

TAKE IT LIKE A MAN: A STUDY
OF MEN'S EMOTION CULTURE

By

Maria Tempenis Shelley

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Sociology

May, 2007

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Professor Peggy Thoits

Professor George Becker

Professor Karen Campbell

Professor Cecelia Tichi

Copyright © 2007 by Maria Tempenis Shelley
All Rights Reserved

To Yiayia, whose wisdom is greater than any degree

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is the fruit of the labor of many people and would not have been possible without them. My brother, Harry, inspired me to tackle this subject because of his big heart and gregarious approach to life. Thanks for being there from my first “B” in middle school to my “Ph.D.” now. I am also grateful for all of my parents and grandparents who waded through the frustrations with me to help me get to the other side. In particular, Yiayia taught me the value of education through her own wisdom and Hershey’s chocolate bar rewards, while Granddaddy gave me the indispensable ambition to get him a copy of this manuscript at last. I would especially like to thank Manita Craft, as well, who gave my baby the gift of independence as she gave me the gift of time to complete this endeavor.

This project has given me the opportunity to work with some wonderful people. The financial support of Vanderbilt University’s Dissertation Enhancement Grant allowed for the analysis of gender reactivity in studying men’s emotions and, in doing so, introduced me to a creative and diligent research assistant; Andrew, the depth of this project would have been unmanageable without you. Next, each member of my Dissertation Committee has endowed me with the skills and encouragement necessary for growing as a scholar. I appreciate your persistence, patience, and expertise. Several colleagues helped me endure the trials of grad school and bring this study to fruition, too. In particular, I thank Carrie Lee Smith, Vanessa and Joseph Fitsanakis, Pam Hull, and Kathryn Lively for sharing their knowledge and their friendship. I am also in awe of the support from my undergraduate mentor and friend, Robert Hartmann McNamara, who

never gave up on me, would not let me quit, and fulfilled his word to keep me on track as a scholar and as a person. I am indebted, as well, to the participants of the study who donated their time to open up their hearts to me and for the people who lead me to these men but who must remain nameless to protect the participants' anonymity. Additionally, my McDonald's crew deserves sincere recognition for cheering me on with kind words, smiles, apple pies, and LOTS of coffee. Their support drove home the most priceless lesson I received from this research: it doesn't take much to bring someone joy. Big G, I thank you most of all for that lesson.

No one has sacrificed more for this project than my child and my spouse. Thank you, John Lawton, for taking long naps so that Mommy could write and for giving me spectacular breaks from writing to keep all this work in perspective. I am also grateful to David, my best friend, who commiserates with me, listens to my rambling ideas, cares for our child, and celebrates the good times. In so many ways, you are the man I hope our child grows up to be. Finally, I extend my gratitude to all of my family, friends, and colleagues who never questioned the value of pursuing higher education or the importance of understanding how emotions influence and are influenced by our social context.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
Chapter	
I. LITERATURE REVIEW	1
Defining Emotion.....	2
Emotion Culture.....	2
Gender and Emotion	6
Masculinity and Emotion.....	11
Gender, Socioeconomic Status, and Emotion.....	16
Masculinity, Socioeconomic Status, and Emotion	25
Inferences about Emotion Culture	32
Theoretical Reasoning	35
II. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	39
Sample.....	41
Procedures.....	43
Measures	45
Analysis	51
III. EMOTION CULTURE(S).....	54
Emotion in General	55
Sadness.....	62
Fear	71
Happiness and Pride.....	79
Love and Affection	85
IV. ASSESSING THE COMPENSATORY MODEL OF MASCULINITY.....	95
Anger and Aggression	95
Concealing Emotion.....	109
Assessing the Compensatory Model of Masculinity	128

V. CRISIS, CHANGE, AND OTHER RESULTS	136
Take it Like a Man.....	136
...Not Like a Woman.....	140
Opening Up to Women and Men.....	143
Dirty Old Men and Young Punks	146
The Good Old Days?	149
Uh-Oh, John Wayne Meets Phil Donahue.....	151
VI. TO CRY OR NOT TO CRY.....	156
Limitations of the Study	162
Suggestions for Further Research	164
Implications of Emotion Culture Studies.....	167
Appendix	
A. RESPONDENT AGE, OCCUPATION, AND SEX OF INTERVIEWER	170
B. OUTLINE OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE AND SAMPLE QUESTIONS	172
C. OPERATIONALIZATION OF MASCULINITY IN QUANTITATIVE SCALE.....	173
D. SUMMARY OF HEGEMONIC EMOTION CULTURE	174
E. SUMMARY OF SECONDARY EMOTION CULTURES.....	175
F. SUMMARY OF HEGEMONIC AND SECONDARY IDEOLOGIES REGARDING ANGER AND AGGRESSION	176
G. SUMMARY OF HEGEMONIC AND SECONDARY IDEOLOGIES REGARDING STOICISM	177
REFERENCES	178

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Sample Descriptives	42
4.1	Mean Scores for Stoicism Items by Class	112
5.1	Comparison of Means for Masculinity Scale	139

CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW

Structural changes (industrialization, contraception, economic restructuring, rising female participation in the workforce, etc.) along with ideological shifts (feminism, sexual revolution, parenting, etc.) are redefining notions of masculinity and men's emotions. The purpose of this study is to explore how emotion culture relates to class position and beliefs about masculinity. What are the cultural ideologies, values, norms, and vocabularies about emotion that structure men's lives? And, do these dimensions of emotion culture vary by socioeconomic status?¹ By addressing these questions, this study begins to uncover the current emotion culture that guides men's lives from their own perspectives. In-depth interviews were conducted with a split sample of eighty men (forty upper-middle class, forty working class) for their perspectives on masculinity and emotion.² To date, little empirical research explicitly focuses on men's emotions and such existing research primarily focuses on hypothetical vignettes, stereotypes about emotion, or theoretical exegesis, rather than on actual emotional episodes. Enhancing our knowledge of men's emotions through studies such as this one adds to the empirical landscape of U.S. emotion culture. Additionally, a deeper understanding of men's emotion culture has implications for addressing issues such as fathering, marital

¹ In this paper, social "class" and "socioeconomic status" (SES) are used interchangeably to refer to an individual's position in the socioeconomic hierarchy. For exact operationalization of the term, see section on "measures."

² As a function of the methodology and small sample size, the study is restricted to only heterosexual, married, non-Hispanic white males. The sampling limitation needs to be addressed through future studies,

relationships, workplace interactions, occupational sex-segregation, and a host of other emotion-influenced situations.

Defining Emotion

As a relatively young area in sociology, emotions research has grown rapidly in a short period of time. Originating in the 1970s, this sub-field of sociology has offered a wealth of insights into the social aspects of emotion, but much work remains to further develop this area of sociological knowledge. Beyond bodily sensation, emotions can be better understood as “complex narrative structures that give shape and meaning to somatic and affective experiences of the body...and of the soul” (Shweder 1994: 37). More systematically, Thoits (1985) delineates four factors comprising emotion including (1) physiological sensations, (2) expressive gestures, (3) situational cues, and (4) cultural labels. The current qualitative study utilizes the respondents’ own understandings or definitions of emotion in order to capture the cultural meaning embedded in their perspectives. From this, we see that a sociological perspective on emotion goes beyond the experience of physical drive states to include cultural meaning and interpretation of social situations. One domain in the sociology of emotions that focuses on meaning is “emotion culture.”

Emotion Culture

Sociologists understand “culture” to include the values, norms, beliefs, behaviors, and objects that, together, form a society’s way of life. Furthermore, culture contains

as variables such as race or region offer potentially important pieces for fully understanding men’s emotion

both material and non-material aspects, with “emotion culture” indicative mostly of the latter. *Emotion culture*, more specifically, entails a group’s ideologies, values, norms, and vocabulary about emotions in general or about particular emotions (Gordon 1990). As Tavis suggests (1989: 47), “People everywhere get angry, but they get angry in the service of their culture’s rules. Sometimes those rules are explicit (‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife’); more often they are implicit, disguised in the countless daily actions....” Alternatively, one might consider vocabularies about emotion as they operate in society. For instance, in contemporary U.S. culture, the idiom of “burning with rage” uses the image of fire to communicate the emotion of intense anger. To be sure, any given society may also have material artifacts that relate to emotion culture, such as artwork, writings, music, symbols, and so forth, but the focus of this study lies more on the nonmaterial dimensions of emotion culture: what people say, believe, and do.

As with general cultural studies, we might also examine basic concepts such as ideology, norms, and deviance as part of our understanding of emotion culture. A recognizable system of beliefs, values, and ideas coalesce to form a society’s ideology. Particular beliefs, values, and ideas about emotions, then, form the *emotional ideology* of a given society. *Emotion norms* (Hochschild 1979) refer to sociocultural guidelines that prescribe what constitute “appropriate” ways of feeling, or of expressing those feelings, in given situations. *Feeling rules* specifically refer to norms that govern the type, intensity, and duration of subjective emotional experiences, while *expression rules* regulate the actual displays or behaviors associated with feelings. Hochschild’s concept of “affective dissonance,” or Thoits’ (1985) subsequent elaboration of the concept as

culture in the U.S.

emotional deviance refers to a discrepancy between one's actual emotional feelings or behaviors and broader feeling and expression norms. Men who cry, infants who do not, or uncontrollable crying that lasts for a very long period of time, each suggests deviations from dominant cultural expectations about sadness, for example. Individuals who experience such emotional deviations are typically motivated to bring their feelings or expressions back into line with cultural standards via techniques of emotion management (1985; Hochschild 1979). *Emotion management* (or emotion work) is the process of invoking or suppressing emotions in order to conform to emotion norms, thereby preserving the social order. Accordingly, researchers of emotion culture can investigate the relationship between culture and structure, in order to understand how structural positions (such as socioeconomic status or gender) act upon the emotional culture of U.S. society as well as how emotion culture influences class and gender differences (Hochschild 1990).

