

# Expression of Anger and the Religious Seminarians

Jobi Thurackal

Institute of Spirituality and Counselling, DVK, Bangalore, India

---

*Anger is a universal emotion. It has been associated with various factors like physiological arousal, unpleasant feelings, appraisals of insult, desire for revenge, frustration, and aggressive behaviour. Cultures vary in the norms regarding the expression of anger and beliefs about the normalcy of anger among the different age groups of the population. Christianity looks at the emotion of anger negatively when it is expressed for personal purpose, whereas when it is put across for common justice it is compromised. This article describes the nature of the emotion of anger and its expression with the help of a study done on the religious male adults who were doing their philosophical and theological studies in seminaries.*

## Introduction

Emotions are defined as states of autonomic arousal (Schachter & Singer, 1962), mechanisms that control shifts in goal states or motivations to act (Frijda, 1986; Lang, 1995), affective reactions preceding and/or lacking perceptual and cognitive encoding (Zajonc, 1980), and cognitive appraisals of social events (Lazarus, 1991). They have different components within the domains of physical responses, subjective experience, and observable behaviors (Frijda, 1999). Most of the definitions are emerged from different theoretical perspectives on emotions and emotional development and therefore, they may differ at each other (Halle, 2003).

Thompson (1993) elucidates the characteristics of emotions as “discrete, coherent constellations of physiological, subjective, and expressive activity”. This explanation has led the emotion researchers to study emotions from the structuralist perspective and tend to use measurement techniques that focus on specific, discrete physiological and behavioural elements of emotion (Halle,

2003). But this approach has been challenged by some psychologists who have questioned whether emotions are truly biologically based or physiologically and expressively distinct (Ortony & Turner, 1990). These theorists have held an approach known as 'functional approach'. From this perspective emotions emerge from ongoing transactions between an organism and its environment, rather than being biologically based (Campos, Campos, & Barrett, 1989; Camras, 1992). To get a balanced view, both perspectives are significant. The experience of emotions and the processes of emotion understanding and emotion regulation influence positively the successful development of individuals (Halle, 2003).

### **The Emotion of Anger**

Anger is a basic emotion that provides a primitive mechanism for physical survival. It can be defined as 'a strong emotion or experiential state occurring in response to a real or imagined frustration, threat, or injustice and...the desire to terminate the negative stimulus' (Biaggio & Maiuro, as cited in Fine & Olson, 1997, 326). From the structuralist perspective, the physiological changes that affect the emotion of anger include more muscle tension, higher blood pressure, and a lower heart rate. The secretion of hormones adrenalin and noradrenalin are the outcome of anger. From the functional perspective it is caused by the frustration of attempts to attain a goal, or by hostile or disturbing actions such as insults, injuries, or threats that do not come from a feared source (Strickland, 2001). The expression of anger very much depends on target and social circumstance (Potegal & Stemmler, 2007).

Anger is an emotion which often helps individuals in expressing how they feel to others. The healthy and appropriate expression of anger enriches the interpersonal relationships. There are mainly three ways to express anger. The first approach is known as 'expression', which involves conveying one's feelings in an assertive and healthy way. This approach is the best way to handle one's anger positively.

### **Anger in the Christian Context**

The Catholic Encyclopaedia defines anger as the desire of vengeance. If it is expressed in conformity with the prescriptions of balanced reason, it is not a sin. In such situations it is praiseworthy and justifiable with a proper zeal. Anger can become sinful when it is sought to wreak vengeance upon one who has not deserved it, or to a greater extent than it has been deserved, or in conflict with the dispositions of law, or from an improper motive. When there is undue vehemence in the passion of anger itself,

whether inwardly or outwardly, it becomes sinful. Anger is serious when acts gravely against the love of God and one's neighbour (Delany, 1907).

### **Emotion of Anger and the Catholic Religious**

Religious men and women are called to show Christ to the world. They aim at union with the Triune God and imitate Jesus Christ with an emphasis on one or another aspect of His mission and virtues as the founders of religious life have conceived to meet a need in the Church (Hoffman & Cole, 2005). They have publicly professed to set aside their own interests. The vows that they profess presuppose knowledge, judgment, deliberate choice and a free act of the will of the human beings. This will enable them to profess the evangelical counsels of poverty, chastity, and obedience, to love and seek above all else the God who took the initiative in loving every human being (Ridick, 1984).

