eisler & Skidmore, 1897); rather, increased stress associated with the fear (or reality) of not being able to conform to those roles seems to be one factor that predisposes men to anger and consequent violence (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002).

For example, Jakupcak, et al. (2002) found that conformity to masculine ideology alone did not explain a significant portion of the variance of violent behavior for subjects in that particular study. In fact, Jakupcak et al. found that a high endorsement of masculine ideology served as a protective factor for violence when paired with low levels of gender role stress; these authors state that this high masculine ideology/low gender role stress subtype may be thought of as a “chivalrous” subtype among the men in their study. However, when subjects endorsed both high masculine ideology and high gender role stress, Jakupcak et al. found that this combination of traits tended to function as a strong risk factor for the perpetration of violence.

Moore, Stuart, McNulty, Addis, Cordova, & Temple, (2010) investigated the relationship between the specific components of the MGRS scale and different types of interpersonal violence among violent men. These authors found that different aspects of MGRS were, indeed, associated with different types of aggression. For example, Moore et al. (2010) found that psychological aggression was associated with MGRS in the realm of performance failure, while sexual coercion was associated with MGRS in the realm of physical inadequacy. Further, Moore et al. (2010) found that injury to a partner was strongly associated with MGRS in the realm of intellectual inferiority.
Copenhaver, Lash, & Eisler, (2000) investigated the association between MGRS, anger, and abusive behavior among substance abusing men. These authors found that substance-abusing men high in MGRS experienced significantly greater levels of anger than substance-abusing men low in MGRS. Eisler, Skidmore, & Ward (1988) found that men high in MGRS endorsed significantly more anger on a measure designed to assess frequency, duration and magnitude of anger, and range of arousing situations and hostile outlook. Similarly, McDermott et al. (2011) investigated the relationship between men’s self-reported gender role identification, entitlement, and anger management strategies in relationships, and reported that gender-role-ambivalence—men’s questioning of, and possible movement away from, traditional male gender roles—was the most consistent predictor of maladaptive anger management strategies, not acceptance of traditional gender roles. These findings are consistent with previous findings (Moore & Stuart, 2005) showing that it is not acceptance of traditional male gender-roles, but rather strain or stress associated with difficulty in adhering to roles, that is a better predictor of violence and aggression.

It seems that the threat of being perceived as feminine, weak, emotional, or unmanly, produces a state of anxiety and stress for certain men, and that under such stress, adherence to traditional gender roles may limit a man to the use of maladaptive coping mechanisms. Clearly, conformity to masculine gender roles is extremely important for some men. If we take a moment to consider the essence of traditional masculine gender roles it becomes apparent that, at their core, they are rather self-aggrandizing. For example, many of the measures of traditional male roles reviewed by Levant, Rankin, Williams, Hasan, & Smalley (2010) in their revision of the Male Role Norms Inventory, endorsed factors associated with dominance, winning, power, control, success, the pursuit of status, strength, self-reliance, and unrealistic sexual prowess. It is
my assertion that such factors, by their very nature, are inherently self-aggrandizing and come with a certain sense of entitlement—especially in relation to women. After all, at the heart of traditional male gender roles is the belief in the superiority of masculinity over femininity (O’Neil, 1981). When certain men feel their masculinity is being somehow threatened or called into question, the literature above tells us that they may become angry and violent.

Interestingly, personal narcissism works the same way. As we will see in the next section, men and women who endorse high levels of narcissism react with maladaptive coping strategies when their sense of grandiosity and entitlement is threatened—much as men who feel threatened in their adherence to masculine gender roles also do. In the next section, I will review the literature on narcissism and anger/anger management, and in the section after that, I will further discuss the ways MGRS is functionally similar to narcissism with regard to anger and anger management.

Narcissism: Definition and Research

Narcissism is a multidimensional construct with many different manifestations. Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) is characterized in the DSM-IV-TR (APA, 2000) by pervasive grandiosity and self-importance, arrogant and haughty behavior, interpersonal exploitativeness, entitlement, and little to no empathy for other people. There is no technical cutoff point between the clinically significant levels of narcissism evident in NPD and narcissism as it is generally measured in studies of narcissism in the population (Foster & Campbell, 2007).

As discussed by Wink (1991), overt narcissism is characterized by the direct expression of grandiosity, an inflated feeling of self-importance, excessive idealization of the self, a need for dominance, and a disproportionate need for admiration.
Narcissism appears to be on the rise in America. Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, & Bushman (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of data gathered using the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI: Raskin & Hall, 1979, 1981; Raskin & Terry, 1988) from 1979 to 2006 and found that college students’ narcissistic traits have significantly increased in the last 25 years. Although certain ethnic groups on college campuses display lower levels of narcissism than others—Asian college students in the U.S., for example, tend to be less narcissistic than native born American college students—all ethnic groups on U.S. college campuses are increasing in narcissism (Twenge & Foster, 2008).

Narcissism is also related to anger with the general pattern being that increases in narcissism significantly predict increased anger scores (White, Callahan, & Perez-Lopez, 2002; Papps & O’Carroll, 1998; McCann & Biaggio, 1989). When narcissists feel their sense of self-importance is threatened, or perceive disrespect from another, they will respond far more aggressively to that other person than non-narcissists would under similar circumstances (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Twenge & Campbell, 2003). McCann & Biaggio (1989) found that individuals with high narcissism scores reported greater potential for anger arousal, and greater expression of anger through verbal hostility. Further, these authors found that men high in narcissism expressed anger through physical means more frequently than did women high in narcissism.

Twenge and Campbell (2003) found that high-narcissism-individuals experienced more anger when getting negative feedback than did low-narcissism-individuals. They also report that narcissists may feel an intense need for either social acceptance or social dominance, and that when this need is challenged, narcissists tend to respond with aggression and anger. Witte, Callahan & Perez-Lopez (2002) found that traits associated with narcissism—specifically
perceived authority and entitlement as measured by the NPI—were associated with increased anger scores. The latter authors state that certain aspects of narcissism (e.g. entitlement and perceived authority) are more relevant to the study of anger than is the broad construct of narcissism. Indeed, this finding is similar to findings reported by Fossati, Borroni, Eisenberg, & Maffei (2010) who found that narcissistic entitlement was a key component in different types of aggression. Rhodewalt & Morf (1998) found that individuals high in narcissism respond to failure on controlled tasks with greater emotional reactivity than non-narcissists. In this study, narcissists responded to success with greater self-aggrandizing attributions, but then responded to subsequent failure with significantly greater amounts of anger than individuals low in narcissism. Finally, Papps & O’Carroll (1998) investigated the way self-esteem and narcissism interact to affect anger; they found that high self-esteem/high narcissism individuals experienced and expressed significantly more provoked and unprovoked anger than high self-esteem/low narcissism individuals.

Ego-threat seems to be functionally related to narcissists’ expression of anger and aggression (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Baumeister, Boden, & Smart, 1996; Twenge & Campbell, 2003), however, narcissists are also prone to unprovoked hostility and aggression, too, (Reidy, Foster, & Zeichner, 2010). When a narcissist’s grandiose sense of self and entitlement is threatened, or when current or future ego-threat is perceived, narcissists tend to respond with anger and aggression. Note that this is almost identical to the way MGRS leads to anger.

Masculine Gender Role Stress and Narcissism in Men

MGRS and narcissism appear to function similarly concerning anger. It seems that if a man has a lofty and grandiose notion of who he is, or who he must be (whether it be related to his gender role or perceived personal importance), and if that notion is challenged or threatened,
then both a narcissist and a man suffering from MGRS seem likely to react with escalating anger toward the source of the threat. Similarly, both constructs (MGRS and narcissism) are characterized by a sense of entitlement and power over others (notably women), thus making the expression of anger and aggression toward another feel more acceptable to the perpetrator. Since both narcissism and MGRS seem to function similarly with regard to anger and violence, it raises the question: “In what way do these constructs influence each other regarding anger and anger management in men?” Clues to this relationship can be found in the literature.

Although MGRS and narcissism function similarly with regard to anger, according to the findings of McDermott et al. (2011), they appear to be distinctly different constructs. As indicated above, these authors investigated the way entitlement, acceptance of traditional gender roles, and anger management are related. These authors noted in their findings that entitlement was not correlated with men’s gender role journey phase, which is the transition a man goes through as he sheds his endorsement of traditional male gender roles and embraces a more egalitarian stance on gender. Although gender role journey phase is not necessarily synonymous with MGRS, McDermott and colleagues likened the stress a man feels as he progresses through gender role journey to MGRS.

These findings suggest that a man’s endorsement or rejection of traditional gender roles does not affect his sense of personal entitlement; they suggest, in other words, that a man can endorse highly egalitarian/feminist views and still maintain a high level of personal narcissism and entitlement. McDermott and colleagues found that men experiencing confusion and ambivalence about their gender roles were at an increased risk of using maladaptive anger management strategies. They also suggest that narcissistic entitlement is an independent and
significant predictor of maladaptive anger management, above and beyond gender role ambivalence.

McDermott et al. (2011) also noted an interaction between entitlement and acceptance of traditional gender-roles with regard to anger management. Specifically, they found that men high in entitlement did not differ in their self-awareness of rising anger as their level of gender-role acceptance changed; however, men low in entitlement were more likely to endorse self-awareness of rising anger as their endorsement of traditional gender-roles decreased. In other words, if a man feels highly entitled, it does not matter where he is with regard to his beliefs about gender roles; he is likely to maintain poor anger management skills no matter what his gender beliefs are. However, a man low in entitlement is affected by his beliefs about gender; such men endorse greater levels of positive anger management skills as their gender role acceptance decreases.

These results indicate that anxiety and stress concerning masculine gender roles may be relevant to anger management only for men low in narcissistic entitlement. Therefore, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that narcissistic entitlement is a variable completely independent of MGRS—despite the fact that the two seem to function similarly. Although McDermott et al. (2011) did not use a measure of MGRS or the typical measure of narcissistic entitlement—the NPI—they did measure men’s entitlement and stress associated with adhering to masculine gender roles. This is the only study I have found that explored the way elements of narcissism and masculine gender role endorsement actually interact to affect anger management. It is also one of the few studies that looks at narcissism and anger management skills, instead of narcissism and anger alone.
Research Direction

More work is needed to understand the relationship between narcissism and MGRS with regard to anger management skills. It is possible that narcissism and MGRS are, in fact, completely different constructs and that, with regard to anger management skills, MGRS is only relevant for individuals who are low in narcissistic entitlement (McDermott et al. 2011). However, as outlined above these constructs seem to function very similarly with regard to their role in the perpetration of violence, and therefore, more work is warranted to further define this relationship.