The current study examines how cultural ideologies about men's emotions generate solidarity within men and seeks to uncover whether these ideologies also perpetuate distinctions among them by socioeconomic status. Gordon's (1990) theory of emotion culture suggests that members are "differentially exposed" to emotional experiences, norms, beliefs and values as a function of their structural position in society. Children of divorced parents, for example, may be exposed to feelings of anger, separation, and loneliness to a degree that children in two-parent families may not experience. Gordon points out that structural positions also create differences in how individuals are socialized to express emotions. To extend the prior example, children of divorced parents in one culture may be socialized to display their feelings while other

cultures may teach them to inhibit such displays. A logical extension of Gordon's work involves understanding the "differential exposure" and differential learning that results from being male or female or from one's socioeconomic position; moreover, feminist theory has shown that we cannot speak of a single male or female perspective, but rather, must also consider the plurality of experiences based on factors such as class, race, and religion (see, for instance, Collins 1986; hooks 1989; Myers, Anderson, and Risman 1998). It is feasible, then, to suggest that working class and upper-middle class men learn to adopt and utilize particular aspects of emotional culture that reflect their social positions.

Unlike much of the existing research, this study does not focus on emotion differences *between* men and women. Departing from across-gender comparisons, this study focuses on emotional experiences and expressions *among* men only (who differ by socioeconomic status) in order to explore more thoroughly how masculinity and emotion culture relate to one another. Similar studies of femininity and emotion culture should also be conducted to develop a fuller understanding. However, I analyze masculinity and emotion culture for the following reasons: (a) to better understand male emotionality because it has been far less studied than that of females, (b) to debunk the cultural myth that depicts women as emotional but men as rational (Shields and Koster, 1989), (c) to improve our understanding of how emotion culture influences social interactions for men, and (d) to address the lag in emotion culture associated with structural changes in gender roles and the economy in the contemporary U.S. I hope that by bringing to the surface some of society's taken-for-granted assumptions about men's emotions, we can better understand how social interactions such as legal disputes, business deals, and family

relationships are influenced by our thoughts, beliefs, and norms about emotions as sociocultural factors.

Given its relatively recent origin, empirical research *explicitly* in the area of emotion culture is still sparse (for a few notable exceptions, see Stearns 1990; Gordon 1990; Shields 2002; Simon and Nath 2004). Nevertheless, I have gleaned from research on gender, masculinity, socioeconomic status, and emotions in general in order to make inferences about the emotion culture of men. What follow below are succinct summaries of findings within each sub-category of research that, together, sketch a background for the study at hand. First, the body of literature on gender/masculinity and emotions has grown considerably and offers important directions for charting emotion culture. On the other hand, studies of socioeconomic status and emotions are far more rare, and only a handful of studies exist on the intersection of gender, socioeconomic status and emotion. Still, existing research on emotions in general points to possible areas of exploration for the study of emotion culture.

Gender & Emotion

A considerable amount of sociological research on emotions includes the examination of gender or sex as a variable that affects emotion norms, experiences, displays, and emotion management. Such research has had mixed results with respect to identifying gender differences or similarities, but the results tend to cluster in two ways: (1) most sex *differences* occur in the domain of emotion expression or as stereotypes about women's and men's emotions, and (2) sex *similarities* tend to appear most often in actual emotion experiences and role performance.

First, the majority of gender differences in emotion research occur in the realms of expressing emotion and stereotyping emotional behavior. With regard to emotional expression, a number of studies point out that women: cry more frequently (Ross and Mirowsky 1984; Lombardo et al. 1983; Vingerhoets and Scheirs 2000), smile more often (Hall 2000), display more anger (Dagan 2001; Kring 2000), express emotions of “being in love” more frequently (Peplau and Gordon 1985), share intimate emotional experiences with a wider variety of individuals (Rime et al. 1991; Jansz 2000), and use more emotional terms in conversation (Flannagan and Perese 1998; Fivush et al. 2000). Indeed, Newberger (1999) concludes that strong evidence exists that boys and girls begin emotional life on a level playing field, showing similar emotional reactions in similar situations, but that males are taught to suppress emotional displays through parental interactions, the media, and even the toys with which they play.

Research on stereotypes similarly reveals that we hold sex-specific beliefs or stereotypes about emotions. Sandra Bem’s (1987) classic work on sex-role stereotyping has led to the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), a widely used scale that measures masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. Of the 20 stereotypically “feminine” traits on the scale, almost half make reference to emotionality. Although Bem is noted for her attempt to redefine masculinity and femininity as qualitatively different, rather than as poles on a single continuum, she clearly defines masculinity as including a “lack” of emotionality. In other work, Bem (1987) has also found a clear inhibition of emotional expression among sex-typed “masculine” subjects, when compared to females or more “androgynous” males. Other studies consider stereotypical role expectations of mothers as emotionally nurturing during interaction with children, while fathers are expected to

be less engaged in familial matters and emotionally removed (Fry and Addington 1984; Kelly and Hutson-Comeaux 1999; Newberger 1999; Peterson and Steinmetz 2000). A longitudinal study by Shields and Koster (1989) documents the long-standing cultural beliefs that women are “emotional” and in need of controlling their emotions to be “good mothers,” while men are aloof and need to increase emotional involvement in the lives of their children. The authors’ content analysis of child-rearing manuals from 1915 to 1980 suggests that a maternal inability to control emotional expression is seen as a root cause for emotional problems in children. Fathers, too, are reproached for their aloofness, but the lack in their emotional attention is largely treated as a natural result of masculine “objectivity” instead of “bad fathering.” The manuals’ persistent request for men to become more emotionally involved with their children itself suggests that fathering has long excluded such behaviors.

A study by Simon and Nath (2004) utilizes data from the 1996 General Social Survey to consider sex differences as they relate to emotional stereotypes. The authors find no sex differences in the respondents’ frequency of feelings, but they do find that women are more likely to *express* such feelings. Also, men are more likely to feel positive emotions (such as calm, excited), while women more often report feeling negative emotions (such as sadness). Thus, the cultural stereotype that women are more emotional is not upheld by the data, but we can rationalize that the stereotype persists because women are more likely to *display* emotions, giving the appearance that they are more emotional than men.

Next, it is important to recognize that the existing research has documented gender similarities in two domains as well: the actual experience of emotion and role

performance. Before proceeding, note that far fewer studies of emotional experience have been conducted, but that some existing research suggests that men and women have similar emotional reactions to situational stimuli. For example, Mills et al. (1989) find that both sexes experience altruistic or empathic feelings to the same degree; however, consistent with other research, each sex expresses and displays altruism differently. In an extensive meta-analysis of research on empathy, Eisenberg and Lennon (1983) conclude that most studies find that men and women experience empathy to a similar extent, but that women are more likely to say they would express such an emotion when self-reports are used to assess empathy. Another domain in which gender similarities in emotion seem evident concerns role performance (rather than stereotypes about gendered roles). Most clearly, Barbara Risman (1987) explains that men adopt “mothering behaviors” when put in situations such as single fatherhood where roles require them to perform accordingly. Pugliesi and Shook (1997) reveal further evidence of sex similarity, indirectly related to role performance, in their finding that emotion management is more a function of job demands and job type than of gender (suggesting that both men and women engage in emotion management in certain occupational roles). Likewise, Duncombe and Marsden (1998) suggest that both men and women engage in emotion work in domestic settings; men engage in emotion work on themselves as a means to preserve masculinity, thereby appearing stoic or lacking in emotional response, despite their actual feelings. In contrast, women’s emotion work utilizes more observable techniques such as talking to others or seeking advice.

An important study by Heise and Calhan (1995) illustrates well the overall patterns: sex differences are apparent in expression and stereotypes but sex similarities

occur in felt experience and role performance. The authors distinguish between “prescriptive norms” (stereotypes about how people ought to react in hypothetical situations) and “reactive norms” (actual responses common to particular situations) that govern emotions. They highlight the fact that respondents held similar gendered stereotypes (prescriptive norms) regarding expected behavior for men and women; however, they also found that “reactive norms” did not show sex differences, but rather, often contradicted the gendered stereotypes or “prescriptive norms” they had previously identified. Another significant study by Janice Kelley and Sarah Hutson-Comeaux (1999) specifies the importance of social setting on the use of gendered stereotypes. The authors examine the basic cultural belief that women are more emotionally expressive than men and conclude that this stereotype is context-specific; certain emotional displays by men are far more acceptable and expected in achievement contexts (such as the workplace) while similar emotional displays by women are expected in interpersonal settings (such as the home). Taken together then, the studies indicate that although we may hold gendered stereotypes about emotional expressions, men and women often experience similar emotions in similar situations.