Anger is human nature's primitive response to hurt and primarily a stimulus-response phenomenon. The vow of obedience of a religious does little to alleviate the basic response of resentment and the rising resentment appears to be morally indifferent (McAllister, 1974). The choice of a religious life does not take any individual away from the outside world. Hoffman & Cole (2005) put it rightly by stating that behind the door of a religious house, are human beings who have struggles and successes, joys and hardships, and who know both the fire of God's love and the fire of temptation. In this context, the expression of anger among the religious has to be seen and analyzed.

### **Expression of Anger among Religious**

There is currently little agreement among mental health practitioners as to what constitutes an anger problem (Olatunji & Lohr, 2004-05). According to Gary Ginter, a psychologist who specializes in anger management, there are several sources of anger. The sources include the areas of physiological, cognitive, and behavioural. The physiological anger is a natural one, which is expressed in certain threatening situations, where the body responds by making oneself physically angry. The perception of things or situations or persons is the basis for cognitive sources of anger. The personal biases and emotions can also become the cognitive source of anger. Behavioural sources of anger come from the environment one creates for oneself. Chronically angry people create an atmosphere in which others are aggressive in return, creating a cycle of anger (Barker, 2003).

Marion (1997), describe the different ways of expression of anger. Some people express their anger through facial expressions, but do little to try to solve a problem or confront the provocateur. Others actively resist by physically or verbally defending their positions, self-esteem, or possessions in nonaggressive ways. Another group of individuals express anger with aggressive revenge by physically or verbally retaliating against the provocateur. Other individuals show their dislike by telling the offender that he or she is not liked. Some people express anger through avoidance or attempts to escape from or evade the provocateur. And others use adult seeking, looking for comfort or solutions from elders, or telling the responsible persons about an incident.

The physiological, cognitive, or behavioural anger is expressed among the religious and from this perspective McAllister (1974) states the objects of the expression of anger. He finds these objects have adequate connection with the expression of anger of a religious with his or her superior, peers, God, and himself or herself.

#### **a. Anger toward superiors**

The primary object of anger is superiors, who represent authority. They personify the strict or cruel parents, the mean grandparents, or the crabby school teacher of childhood. He observes that in many cases, the attitude of the religious toward superiors is undoubtedly influenced by one's earlier attitudes toward authority figures and in particular the problems with parents when he or she was a child. Another factor is the dependency of the religious toward the superior, who has no other choice. It can lead to hostility, which is the natural result in a setting of such dependency (McAllister, 1974). McKenzie (1998) joins with the same idea when he explains the causal factors of anger. For him, the primary causal factor of anger is the types of anger are learned from the family and particularly from the parents. The behavioural expressions of anger in the form of words or actions can range from silent sulking to violent homicide. Some anger expressions are obvious, such as swearing at a person, while others are subtler, such as gossip, forgetfulness, nicknames, biting humour, talking to oneself, or acting like one does not understand. When the situation or people's own preferences prevent them from expressing their anger openly, they use more of these subtle forms of anger expression (Walters, 1981).

#### **b. Anger toward peer religious**

The second area of anger is the community in which a religious lives. Marion (1997) explains anger from an affective or arousal state, or a feeling experienced when a goal is blocked or needs are

frustrated. The relationship of a religious to his or her siblings in the childhood is often re-enacted in his or her community life as one relates to the other members in the community. Any negative feelings toward the siblings can affect a religious unconsciously his or her relationship with others in the religious as well as outside communities. If the person was the favourite at home he or she may be angered if that privileged situation is taken away (McAllister, 1974).

In the authoritarian parenting, children are not allowed to express their anger and an unusual amount of fighting and quarrelling among them are common. They express their anger at one another even though they may not be the source of one another's anger. This phenomenon of the expression of anger is not unusual in the religious life where a religious is unable to vent his or her anger. The individual may make everyone in the community miserable by his or her irritability and vile moods. If the person could once express the bitter resentment over anything, there would be a better feeling of the matter. Any secret complaining to anyone who is not related to the issue may not be a better solution or relief. Instead it can create guilt feeling in the person (McAllister, 1974). The expression of anger can include feelings of irritation, hatred, self pity, temper outbursts, thoughts of frustration, low self-esteem, pessimism, or verbal and physical aggression (Cosgrove, 1988). These negative feelings can badly affect the community life of a religious.