The present study is designed to help further develop a theory concerning the way narcissism and stress associated with traditional masculine gender roles interact to affect anger management skills in men. It is also designed to further understand the relationship between narcissism and anger management skills in women. This study is exploratory by nature and the analysis is designed to investigate the way that individuals cluster together with regard to these different traits. The results of this study may help lay the foundation for a theoretical argument pertaining to an interaction between attitudes of entitlement and gender role stress in men as they relate to anger management skills, and may also further our understanding of women, narcissism, and anger management skills. From the literature discussed above, the following four hypotheses are explored in the chapters to come regarding the presence of distinct latent classes of subjects in the current data:

Hypothesis 1: It is predicted that a distinct cluster of male subjects will endorse a high level of both narcissism and MGRS, and a high level of maladaptive anger management strategies.
Hypothesis 2: It is predicted that a distinct cluster of male subjects will endorse a low level of both narcissism and MGRS, and a high level of adaptive anger management strategies.

Hypothesis 3: It is predicted that a distinct cluster of female subjects will endorse a high level of narcissism and endorse a high level of maladaptive anger management strategies.

Hypothesis 4: It is predicted that a distinct cluster of female subjects will endorse a low level of narcissism and will endorse a high level of adaptive anger management strategies.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants were recruited from undergraduate elective courses through the College of Education at the University of Georgia (which has approximately 35,000 students). Subject selection was based on a convenience sample of undergraduate students from the College of Education subject pool. There were 189 participants in total, including 64 men and 125 women. Descriptive statistics for the participants are provided in the results chapter.

Selection and Recruitment

Selection of participants was based on enrollment status in one of a number of elective undergraduate courses offered through the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at UGA. There were no exclusion criteria for participation in the study. However, at the onset, this was not the case because the original purpose of this study was to explore the way various personality characteristics affected the use of anger management skills in men only. The inclusion of the Masculine Gender Role Stress scale was a direct result of the original theoretical nature of the study. However, to ensure fairness and equity in access to course credit opportunities in the subject pool, female participants were also included in the data gathering process. In fact, the inclusion of female participants did lead to a more robust and ultimately more useful set of results as will be detailed below.
Procedures

Participants completed the survey packet in class during scheduled class time. The survey packet included the measures listed below. Instructors were asked to pass out the survey packed to their students. An alternative activity was provided for students wishing to receive course credit but not wishing to fill out the survey. Students were asked for their informed consent after receiving a full explanation of the risks and benefits of the study and after having understood the voluntary nature of participation. Risks of participation were deemed minimal. Students agreeing to participate signed an informed consent document and were given a copy of this document to keep. Course instructors informed students that they would receive course credit for participation. Students completed four forms, one demographic survey and three psychometric instruments. After completing the survey packet, students were provided with a debriefing form and given the option to have their data removed from the study without the loss of course credit. Participants disclosed no identifying information that could link the answers on their survey packet to their identity. No participants asked to have their data removed from the study.

Measures

Demographic questionnaire

Participants were asked to indicate their age, gender, year in school, ethnicity, current relationship status (currently partnered or not), approximate time in their current relationship, and the gender of their typical romantic partner. No other identifying information was requested of students.

Anger Management Scale

The 36-item Anger Management Scale (AMS: Stith & Hamby, 2002) was designed to evaluate specific cognitions and behaviors related to increases and decreases in anger within
relationships that may influence respondent’s levels of interpersonal violence. According to Stith & Hamby (2002), the overall reliability coefficient for the scale (Cronbach’s alpha) is .87. The AMS is scored on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree) with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of either positive or negative anger management strategies, depending on the subscale in question. The scale contains four subscales. Two of these subscales measure cognitions or behaviors that may increase the likelihood of violence—the Escalating Strategies subscale (15 items) and the Negative Attributions subscale (7 items). The two remaining subscales measure cognitions and behaviors that decrease the likelihood of violence—the Self-Awareness of Rising Anger subscale (6 items) and the Calming Strategies subscale (8 items). According to Stith & Hamby (2002), internal consistency reliability coefficients for each are as follows: Negative Attributions (α = .79); Escalating Strategies (α = .83); Self-Awareness of Rising Anger (α = .70); Calming Strategies (α = .73).

To investigate the validity of the scale, Stith & Hamby used the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2), the Borgata Impulsiveness Scale, the Rutger Alcohol Problem Index (RAPI), and the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale. These authors surmised that since poor anger management is closely associated with partner violence, adjustment problems, impulsiveness, and alcohol problems, correlation with these scales would serve as strong indication of construct validity for the Anger Management Scale. Indeed, Stith & Hamby (2002) found strong correlations ranging from -.13 to .48 (p < .01) in the expected directions with these scales and the overall 36 item scale and 3 of its subscales (excluding the Calming Strategies subscale and the CTS2 Nonviolent Negotiation subscale).

In the present study, alpha reliability analysis was used to analyze the reliability of each of the scales and subscales. Robinson, Shaver, and Wrightsman (1991) state that a measure
should have a reliability score of at least .70 to be considered sufficient in terms of internal consistency. This standard for internal consistency is also echoed by DeVillielles (2012). In the current study, certain items were dropped from the subscales in an attempt to reach this criterion; however, not all subscales achieved an alpha of .70.

Cronbach’s Alpha for the Anger Management Scale data in the present study ranged from .553 to .850. One item (# 19) was deleted from the Self-Awareness subscale to increase reliability, however, reliability for this subscale remained low (.553). Cronbach’s Alpha for the full scale was .856. The reliability estimates for each subscale are detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1

*Table 1: Cronbach’s Alpha: Anger Management Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escalating Strategies</td>
<td>$\alpha = .850$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Attributions</td>
<td>$\alpha = .733$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness of Rising Anger</td>
<td>$\alpha = .553$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calming Strategies</td>
<td>$\alpha = .677$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Scale</td>
<td>$\alpha = .856$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale*

The Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) is a 40 item scale designed to measure the stress men feel in situations that are associated with the traditional male gender role. The scale was developed and normed on college age men. Respondents are asked to identify the degree to which certain situations are stressful on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all stressful*) to 5 (*extremely stressful*). Examples of scale items include: “Admitting that
you are afraid of something”, “Having a female boss”, “Being too tired for sex when your lover initiates it”, and “Letting a woman take control of the situation.” To investigate the validity of the scale, Eisler & Skidmore (1987) compared the MGRS scores of both men and women, and compared MGRS scores to scores of constructs related to stress: i.e., anxiety (State-Trait Anxiety Inventory) and anger (Multidimensional Anger Inventory). Eisler & Skidmore (1987) note that men scored much higher on MGRS than women (t = 3.28, p < .01). Further, these authors found that men who were high on MGRS were also likely to have increased anger scores (r = .54, p < .01) and increased anxiety scores (r = .23, p < .05). Eisler & Skidmore did not report reliability scores; however, they performed factor analysis requiring each factor to contain at least six loadings of .30 or more and at least three loadings of .50 or more. Eisler & Skidmore (1987) noted that loadings for the final five factors ranged from 0.33 to 0.70. Those final five factors were Physically Inadequacy; Emotional Inexpressiveness; Subordination to Women; Intellectual Inferiority; and Performance Failures.

In the present study, Cronbach’s Alpha for the MGRS subscales (men only) ranged from alpha = .566 to .876. To increase subscale reliability, item #2 was deleted from the Emotional Inexpressiveness subscale and items #39 and #19 were deleted from the Intellectual Inferiority subscales. Cronbach’s Alpha for the entire MGRS scale was .890. Complete reliability scores for the MGRS scale in the current study are detailed in Table 2 below.
Table 2

*Cronbach’s Alpha: Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (Men only)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Inadequacy</td>
<td>$\alpha = .701$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Inexpressiveness</td>
<td>$\alpha = .566$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordination to Women</td>
<td>$\alpha = .876$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Inferiority</td>
<td>$\alpha = .650$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Failure</td>
<td>$\alpha = .775$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Scale</td>
<td>$\alpha = .890$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Narcissistic Personality Inventory*

The Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI: Raskin & Hall, 1979, 1981; Raskin & Terry, 1988) is based upon DSM diagnostic criteria but is not used to diagnose Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD). The NPI is a 40 item, forced-choice assessment on which participants choose either a narcissistic response or a non-narcissistic response. After completion, the items are summed with higher scores equating to higher levels of narcissism. Further, the NPI is comprised of seven component factors of narcissism: *Authority, Self-Sufficiency, Superiority, Exhibitionism, Vanity, Entitlement,* and *Exploitativeness.*

Miller, Price, & Campbell (2012) responded to calls for the replacement of the NPI by examining the relationship between the NPI and other, newer measures of grandiosity and entitlement. Miller et al. (2012) compared the NPI to the *Psychological Entitlement Scale* (PES), the *Narcissistic Grandiosity Scale* (NGS), the *Pathological Narcissism Inventory* (PNI), the *revised NEO Personality Inventory* (NEO PI-R), and the *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* (RSE). Miller et al. (2012) noted significant correlations among the scales. For example, according to
these authors the NPI and the NPG profiles were highly correlated ($r = .93$) as was the
correlation between the NPI and the PES and the PNI-F (respectively, $r = .55$ & .43). Miller et al.
(2012) compared Five Factor Model personality profiles generated by these narcissism scales to
typical Five Factor Model expert ratings of individuals with Narcissistic Personality Disorder;
the NPI showed the largest association with these expert profiles ($r = .74$). Further, the NPI was
shown to capture meaningful variance in the FFM profile that was not accounted for by the three
other narcissism scales. After controlling for the shared variance accounted for by scores on the
PES, NGS, and the PNI-G, Miller et al (2012) found that the NPI retained a number of
significant correlations not accounted for by these other measures, notably with Assertiveness ($r$
$= .44$), modesty ($r = -.31$), compliance ($r = -.34$), and straightforwardness ($r = -.32$). The NPI
residual score was also strongly correlated to the expert NPD profile, ($r = .70$). Miller et al.
conclude that “a more cautious approach is warranted when discussing the replacement or
obsolescence of the NPI, a well-known and validated assessment of grandiose narcissism, with
lesser known and less well-validated instruments” (p. 11). Such a change, the authors argue,
may result in measurement of narcissism with less emphasis on key traits such as
noncompliance, dominance, immodesty, and manipulativeness.