Finally, in *Speaking from the Heart* (2002), Stephanie Shields examines the nexus of gender and emotion culture in detail. Her extensive compilation of existing research reflects on the gendered classifications of women as “emotional” and men as “unemotional” or inexpressive and how we then use emotion culture to reproduce gender inequality in everyday interactions. She defines “manly emotion” as “not a male emotion, but a standard that both sexes are expected to aspire to and are measured against” (p.173). She goes on to explain that manly emotion involves strongly felt emotions that

are tightly controlled. Accordingly, all emotions not controlled are deemed to be feminine, and therefore, socially inferior to the standard.

In sum, research on gender and emotions presents complicated differences and similarities between the sexes. What appears to emerge from the literature is that society holds gendered stereotypes and expectations for emotional displays, but that real, day-to-day interactions exact less gender-specific emotional experiences and role performances. In other words, roles themselves may be gendered, but when filled, men and women often behave and feel similarly in those roles. Given these patterns, it remains of critical importance to investigate this discrepancy between social expectations and social experience. Research that simply concludes that sex differences in emotion exist or research that relies solely on cultural explanations for any apparent gender variations in emotion falls short of recognizing important structural realities that may influence emotions in certain situations. By examining within-sex group differences in emotional experiences and expression, the current study moves away from gender comparisons and, instead, begins accounting for the importance of context and structural variables, such as socioeconomic status, in emotional exchanges.

Masculinity & Emotion

So far, I have been discussing broad gender differences and similarities in the beliefs about and experience and expression of emotion. By focusing my attention more narrowly on the notion of “masculinity” and emotion, I now develop a more nuanced understanding of how the role of emotion factors into the development and maintenance of a gendered identity. Before proceeding, it is essential to recognize that *hegemonic*

masculinity—being heterosexual, aggressive, competitive, and homo-social (men preferring to associate with other male friends)—is the dominant cultural definition of masculinity. Conceptions of hegemonic masculinity emphasize hierarchy and the domination by men of women and of other men (Connell 1987). As Connell and others recognize, all men do not benefit equally from hegemonic male privilege nor do all men subscribe to these ideals. Rather, many “subordinated masculinities” exist (e.g., racial minorities, gay men, etc.), forming the bottom of the gender hierarchy among men. Consistent with some feminist theoretical perspectives on gender (see, for instance, Collins 1986), Connell’s interpretation of masculinity recognizes that the intersection of gender with other variables such as race, class, or sexual orientation, creates unique perspectives in the social hierarchy, which then color social interactions.

A number of typologies describing (hegemonic) masculinity exist, yet all suggest at least one common characteristic: a reluctance to be emotionally expressive. Jansz (2000) identifies four dimensions to Western masculine ideology: (1) autonomy or self-reliance, (2) emphasis on achievement, (3) aggression, and (4) stoicism. Snell’s (1986) typology suggests that a tendency to avoid affectionate displays, difficulty with emotional expression, and preoccupation with success characterize masculinity. Both typologies by Jansz and Snell draw on Levant’s (1992) notion of “restrictive emotionality,” or the tendency for men to disguise feelings, remain stoic, and inhibit expression of their emotions. A notable exception involves the expression of anger, often associated with aggressive behaviors, which does appear to be much less inhibited in men than is the expression of other emotions (see, for instance, Jansz in Fischer 2000; Stearns

1990; Tiedens 2000). Nevertheless, research in the U.S. consistently classifies the reluctance to display emotions (other than anger) as an indicator of masculinity.

Despite the theoretical development of typologies, some scholars suggest that contemporary American men are experiencing a “crisis of masculinity,” or a condition in which uncertainty exists as to the requirements for “being a man” (Shields 2002; Stearns 1990; Coltrane 1995; Levant 1992). Structural changes, such as women’s increased participation in the labor force and rising divorce rates, present challenges to conventional definitions of masculinity that are based on aspects such as physical strength or property ownership. Part of such a “crisis” includes calling into question the restrictive emotionality dimension of masculinity that forms a part of so many typologies. The rapid rise in service sector employment, for instance, suggests men can no longer afford to ignore the need for emotional labor in the workplace. Yet society continues to exude mixed signals that stress the hard-hearted, rational male on the one hand, with appeals for sensitivity, concern, and emotional involvement on the other.

Nowhere is the crisis in defining masculinity more evident than in the domain of fatherhood (Shields 2002). How does one combine notions of masculine virility, power, and aloofness with the demands of caring for children? McMahon (1999) describes the eruption of the popular image of the “new man” in the 1980s as a man who is sensitive and nurturing. He proceeds to explain that such an image remained largely an artifact of women’s magazines and movies and was not readily embraced by males because it did not account for the traditional images of masculinity that include strength, paternalism, and economic success. Rather, the notion of the “new man” simply attempted to feminize masculinity. McMahon contrasts this failed image with the much more widely accepted

image of the “new father” of the 1990s. He argues that emphasis on fatherhood was far more palatable to men because it allowed them to shift roles at home (to become a more nurturing, involved father) while simultaneously preserving other domains of traditional masculinity. Here we might recall campaigns that attempt to portray a “strong but sensitive” image of men, such as the faddish poster of a bare-chested, muscular man cradling a tiny baby in his arms. In short, it appears that changing definitions of fatherhood legitimize more caring behaviors and emotional involvement at home while allowing men to maintain a more typical masculine identity at work or elsewhere in public.

Empirical examinations of the emotional involvement of married fathers, however, continue to reveal an overall low level of emotional involvement among the majority of men at home (Duindam 1997; McMahon 1999; Stearns 1990; Simons and Beaman 1996). Studies persistently find that men continue to assume a breadwinner mentality, leaving women with the emotional responsibility of maintaining relationships (Duncome and Marsden 1995; Willinger 1993), and that men are still less often expected to father their children or to take advantage of programs such as paternity leave (Peterson and Steinmetz 2000; Haas in Hood 1993). Yet a study by Duindam and Spruijt (1997) on a subset of “caring” fathers in the Netherlands suggests several variables do influence the degree of men’s involvement in the home. The authors conclude that the majority of males are not occupied with caring for children but that fathers who are more caring than others tend to: work fewer hours, have more progressive gender role attitudes, and place less value on paid labor overall. Thus, it appears that important structural and social

psychological variables mediate paternal involvement in caring for children to some degree.

Literature on fatherhood feeds into our understanding of emotion and masculinity precisely because it provides a nexus for grafting traditionally feminine attributes, such as nurturing and emotional concern, onto a role that is by definition for men only. As the previous paragraph suggested, many men avoid such a nexus by not incorporating an image of the “new father” into their lives. However, for one group of men in particular—single fathers with custody of their children—the nexus is particularly critical. Greif and Demaris (1990; and Greif 1995) reveal that there is a great deal of role ambiguity associated with becoming a single father and learning to balance work and family obligations. Several works expose how stereotypical notions of fathers as uncaring or uninvolved parents work against men when dealing with judges or court systems (Griffiths 1999; Erickson and Babcock 1995), school counselors or teachers (Fry and Addington 1984), and employers or policymakers (Roy 1999; Marsiglio 1995). Moreover, single fathers often lack the networking skills and social support available to single mothers, often making the role transition from married to single more drastic for fathers than for mothers with custody (Cohen 1995; Francis 1997; Griffiths 1999). Notwithstanding the barriers that come with attempts to infuse a more nurturing dimension into to their masculinity, single fathers do seem to succeed in being emotionally involved with their children. Studies continue to show that men who find themselves in the role of sole custody father take on “mothering” emotions and skills as the role summons the need for such interactions (Risman 1987; Vistnes 1997; Burgess 1998; Heath and Orthner 1999). Once more, then, we reaffirm the conclusion that gender

stereotypes do not necessarily carry over into actual emotional experiences or role performances.

In sum, men and women agree that cultural norms demand that males and females “should” display emotions differently, despite the consistent finding that both sexes privately have similar emotional experiences. Indeed, beliefs about masculinity invariably include some sort of regulation of emotion as one part of “doing gender” for men (West and Zimmerman 1987). It is also important, however, that we recognize the small but growing cluster of studies that demonstrate the willingness of men to deviate from these emotion norms--and the reality that they do--in the face of structural conditions that demand such adjustments. There are hints that the ability to become an emotionally involved father also depends, in part, on the single father’s income, occupation, and educational background. Accordingly, we begin to recognize that dominant cultural ideas do not operate in a vacuum, but rather, are filtered through structural positions such as socioeconomic status and through contextual demands such as single parenthood.

Gender, Socioeconomic Status, & Emotion

Research on the relationship between socioeconomic status and emotion is far less developed than existing research on gender and emotion. Even less common are studies that consider the interplay among gender and SES and emotion. Nevertheless, existing research in this area loosely falls into three categories: class-based stereotypes about emotion, the role of emotion in building power or status, and emotion management in the reproduction of status inequalities.