The significant causal factor in this area is the psychological dependence. It can exist when one's attitude about one's self is dependent on the attitude of others toward one's self, when one's mood and opinion is dependent on the mood and opinion of others. This type of dependence can make an individual to be subjected to the influence and will of another. A dependent religious goes out of one's way to please a particular friend so that the individual may bask in affection. Such individuals have to face the other side of dependency, namely, hostility. The psychologically dependent religious rebels against the situation, where he or she feels as a pawn of another or the victim of another's whims, through resentment that must be concealed, through bitterness that must remain coated with sweetness, for the need to please does not permit the individual to show anger (McAllister, 1974).

### **c. Anger toward God**

The third area of anger expression is on God. It can happen mostly unconsciously and it does not occur frequently. Psychologically speaking, scrupulousness is a problem which can occur due to the

transfer of feelings from parental figures to God, and the manner in which hostility can be subtly expressed. Hostility is more with people who are scrupulous (McAllister, 1974). To act out the urges of anger depends upon the mental interpretation of the events and the appropriateness of certain anger expressions. It is a response structured by the concrete ways of thinking about oneself and the people making him or her angry (Cosgrove, 1988). Accepting the cognitive component in the anger response may lead to guilt feelings, because thinking implies control over anger (Selby & Neimeyer, 1986). This irrational cognitive process leads the religious to waver in faith in the providence of God and feels hostility within oneself. Many experiments have been able to demonstrate that generalized arousal biology can result in a variety of emotional states depending on the person's cognitive interpretation of the situation (Schacter & Singer, 1962).

#### **d. Anger toward one's self**

There are two important ways through which an individual expresses anger toward one's self. The first one is self-disparagement. It is sometimes used as a means to get praise from others and as such can be considered an indirect grandiosity. Those who deprecate themselves, feel a serious absence of personal worth, or try to bolster a faltering sense of worth by forcing compliments from others. As a child if a religious was rejected by his or her parents, he or she may come to reject oneself. These individuals destroy themselves psychologically by this self depreciation. This is neither self denial nor submission, for in their own minds they have nothing to relinquish, and servitude is only what they deserve. These individuals make use of others to reject them so that their anger toward themselves can be partially appeased. They cannot survive success or accept appreciation. Such people cannot allow themselves to be happy. They feel that it is easier to attack one's self than to attack another person who is the object of the anger. Cosgrove's statement supports this view. It states that the expression of anger includes feelings of irritation, hatred, self pity, temper outbursts, thoughts of frustration, low self-esteem, pessimism, or verbal and physical aggression (Cosgrove, 1988). Another way of expressing anger is by refusing to relax. They ignore the basic rules of physical and emotional health by driving themselves in a manner that is fatiguing. It is done in order to destroy oneself because of the resentment and for practicing any virtue (McAllister, 1974).

The second way is depression, where the ultimate depth of anger at one's self is found. Depression is not a rare mental illness among

the religious. It is quite interesting to learn the cause of depression among religious men and women who claim to have surrendered completely to the will of God and leading a life with strong spiritual foundation. According to McAllister (1974) the most common cause of depression among religious is the anger toward others that is completely misplaced in its expression and consequently turned against one's self. This anger is primarily directed to others and then toward one's self. Adults who cannot project their anger onto its proper object may focus it inwardly and it leads to depression. It is likely that young adults, with their greater resilience, initiative, and spontaneity, ward off more effectively the inversion of anger. Life offers more hope for them, which carries them forward even against the resistance of their will. However, when one holds back one's anger it can lead to depression easily. Therefore it is not the lack of spiritual life that causes depression among religious, but the emotion of anger itself. Selby & Neimeyer (1986) points out another reason for depression among religious men and women. Depression often correlates with anger feelings because of underlying guilt feelings.

### **Expression of Anger and Young Religious Adults**

The young religious adult may learn the expression of anger from the very childhood itself. Every child develops ideas about how to express emotions (Michalson & Lewis, 1985) primarily through social interaction in their families and later by watching television or movies, playing video games, and reading books (Honig & Wittmer, 1992). Some of them have learned a negative, aggressive approach to expressing anger (Cummings, 1987) and, when confronted with everyday anger conflicts, resort to using aggression in the classroom (Huesmann, 1988). When the children are not encouraged to acknowledge angry feelings and help them learn to express anger in positive and effective ways early childhood, it can badly affect their personality in the adult years of their life. This finding sheds light into the nature of the expression of anger among the young religious adults.