In the present study, Cronbach’s Alpha for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory
subscales ranged from alpha = .530 to .748. One item was deleted from the Exhibitionism
subsacle (#3) to increase reliability of the subscale. The reliability of the entire NPI was .860.
Reliability scores for each NPI subscale are detailed below in Table 3.
### Table 3

*Cronbach’s Alpha: Narcissistic Personality Inventory*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>$\alpha = .748$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>$\alpha = .544$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td>$\alpha = .638$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionism</td>
<td>$\alpha = .686$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitativeness</td>
<td>$\alpha = .580$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanity</td>
<td>$\alpha = .683$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td>$\alpha = .530$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Scale</td>
<td>$\alpha = .860$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Design

The current study is exploratory by nature and no experimental component was employed. Participants in the current study were asked to fill out a variety of surveys. No follow up data was obtained and no control group was utilized. These survey data were then entered into a Latent Class Analysis. Latent Class Analysis (LCA) (Dayton, 1999)—which may also be referred to also as Latent Profile Analysis when the indicators are continuous—is a statistical technique used to determine the likelihood of group membership by identifying latent (unknown) classes of individuals in a sample population. This technique is used to create a model whereby we can say that independent observed characteristics are indirectly related to each other through some unknown latent class.
Although LCA shares some similarities with cluster analysis, they are notably different procedures. Both procedures are used for sorting different objects into mutually exclusive groups based on shared similarities. The two procedures are different in the way in which they produce these results (Dayton, 1999). Cluster analysis is considered an exploratory numerical method designed to summarize data; the goal of this analysis is to minimize within cluster variability and to maximize between-cluster variability (Samuelsen & Raczynski, in press). This type of strategy is used to allocate individual objects into a single group or category. LCA, however, is considered a statistical technique based upon the notion of likelihood; LCA assumes that the observed variables are indirectly related through the latent class variable (Samuelsen & Raczynski, in press). Membership in a latent class is, therefore, considered probabilistic; not deterministic. In other words, the current study used LCA to determine the probability that any one subject belongs to a certain group or latent class.

In the present study, LCA was used to quantify underlying patterns of homogeneity among students with regard to narcissism and MGRS. Then additional LCA models were run to examine the relationship between the anger management scale and the latent classes. SPSS was used to calculate reliability estimates, means, standard deviations, and correlation matrices. MPLUS 7 was used to calculate the LCA for both men and women. The goal of this study was to determine and identify the number—and the type—of classes of individuals that best summarize the data on narcissism and MGRS, and then relate these class memberships to scores on the anger management scale.

One of the advantages of LCA over other similar methods (e.g., factor analysis) is that the procedure is non-parametric in the sense that many common assumptions of linearity, normal distributions, or homogeneity are not necessary for valid inference (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-
2011). However, one important assumption of LCA is that of conditional independence. This assumption states that the observed variables within each latent class are statistically independent of one another after accounting for the effect of the latent class variable (i.e., locally independent). This requirement is based on the larger assumption, shared by other techniques like factor analysis, that the latent classes are the sole “cause” of the relations between the observed variables. As in factor analysis, this assumption is largely not explicitly tested unless there is cause for concern. An example of a clear case where there would be cause for concern is if the observed variables are individual test items, and they are worded in very similar ways, thereby creating correlations between the items due to method variance. In the factor analysis context, this can be handled by allowing the error terms of the observed indicators to correlate, and similar procedures can be done in LCA to account for situations where the conditional independence assumption is thought to be violated. However, many authors advise against adding these types of parameters to models just to improve model fit unless there is a reason to do so (Kline, 2005). In the present study, the observed variables subjected to LCA are average scores from several different subscales, and there is no a priori reason to think that there would be any correlation (method or otherwise) that would violate the conditional independence assumption. In spite of this, additional models were tested relaxing the conditional independence assumption; there were no substantive differences in terms of the model results when relaxing this assumption, suggesting that there are no concerning violations in the present data. Thus, traditional analysis assuming conditional independence are reported below.

Another assumption of LCA is that the model is just identified or over identified. This means that there are more “knowns” than “unknowns” in the model, and will result in positive degrees of freedom. If this is not the case, there will be an infinite number of solutions (i.e., an
infinite number of latent class structures) that have identical fit. With over-identification comes positive degrees of freedom and an ability to explicitly test different models (i.e., different numbers of latent classes) for fit. Each of the models run below are over-identified (i.e., have positive degrees of freedom).

Currently “there are no rules of thumb for the sample size necessary for a latent class analysis” (Samuelsen & Raczynski, in press, p 7.). However, taking into account recommendations for other similar methods, the sample size in the current study is small (notably for men), so caution should be taken in generalizing results. Latent Class/Profile Analysis typically proceeds in a series of steps. The first goal is to find the best fitting model in terms of the number of latent classes. Initially, a two class model is compared to a three-class model. The decision about which model best fits the data is based on the comparison of information criteria, typically the Akaike’s information criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian information criterion (BIC). These measures index the “badness of fit” taking into account model complexity and, therefore, smaller numbers are better. If a three-class model provides a superior fit then this model is tested against a four-class model, and so on. The process stops when a model with a larger number of classes does not provide a superior fit to the data. Once the best fitting model is discovered, the next step is interpreting the latent classes. In the case of Latent Profile Analysis (i.e., continuous latent class indicators), this involves examining the mean values on each indicator in each class and making an interpretation as to the nature of the members within each class.

In the present case, we are interested in testing the relation between this latent class membership and anger management skills. Thus, after the base LCA/LPA model is fit and interpreted, a more complex model is fit to test these relations. Specifically, the anger
management subscale under study (done separately for each subscale) is added as a predictor of latent class membership. In the case of two latent classes, this is the equivalent of a binary logistic regression. With more than two latent classes (as in the case below), this is equivalent to a multinomial logistic regression model. In the multinomial case, contrasts comparing the different classes (i.e., class 1 vs. class 2, class vs. class 3, etc.) are the dependent variables and the continuous anger management subscale score is the predictor. The magnitude of any observed relations are described with the odds ratio, and tested for significance on a z-distribution.

This methodology is similar to that of a variety of studies used to classify participants into hidden or latent classes regarding psychological traits and behaviors. Similar to the present analysis, one such study employed a latent class regression to classify men into groups defined by conformity to masculine gender role norms and psychological distress. Wong, Shea, & Owen (2012) analyzed a racially diverse sample of men (223 participants total) to determine the way differential conformity to masculine norms cluster together with symptoms of psychological distress. Wong et al. identified two latent classes that best fit their data. These classes differed significantly with regard to their endorsement and conformity to masculine gender norms. Notably, the class that conformed most with the norms of ‘power over women’, ‘risk-taking’, ‘winning’, and ‘playboy’ tended to also report significantly higher levels of emotional distress. Wong et al. (2012) suggest that the class of men with the greater endorsement of these masculine roles may be categorized by entrenched patriarchal attitudes and a strong desire to succeed; these values, Wong et al. argue, may lead to less interpersonal attachment and an inability to form close relationships, thus leading to greater psychological distress. Other authors have used latent class analysis to differentiate groups of individuals on a variety of traits and behaviors.
Such authors have also worked to define Latent Class Analysis in somewhat psychological terms. For example, Herman, Ostrander, Walkup, Silvia, & March (2007) refer to LCA and Latent Profile Analysis (LPA) as “person centered analyses” (p. 717). As opposed to other techniques (e.g. factor analysis) that group similar items or variables, LCA according to Herman et al. (2007), is designed to group individuals into classes or categories defined by shared characteristics. These shared characteristics differentiate members of one class from members of a different one. Herman et al. used LPA to define different subtypes of adolescent depression, rigorously developing a five-factor model which outlined distinct classes of depressed adolescents in their study. Other authors have used such techniques to create typologies of human behavior.

Notably, Vaughn, DeLisi, Beaver, & Howard (2008) used LPA to create a quantitative typology of burglars. These authors used data gathered from a large sample of men who had been convicted of burglary to design a four-class model of different types of burglars. Within this model, Vaughn et al. (2008) identified a class of burglars identified as young versatile, drug-oriented, vagrant, and sexual predators. These different classes displayed unique characteristics on the measures used to quantify criminal background, and the authors were able to theorize that, in general, individual burglars might fit into one of these four categories. As is necessary with such models, Vaughn and colleagues were diligent to note that the model they developed was specific to the data they had on-hand, and that different data sets may result in the formation of different models of burglar subtypes.

**Statistical Procedures**

Descriptive statistics were generated so that the participant sample could be broken down and reported in terms of gender, ethnicity, relationship status, year in school, age, and time in
current relationship if applicable. Numbers, percentages, and average scores were reported for the sample regarding these demographic characteristics. Such descriptive statistics were calculated for the sample as a whole, and then separately for male participants and female participants. Prior to running the LCA, reliability coefficients were calculated for each of the scales and subscales to ensure that these measures generally had sufficient reliability estimates to be included in the subsequent analysis. Next, a series of correlation matrices were calculated for inter-scale/subscale analysis and intra-scale/subscale analysis, with means and standard deviations included in the matrices. Finally, an LCA was performed for male and female participants.

Limitations

The current study has several design limitations. First, it had a relatively low number of participants—notably, a low number of male participants. Random selection was not employed; rather, a convenience sample was taken. This could mean that in some unknown ways, the sample of participants could differ significantly from nonparticipants or from a sample drawn using random selection. Further, the survey packets filled out by participants did not differ with regard to order of survey presentation, making it impossible to rule out effects due to ordering of survey items. Neither is there any way to establish causal relationships in the current study because participants were only polled once and no control group was used. Also, it should be noted that reliability estimates were not optimal for all subscales (Robinson, Shaver, and Wrightsman, 1991). Further, the findings of the current study may only be relevant to the predominantly white college population that was assessed. Obviously, future attempts to create a functional model of violence perpetrators and anger management skills should incorporate data drawn more systematically from a diversity of ethnicities and backgrounds; also, as mentioned
above, this data was gathered from students at a major university and may not be comparable to data from more clinical populations (Walker & Bright, 2009).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

A series of preliminary analyses was performed. Reliability estimates for all of the full scales and for each subscale were calculated; as mentioned in Chapter 3, a small number of items were dropped from the final analysis to increase subscale reliability. Correlations between subscale items were produced and correlation matrices were included. Descriptive statistics were also calculated for participants and for the scale items. An analysis of missing data was also performed.