Social psychologists have begun to look at stereotypes or cultural assumptions about social class and emotionality. Some studies find that showing emotion is characteristic of lower status individuals, while others find the expression of emotion to be a privilege, characteristic of higher status individuals (Dagan 2001; Conway et al. 1999; Flannagan and Perese 1998). Other studies go beyond general emotional expression to consider SES differences in *which* emotions are expressed. For example, Tiedens et al. (2000) conclude that people infer socioeconomic status from emotional expression. Using vignettes, the authors show that in situations which elicit negative emotional reactions, respondents expect high status individuals to feel anger but low status individuals to feel sadness; in positive situations, respondents expect high status individuals to exhibit pride and low status individuals to exhibit appreciation or gratitude. A second study by Algoe et al. (2000) considers the effect of job status and gender on the interpretation of facial expressions. For example, images of men and women displaying identical facial expressions received different emotional labels; the male image was seen as expressing “anger” while the female image was labeled as “afraid.” Gender and job status created an interaction effect, however, on the interpretation of “disgust”; respondents rated the male supervisor as showing more disgust than the female supervisor, but male and female subordinates were given the same rating.

Beyond these class-based expectations, another cluster of research has begun to explore the role of emotions in building and maintaining status and power through social interactions. Notably, Kemper’s (1979; 1981; 1987) work on social structure and emotion builds on two basic assumptions: (a) power and status are fundamental dimensions of social relationships, and (b) the real, anticipated, imagined, or recollected outcomes from

these social relationships produce emotions. For Kemper (1981), social structure is defined as the power (coerced or forced domination) and status (uncoerced approval or praise) of actors vis-a-vis one another in social interactions. He explains that differences in power or status produce differing physiological responses, which produce different emotions. To illustrate this point, Kemper offers the scene of social interactions at a dinner party. If the hostess treats the partygoer with respect and admiration, if others laugh at the partygoer's jokes, if the partygoer gains lots of attention, then the partygoer interprets such behaviors as indicators of her high social status and is, therefore, happy in response. Simply stated, the experience of higher net social status produces happiness.

Kemper and Collins (1990) join perspectives to integrate Collins' notion of interaction ritual chains into Kemper's model. Interaction ritual chains are defined as series of microinteractions that generate macrostructure by creating and recreating culturally agreed upon resources and "emotional energies" (Collins 1981). The authors explain that power and status interactions yield a cumulated emotional result, which serves as the emotional energy of subsequent interactions. For instance, the happy partygoer from the prior example carries such positive emotional energy as confidence into the next social interaction. Favorable emotional energies and shared cultural resources (or "definitions of reality") combine to create social structure for Collins (1981). Therefore, at the heart of the perspectives of both Kemper and Collins, emotions serve as both motivators and indicators of status and power building, and such efforts to build and maintain status are central to the success of all social interactions and for the perpetuation of social order.

Other studies focus on “emotional economies” and their ability to create and recreate power and status through the use of emotions (Clark 1987; Schwartz 1967). Candace Clark (1990) explains that emotions operate as social “place-markers,” or indicators of one’s social standing relative to other actors. Feeling pride in response to praise, for instance, suggests one’s social status is deemed to be high in a given setting. Emotions can also be used like “tools” to elevate one’s own social standing and to subordinate or elevate the statuses of others. Through “strategies” such as flattery we might build someone’s social status, or alternatively, strategies such as putting someone down by commenting on his negative attributes (and thus creating discomfort or depression) might subordinate the person.

In her work on sympathy, Clark (1989) identifies the social rules that govern the exchange of sympathy. She notes that not everyone is deemed deserving of sympathy (e.g., those engaging in self-pity, excessive or overly lengthy demands for sympathy, etc.) and that sympathy is also influenced by status characteristics including sex, age, beauty, and social class. Such sympathy “rules” affect the micropolitics of relationships because people may consciously (or unconsciously) give sympathy to put others in a position of closeness or indebtedness, thereby affecting the power or status of the giver relative to receiver. For example, refusing to accept an offer of sympathy reinforces one’s own power while simultaneously reducing the social power of the sympathy giver. Jan Stets (1997) also explores how individuals utilize emotion in order to build status. Through interviews with over 260 married couples, Stets concludes that the use of negative socio-emotional behaviors between marital partners (i.e., criticizing, interrupting, etc.) is a function of lower status rather than gender. Although women did

exhibit more negative socio-emotional behaviors, so too did respondents who were younger, less educated, and of less prestigious occupations than their partners. Stets postulates that low status individuals (not just women) must work to prove their self worth and, therefore, use negative emotion-based behavior as an instrument to modify the structurally inequitable conditions in which they find themselves.

The remaining studies on gender, class, and emotion focus more on the reproduction of gender and status inequalities, largely through emotion management. As described by Hochschild (1979, 1983), society influences emotion in two primary ways. Society presents the social stimuli that elicit feeling responses for given contexts and situations. Emotion management, then, involves “checking” or evaluating one’s response according to the “emotion norms” also provided by society. Emotion management occurs in the process of everyday interactions whenever there is an experience of emotional dissonance between what one feels versus what one should feel. But certain occupations also demand that employees engage in emotion management as a skill that is commodified, i.e., sold as an aspect of one’s labor. Such occupations are largely part of the middle class or service-sector, rather than working class positions, which focus more on manual labor or repetitive motion (1983). Hochschild (1979) also explains that parents in jobs that demand emotion labor often socialize their children via appeals to feelings (“When you scream like that, you make Mommy angry”) and sanction them for deviating from feeling rules (spanking the child for “losing her temper” rather than for hitting another child). In contrast to these middle class parents, working class parents are often in occupations that do not demand emotion work as a “skill” and, therefore, are more

likely to socialize and sanction children for their behavioral performance, not for their emotions.

Thus, it is apparent that emotion management reproduces social inequalities in several ways (Hochschild 1983; Schwalbe et al. 2000). Primarily, it involves conforming to feeling rules, rules that are established and sanctioned by those in positions of power or moral authority (e.g., employers, religious leaders, etc.). Emotion management is also an integral part of certain occupations, largely in the middle class service sector. Finally, it is mainly a learned skill that socialization perpetuates, given that child-rearing tactics mirror the occupational patterns of parents. Hochschild's argument mirrors the earlier work of Kohn et al. (1986) on social class and children's value systems. The authors use structural equation modeling of cross-cultural, longitudinal survey data to demonstrate that "parents' occupational self-direction" (or autonomy in the workplace) mediates the relationship between their social class and their value of autonomy versus conformity in their children. Social class position affects the individual's occupation, which creates differences in autonomy and self-direction on the job. These structural differences then shape the parent's value system, producing different parenting styles (such as Hochschild's emphasis on middle class parents sanctioning children for breaches of "feeling rules"), which finally create particular values for children. The children learn to value autonomy and self-control (or conformity to authority), thereby socializing them for future occupations that demand such skills.

Spencer Cahill's (1999) concept of emotional capital helps clarify the link between the individual's position in the social structure and the reproduction of status inequalities. Consonant with Bourdieu's notion of cultural capital, *emotional capital*

refers to the aesthetic perception, judgements, and tastes about emotions developed through primary and secondary socialization. Cahill uses participant observation of mortuary science students to demonstrate how students learn to overcome any fear of death, aversion to corpses, and how to deal with grieving relatives. He argues that we begin learning such emotional “skills” in childhood, and occupational training or education often cultivates our existing emotional capital. Referring back to Hochschild and Kohn et al., we might refer to the ability to engage in effective emotion management (i.e., discerning the feeling rules and then conforming to them) as yet another example of “emotional capital,” particularly cultivated and transmitted in the middle class service sector. Cahill explains that emotional capital channels people toward different occupations or social positions. For instance, someone who frowns upon the use of violence or who avoids physical confrontation does not have the emotional capital necessary for police work; such an individual may be able, however, to earn such capital through training in the police academy, but it is unlikely that this line of work would have been pursued to begin with. Mortuary science students, as Cahill demonstrates, come almost exclusively from families in which a parent or relative is in the business. Accordingly, we see that one way emotional capital impacts the reproduction of status inequalities is in terms of occupational self-selection or through occupational socialization. Cahill also explains that one’s capital varies depending on “differential exposure” (Gordon 1990) in socialization. The extent, timing, and sequence of children’s exposure to different emotions, to evaluations of those emotions, and to emotion norms vary depending on social class, ethnicity, and other structural positions. Hence, class and

gender inequalities are also perpetuated from the beginning in terms of the different opportunities for building emotional capital.

Several additional studies explore the role of emotion management in reproducing class and gender inequalities. In *Fast Food, Fast Talk*, Leidner (1993) describes how the routinization of labor—including emotion labor—is interpreted by workers to affirm the worker's gender identity, thereby succeeding in maintaining the gender status quo. For instance, customer service occupations center on the “feminine” task of submitting to customer demands. For women in such an occupation, the emotion work involved in customer relations is consistent with their gender identity as women. On the other hand, routinized service labor can also serve as an “excuse” for workers to do things that may otherwise adversely affect their gender identity. If an insurance sales person must smile, show politeness, and make a scripted sales pitch, then a male in such a position may claim these actions are simply “part of the job” rather than feminine attributes. Thus, workers' interpretations of their routinized labor offer justifications for service sector class differences as well as gender inequalities. Kathryn Lively's (2000) analysis of in-depth interviews with paralegals yields the concept of “reciprocal emotion management,” or the efforts of similar others to manage one another's emotions. Lively explains that one way paralegals strive to appear “professional” is by displaying deference to the attorneys. In order to cope with the emotional demands of deference and care-taking, paralegals engage in reciprocal emotion management. In so doing, paralegals reproduce the class hierarchy between attorneys and legal staff, and often reproduce the gender hierarchy as well, given that paralegal is a largely female occupation. Finally, Uttal and Tuominen (1999) study the emotional labor of paid childcare workers. Historically

treated as “women’s work,” childcare now done for pay continues to attract low status, unskilled workers and to offer low monetary pay. Therefore, emotional caregiving that comprises a large and essential component of childcare continues to be devalued in society, thereby perpetuating class and gender inequalities.