Anger, a learned response, is the expression of a feeling and a learned defense against painful feelings (Fernandez, 1986). The life of a religious may undergo painful experiences and it may lead to anger. Johnson & Broman (1987) explain it as a short temper or a general attitude of hostility to everyone and everything. This expression of anger can be violence and competitive arousal and it can share the same physiological arousal state, but be a part of a separate learned response (Cosgrove, 1988).

Hankins and Hankins (1988) affirm that repressing anger is unhealthy. When it is expressed impulsively, may give momentary relief, but inevitably will carry negative consequences (Hankins and Hankins, 1988; Ellis, 1992; Luhn, 1992). Proper expression of anger, says McAllister (1974), is more important than controlling it. In order to be expressed or regulated, the nature of anger has to be recognized. There are individuals in religious life who undergo crying spells and sleepless nights, feelings like running away or else going to explode, which clearly indicate that they are suffering from hostility. McAllister (1974) observes that there are only two great reservoirs of emotional impulse that create conflict for human beings: the sexual impulse and the aggressive impulse. The latter causes much more havoc in the religious life, especially among the young religious adults and little attention is paid to it.

### **Benefits of the Expression of Anger**

One of the benefits of anger is the self-protection. The body is aroused into a state where an individual can respond with maximum physical energy for the defense in response to potential hurt. This is often referred to as the 'fight' component of the fight-or-flight response. The next advantage of the expression of anger is decompression. Here, the body of the individual is given a chance to release the pent-up physical tension caused by overexposure to frustration. The safe physical ventilation of anger is an effective way of helping one's autonomic nervous system to switch back to its normal relaxed functioning state, which is commonly referred to as the 'calm after the storm' (Lindenfield, 1993).

According to Cosgrove (1988), anger can provide the energy and motivation for certain difficult tasks. It serves as a warning that something is wrong with our attempts to relate to the environment. It affects our relationships whenever we work through our anger with others.

#### **a. Anger's energy**

Anger provides the energy and motivation for certain activities. Professional athletes are well aware of the benefits of a "clean" feeling of arousal anger at their opponent. Such anger quickens the senses, shoots adrenaline throughout the body, and sends glycogen to fatigues muscles. This feeling of anger can rouse people out of their lethargy or their apathy and get them to attempt difficult tasks or face imposing threats (Cosgrove, 1988).

#### **b. Anger's warning**

Anger can be a symptom of deeper disturbances in a personality that need attention. It may point to a growing sense of frustration,

fear of failure, irrational expectations about life, unresolved guilt feelings, or physical exhaustion. Therefore, self-examination during times of anger can produce personal growth (Cosgrove, 1988).

### **c. Anger and relationships**

Anger is a positive instrument for change and growth in a relationship, when it is controlled by love and awareness of the other person's rights and worth. It can be the first step of mutual love, understanding, and caring in the relationship when it is expressed between two people. Anger expressed without malice can lead to helpful changes in relationships, changes that will benefit communication and lead to deeper commitment. People who learn to express their anger properly will gain more respect than those who do not express anger or who express it poorly (Cosgrove, 1988).

### **Destructive Aspect of Anger**

When anger gets out of control and turns destructive, it can lead to problems at in the religious community, in personal relationships, and in the overall quality of one's life. The level of physiological and emotional arousal that individuals experience during anger can easily disturb the usual rational thinking and remove learned inhibitions to dysfunctional behavior (Cosgrove, 1988). It is mostly affected by the self defeating styles of anger.

### **Expression of Anger among Men**

Researchers agree that man's expression of anger is associated with the expectation that status and power are important to maintain (Piltch & others, 1994; Timmers & others, 1998). The emotion of anger among men is mostly related to when recognition is not forthcoming (Eckhardt & Deffenbacher, 1995). Masculinity and leadership are interconnected, where the emotion of anger plays significant role. Payne & Cangemi (1997) state that masculine persons as leaders, tend to be aggressive and use counterarguments as strategies to protect their positions. Masculinity in men is related to less stress, less perceived isolation, and more adaptive coping in dealing with work-related stress (Krausz, Kedem, Tal, & Amir, 1992). Studies among undergraduates show that higher masculinity is associated with greater anger proneness, greater anger expression, and lower anger control, whereas androgyny is associated with lower degrees of anger proneness, fewer anger responses, less anger suppression, and greater anger control (Kopper & Epperson, 1991).