Demographics and Participant Characteristics

189 students participated in the survey. 125 (66.1%) identified as female and 64 (33.9%) identified as male. 73.5% of the sample identified as White or Caucasian; 11.1% identified as Black or African American; 8.5% identified as Asian; 3.2% identified as multiracial; 2.6% identified as Hispanic; .5% identified as Indian; and .5% identified as Pakistani. The average age of students in the sample was 20.33 years old; 19% were in their first year of school; 15.9% were in their second; 16.9% in their third year; 31.7% were in their fourth year; and 16.4% were in their fifth year or beyond. 40.7% identified as “involved in a romantic relationship” with the average length of romantic involvement being 1.95 years.

For men, 75% of the sample identified as White or Caucasian; 12.5% identified as Asian; 6.3% identified as Black or African American; 3.1% identified as Hispanic; and 3.1% identified as multiracial. The average age of men in the study was 20.84 years old; 14.1% were in their first
year of school; 15.6% were in their second; 12.5% were in their third; 29.7% were in their fourth; and 28.1% were in their fifth year or beyond. 28.1% identified as “involved in a romantic relationship” with the average length of romantic involvement being 2 years.

For women, 72.8% of the sample identified as White or Caucasian; 13.6% identified as Black or African American; 6.4% identified as Asian; 3.2% identified as multiracial; 2.4% identified as Hispanic; .8% identified as Indian; and .8% identified as Pakistani. The average age of students in the sample was 20.07 years old; 21.6% were in their first year of school; 16% were in their second; 19.2% in their third year; 32.8% were in their fourth year; and 10.4% were in their fifth year or beyond. 47.2% identified as “involved in a romantic relationship” with the average length of romantic involvement being 1.94 years.

Descriptive Data Analyses

Preliminary analyses were performed to examine the distributional properties of each of the study variables and to assess statistical assumptions. One of the advantages of LCA over other similar methods is that the procedure is non-parametric in the sense that the assumptions of linearity, normal distributions, or homogeneity are not necessary for valid inference. Examination of histograms for each subscale did not reveal notable skewness or influential outliers. In addition, examination of scatterplots confirmed that all of the relationships between the various subscales were linear in nature and appropriate for linear correlation (Pearson’s r) and Latent Profile (class) Analysis. There was very little missing data present. Missing data ranged from 0%-3%. Thus, listwise deletion was used to run the analyses below given the very small amount of the missing data for each variable. MPLUS uses full information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimation to handle missing data. Thus, in the LCA analyses all of the available data was used to estimate the parameters. There was no need to delete participants due
to missing data because through the FIML approach researchers can use all available data in the estimation process.

**Analytic approach**

Because a disproportionate number of women responded to the study, changes to the data analysis plan were made. Specifically, due to the gender specific theoretical nature of the MGRS scale, two separate analysis were conducted—one with women only that excluded data from the MGRS scale, and one with men only that included data from the MGRS scale.

**Correlations: Subscale Inter-correlations**

Initial correlations examined the extent to which the different subscales of each measure were correlated with each other. Table 4 lists the means, standard deviations, and internal correlations for items on the MGRS scale for men. Tables 5 and Table 6 list the means, standard deviations, and internal subscale correlations for the NPI for men and women respectively. Tables 7 and Table 8 list the means, standard deviations, and internal subscale and full scale correlations for the AMS for men and women respectively.

Table 4

**Correlation Matrix for Masculine Gender Role Stress: Men (N=64)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical Inadequacy</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emotional Inexpressiveness</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subordination to Women</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intellectual Inferiority</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.529**</td>
<td>.517**</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance Failure</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01**
On the MGRS scale, the Performance Failure subscale was not significantly correlated with either the Emotional Inexpressiveness subscale or the Subordination to Women subscale. All other subscale scores for men on the MGRS scale were significantly and positively correlated. As each subscale uses a summation calculation to measure different aspects of gender role stress, it is appropriate that the subscales are positively correlated with each other.

Table 5

\textit{Correlation Matrix for Narcissism: Men (N=64)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Authority</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Sufficiency</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.309*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Superiority</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>.393**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exhibitionism</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.416**</td>
<td>.517**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exploitativeness</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.321*</td>
<td>.270*</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.321*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vanity</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.278*</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Entitlement</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.560**</td>
<td>.385**</td>
<td>.319*</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>.266*</td>
<td>.298*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* \( p < .05 \)  \** \( p < .01 \)

For men on the NPI, the Vanity subscale was not significantly correlated with the Self-Sufficiency or the Exploitativeness subscales. Further, the Exploitativeness subscale was not significantly correlated with the Superiority subscale. All other subscale scores on the NPI were significantly correlated for men. As each subscale uses a summation calculation to measure the presence of different aspects of narcissism, it is appropriate that the subscales are positively correlated with each other.
Table 6  

*Correlation Matrix for Narcissism: Women (N=125)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Authority</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Sufficiency</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Superiority</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exhibitionism</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exploitativeness</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>.280**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vanity</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Entitlement</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.209*</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  **p < .01

For women, scores on the Exhibitionism subscale were not significantly correlated with scores on the Self-Sufficiency subscale, and scores on the Entitlement subscale were not significantly correlated with scores on the Vanity subscale. All other subscales were significantly correlated. Again, as each subscale uses a summation calculation to measure the presence of different aspects of narcissism, it is appropriate that the subscales are positively correlated with each other.
Table 7

Correlation Matrix for Anger Management Total and Sub-Scale: Men (N=63)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anger Manage Total</td>
<td>103.23</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Escalating Strategies</td>
<td>36.54</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>-.834**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative Attributions</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>-.598**</td>
<td>.260*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Awareness</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.630**</td>
<td>-.310*</td>
<td>-.451**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Calming Strategies</td>
<td>22.24</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  **p < .01

For men, subscale scores on the AMS’ Calming Strategies subscale were not significantly correlated with either the Escalating Strategies or Negative Attributions subscales. All other correlations were significant and in the expected directions; this means that subscales measuring adaptive coping strategies were positively correlated with other subscales measuring adaptive coping strategies, and negatively correlated with subscales measuring maladaptive coping strategies, and vise-a-versa.
Table 8

*Correlation Matrix for Anger Management Total and Sub-Scale: Women (N=125)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anger Manage Total</td>
<td>101.07</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Escalating Strategies</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>-0.876**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative Attributions</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-0.699**</td>
<td>0.569**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Awareness</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.747**</td>
<td>-0.529**</td>
<td>-0.488**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Calming Strategies</td>
<td>20.62</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.512**</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.394**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01

For women, subscale scores on the AMS’ Calming Strategies subscale were not significantly correlated either the Escalating Strategies or Negative Attributions subscales. All other correlations were significant and in the expected directions; again, this means that subscales measuring adaptive coping strategies were positively correlated with other subscales measuring adaptive coping strategies, and negatively correlated with subscales measuring maladaptive coping strategies, and vice-a-versa.

Hypotheses

*Correlations between Predictors and AMS.*

Next, the correlations between the AMS subscales and both the NPI subscales and the MGRS subscales were examined. This portion of the analysis began the process of hypothesis testing. The goal of this analysis was to assess (in a univariate fashion) whether any of the narcissism or MGRS subscales were significantly related to any of the AMS subscales. Table 9 examines correlations relevant to Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2.
Table 9

_Correlation Matrix for AMS and MGRS: Men (N=64)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AM Total</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Escalating Strategies</td>
<td>-.834**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative Attributions</td>
<td>-.598**</td>
<td>.260*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Awareness</td>
<td>.630**</td>
<td>-.310*</td>
<td>-.451**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Calming Strategies</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Physical Inadequacy</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Emotional Inexpressiveness</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Subordination to Women</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intellectual Inferiority</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.529**</td>
<td>.517**</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Performance Failure</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  **p < .01

There were no significant correlations between items on the AMS scale and items on the MGRS scale. These findings were surprising and not consistent with Hypothesis 1 which predicted that high levels of MGRS would be associated (along with high NPI scores) with high levels of maladaptive coping strategies. This finding is also not consistent with Hypothesis 2 which predicted that low MGRS scores (along with low NPI scores) would be associated with the presence of increased _adaptive_ AMS scores. These preliminary correlations revealed, contrary to predictions, that no correlations exist between any of the anger management
subscales and any of the MGRS subscales. Table 10 also examines correlations relevant to Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2.

Table 10

**Correlation Matrix for AMS and Narcissism: Men (N=64)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AM Total</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Escalating Strategies</td>
<td>-.834**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative Attributions</td>
<td>-.598**</td>
<td>.260*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Awareness</td>
<td>.630**</td>
<td>-.310*</td>
<td>.451**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Calming Strategies</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Authority</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Self Sufficiency</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.309*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Superiority</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>.393**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Exhibitionism</td>
<td>-.291*</td>
<td>.314*</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.314*</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.416**</td>
<td>.517**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Exploitativeness</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.321*</td>
<td>.270*</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.321*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vanity</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.264*</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.278*</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Entitlement</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-.312*</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.560**</td>
<td>.385**</td>
<td>.319*</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>.266*</td>
<td>.298*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  **p < .01

For men, there were five significant subscale intercorrelations between the AMS and the NPI. This finding is partially consistent with Hypothesis 1 which predicted that high NPI scores (along with high MGRS scores) would be associated with high maladaptive AMS scores. These correlations show that, indeed, high scores on the Exhibitionism subscale of the NPI are
negatively correlated with over all adaptive anger management skills, positively correlated with maladaptive Escalating Strategies, and negatively correlated with adaptive Self-Awareness. Further, Entitlement is negatively correlated with adaptive Self Awareness and Vanity is positively correlated with maladaptive Negative Attributions. Although these findings are partially supportive of Hypothesis 1, they are not supportive of Hypothesis 2 which predicted that low NPI scores (along with low MGRS scores) would be associated with high adaptive AMS scores. Table 11 examines correlations relevant to Hypothesis 3 and Hypothesis 4.

Table 11

*Correlation Matrix for AMS and Narcissism: Women (N=125)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AM Total</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Escalating Strategies</td>
<td>-.876**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative Attributions</td>
<td>-.699**</td>
<td>.569**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Awareness</td>
<td>.747**</td>
<td>-.529**</td>
<td>-.488**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Calming Strategies</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Author</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Self Sufficiency</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Superiority</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Exhibitionism</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Exploitativeness</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.206*</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>.280**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vanity</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.192*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Entitlement</td>
<td>-.311**</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.209*</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  **p < .01
For women, there were five significant subscale intercorrelations between the AMS and the NPI. These findings were consistent with Hypothesis 3, which stated that high narcissism scores would be associated with the endorsement of poor anger management strategies. Entitlement scores on the NPI were negatively correlated with overall adaptive anger management skills, positively correlated with maladaptive Escalating Strategies, and positively correlated with maladaptive Negative Attributions. Further, Vanity and Exploitativeness were positively correlated with maladaptive Negative Attributions. These findings were not consistent with Hypothesis 4, which predicted that low narcissism scores would be associated with high adaptive anger management strategies.