In summary, we have seen that there are gender-based stereotypes about emotions as well as class-based stereotypes. A few studies, such as the one by Algoe previously discussed, suggest an interaction effect exists between class and gender that creates more nuanced stereotypes or social expectations about emotional displays. A logical extension of this argument, then, is that there are specific emotional stereotypes or cultural expectations about working class men as distinct from upper-middle class men. Beyond cultural expectations of class and/or gender differences in emotional experience and expression, other studies look more deeply at the process of how emotions are used to maintain or build power and status. In these studies, emotions serve both as indicators of one’s status in a given interaction and as tools to be consciously or unconsciously manipulated to build one’s own status or otherwise affect the status of another actor. Class position operates as one form of social status. Accordingly, it is important to consider which emotions indicate high and low SES and how high and low SES actors utilize emotions during the course of social interaction. For example, in the current study, what emotional beliefs and values guide interactions for men of differing class positions, and how do these beliefs and values relate to the individual’s behaviors? Finally, SES is an important part of emotion management in several ways. Analogous to other social norms, the feeling rules that guide emotion management processes are made by those in higher positions in the social hierarchy. Those in power largely determine which feelings

are valued and what the appropriate display of such feelings may be in a given situation. Next, depending on one's gender and SES background, we are differentially exposed to situations, which create differences in emotional capital (i.e., types of emotions we value, encounter, learn to manage, etc.) and differing views as to the importance of controlling emotions. Engaging in emotion management in everyday interactions or at work, then, perpetuates differences in SES and gender in the social hierarchy. Still another way in which the class and gender status quo are expressed involves the way in which individuals interpret emotion management to validate existing gender or class identities. Pertinent to the research at hand, Leidner highlights how male insurance agents construct the job as requiring such masculine traits as aggressiveness, persistence, stoicism, and determination. Rather than focusing on the feminizing aspects of the job—avoiding offense, being pleasant, bolstering customer egos, displaying interest in customer interests—the men construct sales work as a “man's job” by emphasizing competition and aggressive tactics (Leidner 1993:202).

Masculinity, Socioeconomic Status, & Emotion

As these few but insightful studies of gender, class and emotion exhibit, an important future direction for the sociology of emotions lies in better understanding the interplay among these variables. To date, work on the role of emotions in the reproduction of social inequalities focuses on the processes of emotion management and emotional labor. While these studies are indispensable, they are limited in their ability to articulate the *culture* of emotions as an ideological tool involved in the production and reproduction of social hierarchy. Also, only a handful of studies examine how

masculinity, specifically, intersects with socioeconomic status to create more specific emotional expectations and social interactions. Below is a discussion of these studies, followed by a more general discussion of how masculinity relates to socioeconomic status. Although the latter studies do not make explicit reference to the role of emotions, they provide a necessary backdrop for understanding the place for research on men's emotion culture.

Four empirical studies probe the intersection between masculinity, socioeconomic status, and emotion. Ross and Mirowsky (1984) use survey data to show that women cry more frequently than men, but then the authors take the study to a deeper level by examining differences in crying behavior among men. They find that higher socioeconomic status males hold less traditional sex role beliefs, which are associated with an increased tendency to cry under saddening circumstances. Thus, although lower socioeconomic status males may encounter more circumstances in which sadness (and thus crying) could occur, the intersection between class and sex role expectations actually decreases the frequency of expressing sadness through crying. Using data from the 1996 General Social Survey, Thoits (ASA 2002) examines emotional deviance by gender and finds that there is no sex difference in whether or not anger is deemed to be deviant, or "inappropriate," by the respondent. However, she does find that women who hold traditional gender role attitudes see their anger as deviant more than women who hold nontraditional attitudes, while egalitarian men see their anger as more deviant than do nonegalitarian men. Consistent with the work of Ross and Mirowsky, then, Thoits' findings suggest that gender role ideologies do influence emotional perceptions, including which emotions are appropriate to feel or express. Moreover, although Thoits

finds no overall sex differences in viewing anger as deviant, she does find that emotional deviance varies inversely with socioeconomic status; both men and women of a higher SES view anger as less deviant.

Next, Haas' (1972) qualitative study of ironworkers illustrates how working class males manage their emotions and those of apprentice workers in a manner that both preserves their masculinity as well as their social status among the workers. Haas' workers affirm their masculine strength and stoicism in the work environment. Through joking or "binging," the experienced ironworkers test the emotional capital of the new apprentices to be sure that they can control their fear or anger in dangerous situations. Finally, a meta-analysis and literature review on gender and romantic love by Peplau and Gordon (1985) suggests that, in general, men rate sex as more important than affection in a romantic relationship. However, the authors conclude that across social classes, men vary, with working class men placing far less emphasis on affection compared to other men. In short, among men, there do appear to be important variations by SES in emotional experience and expression.

Evident from the studies outlined above, much work still needs to be done to grasp the interplay among masculinity, SES, and emotion culture. Before moving on to discuss how the current study contributes to this area, two theoretical points about the relationship between masculinity and social status are in order: Connell's framework of hegemonic masculinities and the "Compensatory Model of Masculinity" outlined by Donaldson (1993) and Collinson (1992). Though these works do not directly address emotions, they offer an important theoretical stepping stone toward understanding men's emotion culture.

Central to Connell's (1987) perspective on "masculinities," men form their gender identities in relation to "femininities" as well as in relation to one another. As a result, masculinities differ according to socioeconomic status because various structural positions along the class hierarchy present different opportunities and obstacles for men to address. The previous description of Jansz's typology of Western masculinity offers four domains in which men can exhibit gender identity: autonomy, achievement, aggression, and stoicism. Obviously, not all masculinities embrace all of these domains, at least not with equal importance. For example, a working class manual laborer lacks occupational autonomy and has only limited room for achievement in employment. Such blocked opportunity to develop masculinity (as described by Jansz's typology), therefore, suggests that working class men may need to subscribe to a different typology—or, must seek autonomy and achievement in a domain other than employment (such as athletics, dating, or drinking).

Drawing on Pleck's roles strain theory, the *compensatory model* (Donaldson 1993; Collinson 1992) explains that men will exaggerate certain traits of masculinity in the absence of other traits. Thus, in my example above, if structural opportunities are not available for developing masculinity through culturally expected means in the workplace, we might then expect an exaggeration of aggression and stoicism among male working class manual laborers. An alternative example may be that an advertising executive cannot display physical strength or sexual prowess in the workplace in order to demonstrate his masculinity. Applying the compensatory masculinity model, he would likely turn to displays of competitiveness and economic success as indicators of his manhood. Differing positions in the socioeconomic hierarchy should afford different

opportunities, obstacles, and situations for men, making it possible to investigate variations in the emotional values of the men. Do structural obstacles to occupational mobility, independence, economic success, and achievement lead working class men to compensate by magnifying emotional attributes such as aggression and stoicism? More broadly, to what extent do such structural constraints and opportunities shape emotion culture patterns by class?

Two empirical studies on SES and masculinity inadvertently illustrate the compensatory model. An ethnography of working class boys and young adult men in the northeastern United States finds mutual feedback between the reproduction of gender, race, and class hierarchies (Fine et al. 1997). The study demonstrates how high school boys script themselves as the “protectors” of white female students against “oversexed” and dangerous African American male peers. By treating the women as “property” which African American boys are “invading,” the white boys use a heterosexualized, virile image of masculinity that simultaneously subordinates non-white males and all females. A similar situation to that of the schoolboys exists for young men in the employment world. Working class white men, many of whom themselves have been unemployed or on welfare, blame affirmative action for unfairly privileging African Americans and draw the limits of what constitutes a “deserving circumstance” for not working. The authors conclude that because masculinities rooted in economic success or provider roles are so difficult for the working class male to maintain, they attempt to subordinate women and to define other types of men as inferior. They hold onto identities of white race and male gender in order to gain status in an increasingly class segregated world. Or, as Fine et al.

write, "...white working-class male identity is parasitically coproduced as these men name and mark others, largely African Americans and white women" (1997: 55).

An admirable study by Karen Pyke (1996) examines class-based masculinities and amply informs the current study as well. Through in-depth interviews with white men stratified by social class, Pyke uncovers how ideologies about men's careers operate to recreate gender and class hierarchies. She explains that the benefits of the "hegemony of the male career" (i.e., the male provider role) are class-specific, such that higher-class males reap rewards of autonomy, achievement, financial success, cultural support, and spousal approval much more readily than working-class males. For example, wives often affirm ideologies that protect men's interests by criticizing men who do not climb the economic ladder and by encouraging men to work harder; women may relieve their spouses of household or childcare duties by defining such responsibilities as their own and their husbands' role as that of provider. A striking illustration of the subtlety of such ideologies, the construction of "leisure time" by men of different classes creates two opposing interpretations. On the one hand, higher-class individuals blur the distinction between leisure and work—for instance, a lawyer having drinks or playing golf with a partner. Contrast this image with that of a working class man who punches a time clock and then goes out for a beer with a co-worker, creating a much sharper distinction between work and play. Subsequently, Pyke finds that people often interpret the former engagement as evidence of a man's ambition for climbing the social ladder while the latter appears as a lack of ambition and laziness. Here we see that the very same type of interaction yields two very different interpretations, dependent upon the man's class position. More importantly, we see that the hegemony of the importance of the male

career serves to subordinate working class masculinities and perpetuates traditional gender roles. In other words, Pyke asserts, “In doing gender, men and women engage in practices that promote male dominance and female subordination in most social contexts” (1996: 545).