## Study of Anger Expression between Young Catholic Indian Male Religious Philosophy and Theology Students

The aim of the research study was to describe and compare the nature of anger expression between the Philosophy and Theology students of the Catholic Indian male religious. The sample for the study was selected from those who stay in the city of Bangalore. The purposive sampling method was used for the selection of the samples. The samples were selected from a Pontifical Athenaeum who were doing the Bachelor of Theology and Bachelor of Philosophy programmes. The selected students represented different religious communities in India. The research programme was conducted on 136 participants. 74 of them were students of theology while 62 were students of philosophy.

All the participants were administered the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI) developed by Spielberger (1988). The scoring of the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory was done based on the norms given by the author. Subjects were asked to read the given 10 statements in Part 1 and to select their choice from the form. There were four choices – not at all, somewhat, moderately, very much – as given in the form. After completing Part 1, they were asked to go to the next 10 statements in Part 2 and then to 24 statements in Part 3.

The scoring was done in the following way. The three main aspects of State, Trait, and Anger Expression were measured according to the norms. Raw scores were converted into percentile ranks for interpretative purposes. The normal range was considered according to the scores that were commonly found in the middle fifty percent of the distribution - the 25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles. Those who scored above the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile were endorsing levels of state, trait, expression, or control that are likely to impair their optimal functioning. Individuals who scored below the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile on the remaining six scales could generally experience, express, or control relatively little anger. After the scoring, the comparative study between the Catholic Indian religious theology and philosophy male students were statistically analysed. The results were given below.

**Table 1** Indicating the mean, standard deviation and 't' value of the religious theology male and philosophy male groups on the Anger-Expression scores on the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI).

Factor	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t		Sig.
					Equal Variances Assumed	Equal Variances Not Assumed	
Anger-Expression (AX/Ex)	Religious Male (Theology)	74	63.03	8.95	1.12	1.11	.27
	Religious Male (Philosophy)	62	61.16	10.44			

The table 1 shows the mean score, standard deviation, t value and the level of significance of Anger Expression of the theology religious male and philosophy religious male groups. The mean score of the STAXI for Anger Expression of the theology religious male group is found to be 63.03 (SD = 8.95) and that of the philosophy religious male is indicated to be 61.16 (SD = 10.44). The 't' value obtained for equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed are 1.12 and 1.11 respectively, which is found to be not significant (.270 for equal variances not assumed) where  $p > 0.05$ . This indicated that there was no significant difference in the expression of anger between the theology and philosophy religious young adults. It showed that there was no considerable difference in the feelings of intense anger which might be suppressed, expressed in aggressive behaviour or both. The mean score pointed to the slight increase in the overall frequency of anger expression among the theology students of young religious adults. The mean scores of theology and philosophy students were laid between the 25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles and thus they were normal.

**Table 2** Indicating the mean, standard deviation and 't' value of the catholic religious theology male and philosophy male groups on the State Anger scores on the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI).

The table 2 shows the mean score, standard deviation, t value and the level of significance of State Anger of the theology religious male and philosophy male groups. The mean score of the STAXI for State Anger of the theology religious male group is found to be 61.66 (SD = 7.45) and that of the philosophy religious male is indicated to be 58.55 (SD = 6.81). The 't' value obtained for equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed are 2.52 and 2.54 respectively, which is found to be significant (.012 for equal variances not assumed) where  $p < 0.05$ . This signified that there was significant difference in the level of state anger between the theology and philosophy students of young Indian religious male adults. The intensity of angry feelings at a particular time was high with the theology students in comparison with the philosophy students.

Factor	Group	Group N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Equal Variances		Unequal Variances		Sig.	Sig.
					t	Sig.	t	Sig.		
State Anger (S-Ang)	Religious (Theology)	74	61.66	7.45	2.52	.012	2.54	.012		
	Male (Philosophy)	62	58.55	6.81						

**Table 3** Indicating the mean, standard deviation and 't' value of the religious theology male and philosophy male groups on the Trait Anger scores on the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI).

The table 3 shows the mean score, standard deviation, t value and the level of significance of Trait Anger of the theology religious male and philosophy male groups. The mean score of the STAXI for Trait Anger of the theology religious male group is found to be 52.36 (SD = 7.56) and that of the philosophy religious male group is indicated to be 50.6 (SD = 9.35). The 't' value obtained for equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed are 1.22 and 1.2 respectively, which is found to be not significant (.225 for equal variances assumed and .234 for equal variances not assumed) where  $p > 0.05$ . This result pointed out that there was no significant difference in the disposition to experience anger between the theology and philosophy groups. The mean score showed that the level of trait anger was slightly high with the theology religious young adults.

**Table 3.1** Indicating the mean, standard deviation and 't' value of the religious theology male and philosophy male groups on Angry Temperament scores, the subscale of Trait Anger scores on the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI).

Factor	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t		Sig.
					Equal Variances Assumed	Equal Variances Not Assumed	
Angry Temperament (T-Ang/T)	Religious Male (Theology)	74	56.99	5.83	1.04	1.05	.295
	Religious Male (Philosophy)	62	56	5.12			

The table 3.1 gives the mean score, standard deviation, t value and the level of significance of Angry Temperament of the theology religious male and philosophy male groups. The mean score of the STAXI for Angry Temperament of the theology religious male group is found to be 56.99 (SD = 5.83) and that of the philosophy religious male group is indicated to be 56 (SD = 5.12). The 't' value obtained for equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed are 1.04 and 1.05 respectively, which is found to be not significant (.295 for equal variances not assumed) where  $p > 0.05$ . This indicated that there was no difference in the general propensity to experience and express anger without specific provocation between the two groups.

**Table 3.2** Indicating the mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of the religious theology male and philosophy male groups on Angry Reaction scores, the subscale of Trait Anger scores on the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI).

Factor	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t		Sig.
					Equal Variances Assumed	Equal Variances Not Assumed	
Angry Reaction (T-Ang/R)	Religious Male (Theology)	74	47.85	7.75	1.02	1.01	.315
	Religious Male (Philosophy)	62	46.37	9.13			

The table 3.2 shows the mean score, standard deviation, t value and the level of significance of Angry Reaction of the theology religious male and philosophy male groups. The mean score of the STAXI for Angry Reaction of the theology religious male group is found to be 47.85 (SD = 7.75) and that of the philosophy religious male group is indicated to be 46.37 (SD = 9.13). The ‘t’ value obtained for equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed are 1.02 and 1.01 respectively, which is found to be not significant (.315 for equal variances not assumed) where  $p > 0.05$ . The result pointed to the fact that there was no difference between the theology and philosophy religious male young adults in the disposition to express anger when criticized unfairly by other individuals. The mean difference showed that the angry reaction was more with the theology religious male young adults.

**Table 4** Indicating the mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of the religious theology male and philosophy male groups on the Anger-In scores on the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI).

Factor	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t		Sig.
					Equal Variances Assumed	Equal Variances Not Assumed	
Anger-In (AX/In)	Religious Male (Theology)	74	56.68	7.71	0.011	0.011	.992
	Religious Male (Philosophy)	62	56.66	7.95			

The table 4 shows the mean score, standard deviation, t value and the level of significance of Anger In of the theology religious male and philosophy male groups. The mean score of the STAXI for Anger In of the theology religious male group is found to be 56.68 (SD = 7.71) and that of the philosophy religious male group is indicated to be 56.66 (SD = 7.95). The 't' value obtained for equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed are 0.011 and 0.011 respectively, which is found to be not significant (.992 for equal variances not assumed) where  $p > 0.05$ . This indicated that there was no difference in the frequency with which angry feelings were held in or suppressed between theology and philosophy groups.

**Table 5** Indicating the mean, standard deviation and 't' value of the religious theology male and philosophy male groups on the Anger-Out scores on the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI).

Factor	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t		Sig.
					Equal Variances Assumed	Equal Variances Not Assumed	
Anger-Out (AX/Out)	Religious Male (Theology)	74	55.61	6.92	-0.353	-0.355	.723
	Religious Male (Philosophy)	62	56.02	6.46			

The table 5 shows the mean score, standard deviation, t value and the level of significance of Anger Out of the theology religious male and philosophy male groups. The mean score of the STAXI for Anger Out of the theology religious male group is found to be 55.61 (SD = 6.62) and that of the philosophy religious male group is indicated to be 56.02 (SD = 6.46). The 't' value obtained for equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed are -0.353 and -0.355 respectively, which is found to be not significant (.723 for equal variances not assumed) where  $p > 0.05$ . The result illustrated that when the anger was expressed, it was focused outward on other individuals or objects in an equal way by both the groups.

**Table 6** Indicating the mean, standard deviation and 't' value of the religious theology male and philosophy male groups on the Anger-Control scores on the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI).

Factor	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t		Sig.
					Equal Variances Assumed	Equal Variances Not Assumed	
Anger-Control (AX/Con)	Religious Male (Theology)	74	40.51	8.95	1.28	1.24	.217
	Religious Male (Philosophy)	62	38.11	12.83			

The table 6 gives the mean score, standard deviation, t value and the level of significance of Anger Control of the theology religious male and philosophy male groups. The mean score of the STAXI for Anger Control of the theology religious male group is found to be 40.51 (SD = 8.95) and that of the philosophy religious male group is indicated to be 38.11 (SD = 12.83). The 't' value obtained for equal variances assumed and equal variances not assumed are 1.28 and 1.24 respectively, which is found to be insignificant (.217 for equal variances not assumed) where  $p > 0.05$ . The result pointed out that there was no difference in the attempts to control the expression of anger between both the groups, whereas the mean score showed that the anger control was high among the theology male religious young adults.

## Conclusion

Expression of anger is culturally restricted to the males in the patriarchal societies. Meanwhile, Christianity considers the emotion of anger negatively and so far no studies are conducted among the catholic religious adults. The present study shows that the expression of anger is quite normal among the young religious male adults. There is no significant increase or decrease in the expression anger between the philosophy and theology religious male students, expression in one of the factors called state anger. It explicates that the intensity of angry feelings at a particular time is high with the theology students in comparison with the philosophy students.

## References:

Campos, J.J., Campos, R.G., & Barrett, K.C. (1989). Emergent themes in the study of emotional development and emotion regulation. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 394-402.

- Camras, L.A. (1992). Expressive development and basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 6, 269-283.
- Eckhardt, C. J., & Deffenbacher, J. L. (1995). Diagnoses of anger disorders. In H. Kassirer (Ed.), *Anger disorders: Definition, diagnosis, and treatment* (27-47). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Fine, M. A., & Olson, K. A. (1997). Anger and hurt in response to provocation: Relationship to psychological adjustment. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12, 325-344.
- Fridja, N.H. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fridja, N.H. (1999). Emotions and hedonic experience. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.) *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (190-210). New York: Russell Sage.
- Halle, T.G. (2003). Emotional development and well-being. In M.H. Bornstein, L. Davidson, C.L.M. Keyes, & K.A. Moore (Eds.) *Well-being: Positive development across the life course* (pp.125-138). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Kopper, B. A., & Epperson, D. L. (1991). Women and anger: Sex and sex-role comparisons in the expression of anger. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 7-14.
- Krausz, M., Kedem, P., Tal, Z., & Amir, Y. (1992). Sex-role orientation and work adaptation of male nurses. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 15, 391-398.
- Lang, P.J. (1995). Then emotion people. *American Psychologist*, 50, 372-385.
- Ortony, A., & Turner, T. J. (1990). What's basic about basic emotions? *Psychological Review*, 97, 315-331.
- P. Keita & J. J. Hurrell, Jr. (Eds.), *Job stress in a changing workforce* (39-54). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Payne, K. E., & Cangemi, J. (1997). Gender differences in leadership. *IFE Psychologia*, 5, 22-43.
- Piltch, C. A., Walsh, D. C., Mangione, T. W., & Jennings, S. E. (1994). Gender, work, and mental distress in an industrial labor force: An expansion of Karasek's job strain model. In G.

- Potegal, M., & Stemmler, G. (2007). Cross-disciplinary views of anger: Consensus and controversy. In Michael Potegal, Gerhard Stemmler, & Charles Spielberger (Eds.) *International Handbook of Anger* (3 -7). New York: Springer.
- Schachter, S., & Singer, J. (1962). Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional state. *Psychological Review*, 63, 379-399.
- Strickland, B.R. (2001). *The gale encyclopedia of psychology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Farnington Hills, MI: Gale Group.
- Thompson, R. A. (1993). Socioemotional development: Enduring issues and new challenges. *Developmental Review*, 13, 372-402.
- Timmers, M., Fischer, A. H., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Gender differences in motives for regulating emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 974-985.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Thinking and feeling: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist*, 35, 151-175.