In summary, these initial correlations revealed patterns somewhat consistent with Hypothesis 1, consistent with Hypothesis 3, and inconsistent with Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 4. Specifically, Hypothesis 1 predicted that high NPI and high MGRS scores would be associated with maladaptive AMS scores for men. Although no correlations were discovered between the MGRS scale and the AMS for men, several correlations in the predicted direction were found between the NPI and the AMS for men, lending partial support to Hypothesis 1. No support for Hypothesis 2, which predicted that low NPI and low MGRS scores would be associated with high adaptive anger management strategies, was found for men.

Support was found for Hypothesis 3, which stated that high NPI scores would be associated with poor AMS scores for women. These correlations suggest that women endorsing high levels of narcissism also tend to endorse high levels of maladaptive anger management strategies and low levels of adaptive anger management strategies. No support for Hypothesis 4, which stated that low NPI scores would be associated with the presence of adaptive AMS scores, was found.
**Latent Class Analysis**

*Males:* Initial LCA analyses were conducted to explore whether there were distinct classes of men defined by their patterns of narcissism and MGRS. Each of the subscales on the NPI and MGRS scale were included. Table 12 shows the model fit information for the 2 and 3 cluster solutions for both the male analysis and the female analysis, which will be discussed later in this section. For men, a model with three latent classes provided the lowest AIC & BIC and, therefore, best fit to the data. A 4-cluster solution did not improve fit.

Table 12

*Model Fit of LCA Solutions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Npar</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-cluster solution</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3697.57</td>
<td>3617.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-cluster solution</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3679.34</td>
<td>3571.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-cluster solution</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3183.29</td>
<td>3121.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-cluster solution</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3182.01</td>
<td>3097.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Males *N* = 64; Females *N* = 125.

Table 13 shows the parameter estimates (means) for each of the cluster groups on each of the measures. For men, approximately 40% of the sample was classified into cluster 1, 33% into cluster 2, and 27% into cluster 3. The cluster groups can be roughly labeled as follows:

- **Class 1:** Moderate MGRS, low narcissism
- **Class 2:** Moderate MRGS, high narcissism
- **Class 3:** High MGRS, moderate narcissism
These classes draw their names from the means in the parameter estimates listed below in Table 13. For example, regarding MGRS, an inspection of the means for Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 reveal generally moderate MGRS subscale scores. However, the MGRS subscale means for Cluster 3 are noticeably higher; hence, the respective labels for Class 1, Class 2, and Class 3 above. Similarly, with regard to Narcissism, the means from Cluster 1 are relatively low, quite high for Cluster 2, and somewhat moderate for Cluster 3; hence the respective labels for Class 1, Class 2, and Class 3 above.

Table 13

*Parameter Estimates (means) for the 3-Cluster Solution (Men)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M_Phys</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td>36.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_Emo</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>21.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_Sub</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>31.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_Intell</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>19.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_Performance</td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>40.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Auth</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Self</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Sup</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Exhi</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Explo</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Van</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Entit</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $N = 64$; All estimates are statistically significant at $p<.001$. 
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Next, each of the AMS subscales were explored (separately) as predictors of latent class membership. This is equivalent to a multinomial logistic regression model with class membership used as the dependent variable. The only significant effect was with the AMS Escalating Strategies subscale, odds ratio=1.11, z=-1.97, p=.048. People scoring higher on the AMS Escalating Strategies subscale were more likely to be in class 2 as opposed to class 1. Specifically, for each unit increase in AMS Escalating Strategies endorsement, the odds of being in class 2 as opposed to class 1 increase by 1.11 times. Seeing that these two classes differ only on levels of narcissism suggests that men with moderate MGRS and high narcissism (as opposed to low narcissism) score higher on the endorsement of maladaptive Escalating Strategies.

It is notable that only a difference in narcissism separated these groups; both groups endorsed moderate levels of MGRS. These findings lend partial support to Hypothesis 1, which predicted that high MGRS/high narcissism men would also endorse high maladaptive anger management strategies. None of the three classes differed on any other AMS subscale scores. These findings lend no support to Hypothesis 2, which predicted that low MGRS/low narcissism men would also endorse high adaptive anger management strategies.

Females: Initial LCA analyses were conducted to explore whether there were distinct classes of women defined by their patterns of narcissism. Each of the subscales on the NPI was included. Again, Table 12 shows the model fit information for the 2 and 3 cluster solutions. A model with three latent classes provided the lowest AIC & BIC and, therefore, best fit to the data. A 4-cluster solution did not improve fit.

Table 14 shows the parameter estimates (means) for each of the cluster groups on each of the measures. Approximately 34% of the sample was classified into cluster 1, 50% into cluster 2, and 16% into cluster 3. The cluster groups can be roughly labeled as follows:
Class 1: Moderate narcissism

Class 2: Low narcissism

Class 3: High narcissism

These cluster groups draw their names from the means in the parameter estimates listed below in Table 14. An inspection of the table reveals that the means for Cluster 2 are almost universally low in comparison to the other two clusters. It also reveals that the means for Cluster 1 are almost universally higher than the means for Cluster 2, and almost universally lower than the means for Cluster 3. In other words, there is a low narcissism class, a moderate narcissism class, and a high narcissism class.

Table 14

Parameter Estimates (means) for the 3-Cluster Solution (Women)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N_Auth</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Self</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Sup</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Exhi</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Explo</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Van</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_Entit</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 125; All estimates are statistically significant at p<.001.

Next, each of the AMS subscales were explored (separately) as predictors of latent class membership. This is, again, equivalent to a multinomial logistic regression model with class membership entered as the dependent variable. Again, the only significant effect was on the
AMS Escalating Strategies subscale. Women scoring higher on the AMS Escalating Strategies subscale were less likely to be in class 2 as opposed to class 3, odds ratio=.80, z=-3.44, p=.048, or class 1, odds ratio=.83, z=-3.12, p=.002. In other words, women scoring higher in maladaptive escalating anger management strategies were more likely to be in the latent class with the highest narcissism.

These results are consistent with Hypothesis 3, which predicted that women high in narcissism would also endorse higher levels of maladaptive anger management strategies. These results are not consistent with Hypothesis 4, which predicted that women low in narcissism would endorse higher levels of adaptive anger management strategies. The Escalating Strategies subscale was the only subscale to have a significant effect on the analysis for both men and women.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Summary of the Study

Much research over the past few decades has investigated the various factors that contribute to spousal/dating violence and many different factors have been implicated in the perpetration of such violence. Among those factors, anger management skills have been identified as key components of dating violence perpetration: Individuals with poor anger management skills may be more likely to commit acts of violence against their romantic partners than individuals with more adaptive anger management skills (Stith & Hamby, 2002; Dye & Eckhardt, 2002; Baker & Stith, 2008; Turcotte-Seabury, 2010).

Indeed, many different variables are known to contribute to the development of poor anger management skills (Hazebroek, Howells, & Day, 2001; Kuppens & Tuerlinckx, 2006; Turcotte-Seabury, 2010) and understanding such variables is important in the domains of clinical treatment and prevention. Regarding anger management training, and the treatment and prevention of spousal/dating violence, a major focus in the literature has been on self-esteem (Bradbury & Clarke, 2006; Walker & Bright, 2009). This literature will be detailed below as it relates to the results of this study. Despite this focus on self-esteem in the literature, however, a growing body of research suggests other personality variables may be more important regarding such violence. It is, therefore, important to further investigate and understand such variables—most important, so that treatment and prevention programs may be better able to provide services to individuals and couples struggling with dating violence.
This study was designed to investigate the relationship between the traits narcissism and MGRS, and the association these traits have with anger management skills. Narcissism and Masculine Gender Role Stress are both personality traits known to be highly associated with aggression and with problems in anger management (Twenge & Campbell, 2003; Jakupcak, et al., 2002). They were chosen as variables of interest in this study due to the way they seem to function similarly with regard to anger management; both seem to be associated with anger that arises as a result of perceived or actual environmental threats to an idealized and unrealistic view of self. It was predicted, therefore, that participants in the present study would cluster together in accordance with patterns found in the literature discussed above. The following section outlines the predictions of the current study, and details the support and lack of support for these predictions in the current data.

Conclusions

Findings of Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis One. It was predicted that a distinct cluster of men would emerge who endorsed a high level of both narcissism and MGRS, and a high level of maladaptive anger management strategies. This prediction was based on the author’s speculation that narcissism and MGRS—both known to be associated with anger based on an idealized and unrealistic view of self—function similarly with regard to anger management skills. Such similarity, it was predicted, would lead to a latent group of men with high scores on these two personality variables and with high levels of maladaptive anger management strategies. This hypotheses was partially supported.

Three latent classes of men emerged in the data analysis. Within these classes, no clear pattern emerges with regard to an association between narcissism and MGRS. Class 1 was
comprised of men with moderate levels of MGRS and low levels of narcissism. Class 2 was also comprised of men with moderate levels of MGRS but high levels of narcissism. Class 3 was comprised of men with high levels of MGRS and moderate levels of narcissism. By themselves, these three classes seem somewhat confusing and provide no clear pattern of association.

Stated more clearly, within these three classes, there was a class of low, a class of moderate, and a class of high narcissism individuals; two of these three classes were comprised of individuals who endorsed moderate levels of MGRS and one was comprised of individuals who endorsed high levels of MGRS. Again, there seems to be no clear association or pattern between MGRS and narcissism in these three classes. Thus, and contrary to the above predictions, no “high narcissism/high MGRS” class emerged. However, in the next step of the analysis a pattern at least somewhat consistent with the expected results did emerge.

A second latent class model was conducted to determine if these three groups differed on any of the anger management subscales. The results of this analysis showed that only Class 1 (low narcissism/moderate MGRS) and Class 2 (high narcissism/moderate MGRS) differed with regard to only one of the AMS subscale—specifically, on their endorsement of items on the Escalating Strategies subscale. Recall that the Escalating Strategies subscale is one of the two subscales on the Anger Management Scale that measures maladaptive coping strategies. As its name implies, this subscale measures strategies and tactics that tend to exacerbate and enflame anger during arguments or disagreements, thus leading to the potential for violence perpetration. Specifically, men in the higher narcissism group of Class 2 were more likely to endorse the use of these maladaptive escalating strategies than men in the lower narcissism group of Class 1.

This finding is at least somewhat consistent with the predicted results; although levels of MGRS did not seem to play any part in differentiating Class 1 and Class 2, narcissism did. Individuals
endorsing higher levels of narcissism also endorsed higher levels of maladaptive anger management skills, and men low in narcissism were less likely to endorse high levels of maladaptive anger management strategies.

_Hypothesis Two._ It was also predicted that a distinct cluster of men with low narcissism and low MGRS scores, and high levels of adaptive anger management skills would emerge from the data. No such cluster did emerge. As stated above, although a low narcissism/moderate MGRS class with low levels of _maladaptive_ anger management skills did, in fact emerge, this group was _not_ differentiated by the presence of increased _positive_ coping strategies, nor was it characterized by relatively _low_ levels of MGRS as was predicted.

_Hypothesis Three._ It was predicted that a distinct cluster of women would emerge comprised of high narcissism individuals who also endorsed high levels of maladaptive anger management strategies. Similar to the men in the study, three latent classes of female participants emerged from the data: a low narcissism class, a moderate narcissism class, and a high narcissism class. (MGRS was not included in this analysis due to its theoretical inappropriateness for a female population.)

When a second latent class model was conducted to determine if these groups differed with regard to anger management skills, it was found that subjects in the high narcissism group were more likely to endorse high levels of maladaptive anger management skills than individuals in the low narcissism group. As with the men, the high narcissism group was more likely to endorse high scores on the Escalating Strategies subscale than subjects in the low or moderate narcissism group. This finding was consistent with predicted results and consistent with the consensus in the aforementioned literature that high levels of narcissism are generally
accompanied by high levels of anger and poor anger management skills among women (McCann & Biaggio, 1989; Rhodewalt & Morf; 1998).

*Hypothesis Four.* It was predicted that a distinct cluster of women would emerge comprised of low narcissism individuals who also endorsed high levels of adaptive anger management strategies. As with the men, no such cluster emerged from the data. As stated above, a low narcissism cluster of individuals who also endorsed low levels of *maladaptive* anger management strategies emerged, but this cluster did *not* endorse higher levels of *adaptive* anger management strategies.

As predicted for both men and women in the current study, it seems that a difference in narcissism may be responsible for differences in the use of maladaptive anger management strategies. The literature cited above would suggest that people who score high on measures of narcissism are also more likely to endorse higher levels of anger in conflict situations and lower levels of control over that anger (White, Callahan, & Perez-Lopez, 2002; Papps & O’Carroll, 1998; McCann & Biaggio, 1989), and the results of the current study are consistent with that literature. In this study the more narcissistic group of both men and women were more likely to endorse maladaptive anger management strategies than their less narcissistic peers.

Contrary to predictions, for both men and women in the present study low levels of narcissism did not cluster together with high levels of positive coping strategies. Although the presence of high narcissism seems to be associated with the presence of maladaptive anger management strategies, the *absence* of high narcissism is not necessarily sufficient to predict the presence of *positive* and *adaptive* anger management strategies. The presence of positive and adaptive anger management strategies may require more than simply the absence of maladaptive narcissism. Future modeling efforts should investigate not only the personality characteristics
that contribute to the presence of maladaptive anger management skills (e.g., narcissism) but also the personality characteristics that contribute to the presence of adaptive anger management skills. The current study supports the notion that the absence of high levels of narcissism is not necessarily sufficient for the presence of adaptive anger management skills.

Regarding the relationship between narcissism and aggression, previous work has suggested that the mechanism responsible for this relationship may be complex. Threatened egotism, violated assumptions of intense entitlement, inherent low levels of empathy or caring for others, the intense desire to protect a fragile sense of self-worth, a heightened desire to have authority over others, and a high propensity and acceptance for interpersonal exploitativeness to meet one’s own needs have all been suggested as mechanisms by which narcissism leads to aggression and violence against others (Twenge & Campbell, 2003; Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Fossati et al., 2010; & Reidy, Zeichner, Foster, & Martinez, 2008). The results of the present study cannot speak to a causal mechanism by which subjects who endorse high levels of narcissism also tend to endorse high levels of maladaptive anger management skills; the present study was designed to be exploratory only and causal statements are not warranted from the data. However, in the present study, the emergence of a distinct cluster of men and a distinct cluster of women endorsing high levels of narcissism and high levels of maladaptive anger management strategies does lend further support to the aforementioned literature documenting the relationship between narcissism and aggression.

It may be that both men and women endorsing high levels of narcissism in the current study also experience high levels of entitlement and a readiness to exploit others for personal gain. If this were the case, such individuals may perceive little need or desire to restrain or modulate their expression of anger. In fact, it may be that for such individuals, the escalation of
anger and aggression during interpersonal conflict leads to a greater propensity to obtain what they feel they are entitled to, regardless of the degree to which such escalation of anger leads to the exploitation of others. If this were the case, it could be argued that such individuals perceive no need or necessity to reduce the expression of their anger, but rather, that they believe they have much to gain by escalating anger and aggression toward others. This speculation would fit the pattern of results found in this study, but—of course—must remain speculative at best, given the exploratory nature of the data reported.

Future latent class modeling employing larger sample sizes randomly drawn from appropriate populations may benefit from an analysis of the specific components of narcissism that tend to cluster with poor anger management skills. As suggested by Reidy et al. (2008), a sense of entitlement over others and a readiness to act in an exploitative way to meet one’s needs may differentiate narcissistic individuals who do, and who do not, employ negative anger management strategies; it may be that narcissistic features such as vanity, self-sufficiency, and exhibitionism play little to no role in the perpetration of aggressive acts, but that narcissistic traits of entitlement and exploitativeness do. Future efforts to model the complex relationship between these traits and the utilization of adaptive and maladaptive anger management skills may make this complex association more clear.

Despite predictions to the contrary, for men in the current study differences in the level of Masculine Gender Role Stress did not affect the endorsement of negative or positive anger management skills, and no interaction between narcissism and MGRS was apparent. This would imply that, similarly to the findings of McDermott et al. (2011), for men, attitudes and feelings related to gender roles may be separate from attitudes related to personal grandiosity and
entitlement. Despite the above hypothesis that the two constructs function similarly with regard to anger management, the present data would suggest that they do not.

McDermott and colleagues found that men experiencing confusion regarding their endorsement of traditional gender roles were at an increased risk of using maladaptive anger management strategies, and they directly likened this process to MGRS. These authors also noted an interaction between entitlement and acceptance of traditional gender-roles with regard to anger management; in their data, men high in entitlement did not differ in their self-awareness of rising anger as their level of gender-role acceptance changed, but men low in entitlement did endorse greater self-awareness of rising anger as their endorsement of traditional gender-roles decreased. As mentioned above, the results of the McDermott et al. study seemed to indicate that anxiety and stress concerning masculine gender roles may be relevant to anger management only for men low in narcissistic entitlement.

Unlike the findings of McDermott et al. (2011), no interaction between ideas related to gender (i.e. MGRS) and Narcissism was found in the current study and MGRS did not seem to be related to anger management skills. McDermott et al. (2011) recruited a sample of 198 men and the present study was only able to recruit 64 men. It is possible that with a greater sample size, an interaction between MGRS, narcissism, and anger management skills would have been obtained. It is also possible that the MGRS scale may not, in fact, be a sufficient measure for such research. McDermott et al. used a measure of what they called “Gender Role Journey Phase” and although similar to MGRS, these are, in fact, two different measures. Further, a convenience sample was employed in the current study and it may be that some unknown variable or characteristic of this sample contributed to the current findings—meaning that a random sample may have generated different results.
For both men and women, a latent class analysis was employed to determine how subjects cluster together with regard to these variables. These data generally suggest that people endorsing higher levels of narcissism are more likely also to endorse the increased use of maladaptive anger management skills than individuals endorsing lower levels of narcissism. These findings support the general consensus in the literature that increased narcissism scores are related to increased problems associated with anger in relationships.

Limitations

Notably, this study used self-report data only and did not obtain information from both members of couples. Violence in dating relationships is part of a multifaceted interaction, and the incorporation of partner data may help further clarify the variables that contribute to poor anger management skills and the use of aggression. No measure of social desirability was obtained and, therefore, it is not possible to say to what degree participants responses were biased. It may further enhance the study of anger management and dating violence to employ qualitative analysis to supplement quantitative data; again, such data may further uncover key aspects of anger management in relationships that are not captured via single informant, self-report studies. Indeed, studies such as the present one only capture a small and potentially biased view of what is certainly a complex and multifaceted social interaction. The incorporation of partner data, qualitative measurement of couples’ interactions, and control for social desirability effects would certainly strengthen the external validity of a study such as this.

Implications and Future Research

This body of findings has the potential to be useful in its practical implications for the treatment of anger management issues, and the prevention of dating violence. Therapeutic interventions for perpetrators of dating violence and clients of anger management treatment may
be better and more successfully served by an increased understanding of the variables (such as narcissism) that contribute to such behaviors. However, determining the most relevant variables regarding such treatment and prevention efforts is important. This study—along with the many cited above—has highlighted the importance of narcissism as one such variable.

Previous literature cites self-esteem as another such variable that should be included in future models of narcissism and anger management. As detailed below, the literature on anger management and violence prevention is replete with statements and findings regarding the importance of self-esteem. However, the following discussion reviews the somewhat contradictory and complicated nature of the findings on self-esteem with regard to anger management. These findings may suggest that the results of the current study are important when it comes to further refining models of anger management to include measures of both narcissism and self-esteem.

As stated above, Bradbury & Clarke (2006) evaluated the implementation and outcome of a manualized cognitive behavioral anger management program. These authors noted that clients who stayed in and completed the program had significantly higher self-esteem scores after successfully completing the program than when they entered the group. Further, Bradbury & Clarke noted significant increases in anger control and self-esteem, and as stated above, postulated that either learning to successfully manage anger may increase a person’s self-esteem, or increasing a person’s self-esteem, may in fact, motivate clients to work harder on resolving their issues with anger.

Regarding the potential importance of self-esteem, Bradbury & Clarke (2006) further go on to cite Prochaska and DiClemente (1984), who discuss the way failure to change may be caused by low self-esteem, and Miller & Rollnick (1991), who state that self-esteem is central to
making changes in a client’s life. The realization that one has a problem, these authors argue, may decrease self-esteem and thereby decrease motivation to change; therefore, by raising a person’s self-esteem, Miller & Rollnick (1991) argue that clinicians may effectively increase motivation for treatment and change.

Support for the notion that self-esteem is a valuable variable in the study of violence comes from Walker & Bright (2009). In their review of 19 articles investigating the link between self-esteem and violence, these authors concluded that, indeed, low self-esteem rather than high self-esteem is related to violence. Walker & Bright reviewed articles drawing from undergraduate, prison inmate, adolescent, partner-violent men, and adjudicated male populations. They conclude that the majority of studies indicated that low self-esteem rather than high self-esteem is associated with violent and aggressive behavior; however, they also noted that some studies found that both low and high self-esteem were related to violence. These authors state that “there may be both conscious and unconscious inflation of self-esteem, conscious inflation being more commonly recognized as arrogance, and unconscious inflation being more similar to the narcissistic defence (defence mechanisms being unconscious ways of minimizing conscious or psychic disturbance)” (p. 18).

Walker & Bright (2009) do address the idea of narcissism in their paper, but only insofar as they believe it relates to self-esteem. These authors state that 6 of the papers they reviewed showed that, “Concerning the inflation of self-esteem, it was found…that narcissism predicts aggression”. (p. 19). These authors discuss the way extremely low self-esteem is covered up by a false inflated self-esteem (narcissism), and state that therapy should be aimed at increasing actual self-esteem. Further, in response to Baumeister et al. (2000) who state that narcissism, not self-esteem, is the relevant variable with regard to clinical intervention with aggressive individuals,
Walker & Bright (2009) discuss the way focusing on feelings of superiority may compound clinical problems, if such feelings are simply a proxy for inner feelings of inferiority.

There seems to be a compelling case for the importance of self-esteem as it relates to the etiology and treatment of anger management issues and aggression. However, does a clinical and research focus on self-esteem capture the entire picture when it comes to aggression and anger management? These arguments about the importance of self-esteem in anger management treatment raise an interesting question: Is narcissism just another word for “false inflated self-esteem”?

Despite the evidence that low self-esteem may be strongly related to aggression and violence, the popular notion that narcissism serves a protective function against painfully diminished feelings of self-worth may not be accurate. Campbell, Bosson, Goheen, Lakey, & Kernis (2007) respond to this popular notion by asking “Do narcissists dislike themselves, ‘Deep down inside’?” According to their findings, the answer seems to be, “no, they don’t”. In fact, according to Campbell et al. (2007), narcissists seem to like themselves just fine. The important component of Campbell et al.’s research seems to have been determining exactly what questions to ask narcissists regarding their self-appraisal. For example, when asked to rate their self-concept in agentic domains (e.g. with regard to status, power, influence, intelligence, etc) narcissists report both high implicit and high explicit self-views. However, when asked to rate their self-concept in communal domains (e.g. with regard to kindness, affection, morality, friendliness, etc) narcissists report neutral self-views. This would tend to suggest that when thinking about one’s self in regard to ideals of power and authority, narcissists think quite highly of themselves. When asked to consider their self-worth with regard to interpersonal kindness and moral functioning, narcissists seem not to have either a positive or negative view of themselves.
Further evidence would suggest that not only are high narcissism and low self-esteem not entirely synonymous, but they are, in fact, functionally different with regard to anger management and violence. As above, Twenge & Campbell (2003) investigated the relationship between narcissism, self-esteem, and the perpetration of violence against another person. They found that individuals who score high on narcissism are more likely to respond aggressively to social rejection than non-narcissistic individuals are. In their study, Twenge & Campbell also found that narcissists were more likely to respond aggressively to an “innocent third party” after being socially rejected; even when the third party was not the source of the social rejection. As stated above, Twenge & Campbell also found that an individual’s level of narcissism is, in fact, the critical variable in terms of predicting aggression, whereas an individual’s level of self-esteem is not related to their propensity to commit violence. These findings were consistent with Baumeister, Bushman, & Campbell, (2000), and Bushman & Baumeister, (1998).

Twenge & Campbell also investigated the affective responses of subjects as they faced social rejection. They measured subjects’ levels of feelings of anger (e.g. irritability, wrath, rage, etc) and feelings of internalized negative affect (e.g. sadness, shame, guilt, embarrassment, anxiety, etc) following social rejection. They found that self-esteem and narcissism scores were both related to subjects’ ratings of different affective states following rejection, but in different ways. After a social rejection, narcissists’ scores were positively and significantly correlated with emotions related to anger, and significantly and negatively correlated with internalized negative affect. Self-esteem scores, on the other hand, were not correlated with anger scores after social rejection.

In other words, what Twenge & Campbell (2003) found was that, although both narcissism and self-esteem scores predict feelings of internalized negative affect after social
rejection (e.g., shame, sadness, etc), only narcissism predicts feelings of anger. These authors also found that narcissists respond to rejection with less shame, sadness, and hurt than do non-narcissists following a rejection. Based on their findings that narcissism rather than self-esteem predicts aggression, Twenge & Campbell (2003) discuss the way school programs designed to identify students who may become violent should use measures of narcissism rather than measures of self-esteem as a potential screening device.

Further literature suggests that the relationship between narcissism, self-esteem, and anger may be even more complicated. Papps & O’Carroll (1998) also investigated the relationship between self-esteem, narcissism, and anger. They identified four groups in their study; a high self-esteem/high narcissism group; a high self-esteem/low narcissism group; a low self-esteem/high narcissism group; and finally, a low self-esteem/low narcissism group. They measured the degree to which these groups differed in regard to the expression, control, frequency, strength of, and disposition to experience anger. What they found was that high narcissism/high self-esteem individual experience more trait anger, are prone to more anger both with and without provocation, express their anger more openly to other people and objects in their environment, express anger more frequently, and express greater levels of anger than low narcissism/high self-esteem participants. The low narcissism/high self-esteem group controlled the expression of their anger more and expressed significantly lower levels of anger. Papps & O’Carroll state that high self-esteem is associated with an increased or decreased tendency to experience anger and express anger, and that the variability in this anger is due to an individual’s level of narcissism.

Further, Papps & O’Carroll found that low self-esteem individuals, in general, are prone to moderate levels of anger arousal; these levels of anger arousal are less than those experienced
by high narcissism/high self-esteem individuals, but greater than those experienced by low narcissism/high self-esteem individuals. With regard to response to criticism, Papps & O’Carroll found that low self-esteem/high narcissism individuals indicated the highest levels of anger out of all the groups. These authors concluded that since both high and low self-esteem individuals express the most anger after criticism, it may be the case that narcissism levels are what actually predict trait anger reactions to criticism, independent of an individual’s level of self-esteem.

It is clear that the relationship between narcissism, self-esteem, and anger is complicated. The way self-esteem is measured may be critical in further understanding this complex relationship (Walker & Bright, 2009; Campbell et al. 2007). Also, further differentiating the functional concepts of low self-esteem and narcissism with regard to anger management may be increasingly accomplished by investigating the components of narcissism most relevant to anger management. Recall that Witte, Callahan & Perez-Lopez (2002) found that perceived authority and entitlement as measured by the NPI were associated with increased anger scores; these authors stated that these particular aspects of narcissism may be more relevant to the study of anger than the broad construct of narcissism. Indeed, this finding is similar to findings reported in Fossati et al. (2010) who found that entitlement was a key component in different types of aggression.

It is against this complicated theoretical backdrop that the results of this study lend further evidence to the already well established idea that an individual’s level of narcissism is a critical variable to consider when working to address anger-management issues. Higher levels of narcissism seem to be strongly and consistently related to poorer anger management strategies. Such information may be critical in the design and implementation of anger management programs and dating violence prevention programs. However, it is the assertion of the author that
such programs need to be informed by accurate and, likely complex, models of personality and anger-management. Simply focusing on clients’ levels of self-esteem may not be sufficient in the context of anger management treatment and research. A thorough understanding of the complicated and multifaceted nature of the relationships between these variables will likely prove far more helpful than simplistic models based on self-esteem alone.

Future modeling techniques should be employed to help identify different clusters of individuals who struggle with anger management skills in an effort to tailor and craft more effective treatments. Although the results of this study did not support the idea that Masculine Gender Role Stress contributes to anger management problems, it may be that future models will find different results, more consistent with the pre-existing literature on MGRS. This study has suggested that narcissism may be a variable that contributes to problems with anger management and aggression, and this finding is consistent with the existing literature.

However, the literature above tells us that the relationship between these two variables may not be simple. An individual’s level of self-esteem, circumstantial factors, family of origin issues, and other personality variables may be important factors to include in future models of personality and anger management. Further, issues related to culture and ethnicity may also be extremely important variables to consider with regard to future modeling, as would a continued focus on sex differences.

Conclusion

The present study represents a first step in modeling the personality traits that cluster around, and contribute to, poor anger management skills. The current findings are intended to provide a foundational structure upon which to further build a theory of anger management and violence perpetration. Continued research employing different samples, multiple informants as
opposed to self-report only, measures of life experience and relationship dynamics as well as personality, and multiple measures addressing actual violence perpetration will contribute to, further develop, and refine an accurate and useful model of perpetrators of relationship violence. Clinicians and administrators alike should be aware of the relationship between narcissism and aggression when conceptualizing treatments, intervention programs, and trying to identify risk factors for violent behavior (Twenge & Campbell, 2003).
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Consent Form

CONSENT FORM
Counseling and Human Development Services

I, _________________________________, agree to participate in a research study titled Factors Affecting Anger Management in College Students conducted by Matthew Orbell from the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services (542-1812) under the direction of Dr. Alan Stewart, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, University of Georgia (542-1812). I understand that my participation is voluntary. I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at anytime without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I understand that I am eligible to participate in this study provided that I am at least 18 years old and I have not previously participated in this same study.

The reason for this study is to assess the relationship between certain personality factors and the strategies people use to manage anger. In order to make this study a valid one, some information about the study will be withheld until the end of today’s data gathering session. If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to answer survey questions about myself, my relationships with others, and my reactions to certain situations. Total participation should take approximately 30 minutes.

As incentive for my participation, I will receive .5 credits for my participation in this study. Even if I do not answer all questions or if I decide to withdraw from the study, I will still receive my extra course credit. Alternately, I understand that there are other studies in the ECHD research pool that I can complete for credits or I can see my instructor for alternative non-research assignments for credits.

The benefit for me is that I will experience what it is like to participate in an academic study.

No more than minimal risk is expected for me regarding my participation in this study, but I may experience some discomfort or mild anxiety answering some of the questions or addressing some of the hypothetical scenarios presented to me in the surveys. Any anxiety that I may experience will likely be mild and short lived. I understand that if I experience lingering or intense anxiety, I may withdraw my participation. I may skip any questions I do not wish to answer. I also understand that the researcher will make information about on-campus counseling available to me.

Counseling Resources on UGA campus
Center for Counseling and Personal Evaluation: 424 Aderhold Hall. 706-542-8508
Counseling and Psychiatric Services (CAPS): UGA Health Center. 706-542-2273

Results of my participation will be anonymous.

The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project. I can contact the primary researcher, Matt Orbell, via phone with any questions I have about the research, either now or later. I understand that as I am filling out these surveys, he will be available for questions. (706) 614-4045.
I understand that I am agreeing by my signature on this form to take part in this research project and understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form for my records.

_________________________________  ___________________________  __________
Name of Researcher  Signature   Date
Telephone: ______________________
Email: ____________________________

_________________________________  ___________________________  __________
Name of Participant  Signature   Date

Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 629 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.
APPENDIX B

Demographic Form

Please answer the following demographic questions.

1. What is your gender?  A) Male      B) Female

2. What is your age? ______________

3. What is your Ethnicity? _________________

4. What is your year in college?
   a. First Year (Freshman)
   b. Second Year (Sophomore)
   c. Third Year (Junior)
   d. Fourth Year (Senior)
   e. Fifth Year or beyond.

5. Are you currently in a romantic relationship?  A) Yes      B) No

6. If yes, how long have you and your partner been together? ______________

7. Do you typically date,  A) Men      B) Women
# APPENDIX C

## Narcissistic Personality Inventory

In each of the following pairs of attitudes, choose the one that you **MOST AGREE** with. Mark your answer by **writing EITHER A or B** in the space provided. If you do not identify with either statement, select the one which is least objectionable or remote. In other words, read each pair of statements and then choose the one that is closer to your own feelings. Only mark **ONE ANSWER** for each attitude pair.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I have a natural talent for influencing people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I am not good at influencing people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Modesty doesn’t become me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I am essentially a modest person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I would do almost anything on a dare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I tend to be a fairly cautious person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>When people compliment me I get embarrassed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I know that I am a good person because everybody keeps telling me so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell out of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>If I ruled the world it would be a much better place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I can usually talk my way out of anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I try to accept the consequences of my behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I prefer to blend in with the crowd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I like to be the center of attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I will be a success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I am not too concerned about success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I am no better or no worse than most people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I think I am a special person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I am not sure if I would make a good leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I see myself as a good leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I am assertive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I wish I were more assertive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I like having authority over other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I don’t mind following orders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I find it easy to manipulate people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I don’t like it when I find myself manipulating people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.</td>
<td>I usually get the respect I deserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I don’t particularly like to show off my body.</td>
<td>I like to show off my body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I can read people like a book.</td>
<td>People are sometimes hard to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>If I feel competent I am willing to take responsibility for making decisions.</td>
<td>I like to take responsibility for making decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I just want to be reasonably happy.</td>
<td>I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My body is nothing special.</td>
<td>I like to look at my body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I try not to be a show off.</td>
<td>I will usually show off if I get the chance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I sometimes depend on people to get things done.</td>
<td>I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Sometimes I tell good stories.</td>
<td>Everybody likes to hear my stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I expect a great deal from other people.</td>
<td>I like to do things for other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.</td>
<td>I will take my satisfactions as they come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Compliments embarrass me.</td>
<td>I like to be complimented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I have a strong will to power.</td>
<td>Power for its own sake doesn’t interest me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I don’t care about new fads and fashion.</td>
<td>I like to start new fads and fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I like to look at myself in the mirror.</td>
<td>I am not particularly interested in looking at myself in the mirror.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I really like to be the center of attention.</td>
<td>It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I can live my life any way I want to.</td>
<td>People can’t always live their lives in terms of what they want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Being in authority doesn’t mean much to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>People always seem to recognize my authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I would prefer to be a leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>It makes little difference to me whether I am a leader or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I am going to be a great person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I hope I am going to be successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>People sometimes believe what I tell them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I can make anyone believe anything I want them to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I am a born leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leadership is a quality that takes a long time to develop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I wish someone would someday write my biography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I don’t like people to pry into my life for any reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I get upset when people don’t notice how I look when I go out in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I don’t mind blending into the crowd when I go out in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I am more capable than other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>There is a lot I can learn from other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I am much like everybody else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I am an extraordinary person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale

Please rate the following items according to how stressful the situation would be for you. Give each item a rating on the scale ranging from (1) "Not Stressful" to (6) "Extremely Stressful". Please place the number (1 through 6) of your response on the line next to the item. If you have not had the experiences listed in this survey—e.g., "How would you feel if YOUR children saw you cry"—please consider the question as a "hypothetical", and give your best guess for an answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Stressful</th>
<th>Minimally Stressful</th>
<th>Somewhat Stressful</th>
<th>Moderately Stressful</th>
<th>Very Stressful</th>
<th>Extremely Stressful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Feeling that you are not in good physical condition. __________

2. Telling your spouse that you love her/him. __________

3. Being outperformed at work by a woman. __________

4. Having to ask for directions when you are lost. __________

5. Being unemployed. __________

6. Not being able to find a sexual partner. __________

7. Having a female boss. __________

8. Having your lover say that she/he is not satisfied. __________

9. Letting a woman take control of the situation. __________

10. Not making enough money. __________

11. Being perceived by someone as "gay" or “lesbian”. __________

12. Telling someone that you feel hurt by what they said. __________

13. Being married to someone who makes more money than you. __________
14. Working with people who seem more ambitious than you.

15. Finding you lack the occupational skills to succeed.

16. Losing in a sports competition.

17. Admitting that you are afraid of something.

18. Being with a woman who is more successful than you.

19. Talking with a "feminist".

20. Being unable to perform sexually.

21. Being perceived as having feminine traits.

22. Having your children see you cry.

23. Being outperformed in a game by a woman.

24. Having people say that you are indecisive.

25. Being too tired for sex when your lover initiates it.

26. Appearing less athletic than a friend.

27. Talking with a woman who is crying.

28. Needing your spouse to work to help support the family.

29. Having others say that you are too emotional.

30. Being unable to become sexually aroused when you want.

31. Being compared unfavorably to men.
32. Comforting a male friend who is upset.

33. Admitting to your friends that you do housework.

34. Working with people who are brighter than yourself.

35. Getting passed over for a promotion.

36. Knowing you cannot hold your liquor as well as others.

37. Having a man put his arm around your shoulder.

38. Being with a woman who is much taller than you.

39. Staying home during the day with a sick child.

40. Getting fired from your job.
APPENDIX E

Anger Management Scale

The following statements are about you and the relationship between you and your partner. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree with it. Answers range from (1) Strongly Disagree to (4) Strongly Agree. Place the number (1 through 4) of your response on the line next to the item. If you are not currently in a romantic relationship, you may reference a previous relationship. If you have never been in a romantic relationship, you may reference a relationship with a peer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>When my partner picks a fight with me, I fight back.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>When my partner won’t give in, I get furious.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I often take what my partner says personally.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My partner believes I have a short fuse.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I can feel my blood rising when I start to get mad at my partner.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Taking a break from my partner is a good way for me to calm down.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When my partner is around I feel like a bomb waiting to explode.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I prefer to get out of the way when my partner hassles me.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>It is my partner’s fault when I get mad.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>When my partner is nice to me I wonder what my partner wants.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>No matter how angry I am, I am responsible for my behavior toward my partner.</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>When my partner provokes me, I have a right to</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fight back.

13. I can feel it in my body when I’m starting to get mad at my partner.

14. My partner does things just to annoy me.

15. There is nothing I can do to control my feelings when my partner hassles me.

16. My partner is rude to me unless I insist on respect.

17. My partner likes to make me mad.

18. When my partner annoys me, I blow up before I even know that I am getting angry.

19. I recognize when I am beginning to get angry at my partner.

20. I am able to remain calm and not get angry at my partner.

21. I can usually tell when I am about to lose my temper at my partner.

22. I take time out as a way to control my anger at my partner.

23. I take a deep breath and try to relax when I’m angry at my partner.

24. I can set up a time-out period during an argument with my partner.

25. When I feel myself getting angry at my partner, I try to tell myself to calm down.

26. I often think of something pleasant to keep from thinking about my anger at my partner.

27. When I’m angry at my partner, I try to handle my feelings so no one gets hurt.

28. If I keep thinking about what made me mad, I get angrier.

29. When arguing with my partner, I often raise my voice.

30. I do something to take my mind off my partner.
when I’m angry.

31. When I’m mad at my partner, I say what I think without thinking of the consequences.

32. When my partner’s voice is raised, I don’t raise mine.

33. My partner thinks I am very patient.

34. I can calm myself down when I am upset with my partner.

35. When I feel myself starting to get angry at my partner, I try to stick to talking about the problem.

36. I am even-tempered with my partner.
APPENDIX F

Debriefing Information

Thank you for participating in this study. The purpose of this study is to assess the way narcissism, and the stress associated with conforming to masculine gender role norms, may or may not affect anger management skills. This study may help increase understanding of the relationship between narcissism, stress, and the perpetration of dating violence. Ultimately, this understanding may help prevent dating violence in college relationships. If you are uncomfortable with any aspect of this study or any of this new information, you are free to withdraw your data from the data pool. If you have any questions about this study, feel free to contact Matt Orbell (morbell@uga.edu or 706 614-4045) for follow up information. If any aspect of this study, or your participation in this study, has been distressing or uncomfortable and you wish to seek mental health services, a list of campus resources is available at the bottom of this sheet. Thank you for your participation.

If you would like to withdraw your data from the data pool, either mark the box below or do not turn your survey in to the administrator.

☐ I want to withdraw my participation, please discard all of my data/information.

Matt Orbell, M.Ed.
Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Student

Dr. Alan Stewart
Counseling and Human Development Services

Counseling Resources on UGA campus

Center for Counseling and Personal Evaluation: 424 Aderhold Hall. 706-542-8508
Counseling and Psychiatric Services (CAPS): UGA Health Center. 706-542-2273