Taken together, the studies of Fine et al. and Pyke show that working class males define their own identity in terms of physical strength and sexual prowess, while others define them as misogynist, violent, or lazy. Higher-class males define their identity largely through work and financial provision, distancing themselves from images of working class males; yet, they also participate vicariously in a masculinity based on strength through the use of leisure activities, such as sports, or through their support of military actions. In turn, working class males describe their higher-class peers as “effeminate” or engaged in “wimpy” work such as paper-pushing. In short, men of various socioeconomic positions carve out their own identities in contrast to men of a different class or race, as well as in relation to women. Operating in this logic are emotional ideologies about the appropriateness of aggression, intimacy, fear, joy, and anger. Indeed, what is absent, yet might be inferred, from Pyke’s work is the existence of ideologies about emotion (beyond the ideology of the career) that also serve to subordinate women and certain men in social interactions. This dissertation, then, serves to discover and outline the emotional ideologies and norms that shape class-based masculine identities.

Inferences about Emotion Culture

As reviewed above, the literature on gender, masculinity, class, and emotion yields a considerable amount of information on the sociology of emotions in general. By piecing together inferences about emotion culture from these writings, several premises about emotion culture arise. First, men in the U.S. clearly face a cultural expectation that they “ought to” remain stoic and avoid emotional involvement but that they may also exhibit aggression or anger. Gendered roles, such as “father” and “breadwinner,” sometimes embody these cultural norms about emotion to varying degrees. Secondly, we see that what men “ought to” feel can sometimes vary from what they actually or typically do feel or express (Heise and Calhan 1995; Hood 1993; Doss 1998). The literature on single fathers and their emotional involvement, in particular, demonstrates that not all men subscribe to the hegemonic cultural ideal of restrictive emotionality. Evidence exists that socioeconomic status, in part, accounts for this discrepancy. Precisely how emotional expressivity is a function of socioeconomic status remains to be disentangled; some studies describe expressivity as a “privilege” of higher status men, others distinguish it as a tool that lower status men employ to challenge the status quo (Stets 1997), still other studies suggest that men of different status positions express different emotions. Regardless, people do make inferences based on status as to what men “should” feel or display and men do seem to express emotion differently depending on their positions in the economic hierarchy. Next, emotional indifference appears to be an accomplished identity trait, which men must struggle to achieve or maintain via emotion management and emotion work. This supposition challenges notions that women are emotional and men are not by suggesting, instead, that men have feelings that need to

be controlled. Norms about what men should *feel* versus what men should *show* still require clarification. It remains an important duty of emotion culture research to detail what beliefs, values, and so forth form the “feeling rules” and normative ideas that are integral to emotion management. Finally, existing research speaks to the importance of structural changes in creating a “crisis of masculinity,” or at least a great deal of ambiguity about what cultural expectations exist about emotions and men’s identity. Some structural changes (such as the rise of service sector jobs, demands of single fatherhood, etc.) suggest men need to embrace greater sensitivity or emotional involvement and awareness. But other changes would prompt men to decrease sensitivity and amplify emotional indifference. For instance, economic restructuring, increased participation of women in the labor force, rising unemployment, and escalating numbers of dual career families suggest that men can no longer rely on economic success or “provider” images to define masculinity; accordingly, they may be more inclined to draw upon stoicism or aggressive violence to validate their masculinity.

Accordingly, existing studies offer some theoretical and empirical contributions to research on emotion culture, but they also demonstrate the limitations of this research. They offer insights on some cultural expectations about men’s emotions as well as open up the door to recognizing the importance of race, class and social context in studies of emotion. They also demonstrate solid attempts at developing theories to ground empirical findings, submitting well organized meta-analyses of current findings on emotions, and situating emotions and masculinity in a socio-historical context. Nevertheless, existing studies fail to capture the details of emotion culture as it applies to men because emotion culture is not their central focus of concern. Though an extensive consolidation of

research on gender and emotions exists, particularly in the compilation by Agneta Fischer (2000), the current study seeks to concentrate what is known about men's emotion culture. Such knowledge is critical in order to eschew relying on emotion stereotypes about men and to avoid making false generalizations in emotions research.³ A narrow conceptualization of gender as conflated with "sex," or simply examined in terms of sex differences and similarities, also speaks to the limited quality of within-sex research on emotions. In addition, the empirical gap in explorations of emotion culture hinders the development of other themes in the sociology of emotions. While we know that emotion work and management are processes that contribute to the reproduction of status inequalities, we know strikingly little about the emotion culture embedded in these processes. In order to avoid basing future research on these concepts on faulty assumptions about shared ideologies or norms, methodical research on emotion culture is necessary. Finally, beyond its sociological contributions, the current study holds implications for more accurately interpreting emotion-laden interactions--such as employee disputes, custody battles, or even positive exchanges like those following the birth of a child--in which gender and class positions may color cultural understandings of such behavior.

³ Research often operationalizes emotion in gendered terms. Conventionally feminine emotions, such as crying, sensitivity, and giddiness are measured as indicators of being "emotional," while feelings like confidence, calmness, and solemnity are often treated as indicators of a *lack* of emotion. The current study, however, deems all of the above as different types of emotion, not as the presence or absence thereof.

Theoretical Reasoning

I suggest that socioeconomic status influences emotion culture and beliefs about masculinity. Although the role of emotion culture in reproducing social inequalities at the macro level remains the subject of future research, this study considers how class and masculinity operate within emotion culture. I begin to explore and map out the cultural terrain of working class and upper-middle class men's emotion culture. Given the relative dearth of empirical work on emotion culture, this study's key contribution rests on cataloging the norms, beliefs, values, symbols, and vocabularies of emotion that influence the lives of these men. I consider how emotion culture promotes cohesion among men, while also perpetuating distinctions within particular groups of men by socioeconomic status.

Two currents of social thought, then, direct this study. A critical theory approach (Gramsci 1971; Foucault 1980) considers that "ideological hegemony" operates as a means of producing general social consensus about men's emotion culture. Then, the "Compensatory Masculinity Model" (Donaldson 1993; Collinson 1992) is used to explore the extent to which structural constraints and opportunities shape emotion culture patterns by class.

The concept of "ideological hegemony" refers to the way in which cultural ideologies can assume the level of common sense knowledge, thereby obscuring power dynamics between dominant and subordinate groups. For emotion culture, this study attempts to uncover taken-for-granted "truths" about emotions from the men's perspectives. The current study describes the hegemonic ideology about men's emotions,

as well as any secondary ideologies (i.e., beliefs that justify or explain non-hegemonic views) that emerged.

The compensatory masculinity model then permits us to examine emotional variations among men, given their common, overarching emotion culture. Briefly, class position presents certain opportunities and obstacles that influence how one can express masculinity (e.g., manual labor offers opportunities to display strength and stoicism, but may lack opportunities for the display of autonomy or achievement). As compensatory theorists explain, men exaggerate particular aspects of masculinity to “compensate” for those that they lack. Michael Messner (1993), for instance, argues that men’s displays of “sensitivity” via crying or sympathy are not becoming increasingly universal. Rather, such displays are a luxury for men who have already established a solid identity as a masculine through financial success, prestige, or power. He cites instances of “sensitivity” expressed by famous men such as Michael Jordan, Colin Powell, and Ronald Reagan to illustrate his point. Though Messner does not draw upon the compensatory model, his arguments are consistent with the model by demonstrating that when holding certain attributes of masculinity, men are at liberty to be more emotionally expressive in public. As mentioned earlier, the work of McMahan on the failure of the sensitive “new man” image contrasted with the success of the “new father” image also fits the compensatory model; fatherhood provides a domain in which men can display nurturing emotions without threat to their overall masculine identity. In sum, in the analysis to follow, I remain attuned to instances where situational context affects the presence or absence of masculinity traits and to instances where a well-established masculine identity loosens a man’s need to restrain emotional displays.

In order to examine the hegemonic idea of men's emotion culture as well as its possible class-based variations, I make several assumptions as well. I assume that SES largely shapes emotion culture through Gordon's notion of "differential exposure" and Cahill's description of "emotional capital" acquired through socialization, as previously described. Gordon explains that one's structural position in the economic hierarchy exposes individuals to particular emotions and provides experiences that generate certain emotions with greater frequency. While Cahill's work affirms the importance of differential exposure and childhood socialization, he also identifies occupational socialization and education as two more factors responsible for generating emotion capital that is particular to one's social class.

Another assumption I draw from the literature is that men's emotion work is often hidden from public view, thereby perpetuating the stereotype of male stoicism. Briefly mentioned earlier, Duncombe and Marsden (1998) find that men engage in emotion work, but that men's emotion work is primarily done by the self on the self (i.e., intrapersonally, through unseen cognitive techniques, etc.) such that it is largely invisible (compared to women's emotion work which also often involves work done on others). Men often feel compelled to suppress feelings such as fear and sadness or to exaggerate outward appearances of calmness or indifference. The effect of such "invisible" emotion work is to perpetuate stereotypes of men as aloof and emotionally stoic or apathetic. Hochschild's (1998) notion of emotion work rests on the idea that we manage our emotions in order to bring our experiences into line with "feeling rules," or cultural beliefs about appropriate affective responses. Emotion work is the process by which emotion culture is internalized, expressed, and perpetuated through social interaction. In

short, exploring the tacit link between emotion work and emotion culture reveals how stoicism or emotional remoteness operates as part of the ideological hegemony of men's emotion culture.

Obviously, emotion culture is a concept distinct from and larger than the concept of masculinity, but emotions form an integral component of masculine identity. As such, it is important to examine the emotion culture in which men establish their masculinity. Similarly, masculinity is a concept distinct from emotion culture, but its emphasis on stoicism and aggression ties it directly to research on emotion. Because we cannot speak of a single masculinity, but rather, must acknowledge the intersection of gender and class, it is also helpful to examine the relationship between SES and emotion culture within men.

Specific hypotheses and research questions that guide this study are outlined in more detail in the methodology section in chapter two. The heart of the study, however, aims to understand how emotion culture interacts with class position and images of masculinity. Using qualitative interviews, I more clearly delineate the norms, beliefs, and values that comprise men's emotion culture. What is the hegemonic understanding of how men should experience and display emotions? Moreover, do class-based variations in men's emotion culture exist, such that lower SES men exaggerate the importance of stoicism and anger or aggression as part of working class masculinity? In the next chapter, I describe the research strategy that enables an examination of these questions.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

As a result of its relatively recent inception, the sociological study of emotions has a number of gaps that require filling, notably the dearth of research on men and socioeconomic status. This study draws on qualitative data in order to begin to explore variations by class in men's emotion culture. In-depth interviews with a split sample of forty working class and forty upper-middle class men were conducted in order to outline the norms, beliefs, and values that comprise men's emotion culture.

An underlying assumption of survey research is that the researcher knows enough about the population or topic to ask the right questions. Given the paucity of research on men's emotions, however, this assumption cannot be made. Qualitative interviews, then, serve as an essential methodological approach to enhance our knowledge of emotion culture. To be sure, speaking to men through interviews offers only one of many ways to gain insight about the norms and beliefs that comprise emotion culture.⁴ Other techniques, such as the content analysis of television or film portrayals and men's magazines, as well as participant observation of emotional displays in settings such as sporting events or dinner parties, are also essential to understand fully men's emotion culture. Feminist research repeatedly underscores this need for triangulation in order to maximize strengths and minimize weaknesses of social research (Reinharz 1992). Thus,

⁴ Further studies of women's perspectives on men's emotion culture would provide necessary depth to our understanding. However, given that the purpose of this study is to understand men's emotion culture from

the current study offers a necessary background for future research on emotions to build upon.

Qualitative interviewing is appropriate for the fundamental goal of this study – to understand men’s interpretations of emotional events in their own words. As discussed further in the section on measures below, my interview guide was organized to address three objectives that flesh out this goal: (1) describing the “hegemonic” view of men’s emotion culture (beliefs about particular emotions, norms about appropriate expression or duration of feelings, etc.), (2) identifying any class-based patterns of difference in emotion culture and beliefs about feelings or emotional expression, and (3) examining how views of masculinity relate to perceptions of emotion culture as well as to the degree of conformity to hegemonic emotion culture. Briefly, what is men’s emotion culture, and how does it relate to masculinity? And, are there any class-based patterns of difference in emotion culture and attributes of masculinity?

Socioeconomic status, emotion culture, and masculinity are the three primary concepts of interest. The sample was selected on the basis of socioeconomic status, described below. **Socioeconomic Status** or “class” has been established through the purposive selection of working and upper-middle class respondents. Consistent with Giddens’ (1973) terminology, I designated respondents to each class based largely on occupational affiliation. Those with supervisory or professional positions, accompanied by high income and education are labeled “upper-middle class,” while those with lower occupational prestige, income, and education form the “working class.” By operationalizing SES in these terms, the sample was essentially stratified in terms of the

their own standpoint, and in order to avoid an emphasis on gender comparisons, the sample is limited to

amount of physical or manual labor, another attribute of masculinity. To be sure, an ongoing debate exists in the stratification literature as to the existence and exact definition of “social class” (see, for instance, E.O. Wright 1982; Blau and Duncan 1967; Langston 1992; Kingston 2000). It is not the purpose of the current study to speak to this debate. Rather, I aim to consider the implications—if any—of one’s socioeconomic position on his understanding of emotion culture. Such information empirically contributes to scholarly debates about the effects of social class, and beyond this, it may hint at why particular class-based outcomes occur (e.g., differences in arrest rates, homicides, etc.).

Sample

A purposive snowball sample of forty working class and forty upper-middle class Caucasian, heterosexual, married men was drawn from three cities in the southeastern United States. Such quota sampling helped ameliorate confounding variables in the data; it is possible that factors such as sexual orientation, race, or region could influence definitions of masculinity and emotion culture. Attempts were made to restrict the sample as much as possible to men who are also fathers so that accounts of expressing emotion in the home would be more comparable across respondents. All of the men were either married, divorced and remarried, or cohabiting with a longtime girlfriend. Respondents also ranged from 20 to 72 years of age, with an average age of 37 for working class men and 45 for upper-middle class men. Table 2.1, following, summarizes the sample composition. However, a full description of each respondent’s pseudonym, age,

men only.

occupation, and the sex of the researcher who conducted the interview is available in Appendix A in order to adequately describe the sample in this study.

Table 2.1: Sample Descriptives

	Upper – Middle Class		Working Class	
	N	%	N	%
EDUCATION				
< High School or GED ¹	--	--	8	20%
High School	--	--	32	80%
B.S. / B.A.	19	48%	--	--
Post B.S. / B.A.	21	53%	--	--
OCCUPATION²				
Laborer	--	--	5	13%
Short Order Cook	--	--	5	13%
Retail / Cashier	--	--	6	15%
Other Working	--	--	24	60%
Systems Analyst	6	15%	--	--
Attorney	7	18%	--	--
Titled Position	6	15%	--	--
Other Upper-Middle	21	53%	--	--
MARITAL STATUS				
Married	32	80%	24	60%
Remarried	8	20%	14	35%
Cohabiting	0	0%	2	5%
PARENTAL STATUS				
Father	32	80%	30	75%
No Children	8	20%	10%	25%

¹ Two respondents had less than a high school degree; six respondents earned a GED equivalent.

² The three most common occupations for each class are specified. Other upper-middle class occupations included such jobs as accountant, engineer, and physician. Other working class occupations included jobs such as maintenance technicians, production line workers, and newspaper carriers. Finally, “Titled Position” refers to labels such as “Vice President of Operations” or “Executive Director.”

The snowball sample of working class participants began with two contacts, one a production line worker in a major textile factory and the other a short-order cook in a local diner. Similarly, upper-middle class interviewees were chosen by snowballing from two contacts, a lawyer in a major downtown law firm and an ophthalmologist in upstate

South Carolina. While a non-random sample of eighty men from three cities is clearly not generalizable to all men in the Southeast—much less to the entire population—their responses offer a necessary depth of understanding and ability to explore themes not available from content analysis, surveys, or other forms of research.

But qualitative interviewing is not without its limitations. Obviously, findings from the research cannot be generalized to all men, not even to all men in a small city in the South. However, “theoretical generalizability,” developing an understanding of the social and cultural processes involved in men’s emotions and the conditions under which they occur, is possible with the present methodological approach (Weiss 1994). Interview methodology allows for theoretical generalizability on the phenomenon of interest, enabling future studies to address details of frequency and distribution and the impact of factors such as sexual orientation or race.

Procedures

In-depth, qualitative interviews began by obtaining informed consent as well as permission to tape-record and were conducted in a variety of settings. Several interviews (8) were held in my office, others at local restaurants (18 interviews), and still others at the homes or workplaces of the interviewees (54 interviews). Location of the interview depended upon the participant’s convenience or preference.

All research must confront particular methodological obstacles, and sometimes the only viable solution entails an honest acknowledgment of the limitation of the design. However, some obstacles can be not only resolved, but rather, transformed into new strengths for the study. In the present study, it is important to recognize the potentially

problematic issue of the sex of the researcher, given that I interviewed a sample of men about a conventionally “feminine” topic. While I acknowledge that the sex of an interviewer may influence data, such influence need not be a disadvantage. Rather, borrowing from Patricia Hill Collins’ (1986) notion of the “outsider within,” as a female researcher I was in a position to ask the men otherwise “obvious” questions and to probe taken-for-granted truths. The interviewees could more easily assume the role of expert, which, in turn, made them more amenable to discussing emotions as well. Nevertheless, the gender dynamics of interview interaction may still shape the sort of information that the participants divulged.

Precisely because gender is so intimately related to emotion culture, norms exist that govern the interaction. Questions arise. Are there expectations about what emotions are appropriate (or inappropriate) for men to discuss with women? What terminology about emotions do men use when talking with women as opposed to other men? Do men actually seek sympathy (i.e., emotional identification) with other men when discussing emotional experiences in a way that they cannot do so with women? Or, does the status dynamic of the researcher-interviewee relationship annul any potential gender biases in the interaction? In order to explore the possibility of gender reactivity, a male research assistant was hired to administer the same interview questions to half of the sample of men (20 working class and 20 upper-middle class men), and I interviewed the other 40 men. Our results were then compared to check for possible sex-related reactivity in the interviews. The results of this analysis are discussed in detail in chapter five, but basically revealed little, if any, gender reactivity in the interviews.

Following the main, qualitative portion of the interview, respondents completed a brief inventory of questions designed to measure hegemonic masculinity. An outline of the interview guide as well as the masculinity inventory follows, along with a description of key concepts and measures in the study.

Measures –Interview Guide and Masculinity Questionnaire

Interview Guide

A pretest of the interview schedule was conducted on a small sample of men, three from each class, in order to evaluate the adequacy of the instrument and to correct any problems. A refined version of the interview schedule was prepared and used for actual data collection. After a brief introduction to the study and then signing of consent forms, interviews opened with demographic questions that lead into simple questions about favorite hobbies, television shows, or movies to ease participants into the more substantive part of the interview. Next, participants were asked a series of questions about expressing or hiding emotions in general. Following these broad questions, the interview quickly moved into a series of questions focusing on sadness, then anger, followed by fear, then shifting to love, and finally, pride and joy. At this point, respondents were asked to volunteer any thoughts or questions that may have arisen which were not specifically introduced by the researcher. Finally, the interview transitioned into subjective questions about masculinity and the administration of a brief questionnaire described below. Interviews lasted about two hours. Not every interview followed the exact pattern of the interview schedule, as is often the case with in-depth qualitative interviews. If during the course of describing their favorite movies a

respondent launched into their fascination with horror flicks, then the researcher may have jumped to questions about fear, moving back to more general questions about emotions, and then proceeding with the rest of the interview schedule. In every instance, however, the questionnaire was the final step in the interview process.

Because the main concept of interest is men's **emotion culture**, questions were designed to reveal information about the norms, beliefs, and values that form emotion culture. The study delineates **emotion norms** to include those applying to: the expression of emotions, the proper intensity or duration of feelings, where and to whom emotions may be revealed, and appropriate or inappropriate causes of emotions (such as crying in the event that a sports team loses, but not if one cuts one's finger). Emotion norms tend to involve specific details about what "should" or "ought" to be or what is "expected" of people. **Emotion beliefs** tend to be more general references to what is "true" or "fact," and they refer to ideas men hold about particular feelings or about emotions in general, such as the belief that "real men do not cry." It is important to note, however, that norms and beliefs are closely related and often nested in one another, or they simply differ based on the participants' word choice. Finally, **value** refers to the importance of an emotion as it relates to some desired goal or end, or to the symbolic value of showing a particular emotion (e.g., calling a man who shows fear a "baby").

A series of questions aimed at exploring several emotional states (stoicism, anger or aggression, sadness, fear, love and affection, and pride or joy) in the domains of either work or home. One strategy for tapping these concepts builds on Hochschild's technique of asking about "discrepant" emotions (see also Thoits 1995 on emotional deviance). Respondents were not only asked to recall particularly vivid or recent occurrences of

emotions, but were also asked to recall any instances in which they believed their emotional response or display to have been “inappropriate” to the situation. By understanding what men found abnormal, then, I was able to clarify other norms that comprise men’s emotion culture. Lastly, I remained attuned to the possibility that existing research on emotions has had a bias toward defining emotionality in “feminine terms,” such as crying or showing sensitivity, both very visible displays of feeling. However, men sometimes described feelings or expressions of calmness, solemnity, or otherwise *visually* “unemotional” states as one way of expressing emotion, which researchers have simply dismissed as a *lack* of emotion to date (Shields 2002).

Most of the questions in the interview schedule asked respondents to describe basic norms, beliefs, and values about particular emotions and about emotionality in general (see Appendix B for an outline of particular questions and follow-up probes). Interviewees were asked to recall instances of a particular feeling, and then, through a series of probes, to describe the event in detail by indicating who was present during the event, how the men and witnesses responded or coped with the emotional reaction, where the emotion occurred, what circumstances generated the emotion, and how the emotion was expressed or not. Participants were also asked to recall instances of feeling or showing “deviant” emotions, instances in which they felt or responded a certain way but either felt uncomfortable or later regretted their action. Finally, some questions asked “how important” a particular emotional response or behavior was to the interviewee (such as crying, not showing fear, etc.) in order to assess the “value” of such an emotion. The norms, beliefs, and values that comprise emotion culture were distilled through the

participants' discussions of emotional experiences and their attitudes toward those experiences.

The goal of these questions was to capture men's views of emotions in their own terms, rather than by imposing a framework or making inferences about what constitutes emotion culture. By asking participants to recall actual episodes, this study also moves away from the more traditional technique of using vignettes or hypothetical situations about emotions (see, for instance, Tiedens et al. 2000, Robinson et al. 1994, Tsoudis and Smith-Lovin 1998). In-depth interviewing permitted the researcher and respondent to establish working definitions of complex emotion topics and it offered more latitude for both to reach a consensus of meaning that more accurately reflected the respondent's perspective. However, the potential for social desirability effects cannot be ruled out as a problem inherently related to interview methodology. It is hoped that through assuring confidentiality and reiterating the lack of scholarship on the subject, the respondents recognized their expertise on men's emotion culture and our need for their knowledge. Given that existing research highlights the influence of stereotypes and our cultural assumptions about gender, class, and emotion, it is possible that more educated men, for example, may attempt to downplay particular stereotypes, making class differences in emotion culture appear larger than perhaps they really are. Accordingly, asking for concrete examples was essential to this study because it is harder to sustain "socially desirable" responses or stereotypes. While recall bias often exists in such an approach, tapping actual emotional episodes helps to reduce socially desirable responding. Furthermore, the findings were not dependent on the recollection of specific details of an

emotional episode; rather, the study relies on the overall emotional view of such events, minimizing any concern about recall bias.

Attempts were made to pick up on all “markers,” or casual remarks that indicate areas for additional probing (Weiss 1994). For instance, if during the course of describing his mother’s funeral a respondent remarked that he grieved more over the loss of his dog, then the researcher would follow up with questions about the death of his pet. Such attention to markers or passing details served to assure respondents that the interviewer was attentively interested in their viewpoint on the subject matter.

Finally, in order to assess the concept of **stoicism**, the study uses multiple indicators because stoicism is a central feature of the compensatory masculinity model and hegemonic masculinity. Five indicators were used to tap into this concept: 1) a quantitative estimation via the questionnaire discussed in the next paragraph, 2) interview questions about “hiding” emotions, 3) the respondent’s attitude toward crying, 4) whether or not the respondent openly cried or “teared up” during the course of the interview, and 5) the respondent’s attitude toward fighting. Because crying and fighting are both overt, visible displays of sadness and anger respectively, their presence indirectly speaks to a lack of stoicism.

Masculinity Questionnaire

Masculinity was measured quantitatively at the conclusion of each interview by using a brief, self-administered questionnaire (see Appendix C). The masculinity mini-questionnaire was placed last in the interview process in order to avoid biasing interviewees’ responses to the emotion questions in a way that might have artificially inflated references to hegemonic masculinity. Just prior to administering the

questionnaire, the interviewer asked each participant to discuss the meaning of the common phrase “act like a man,” in order to get a more subjective understanding of the participant’s own definition of masculinity as well. Respondents were also asked to identify any role models, heroes, or heroines (and which attributes they admired) to further assess what traits the respondents respected in other men.

Specific items for the questionnaire were developed in conjunction with two important existing scales, Snell’s (1986) Masculine Role Inventory (MRI) and the Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale (MMIS) by Doss and Hopkins (1998). Many of the items on the questionnaire come directly from the two existing masculinity scales, while several additional items are included in order to tap into other domains of masculinity as suggested by the literature. Neither of the parent scales encompassed all of the dimensions of hegemonic masculinity; furthermore, taking all of the items from those scales as well as introducing additional ones would have made the questionnaire far too long. As illustrated in Appendix C, item numbers 1,7,11,14,15,20,21,23, and 24 are drawn directly from Doss and Hopkins. Item numbers 2 and 4 are from Snell, and I designed all other items. Also, the use of “man” or “men” (instead of “guy(s)”) was maintained throughout the questionnaire, unlike the parent scales that used the terms interchangeably. Alpha reliability scores were calculated in order to examine the reliability of the scale. The overall inventory has an acceptable score ($\alpha = .71$), but when split into subgroups by status, the reliability is more questionable for the working class men ($\alpha = .78$ for upper-middle class respondents, $\alpha = .58$ for the working class respondents).

Items in the scale tap seven dimensions of hegemonic masculinity: autonomy, achievement, stoicism, aggression, athleticism, provider role or financial success, and sexual prowess. A list of items, each followed by a Likert-type scale, directed participants to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with statements about each of the seven dimensions. A composite masculinity score was created using any necessary reverse-coding and summing items. