

SECHRIST, STACY M., Ph.D. *The Form and Function of Females' Aggression*. (2006)
Directed by Dr. Jacquelyn White. 74 pp.

Many researchers approach the study of aggression by searching for gender differences. The end result has depicted females as emotionally uncontrolled and irrational in their use of aggression. The present studies seek to disrupt this view by examining simultaneously the function and form of females' aggression.

Study 1 asked women to describe an experience where they had been either relationally or directly aggressive and to report on the instrumentality and affect associated with the experience. Support was found for the hypothesis that relational aggression was more instrumental in function for female aggressors, particularly when the target was also female.

Study 2 asked women to describe either two relationally or two directly aggressive experiences. In one description, a same sex friend was the target. In the other description, a dating partner was the target. Participants then responded to a questionnaire that related to aggression. Nine factors were extracted from the questionnaire items. The factors represented affective responses to aggression, and motives and outcomes of aggression—suggesting that aggression is a multi-faceted phenomenon that should be measured as such. While no interactions were found between form and the nature of the relationship between the participant and target, results suggest that females are more likely to describe their aggression in instrumental terms when it is used against same sex friends than when it is used against male dating partners, and when aggression is relational in form rather than direct.

THE FORM AND FUNCTION OF FEMALES' AGGRESSION

by

Stacy M. Sechrist

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty at The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2006

Approved by

Committee Chair

To my parents who always said I could do anything I set out to do. Thank you for standing behind me and encouraging me throughout. You have always inspired me to do my best. I love you.

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Jacquelyn White, for her guidance in this project. I would also like to acknowledge and thank committee members, Dr. John Seta, Dr. Paul Silvia, and Dr. Katherine Jamieson for their valuable input into this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDIES.....	8
III. STUDY 1.....	11
IV. STUDY 2.....	17
V. GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	38
REFERENCES.....	44
APPENDIX A. TABLES.....	49
APPENDIX B. SCENARIOS PRESENTED TO PARTICIPANTS IN STUDY 1.....	69
APPENDIX C. PROMPT FOR PARTICIPANTS IN STUDY 1 TO THINK ABOUT AN EXPERIENCE WHERE THEY HAD USED DIRECT AGGRESSION.....	70
APPENDIX D. PROMPT FOR PARTICIPANTS IN STUDY 1 TO THINK ABOUT AN EXPERIENCE WHERE THEY HAD USED RELATIONAL AGGRESSION.....	71
APPENDIX E. SCENARIOS PRESENTED TO PARTICIPANTS IN STUDY 2.....	72
APPENDIX F. PROMPT FOR PARTICIPANTS IN STUDY 2 TO THINK ABOUT AN EXPERIENCE WHERE THEY HAD USED DIRECT AGGRESSION AGAINST A DATING PARTNER.....	73
APPENDIX G. PROMPT FOR PARTICIPANTS IN STUDY 2 TO THINK ABOUT AN EXPERIENCE WHERE THEY HAVE USED RELATIONAL AGGRESSION AGAINST A SAME-SEX FRIEND.....	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research on aggression has come a long way in understanding why and how people use aggression. A major breakthrough in the past fifteen years has been the acknowledgment that females are aggressive (Richardson, 2005; White & Kowalski, 1994), thereby debunking the myth of the non-aggressive woman and the myth of female passivity. However, many researchers still approach the study of aggression by searching for gender differences. The end result of that work has depicted females as emotionally uncontrolled and irrational in their use of aggression. The purpose of the present studies is to disrupt this view—yet another myth—about females and aggression by examining simultaneously the function and form of females' aggression.

Function refers to the purpose that aggression is meant to serve for the aggressor. Females have been reported to use aggression expressively (Campbell, 1993; Campbell & Muncer, 1987; Campbell, Muncer, & Coyle, 1992). Expressive aggression results from a loss of control over one's own emotions (Campbell, 1993; Campbell & Muncer, 1987). Essentially, emotions build to a level that can no longer be maintained. Once past some threshold, an emotional outburst will occur resulting in an aggressive act. Expressive aggression then serves the function of allowing the aggressor to vent or to release emotions that have become uncontrollable.

The negative affective response associated with expressive aggression is due to the aggressor feeling that she should have been better able to control her emotions. Negative affect has been reported as sadness, remorse, guilt, and anxiety, and aggressors often reporting crying along with their fighting (Campbell & Muncer, 1987). The expressive function of aggression is contrasted with the instrumental function of aggression, which has been reserved for males. Instrumental aggression is used when an aggressor hopes to gain control or maintain control over a situation or another person (Campbell, 1993; Campbell & Muncer, 1987). Instrumental aggression is a means to an end serving the function of allowing the aggressor to get a desired outcome. Instrumental aggression is typically associated with a positive affective response because it affords power and control (Campbell & Muncer, 1987). Thus, aggressors often report feeling happy, rewarded, justified, and unremorseful, and often times they talk boastfully of their aggressive acts.

Socialization is one process that has been theorized to lead females to use aggression expressively (Campbell, 1993). Girls learn at an early age what behaviors are appropriate for their gender (Jacklin & Reynolds, 1993). Girls are taught to suppress feelings of anger and frustration (Averill, 1983; Kaplan, 1977 cited in Macaulay, 1985), a message much different than that learned by boys. Boys grow up to learn that threats, especially to their masculinity, are to be countered with aggression. Boys become men who realize that aggression is about gaining control over others, whereas girls become women who see aggression as a loss of control (Campbell, 1993).

Another theory about why females use aggression expressively is that instrumental and expressive views of aggression may simply be post-hoc accounts of experiences with aggression (Campbell, Muncer, Guy, & Banim, 1996; Campbell, 1999; Astin, Redston, & Campbell, 2003). Post-hoc accounts do not necessarily reflect how people felt or thought at the time the aggression occurred. Instead, when people report on their experiences with aggression later on, their descriptions have been reconstructed into excuses for their aggressive behavior. Expressive views of aggression may serve as excuses for females for behavior that is gender-role inappropriate although this theory has not received much support. Another theory is that instrumental and expressive aggression may result from gender differences in inhibitory control that underlies aggression (Alexander, Allen, Brooks, Cole, & Campbell, 2004). The differences in inhibitory control are phenomenologically distinctive. Specifically, females have a higher threshold than males that must be reached before they react to anger. Thus, females' reports of feeling emotionally out of control when aggressive are a result that phenomenologically corresponds to their physiological response to anger.

Whatever the cause for females' expressive views of aggression, there is reason to believe that the relationship between the function of aggression for an aggressor and the gender of the aggressor is not as clear-cut as has been previously presented. A frequently used self-report measure of aggression's function is the Expagg questionnaire (Campbell et al., 1992; Campbell, Muncer, McManus, & Woodhouse, 1999). The items on the Expagg assess only respondents' thoughts and feelings about direct aggression. Direct aggression is only one form of aggression. Without taking into account other forms of

aggression, the Expagg falls short of explaining the function of aggression specifically for females. The next section will discuss why asking females about their use of direct aggression will likely lead to erroneous conclusions about females' experiences with aggression.

Females and Form of Aggression

Form refers to how aggression manifests—through what behaviors. Direct aggression, defined as harm delivered face-to-face (Richardson & Green, 1999), includes both physical and verbal harm, and occurs more often by males than females (Baron & Richardson, 1994; Bettencourt & Miller, 1996; Eagly & Steffen, 1986; Harris, 1995, 1996). Females' aggression typically consists of covert, indirect harm in which the aggressor often remains anonymous (Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Kaukiainen, 1992; Crick, Bigbee, & Howes, 1996; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). This latter form of aggression has been described variously as *relational*, *indirect*, and *social*.

Relational aggression includes “behaviors that are intended to significantly damage another child’s [or person’s] friendships or feelings of inclusion by the peer group” (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995, p. 711). *Indirect aggression* is “social manipulation, attacking the target in circuitous ways” (Osterman et al., 1998, p. 1). Indirect aggression has been conceptualized to also include physical acts where the aggressor remains anonymous, such as the act of gluing a target’s school locker shut (Goldstein & Tisak, 2004). *Social aggression* includes “behavior directed toward harming another’s friendships, social status, or self-esteem, which may take direct forms such as social rejection and negative facial expressions or body movements, or indirect forms such as

slandorous rumors, friendship manipulation, or social exclusion” (Underwood, 2003, p. 5).

For purposes of the present studies, *relational aggression* will be used as an inclusive term to refer to aggressive behaviors that take relational, indirect, and social forms. There are subtle differences between the sub-types of aggression that have been grouped as relational aggression. Behaviors that are specific to each sub-type have differential effects on the target, but those will not be addressed here (see Goldstein & Tisak, 2004; Prinstein & Cillessen, 2003). Nonetheless, the aggressive behaviors in the sub-types being considered relational aggression are conceptually more similar to one another than they are to behaviors that are considered to be direct aggression.

It has been hypothesized that females choose more covert relationally aggressive strategies due to the higher social acceptability of those strategies relative to direct aggression (Richardson & Green, 1999). Displays of overt aggression are not acceptable feminine behaviors, but covert aggression often goes unnoticed and unsanctioned. However, research shows that relational aggression may be more functional for females than direct aggression, in terms of damage incurred by targets, when it is used against other females (Crick, 1995; Crick et al., 1996; Galen & Underwood, 1997; Goldstein & Tisak, 2004; Paquette & Underwood, 1999). Females relative to males report that threats of relational aggression are particularly salient, and they report feeling worse about themselves than do males after being victims of relational aggression (Goldstein & Tisak, 2004). This suggests that relational aggression is a cause of concern and worry for females and it is a functional means of inflicting harm on female targets.

Measurement of Instrumental and Expressive Aggression

As stated previously, the most common measure of function of aggression is the Expagg (Campbell et al., 1992; Campbell et al., 1999) questionnaire. The Expagg asks participants to rate their agreement with 8 statements that measure expressive views of aggression and 8 statements that measure instrumental views of aggression. The problem with this measure is that all items refer to experiences with aggression that are direct in form. Sample items include, “I believe that physical aggression is necessary to get through to some people” (instrumental view) and “During a physical fight, I feel out of control” (expressive view). None of the 16 items on the Expagg asks participants to report on their feelings when using relational aggression—the form that females’ aggression most often takes. Thus, it seems inappropriate to draw conclusions about the function that aggression serves for females if they are not asked about the form of aggression that they most often use.

There is considerable debate in the literature as to whether the instrumental and expressive functions measured by the Expagg are two separate dimensions or one dimension, with expressive views on one end of the dimension and instrumental views on the other end (Archer & Haigh, 1997a; Campbell et al., 1992; Forrest, Shevlin, Eatough, Gregson, & Davies, 2002; Muncer & Campbell, 2002). Most reviewers have concluded that expressive views and instrumental views are two separate dimensions. Thus, the two functions need not be mutually exclusive. While Expagg items are designed to measure the function of aggression, the items also tap into what could be considered different factors that relate to how and why people use aggression. The item, “When I get to the

point of physical aggression, the thing I most aware of is how upset and shaky I feel” taps into the feeling of personal control that the aggressor experiences, while the item, “If I hit someone and hurt them, I feel as though they were asking for it” points toward a motive for the aggression. A better measure of aggression is needed that assesses not only the function of aggression broadly (i.e., instrumental or expressive), but also includes assessment of motives, outcomes, and emotional experiences during and after the aggressive episode. A more thorough measure of aggression would be more informative about aggressive episodes from the aggressor’s point of view allowing for a more thorough understanding of the phenomenon.

CHAPTER II

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDIES

The present studies will examine the hypothesis that women can and do use instrumental aggression by taking into account the form of aggression, the sex of the target, and the context in which aggression takes place. The instrumental and expressive functions of aggression (Campbell, 1993; Campbell & Muncer, 1987; Campbell et al., 1992) have never been examined along with the relational and direct forms that aggression can take. This gap has likely resulted in a misinformed view of females' aggression, specifically that it is emotionally uncontrolled and irrational. The main thesis is that women can use aggression instrumentally. Instrumental aggression for females will be relational in form and will be used against female targets. Although females may use relational aggression more than direct aggression because of its covert nature and social acceptability, the main rationale as to why relational aggression is instrumental for females is because it better meets the objective of the female aggressor when the target is another female (Crick, 1995; Crick et al., 1996; Galen & Underwood, 1997; Goldstein & Tisak, 2004; Paquette & Underwood, 1999). Specifically, greater harm can be inflicted against female targets because damage to social peer groups is extremely threatening to females (Goldstein & Tisak, 2004; Gilligan, 1982).

In conclusion, relational aggression is self-serving for female aggressors because it is covert and often unsanctioned. Also, relational aggression is often capable of causing greater harm than other forms of aggression when it is used against female targets. For these reasons, relational aggression meets the needs and desires of the female aggressor, thus making relational aggression instrumental in function.

Two studies were conducted to examine the hypothesis that relational aggression is more instrumental for female aggressors than direct aggression, particularly when the target is another female. Study 1 asked women to report on experiences where they were either relationally aggressive or directly aggressive. Participants identified the sex of the target and responded to a questionnaire designed to assess the instrumentality and the negative affect associated with their aggressive experiences. An interaction was expected for sex of the target and form of aggression for both instrumentality and negative affect. Specifically, instrumentality scores were expected to be higher and negative affect scores lower when participants reported on aggression that was relational in form and used against female targets. The lowest instrumentality scores and highest negative affect scores were expected when participants described use of direct aggression against female targets.

Study 2 also asked women to report on experiences when they were either relationally or directly aggressive, but they were directed to describe experiences against both a same-sex friend and a dating partner. Study 2 attempted to provide a more thorough understanding of females' use of aggression by having participants respond to a questionnaire about their aggressive experiences that included assessment of possible

motives, outcomes, and emotional experiences both during and after the aggressive episode. The questionnaire was designed to be more informative than the Expagg or the questionnaire used in Study 1 about the aggressor's intentions and experience from the aggressor's point of view.

CHAPTER III

STUDY 1

Study 1 Method

Participants. Seventy-eight college females participated in the study in exchange for partial credit toward an introductory psychology course. Participant demographics for race and year in school are presented in Table 1. The mean age of participants was 19.15 ($SD = 3.43$) years. Due to the small number of non-white and non-freshman participants, and the fact that these factors would not be expected to have effects on the measures of interest, race and year in school were not used as variables in data analysis. All participants gave informed consent before beginning the study and were given debriefing statements upon concluding the study.

Procedure. Participants completed a series of paper-and-pencil questionnaires that included a demographics questionnaire and several questionnaires that are unrelated to the present study. After completing the questionnaires, participants read two hypothetical scenarios (see Appendix B) adapted from Goldstein and Tisak (2004) depicting either relational or direct aggression. After reading the hypothetical scenarios, participants were prompted to think about a time where they had used the form of aggression (relational or direct) depicted in the scenarios (see Appendices C & D). After being prompted, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire constructed by the researcher about their experience with aggression. Participants were administered the questionnaires in

small group sessions of no more than ten participants. The study took approximately thirty to forty-five minutes to complete.

Aggression questionnaire. The aggression questionnaire used in the study was designed by the researcher to assess characteristics of participants' use of aggression in a specific episode. The first section of the aggression questionnaire asked about the context in which the aggression occurred. Of relevance to the present study, participants were asked the sex of the target and the nature of the relationship between the participant and the target. Participants were allowed to describe an incident of aggression against a target of their choosing which resulted in unequal cell sizes across conditions. Twenty-four participants described relational aggression against female targets; 10 participants described relational aggression against male targets; 22 participants described direct aggression against female targets; and 19 participants described direct aggression against male targets. The majority of male targets were dating partners, regardless of the form of aggression. The most common source of conflict that participants mentioned in their descriptions of aggressive episodes with male dating partners was real or suspected infidelity. The majority of female targets were friends for relational aggression and friends and siblings for direct aggression. Sources of conflict varied widely in participants' descriptions of aggression against female targets. Participants then responded to 13 items on a 7-point Likert scale to assess the instrumentality of the aggression and affective reactions to the experience. Items were developed to reflect the descriptions of instrumental aggression reported in the literature (Campbell, 1993).

Instrumentality was assessed by asking participants: 1) whether they felt out of control of their own emotions during the events leading up to the aggressive episode, 2) whether they felt out of control of their own emotions during the aggressive episode itself, 3) whether they felt they could control the target by using aggression, 4) whether they had accomplished what they had hoped by using aggression, 5) whether they gained control over the other person by using aggression, 6) whether they gained control over the situation by using aggression, 7) whether they felt justified in using aggression in the situation, and 8) whether they would act the same way again in a similar situation. Responses to all items were given on 7-point Likert scales with 1 = “absolutely not” to 7 = “absolutely so.” An instrumentality scale score was created for each participant by summing their responses to the eight instrumentality items ($\alpha = .73$). The two items asking about emotional control were reverse scored so that higher scores indicated higher instrumentality. Higher scores on the summed scale indicate more instrumentality. Table 2 shows the correlation matrix for all items on the scale.

Negative affect associated with use of aggression is an indicator of expressive aggression according to descriptions by Campbell and colleagues (Campbell, 1993; Campbell & Muncer, 1987). Participants reported the degree to which they felt five emotions about the aggressive episode. The five emotions were guilt, happiness, shame, sadness, and regret. Happiness was reverse scored. The scores on the five negative affect items were summed with higher scores indicating participants felt worse about their use of aggression than participants with lower scores ($\alpha = .89$). In theory, instrumental use of aggression should be associated with less negative affect and expressive use of

aggression should be associated with high negative affect. The correlation matrix for all items on the negative affect scale is displayed in Table 3.

Study 1 Hypothesis Testing and Results

The key hypotheses under investigation were that participants would report the highest instrumentality associated with their use of relational aggression against female targets and the lowest instrumentality associated with their use of direct aggression against female targets as measured by the instrumentality scale and the negative affect scale. Two separate two-way ANOVAs were conducted using the instrumentality scale scores and negative affect scale scores as dependent variables with sex of the target (female or male) and form of aggression (relational or direct) as the independent variables.

Significant interactions were expected for sex of the target and form of aggression for both analyses. The highest mean instrumentality scale score was expected for use of relational aggression against female targets and the lowest mean instrumentality scale score was expected for use of direct aggression against female targets. Similarly, the lowest mean negative affect scale score was expected for use of relational aggression against female targets and the highest mean negative affect scale score was expected for use of direct aggression against female targets.

A significant interaction was found to support the first hypothesis that participants would report the greatest instrumentality associated with use of relational aggression against female targets, and the least instrumentality associated with use of direct aggression against female targets, $F(1, 71) = 8.26, p = .005$ (see Table 4 for means). A

nearly significant interaction was found to support the second hypothesis that participants would report the least negative affect associated with use of relational aggression against female targets and the greatest negative affect with use of direct aggression against female targets, $F(1, 71) = 3.02, p = .087$, (see Table 5 for means).

Study 1 Discussion and Overview of Study 2

Results support the hypothesis that females do use aggression instrumentally, particularly when they use relational aggression against other females. Females scored highest on the instrumentality scale and the lowest on the negative affect scale when they described use of relational aggression against female targets. Also, the lowest instrumentality and highest negative affect was associated with female participants' use of direct aggression against female targets.

However, a possible confound exists in Study 1 that is addressed in Study 2. Specifically, participants in Study 1 were allowed to describe an aggressive act that occurred between themselves and a target of their choosing. In Study 1, only ten participants described use of relational aggression against male targets and the cell sizes across conditions were uneven. In Study 2, participants were instructed specifically to describe aggression against a same-sex target *and* a dating partner allowing for within-subjects analyses. When participants are allowed to describe aggression against a target of their choosing, like in Study 1, it is possible that they pick mostly same-sex targets because that is with whom most of their aggressive encounters have been with, or because those incidents come more readily to mind. Either of these reasons could bias the results. Previous research on direct aggression has shown that men nearly always indicate

a same-sex target when asked to describe their own use of aggression, whereas women indicate a male partner about half of the time and a same-sex target who is not a partner the other half of the time (Archer & Haigh, 1997b). Thus, there is an inherent confounding of the main effects with the uneven cell sizes generated in Study 1 by the self-selection of targets.

Study 2 also provides a more informative view than Study 1 of how and why women are aggressive. Additional items were added to the aggression questionnaire to more fully assess the motives, outcomes, and emotional experiences associated with women's use of aggression. Other theories of aggression, such as Anderson and Bushman's (2001) theory, reject the distinctions between hostile and instrumental aggression drawn in the classic theories. Additionally, Anderson and Bushman's theory suggests that people usually have many goals and motives in mind when they are aggressive. Thus, there is a need for a more detailed account of aggressive experiences, including the assessment of motives and outcomes of aggressive experiences. The items on the aggression questionnaire used in Study 2 were factor analyzed to find meaningful constructs that can be used to better describe the multi-faceted nature of aggression and the possible differences in aggression due to form and target.

CHAPTER IV

STUDY 2

Study 2 Method

Participants. Participants were 149 college females who completed the study in exchange for partial credit toward an introductory psychology course. Participant demographics for race and year in school are presented in Table 6. The mean age of participants was 18.90 ($SD = 1.85$) years. Race was used as a factor in data analysis because the unexpected racial diversity in the sample and, even more surprising, the diversity in the sample was fairly evenly distributed among experimental conditions. However, year in school was not used as a factor in data analysis since the overwhelming majority of participants were freshmen. All participants gave informed consent before beginning the study and were given debriefing statements upon completing the study.

Procedure. Participants completed a series of paper-and-pencil questionnaires that included a demographics questionnaire and several questionnaires that are unrelated to the present study. After completing the questionnaires, participants read two hypothetical scenarios (see Appendix E) adapted from Goldstein and Tisak (2004) depicting either relational or direct aggression. One of the scenarios was the same as used in Study 1 for each form of aggression. An additional scenario was added for each form to give participants the opportunity to conceptualize two different tactics for each form of

aggression. After reading the hypothetical scenarios, half of the participants were prompted to think about a time where they had used the form of aggression (relational or direct) depicted in the scenarios against a same-sex friend (see Appendix F). The other half of the participants was prompted to think about a time where they used the form of aggression depicted in the scenarios against a dating partner (see Appendix G). After being prompted, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire constructed by the researcher about their experience with aggression.

After completing the questionnaire about their experience with aggression against the specified target, participants were asked to read the hypothetical scenarios again. Participants were then prompted again to think about a time where they had used the form of aggression depicted in the scenarios. The participants who were first asked to describe aggression used against a same-sex friend were asked to describe aggression against a dating partner, and the participants who were first asked to describe aggression against a dating partner were asked to describe aggression against a same-sex friend. Participants then responded to the same aggression questionnaire about their experience. Participants were administered the questionnaires in small group sessions of no more than ten participants. The study took approximately thirty to forty-five minutes to complete.

Aggression questionnaire. The aggression questionnaire used in the study was designed by the researcher to assess characteristics of participants' use of aggression in a specific episode and was similar to the aggression questionnaire used in Study 1. Participants responded to the aggression questionnaire for both their aggressive experience against a same-sex friend and a dating partner. The first section of the

aggression questionnaire asked about the context in which the aggression occurred. Of relevance to the present study, participants were asked the sex of the target and the nature of the relationship between the participants and the target to ensure that they were responding as directed. Sixty-eight participants described relational aggression and 72 participants described direct aggression. Of participants who described relational aggression, 33 described aggression against a same-sex friend first and 35 described aggression against a dating partner first. Of participants who described direct aggression, 41 described aggression against a same-sex friend first and 31 described aggression against a dating partner first.

Nine participants stated that they had never been aggressive against friends or dating partners, so their responses were omitted from analysis. An additional 27 participants were not included in the subsequent within-subjects analyses due to the fact that they did not follow directions in responding to the aggression questionnaire. Most of the participants who were excluded described only an aggressive episode against one specified target or the other (i.e., only a friend *or* only a dating partner). The remaining participants who were excluded from the within-subjects analyses described two incidents against one specified target (i.e., two incidents against a friend or two incidents against a dating partner). Only one participant was excluded due to her dating partner being female. There were no order effects based on which target (same-sex friend or dating partner) participants described first.

The next section of the aggression questionnaire assessed specific characteristics of the aggressive episode by having participants respond to 60 items on a 7-point Likert

scale. The same instrumentality and negative affect items used in Study 1 were included in the questionnaire. Additional items were included to better assess motives, outcomes, and emotional experiences both during and after the aggressive episode. Several items were taken from the Mental Health Inventory (Viet & Ware, 1983) and modified to assess anxiety and emotional responding during and after the aggressive episode. Some items were taken from the recently revised Expagg-short form (Driscoll, Campbell, & Muncer, 2005; Muncer & Campbell, 2004), which is designed to provide a brief assessment of instrumental and expressive views of aggression. The remaining items were developed by the researcher, based on a review of the literature, mostly to assess specific motives for aggression.

Factor Analysis of Items on the Aggression Questionnaire Used in Study 2

Items on the aggression questionnaire were factor analyzed using varimax rotation. Items on the friend and dating questionnaires were included simultaneously in the factor analysis. Thirteen total factors were extracted with the criteria being that the Eigenvalues were greater than 1. Nine factors will be used in subsequent analyses due to the fact that the reliability coefficients obtained for the items in the latter four factors were weak (α 's < .60). Rotated loadings for the items included in the nine individual factors used in data analyses are presented in Table 7. The first four factors reflect emotional responses to the aggressive episode both during the event and after. The latter five factors reflect motives and outcomes of the aggression.

The first factor was comprised of items that assessed sense of loss of personal control during the aggressive episode ($\alpha = .91$ for dating, $\alpha = .91$ for friend). Factor 1

reflects being out of control during the episode, sense of emotional instability during the event, and difficulty calming down. The second factor was comprised of items that assessed positive affect after the aggressive episode ($\alpha = .90$ for dating, $\alpha = .92$ for friend). Factor 2 included feelings of cheer and happiness after the episode, feeling relaxed after the episode, and feeling satisfied or pleased. The third factor reflected negative self-evaluation of oneself after the aggressive episode ($\alpha = .90$ for dating, $\alpha = .88$ for friend). Factor 3 assessed feelings of guilt, shame, and regret, feeling unjustified and unwilling to act the same way again, and taking personal responsibility for the event. The fourth factor was comprised of items indicating anxiety during the aggressive episode ($\alpha = .87$ for dating, $\alpha = .80$ for friend). Factor 4 reflected somatic symptoms of anxiety such as feeling shaky, restless, or fidgety, and reports of nervousness and worry during the event.

The fifth factor was comprised of expressive motives for the aggression ($\alpha = .83$ for dating, $\alpha = .81$ for friend). Factor 5 reflected using aggression because it was necessary to get through to the target or to get a point across. The sixth factor was comprised of revenge or punishment motives for aggression ($\alpha = .69$ for dating, $\alpha = .75$ for friend). The seventh factor was comprised of instrumental motives for aggression ($\alpha = .78$ for dating, $\alpha = .65$ for friend). Factor 7 reflected aggressing as a means to get the target to do or stop doing something that the participant wanted, aggressing because the participant felt they could control the target, and aggressing because the target was blocking a goal. The eighth factor was comprised of items reflecting instrumental outcomes of the aggression ($\alpha = .80$ for dating, $\alpha = .78$ for friend). Specific outcomes in

Factor 8 included gaining control of the situation, the aggression having a positive effect on the relationship, and gaining control of the target. The ninth factor included items that assessed harm as a motive and outcome of aggression ($\alpha = .72$ for dating, $\alpha = .80$ for friend).

Study 2 Hypothesis Testing

Scores for each of the nine factors were computed by summing the items on each factor for each participant giving them a total score for the factor for aggression against a same-sex friend and a total score for the factor for aggression against a dating partner. Items were reverse scored in cases where the item loaded negatively on a factor. Scores for each of the nine factors were used as the dependent variables in mixed-model ANOVAs to test hypotheses of interest. Form of aggression (relational or direct) and race (non-white and white) were the between-subjects factors and relationship (same-sex friend or dating partner) was the within-subjects factor. Significant interactions were expected for form and relationship. Note that scores for only 112 participants were included in the ANOVAs due to the fact some participants completed an aggression questionnaire for only one of the two relationship types or because one had to be omitted for failure to follow directions.

Race was categorized into only two variables—non-white and white—due to the small number of participants who reported being any race other than African-American or white. However, results using only African-American and white participants were no different than those subsequently reported which were obtained by combining African-

American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, and “Other” race participants into one “non-white” category.

Specific hypotheses for each of the nine factor scores are presented in the subsequent sections. No specific hypotheses are presented for race for two reasons. The first reason is that a sample that would be racially diverse enough to allow for analyses was not anticipated. The second reason is that no studies on relational aggression have found consistent race effects. Therefore, none were expected in the present study. Race was included as a factor in the ANOVAs to be certain that it did not have any effect, however, effects were found. The effects for race will be reported in the Results section where appropriate even though no a priori hypotheses were made.

The rationale for how scores for each factor relate conceptually to the level of instrumentality associated with aggression are based on Campbell’s (1993) descriptions of instrumental and expressive aggression, as well as on results from Study 1. Campbell’s descriptions and Study 1 results provide a framework for constructing specific hypotheses about each factor. The rationale for the hypotheses for each individual factor is presented first followed by specific hypotheses that were generated from the rationale.

Hypothesis 1: Factor 1- Loss of Personal Control

Rationale: According to descriptions by Campell (1993), loss of personal control characterizes expressive aggression. Maintaining a sense of personal control characterizes instrumental aggression. Thus, lower scores on this factor reflect aggression that is instrumental in function. Results from Study 1 for the instrumentality scale, which included feelings of emotional control, indicated that participants associated high

instrumentality with use of relational aggression against female targets and low instrumentality with use of direct aggression against female targets.

Specific hypotheses: Participants describing direct aggression against same-sex friends will report the highest mean score for loss of personal control. Participants reporting on relational aggression against same-sex friends will report the lowest mean score for loss of personal control.

Hypothesis 2: Factor 2- Positive Affect After the Aggressive Experience

Rationale: Campbell's (1993) description of instrumental aggression includes positive affect due to the gains and rewards that instrumental aggression brings for the aggressor. Campbell (1993) describes expressive aggression as associated with negative affect since it is aggression that should have been contained. High scores on Factor 2 reflect high positive affect, and therefore, reflect aggression that is instrumental in function. Results from the negative affect scale in Study 1 supported that low negative affect was associated with use of relational aggression against female targets, while high negative affect was associated with use of direct aggression against female targets.

Specific hypotheses: Participants reporting on relational aggression against same-sex friends will report the highest mean score for positive affect after the aggressive episode. Participants describing direct aggression against same-sex friends will report the lowest mean score for positive affect after the aggressive episode.

Hypothesis 3: Factor 3- Negative Self-Evaluation After the Aggressive Experience

Rationale: Campbell's (1993) description of expressive aggression includes that women often feel guilty, ashamed, unjustified, and regretful when they use aggression

due to the fact that the aggressor feels she should have been able to control her aggressive outburst. Instrumental aggression, as described by Campbell (1993), is viewed as justified by the aggressor, hence, they evaluate themselves positively after the aggression. So, higher scores on Factor 3 reflect more expressive views of the aggressive experience and lower scores reflect more instrumental views of the experience. Results from Study 1 for the instrumentality scale, which included feeling justified and willing to act similarly again, and for the negative affect scale, which included feelings of guilt, shame, and remorse, support a hypothesis that high negative self-evaluation should be associated with direct aggression against female targets and low negative self-evaluation should be associated with relational aggression against female targets.

Specific hypotheses: Participants reporting on relational aggression against same-sex friends will report the lowest mean score for negative self-evaluation after the aggressive episode. Participants describing direct aggression against same-sex friends will report the highest mean score for negative self-evaluation after the aggressive episode.

Hypothesis 4: Factor 4- Anxiety During the Aggressive Episode

Rationale: Campbell's (1993) description of expressive aggression indicates that expressive aggression is associated with feelings of anxiety, probably associated with the accompanying feeling of being out of control. Instrumental aggression is more controlled and should not be associated with anxiety. Thus, lower scores on Factor 4 reflect aggression that could be considered more instrumental in function than aggression that is associated with high scores on this factor.

Specific hypotheses: Participants reporting on relational aggression against same-sex friends will report the lowest mean score for anxiety during the aggressive episode. Participants describing direct aggression against same-sex friends will report the highest mean score for anxiety during the aggressive episode.

Hypothesis 5: Factor 5- Expressive Motives

Rationale: Conceptually, it fits that people who use aggression as a means to get a point across or because they feel that it is necessary to get through to another person probably feel that they have no other alternative to communicate with a target other than aggression. Expressive motives then reflect a sense of desperation that the aggressor may feel, which reflects what Campbell (1993) describes as feelings that have reached some threshold—a point at which emotions can no longer be contained. So, higher scores on Factor 5 reflect aggression that is expressive in function as Campbell would see it. There is debate as to whether instrumental and expressive functions of aggression are the endpoints on the same continuum (Archer & Haigh, 1997a; Campbell et al., 1992; Forrest et al., 2002; Muncer & Campbell, 2002). In other words, instrumental and expressive motives do not necessarily have to be mutually exclusive. Therefore, even though specific hypotheses will be made that assume that aggression with expressive motives is not instrumental in function, these hypotheses may not be supported.

Specific hypotheses: Participants describing direct aggression against female targets will have the highest mean score for expressive motives, while participants describing relational aggression against female targets will have the lowest mean score for expressive motives.

Hypothesis 6: Factor 6- Revenge/Punishment Motive

Rationale: The desire for revenge or to punish reflects a specific motive with a desired outcome. In this case, revenge or punishment as a motive could be viewed as an instrumental motive. There is a specific reason for the aggression and a specific outcome that the aggressor hopes to achieve. However, it is unclear whether a desire to punish or get revenge truly reflects aggression that is instrumental in terms of gaining control of getting a desired outcome. What an aggressor hopes to achieve via their motive does not necessarily result in the desired outcome, which highlights a major problem with assessing aggression.

Nonetheless, specific hypotheses will be drawn on the assumption that the aggressor has a very deliberate intent that reflects some sense to gain a desired outcome, which is to punish or avenge. So, in Campbell's (1993) sense, the motive to punish or seek revenge can be conceptualized as instrumental in function. It is unclear whether female participants would be expected to have the specific motive to punish or seek revenge more often for aggression used against same-sex friends or against dating partners. However, prior research (Goldstein & Tisak, 2004; Gilligan, 1982) suggests that the best way to harm, or in a sense to punish, a female target is to use relational aggression, while the best way to harm, or punish, a male target is to use direct aggression.

Specific hypotheses: Participants should report the greatest revenge/punishment motives for relational aggression used against same-sex friends and for direct aggression used against dating partners.

Hypothesis 7: Factor 7- Instrumental Motives

Rationale: Instrumental motives included in this factor clearly reflect what Campbell (1993) meant by her conceptualization of instrumental aggression. Campbell's description of instrumental aggression includes aggressing to get a target to do something that the aggressor desires or to gain control of the target. Therefore, higher scores on this factor for instrumental motives reflect aggression that is instrumental in nature according to Campbell. Results from Study 1 for the instrumentality scale, which assessed aggressing because participants felt they could control the target, supported that instrumental motives are associated with use of relational aggression against female targets, but not with use of direct aggression against female targets.

Specific hypotheses: Participants who report on relational aggression against same-sex friends should have the highest mean score on the instrumental motives factor. Participants who report on direct aggression against same-sex friends should have the lowest mean score on the instrumental motives factor.

Hypothesis 8: Factor 8- Instrumental Outcomes

Rationale: Essentially the same rationale used above in Factor 7 applies to Factor 8. The key difference is that now the rationale pertains to outcomes that reflect control, accomplishment, and positive rewards. Higher scores on this factor reflect aggression that is instrumental in nature according to Campbell (1993). Results from Study 1 for the instrumentality scale, which assessed the outcomes of accomplishing what one had hoped and gaining control over the situation or person, supported that instrumental outcomes

were associated with use of relational aggression against female targets, but not with direct aggression against female targets.

Specific hypotheses: Participants who report on relational aggression against same-sex friends should have the highest mean score on the instrumental outcomes factor. Participants who report on direct aggression against same-sex friends should have the lowest mean score on the instrumental outcomes factor.

Hypothesis 9: Factor 9- Harm

Rationale: The rationale for Factor 9 is similar to the rationale used above for Factor 6 and has the same accompanying problem of separating motives from outcomes in measuring aggression. Using the same rationale as used in Factor 6, research suggests that the way to inflict the greatest harm on a female target is to damage friendships by using relational aggression. The way to inflict the greatest harm to a male target is to insult or degrade by using direct aggression. So, if the desired outcome is to harm, relational aggression is instrumental against female targets and direct aggression is instrumental against male targets. Harm as an outcome is better achieved, and hence the aggression is more instrumental in nature.

Specific hypotheses: Participants who describe relational aggression against same-sex friends and direct aggression against dating partners should score the highest on the harm factor.

Study 2 Results

Factor 1: Loss of personal control. Table 8 displays the mean scores for participants on Factor 1. There was no significant interaction found for relationship and

form of aggression for scores on Factor 1, $F(1, 108) = .52, p = .471$. There was a significant within-subjects main effect for relationship, $F(1, 108) = 5.39, p = .022$. Participants reported a greater loss of personal control when describing aggression against dating partners ($m = 38.63$) than against same-sex friends ($m = 35.33$). A significant between-subjects main effect was found for form of aggression, $F(1, 108) = 18.15, p < .001$. Participants reported a greater loss of personal control when they described direct aggression ($m = 40.59$) than when they described relational aggression ($m = 32.65$). The main effect for form was qualified by an unexpected interaction between form of aggression and race of the participant, $F(1, 108) = 5.84, p = .017$. The greatest mean score for loss of personal control was reported by non-white participants when they described direct aggression, and the lowest mean score for loss of personal control was reported by non-white participants when they described relational aggression. See Table 9 for the means for the race by form interaction.

Factor 2: Positive affect after aggressive episode. Table 10 displays the mean scores for participants on Factor 2. No significant interaction was found for relationship and form of aggression for scores on Factor 2, $F(1, 108) = 1.39, p = .240$. A significant within-subjects main effect was found for relationship, $F(1, 108) = 12.45, p = .001$. Participants reported the greatest positive affect after the aggressive episode when they described aggression against same-sex friends ($m = 27.04$) than when they described aggression against dating partners ($m = 23.35$). A between-subjects main effect was found for form of aggression, $F(1, 108) = 11.92, p = .001$. Greater positive affect was associated with use of relational aggression ($m = 28.52$) than with use of direct

aggression ($m = 22.58$). There was also a significant main effect for race, $F(1, 108) = 14.44, p < .001$. Non-white participants reported greater positive affect after the aggressive episode ($m = 28.82$) than white participants ($m = 22.28$).

Factor 3: Negative self-evaluation after aggression. Table 11 displays the mean scores for participants on Factor 3. There was no significant interaction found between relationship and form of aggression for scores on Factor 3, $F(1, 108) = .14, p = .706$. A within-subjects main effect was found for relationship, $F(1, 108) = 7.59, p = .007$. More negative self-evaluation was associated with aggression against dating partners ($m = 40.46$) than against same-sex friends ($m = 35.93$). A between-subjects main effect was found for form of aggression, $F(1, 108) = 4.06, p = .046$. Participants reported more negative self-evaluation after their use of direct aggression ($m = 40.12$) than after use of relational aggression ($m = 35.57$). A significant main effect was found for race, $F(1, 108) = 8.34, p = .005$, with white participants reporting more negative self-evaluation after aggression ($m = 41.13$) than non-white participants ($m = 34.58$).

Factor 4: Anxiety during the aggressive episode. Table 12 displays the mean scores for participants on Factor 4. No significant interaction was found between relationship and form of aggression for scores on Factor 4, $F(1, 108) = 2.15, p = .145$. A within-subjects main effect was found for relationship, $F(1, 108) = 9.98, p = .002$. Greater anxiety during the episode was reported for aggression against dating partners ($m = 17.65$) than for aggression against same-sex friends ($m = 15.11$). A significant between-subjects main effect was found for form of aggression. Greater anxiety during the aggressive episode was reported for use of direct aggression ($m = 17.55$) than for

relational aggression ($m = 14.71$). The main effect for form was qualified by a significant interaction between form and race of the participant, $F(1, 108) = 8.31, p = .005$. The greatest level of anxiety during the aggressive was reported by non-white participants when they described use of direct aggression ($m = 18.31$) and the lowest level of anxiety was reported by non-white participants when they described use of relational aggression ($m = 12.00$). See Table 13 for the means for the interaction.

Factor 5: Expressive motives. Table 14 displays the mean scores for Factor 5. No significant interaction was found for form of aggression and relationship for scores on Factor 5, $F(1, 108) = .31, p = .578$. A significant between-subjects main effect was found for form of aggression, $F(1, 108) = 7.11, p = .009$. Participants reported more expressive motives associated with use of direct aggression ($m = 10.70$) than with use of relational aggression ($m = 9.48$). No other significant main effects or interactions were found.

Factor 6: Revenge/Punishment motive. Table 15 displays the mean scores for Factor 6. No significant interactions or main effects were found for Factor 6.

Factor 7: Instrumental motive. Table 16 displays the mean scores for Factor 7. No significant interactions or main effects were found for Factor 7.

Factor 8: Instrumental outcomes. Table 17 displays the mean scores for Factor 8. No significant interactions or main effects were found for Factor 8.

Factor 9: Harm. Table 18 displays the mean scores for Factor 9. No significant interactions or main effects were found for Factor 9.

Study 2 Discussion

Nine reliable factors were extracted from the factor analysis on the items that comprised the aggression questionnaire used in Study 2. The factors related to emotional responses both during and after aggression and to motives and outcomes of aggression suggesting that aggression is a multi-faceted phenomenon that is better understood by assessing multiple domains. A measure such as the aggression questionnaire used in Study 2, which separates outcomes from motives, and measures affective responses separately from motives and outcomes, may be a more useful measure of aggression than measures such as the Expagg, which combines motives, outcomes, and affective responses.

Significant main effects for form and relationship indicate that these two factors are important determinants of how people feel about and describe their aggression, though not in combination. Overall, participants described use of direct aggression and aggression against dating partners as more emotionally uncontrolled and more anxiety-inducing than their use of relational aggression and aggression against same-sex friends. Overall, participants felt better about their aggression and evaluated themselves less negatively when they used relational aggression and aggressed against same-sex friends than when they used direct aggression and aggressed against dating partners. The only significant finding for the factors assessing outcomes and motives was for use of expressive motives. Participants indicated more expressive motives when they described use of direct aggression rather than relational aggression. None of the hypothesized

interactions between form of aggression and relationship between the aggressor and target were significant.

The fact that there were no significant findings for outcomes or motives could suggest that form of aggression and relationship between target and aggressor have little to do with how Campbell (1993) conceptualizes instrumental aggression. It was difficult to formulate specific hypotheses about the factors that related to motives and outcomes because it was difficult to assess exactly how motives and outcomes such as revenge/punishment and harm fit into Campbell's typology of functions of aggression. Perhaps emotional or affective responses are more important determinants of the instrumental nature of aggression from Campbell's view. It is also possible that because participants in the present study were describing one specific experience with aggression, that one experience does not reflect motives or outcomes of participants' aggression in general. It is worth noting that the reliability coefficients for the latter four factors related to outcomes and motives were low (α 's ranged from .65 to .80) relative to the reliability coefficients obtained for the first four factors (α 's ranged from .80 to .92). It is possible that the latter factors represent somewhat less stable factors, and this could be related to the non-significant findings. Thus, there is a need to further develop the aggression questionnaire to better assess outcomes of and motives for aggression.

Unanticipated race effects were found indicating that this is a relatively unexplored area that deserves further empirical study. Before doing so, however, researchers must assess what race is a proxy for in order for results to be meaningful. It is noteworthy that white participants reported feeling more out of control of their emotions

and more anxiety during the aggressive episode than non-white participants when they described their use of relational aggression. Though white participants did not differ in their mean scores for feelings of personal control or anxiety during the episode for use of direct and relational aggression, non-white participants did. Non-white participants reported feeling significantly more emotionally uncontrolled and anxious when describing use of direct aggression than relational aggression. Despite feeling more emotionally uncontrolled and anxious during the aggression, non-white participants reported feeling greater positive affect after the aggression and less negative self-evaluation following the aggression than white participants. This finding could suggest that external social sanctions are not as great for aggression performed by non-white females, thus negative affect following aggression is not as severe. This hypothesis would suggest, as others have (Hadley, 2003), that the view that aggression and femininity do not coincide is strictly a white middle-class norm. However, more research is needed to better understand the findings.

Study 2 suggests that Campbell's descriptions of instrumentality may have more to do with emotional or affective responses to aggression than with motives or outcomes for female aggressors. A measure such as the Expagg combines items asking respondents about outcomes, motives, and affective responses to aggression in the same scale. In other words, several items that ask about outcomes, motives, and affective responses may be included in a single scale. By doing so, the Expagg is actually assessing multiple domains simultaneously, which completely overlooks the information that can be gleaned about function when participants are asked about each domain separately. Inherent in

Campbell's descriptions of instrumental and expressive functions of aggression are an affective component, a motive component, and an outcome component. These components were extracted from the factor analysis of the aggression questionnaire items from Study 2. Therefore, it could be only one of these components that has driven the commonly found gender difference in function of aggression as measured by the Expagg questionnaire. The key component is most likely, based on results from Study 2, the affective response during and after the aggression.

Function of aggression, if it is conceptualized as Campbell describes, would be better understood with a measure specifically designed to assess multiple domains. Items should be constructed that assess only one component (i.e. affective, motive, or outcome) at a time so as not to confound what is actually being measured. It could be problematic to operate on the idea that the characteristics of instrumental and expressive aggression are reverse ends of the same continuum, which Campbell's work seems to do, or that affective, motive, and outcome components should be analyzed collectively in reaching conclusions. Instead, future work should seek to understand females' use of aggression by taking a multi-faceted approach assessing affective responses, motives, and outcomes of aggression separately.

In addition, future research could glean valuable information by assessing the reception of aggression from the point of view of targets. Specifically, it would be useful to compare the consequences and outcomes from the perspective of targets with the motives and perceived outcomes from the perspective of aggressors. By doing so, the instrumental nature of aggression could be operationalized not only in terms of

accomplishing goals and establishing control from the aggressor's point of view, but also in terms of damage incurred and loss of control from the target's point of view.

CHAPTER V

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Results from Study 1 and Study 2 seem contradictory to a certain extent. Study 1 found that sex of the target was important in determining which form of aggression, relational or direct, was described in more instrumental terms and associated with more negative affect. Study 2 found no significant interactions between relationship between aggressor and target and the form of aggression used. However, the items used in Study 1 to comprise the instrumentality and negative affect scales are subject to the same criticism as the Expagg questionnaire described above. Specifically, items on the instrumentality scale in Study 1 assessed outcome and motive components, as well as two items that ended up loading on the negative self-evaluation factor and two items that loaded on the personal control factor. The individual items on the negative affect scale in Study 1 loaded on both the positive affect factor and the negative self-evaluation factor in Study 2. Therefore, a comparison between the results from both studies is problematic.

Some general conclusions from both studies can be drawn about female's use of aggression. First, Study 1 demonstrated that females do use aggression instrumentally as defined by Campbell, particularly when relational aggression was used against female targets. This finding suggests that form of aggression should be assessed before researchers attempt to draw conclusions about the function that aggression serves. By

doing so, the gender differences in function of aggression that have been previously reported may disappear.

Second, Study 2 suggests that for females direct aggression and aggression against dating partners is associated with more negative affect during and after the aggression than relational aggression and aggression against same-sex friends. Future research should attempt to address why aggression against dating partners was associated with such great negative affect. High negative affect could have been due to the nature of the conflict in most dating descriptions, which was real or suspected infidelity. Thus, the overall negativity of the experience of infidelity and the circumstances surrounding it could have been viewed as much more severe than the conflicts that arose in same-sex friendships. Another possibility is that perhaps participants valued their dating relationship more than their same-sex friendships, therefore, conflict and aggression in dating relationships could be associated with greater negative affective responses than in friendships. A final possibility is that participants knew that friends would be more likely than dating partners to stay true to the relationship in the face of conflict. Thus, fear of losing, or even actually losing the dating partner may lead to greater anxiety and negative affect when conflict and subsequent aggression arises.

Study 2 also suggests that form of aggression and relationship between the target and aggressor have little to do with expressive and instrumental outcomes and motives. The one exception was that expressive motives such as trying to get a point across were related to use of direct aggression. Specific hypotheses about how form and relationship should relate to the factors related to outcomes and motives extracted in Study 2 were

difficult to formulate because it was difficult to assess exactly how motives and outcomes such as revenge/punishment and harm fit into Campbell's typology of function of aggression.

Preliminary results using male participants indicate that men do not score significantly higher than women on the instrumentality scale used in Study 1 ($m = 27.85$ for men, $m = 28.48$ for women), which indicates that men do not set the norm for instrumentality that should be used as a comparison for women. The same data show that men do not score significantly lower than women on the negative affect scale used in Study 1 ($m = 18.45$ for men, $m = 19.80$ for women). Male participants did indicate a significantly more negative affect when they aggressed against female targets ($m = 22.22$) than when they aggressed against male targets ($m = 15.36$). These findings indicate that men do not always have a positive affective response to their use of aggression—a finding that suggests that Campbell's typology is limited in describing in males' use of aggression without taking into account the context in which aggression occurs. Thus, for both sexes, an understanding of aggression is limited without knowledge of contextual factors such as sex of the target.

Although the findings for men are preliminary, they do not map onto the stereotype set in place by Campbell's typology about how men use aggression—mainly that it is a positive and rational experience. Men can feel bad about their use of aggression when specific contextual variables are in place. Additionally, results from the present studies do not map onto the stereotype set in place by Campbell's typology about how women use aggression—mainly that it is irrational and impulsive, and a highly

negative affective experience. Women can feel positively about and controlled in their use of aggression when specific contextual variables are in place. Further data collection and analyses with a larger sample of men could challenge the dichotomies related to sex and aggression in such a way as to render the analysis of sex alone useless in the study of aggression.

A final conclusion is that a multi-faceted assessment tool such as the aggression questionnaire used in Study 2 should be utilized in future studies of aggression. Specifically, it appears that affective responses, motives, and outcomes are all important and different factors that relate to how people view and describe their aggressive experiences. This approach is more informative about how and why people use aggression. The aggression questionnaire could be revised to assess more general views of respondents' use of aggression instead of just having participants apply the items to one specific incident where they have used aggression.

One limitation of the present studies is that participants were describing their use of aggression in single incidents, which does not necessarily reflect how they use aggression more generally. Future studies should assess more general views of the affective responses associated with aggression and the outcomes and motives of female's use of aggression. Research designs using form of aggression as a within-subjects factor could prove useful in determining whether individual women use aggression differently based on the relationship they have with the target. There are several other variables that could influence the form that aggression takes that were not addressed in the present studies. For instance, aggression that occurs in a public versus a private setting may look

very different, be motivated by different reasons, or lead to different affective outcomes. The length of time that the aggressor has known the target, the history of aggression with the target, and whether the aggressor hopes to maintain or end the relationship are other variables that could affect the form the aggression takes and the associated affective responses.

Another limitation that is specific to Study 2 is the use of the term, “dating partner,” which could evoke scripts of heterosexuality. Only one participant in Study 2 indicated that her dating partner was a female. This could be due to participants’ equivocation of dating partners with heterosexual experiences, due to the youth of the sample, which could correlate with a lack of experience or experimentation with same-sex dating partners, or due to the unwillingness of participants to disclose information about same-sex dating experiences. Since the present study was only interested in female participants’ experiences with male dating partners, the one participant who indicated that her dating partner was female was excluded from analysis. However, it is possible that the dynamics within same-sex dating relationships could lead to differences in aggressive strategies or the form that aggression takes, which could result in different outcomes and affective responses on the part of female aggressors. Thus, comparing aggression within same-sex dating relationships with aggression within same sex friendships could prove to be a useful advancement in the understanding of females’ use of aggression.

Despite the limitations, the present studies advance the knowledge about women’s use of aggression and, hopefully, will lead future researchers to acknowledge that aggression’s form is an important part in understanding women’s use of aggression. The

present studies suggest that aggression is a multi-faceted phenomenon that should be assessed and measured as such. Contextual factors that influence the form of aggression, its motives, outcomes, and affective responses should be examined. Finally, the present studies debunk the myth that women's aggression is often passive, uncontrolled, and irrational. Females can use aggression instrumentally, in a very controlled and purposeful manner, to gain ends and meet their needs. Most often aggression that is instrumental for females will take a relational form and be used against same-sex targets.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, F., Allen, C., Brooks, J., Cole, C., & Campbell, A. (2004). Reason to believe: representations of aggression as phenomenological read-out. *Sex Roles, 51*, 647-659.
- Archer, J. & Haigh, A. (1997a). Beliefs about aggression among male and female prisoners. *Aggressive Behavior, 23*, 405-415.
- Archer, J. & Haigh, A. (1997b). Do beliefs about aggressive feeling and actions predict reported levels of aggression? *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 83-105.
- Astin, S., Redston, P., & Campbell, A. (2003). Sex differences in social representations of aggression: men justify, women excuse? *Aggressive Behavior, 29*, 129-133.
- Averill, J. R. (1983). Studies on anger and aggression: implications for theories of emotion. *American Psychologist, 38*, 1145-1160.
- Baron, R. & Richardson, D. (1994). *Human aggression*. New York: Plenum.
- Bettencourt, B. A. & Miller, N. (1996). Gender differences in aggression as a function of provocation: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*, 422-447.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Kaukianinen, A. (1992). The development of direct and indirect aggressive strategies in males and females. In P. Niemela & K. Bjorkqvist (Eds.), *Of mice and men: aspects of female aggression* (pp. 51-64). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Bushman, B. J. & Anderson, C. A. (2001). Is it time to pull the plug on the hostile versus

- instrumental aggression dichotomy? *Psychological Review*, 108, 273-279.
- Campbell, A. (1993). *Men, women, and aggression*. New York: Basic Books.
- Campbell, A. (1999). Staying alive: evolution, culture, and women's intrasexual aggression. *Behavioral and Brain Science*, 22, 203-252.
- Campbell, A. & Muncer, S. (1987). Models of anger and aggression in the social talk of women and men. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 17, 489-512.
- Campbell, A., Muncer, S., & Coyle, E. (1992). Social representations of aggression as an explanation of gender differences: a preliminary study. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 95-108.
- Campbell, A., Muncer, S., Guy, A., & Banim, M. (1996). Social representations of aggression: crossing the sex barrier. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 135-147.
- Campbell, A., Muncer, S., McManus, C. & Woodhouse, D. (1999). Instrumental and expressive representations of aggression: one scale or two? *Aggressive Behavior*, 25, 435-444.
- Crick, N. R. (1995). Relational aggression: the role of intent attributions, feelings of distress, and provocation type. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 313-322.
- Crick, N. R., Bigbee, M. A., & Howes, C. (1996). Gender differences in children's normative beliefs about aggression: How do I hurt thee? Let me count the ways. *Child Development*, 67, 1003-1014.
- Crick, N. R. & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 710-722.

- Driscoll, H., Campbell, A., & Muncer, S. (2005). Confirming the structure of the ten-item Expagg scale using confirmatory factor analysis. *Current Research in Social Psychology, 10*(5).
- Eagly, A. H. & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: a meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*, 309-330.
- Forrest, S., Shevlin, M., Eatough, V., Gregson, M., & Davies, M. (2002). Factor structure of the Expagg and Revised Expagg: failure to replicate using confirmatory factor analysis. *Aggressive Behavior, 28*, 11-20.
- Galen, B. R., & Underwood, M. K. (1997). A developmental investigation of social aggression among children. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 589-600.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldstein, S. E. & Tisak, M. S. (2004). Adolescents' outcome expectancies about relational aggression within acquaintanceships, friendships, and dating relationships. *Journal of Adolescence, 27*, 283-302.
- Hadley, M. (2003). Relational, indirect, adaptive of just mean: recent work on aggression in adolescent girls—part 1. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality, 4*, 367-394.
- Harris, M. B. (1995). Ethnicity, gender, and evaluations of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 21*, 343-357.
- Harris, M. B. (1996). Aggressive experiences and aggressiveness: relationship to ethnicity, gender, and age. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 843-887.

- Jacklin, C. N. & Reynolds, C. (1993). Gender and childhood socialization. In A. E. Beall & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender* (pp. 197-214). New York: Guilford.
- Macaulay, J. (1985). Adding gender to aggression research: incremental or revolutionary change? In V. A. O'Leary, R. K. Unger, & B. S. Wallston (Eds.), *Women, gender, and social psychology* (pp. 191-224). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Muncer, S. & Campbell, A. (2002). Confirmatory factor analysis and the factor structure of the Expagg in context: a reply to Forrest et al., 2002. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30, 146-157.
- Osterman, K., Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Kaukiainen, A., Landau, S. F., Fraczek, A., & Capara, G. (1998). Cross-cultural evidence of female indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 24, 18.
- Paquette, J. A. & Underwood, M. K. (1999). Gender differences in young adolescents' experiences of peer victimization: social and physical aggression. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 45, 242-266.
- Prinstein, M. J. & Cillessen, A. H. N. (2003). Forms and functions of adolescent peer aggression associated with high levels of peer status. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 49, 310-342.
- Richardson, D. (2005). The myth of female passivity: thirty years of revelations about female aggression. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29, 238-247.

- Richardson, D. R. & Green, L. R. (1999). Social sanction and threat explanations of gender effects on direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 25, 425-434.
- Underwood, M. K. (2003). *Why is she so mean?* New York: Guilford Press.
- Viet, C. T. & Ware, J. E. (1983). The structure of psychological distress and well-being in general populations. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 51, 730-742.
- White, J. W. & Kowalski, R. M. (1994). Deconstructing the myth of the nonaggressive woman: a feminist analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18, 487-508.

Appendix A. Tables

Table 1

Participant demographics for Study 1

Race	African American or Black	Count	13
		% of Total	16.7%
	Asian	Count	5
		% of Total	6.4%
	Hispanic or Latin American or Mexican American	Count	3
		% of Total	3.8%
	White, non-Hispanic	Count	56
		% of Total	71.8%
	Other	Count	1
		% of Total	1.3%
Total		Count	78
		% of Total	100%
Year	Freshman	Count	63
		% of Total	79.7%
	Sophomore	Count	13
		% of Total	16.5%
	Junior	Count	1
		% of Total	1.3%
	Senior	Count	1
		% of Total	1.3%
	Other	Count	1
		% of Total	1.3%
Total		Count	79
		% of Total	100%

Table 2

Correlation matrix for items on the instrumentality scale

	Out of control leading up to	Out of control during	Feel could control person	Accomplish what hoped	Gain control over person	Gain control over situation	Justified	Act the same
Out of control leading up to	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Out of control during	.74**	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--
Feel could control person	-.18	-.42**	1.00	--	--	--	--	--
Accomplish what hoped	.28*	.40**	-.13	1.00	--	--	--	--
Gain control over person	.13	.03	.42**	.43**	1.00	--	--	--
Gain control over situation	.16	.33**	.01	.72**	.51**	1.00	--	--
Justified	.18	.36**	-.27*	.60**	.06	.48**	1.00	--
Act the same	.04	.34**	-.14	.57**	.11	.43**	.63**	1.00

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3

Correlation matrix for items on the negative affect scale

	Guilt	Happiness	Shame	Sadness	Regret
Guilt	1.00	--	--	--	--
Happiness	.47*	1.00	--	--	--
Shame	.71*	.49*	1.00	--	--
Sadness	.59*	.51*	.62*	1.00	--
Regret	.77*	.48*	.78*	.68*	1.00

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4

Descriptive statistics for instrumentality scale scores

Form of aggression	Sex of target	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
relational	female	32.04 ^a	7.87	24
	male	25.30 ^{ab}	4.99	10
direct	female	25.18 ^a	7.94	22
	male	29.47 ^b	8.79	19

Note: Means with the same superscript are significantly different from one another at the $p = .02$ level or less

Table 5

Descriptive statistics for negative affect scale scores

Form of aggression	Sex of target	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
relational	female	17.00 ^a	7.25	24
	male	21.00	7.93	10
direct	female	22.36 ^a	9.16	22
	male	19.74	6.54	19

Note: Means with the same superscript are significantly different from one another at the $p = .03$ level

Table 6

Participant demographics for Study 2

Race	African American or Black	Count	50
		% of Total	33.6%
	Asian	Count	8
		% of Total	5.4%
	Hispanic or Latin American or Mexican American	Count	1
		% of Total	0.7%
	White, non-Hispanic	Count	80
		% of Total	53.7%
	Other	Count	10
		% of Total	6.7%
Total		Count	149
		% of Total	100%

Year	Freshman	Count	118
		% of Total	79.2%
	Sophomore	Count	23
		% of Total	15.4%
	Junior	Count	6
		% of Total	4.0%
	Senior	Count	1
		% of Total	0.7%
	Other	Count	1
		% of Total	0.7%
Total		Count	149
		% of Total	100%

Table 7

Rotated factor loadings for items on nine factors

	Rotated factor loading	Eigenvalue	% variance
<i>Factor 1 Items</i>		13.88	23.14
During the action did you feel out of control	.80		
How out of control were you of your emotions when you actually performed action	.79		
How of control of your emotions were you during events leading up to the action	.76		
Do you believe your action came from losing your self-control	.76		
During the event, did have difficulty calming down	.64		
During the event did you feel emotionally stable	-.62		
During the event did you feel upset, rattled, or flustered	.59		
How angry were you when you performed action	.59		
During the event did you feel tense or high strung	.57		
<i>Factor 2 Items</i>		9.13	15.21
After the event did you feel cheerful and lighthearted	.86		
After the event did you feel calm and peaceful	.84		
After the event did you feel happy, satisfied, pleased	.81		
How happy do you feel about event now	.80		
After the event did you feel relaxed and free of tension	.80		
Looking back on the event did you generally enjoy things	.58		
After the event did you feel depressed	-.50		
After the event did you feel under strain, pressure, stress	-.44		
<i>Factor 3 Items</i>		2.91	4.84
How guilty do you feel now	.81		
How ashamed do you feel now	.75		
How much regret do you feel now	.75		
How sad do you feel now	.64		
If you ran into similar situation again, would you act the same	-.56		
Who was more responsible for events that led up to action	-.55		

During the event were you most afraid of doing something you could not take back	.55		
After the event did you feel drained and guilty	.54		
How justified do you view your action now	-.48		
After the event did you feel downhearted and blue	.45		
Was the other person asking for it	-.45		
	Rotated factor loading	Eigenvalue	% variance
<i>Factor 4 Items</i>		2.21	3.69
During the event were you anxious or worried	.80		
During the event were you a very nervous person	.70		
Was the thing you were most aware of during event was how shaky and upset you felt	.66		
Did your hands shake during the event	.65		
During the event did you feel restless, fidgety, impatient	.64		
<i>Factor 5 Items</i>		2.19	3.65
Did you perform action because you felt it was necessary to get through to the person	.80		
Did you perform the action to get a point across	.72		
<i>Factor 6 Items</i>		1.91	3.18
Did you perform the action for revenge	.83		
Did you perform the action to punish the person	.66		
Did you perform the action to vent frustration	.50		
Were you attempting to express opposition by performing action	.47		
<i>Factor 7 Items</i>		1.77	2.95
Were you performing action to get person to do what you wanted	.81		
Were you performing action to get person to do or stop doing what you wanted	.67		
Did you perform action because you felt you could control other person	.61		
Did you perform action because you felt other person was blocking you from getting what you wanted	.54		

	Rotated factor loading	Eigenvalue	% variance
<i>Factor 8 Items</i>		1.39	2.32
Did you gain control over the other person	.72		
What effect did the action have on the relationship	.71		
Did you gain control over the situation	.68		
Did you accomplish what you had hoped	.55		
Did you feel that the best thing about performing the action was that it made the other person get in line	.49		
<i>Factor 9 Items</i>		1.33	2.22
How much harm or hurt did you actually cause	.80		
How much harm or hurt did you hope to cause	.71		
Did you perform the action to hurt or cause harm	.58		

Table 8

Descriptive statistics for scores on Factor 1

Relationship	Form of aggression	Participant race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
dating partner	relational	white	38.63	13.68	32
		non-white	31.00	13.99	23
		total	35.44	14.20	55
	direct	white	41.96	12.06	28
		non-white	41.48	10.96	29
		total	41.72	11.41	57
	total	white	40.18	12.95	60
		non-white	36.85	13.34	52
		total	38.63	13.18	112
same-sex friend	relational	white	33.75	11.95	32
		non-white	27.22	11.25	23
		total	31.02	12.00	55
	direct	white	37.29	12.31	28
		non-white	41.62	12.04	29
		total	39.49	12.26	57
	total	white	35.40	12.15	60
		non-white	35.25	13.65	52
		total	35.33	12.81	112

Table 9

*Descriptive statistics for form * race interaction for Factor 1 scores*

Race of participant	Form of aggression	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-white	relational	29.11 ^{ab}	2.04	23
	direct	41.55 ^a	1.82	29
white	relational	36.19 ^b	1.73	32
	direct	39.63	1.85	28

Note: Means with the same superscripts are significantly different from one another at the $p < .02$ level

Table 10

Descriptive statistics for scores on Factor 2

Relationship	Form of aggression	Participant race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
dating partner	relational	white	24.19	11.92	32
		non-white	30.30	10.99	23
		total	26.75	11.84	55
	direct	white	17.39	7.35	28
		non-white	22.66	9.86	29
		total	20.07	9.04	57
	total	white	21.02	10.54	60
		non-white	26.04	10.97	52
		total	23.35	10.98	112
same-sex friend	relational	white	24.72	10.20	32
		non-white	34.87	10.43	23
		total	28.96	11.38	55
	direct	white	22.82	10.91	28
		non-white	27.45	12.82	29
		total	25.18	12.04	57
	total	white	23.83	10.49	60
		non-white	30.73	12.29	52
		total	27.04	11.82	112

Table 11

Descriptive statistics for scores on Factor 3

Relationship	Form of aggression	Participant race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
dating partner	relational	white	40.91	13.48	32
		non-white	34.22	15.37	23
		total	38.11	14.55	55
	direct	white	45.46	14.00	28
		non-white	40.07	17.92	29
		total	42.72	16.20	57
	total	white	43.03	13.80	60
		non-white	37.48	16.94	52
		total	40.46	15.52	112
same-sex friend	relational	white	38.50	14.92	32
		non-white	28.65	12.03	23
		total	34.38	14.52	55
	direct	white	39.64	14.60	28
		non-white	35.38	15.21	29
		total	37.47	14.94	57
	total	white	39.03	14.66	60
		non-white	32.40	14.17	52
		total	35.96	14.75	112

Table 12

Descriptive statistics for scores on Factor 4

Relationship	Form of aggression	Participant race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
dating partner	relational	white	19.47	9.01	32
		non-white	13.65	8.86	23
		total	17.04	9.32	55
	direct	white	17.04	6.93	28
		non-white	19.41	7.69	29
		total	18.25	7.36	57
	total	white	18.33	8.13	60
		non-white	16.87	8.64	52
		total	17.65	8.37	112
same-sex friend	relational	white	15.38	8.47	32
		non-white	10.35	4.67	23
		total	13.27	7.51	55
	direct	white	16.54	6.70	28
		non-white	17.21	6.97	29
		total	16.88	6.78	57
	total	white	15.92	7.65	60
		non-white	14.17	6.92	52
		total	15.11	7.34	112

Table 13

*Descriptive statistics for form * race interaction for Factor 4 scores*

Race of participant	Form of aggression	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-white	relational	12.00 ^{ab}	1.32	23
	direct	18.31 ^a	1.18	29
white	relational	17.42 ^b	1.12	32
	direct	16.79	1.20	28

Note: Means with the same superscripts are significantly different from one another at the $p < .01$ level

Table 14

Descriptive statistics for scores on Factor 5

Relationship	Form of aggression	Participant race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
dating partner	relational	white	9.56	3.59	32
		non-white	9.04	3.90	23
		total	9.35	3.70	55
	direct	white	9.71	2.42	28
		non-white	10.90	3.35	29
		total	10.32	2.97	57
	total	white	9.63	3.08	60
		non-white	10.08	3.69	52
		total	9.84	3.37	112
same-sex friend	relational	white	9.41	2.93	32
		non-white	9.91	3.19	23
		total	9.62	3.02	55
	direct	white	11.39	2.54	28
		non-white	10.79	3.06	29
		total	11.09	2.81	57
	total	white	10.33	2.91	60
		non-white	10.40	3.12	52
		total	10.37	3.00	112

Table 15

Descriptive statistics for scores on Factor 6

Relationship	Form of aggression	Participant race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
dating partner	relational	white	17.00	5.97	32
		non-white	16.22	5.43	23
		total	16.67	5.71	55
	direct	white	15.14	4.62	28
		non-white	15.52	5.75	29
		total	15.33	5.18	57
	total	white	16.13	5.42	60
		non-white	15.83	5.57	52
		total	15.99	5.46	112
same-sex friend	relational	white	16.34	6.01	32
		non-white	14.87	5.32	23
		total	15.73	5.73	55
	direct	white	16.14	5.54	28
		non-white	16.48	6.78	29
		total	16.32	6.15	57
	total	white	16.25	5.75	60
		non-white	15.77	6.17	52
		total	16.03	5.93	112

Table 16

Descriptive statistics for scores on Factor 7

Relationship	Form of aggression	Participant race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
dating partner	relational	white	14.72	6.87	32
		non-white	12.22	6.47	23
		total	13.67	6.76	55
	direct	white	13.57	4.85	28
		non-white	15.62	5.97	29
		total	14.61	5.50	57
	total	white	14.18	5.99	60
		non-white	14.12	6.36	52
		total	14.15	6.14	112
same-sex friend	relational	white	14.53	5.39	32
		non-white	13.04	4.67	23
		total	13.91	5.11	55
	direct	white	16.04	5.25	28
		non-white	14.72	5.13	29
		total	15.37	5.18	57
	total	white	15.23	5.34	60
		non-white	13.98	4.95	52
		total	14.65	5.18	112

Table 17

Descriptive statistics for scores on Factor 8

Relationship	Form of aggression	Participant race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
dating partner	relational	white	13.78	6.55	32
		non-white	16.83	5.86	23
		total	15.05	6.40	55
	direct	white	13.46	7.37	28
		non-white	15.34	6.15	29
		total	14.42	6.78	57
	total	white	13.63	6.88	60
		non-white	16.00	6.01	52
		total	14.73	6.57	112
same-sex friend	relational	white	14.06	6.06	32
		non-white	15.78	5.82	23
		total	14.78	5.97	55
	direct	white	15.25	5.67	28
		non-white	16.17	7.31	29
		total	15.72	6.52	57
	total	white	14.62	5.86	60
		non-white	16.00	6.64	52
		total	15.26	6.24	112

Table 18

Descriptive statistics for scores on Factor 9

Relationship	Form of aggression	Participant race	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
dating partner	relational	white	9.50	4.58	32
		non-white	9.70	4.44	23
		total	9.58	4.48	55
	direct	white	8.11	4.56	28
		non-white	9.45	4.95	29
		total	8.79	4.77	57
	total	white	8.85	4.58	60
		non-white	9.56	4.68	52
		total	9.18	4.62	112
same-sex friend	relational	white	9.47	4.36	32
		non-white	10.39	5.04	23
		total	9.85	4.64	55
	direct	white	7.89	4.29	28
		non-white	10.62	5.25	29
		total	9.28	4.95	57
	total	white	8.73	4.36	60
		non-white	10.52	5.11	52
		total	9.56	4.79	112

Appendix B. Scenarios Presented to Participants in Study 1

Direct Dating Scenario

X and Y are dating. One day, the two have a disagreement. Later, Y shoves X as X was walking by.

Relational Friendship Scenario

X and Y are good friends. One day the two have a disagreement. Later, X finds out that Y talked about them behind their back. The things Y said about X were not very nice at all.

Appendix C. Prompt for Participants in Study 1 to Think About an Experience Where They Had Used Direct Aggression

Sometimes people will do things like Y did (shove or push) to someone else. These things involve direct physical or verbal confrontation. Sometimes people will hit, punch, shove, yell at, insult, or kick other people.

Think back to a time where you did one of these things to another person. Think about how you felt at the time, the reasons for doing so, and how you felt afterward. After thinking for a few minutes, please take a few more minutes to answer the questions on the following pages about that experience.

Appendix D. Prompt for Participants in Study 1 to Think About an Experience Where They Had Used Relational Aggression

Sometimes people will do things like Y did (talk about someone behind their back) to someone else. These things do not involve direct physical or verbal confrontation.

Sometimes people will spread rumors about others, turn people against others, leave another person out of group activities, or socially isolate others.

Think back to a time where you did one of these things to another person. Think about how you felt at the time, the reasons for doing so, and how you felt afterward. After thinking for a few minutes, please take a few more minutes to answer the questions on the following pages about the experience.

Appendix E. Scenarios Presented to Participants in Study 2

Direct scenarios

Please read the following two scenarios.

Scenario 1D

One day X and Y have a disagreement. Later, X shoves Y as Y was walking by.

Scenario 2D

One day A and B have a disagreement. Later, A shouts insults at B.

Relational scenarios

Please read the two scenarios again.

Scenario 1R

One day X and Y have a disagreement. Later, Y finds out that X had a party and did not invite Y to come.

Scenario 2R

One day A and B have a disagreement. Later, B finds out that A talked about them behind their back. The things A said about B were not very nice at all.

Appendix F. Prompt for Participants in Study 2 to Think About an Experience Where They Had Used Direct Aggression Against a Dating Partner

Sometimes people will do things like X and A did (shove or yell at) to someone else. These things involve direct physical or verbal confrontation. Sometimes people will hit, punch, shove, scream at, curse at, insult, or kick other people.

Think back to a time where you did one of these things to a DATING PARTNER. Think about how you felt at the time, the reasons for doing so, and how you felt afterward. After thinking for a few minutes, please take a few more minutes to answer the questions the following pages about the experience.

Appendix G. Prompt for Participants in Study 2 to Think About an Experience Where They Had Used Relational Aggression Against a Same-Sex Friend

Sometimes people will do things like X and A did (talk about someone behind their back or leave someone out of group activities) to someone else. These things *do not* involve direct physical or verbal confrontation. Sometimes people will spread rumors about others, gossip about others, turn people against others, or socially isolate others.

Think back to a time where you did one of these things to a SAME SEX FRIEND. Think about how you felt at the time, the reasons for doing so, and how you felt afterward. After thinking for a few minutes, please take a few more minutes to answer the questions the following pages about the experience.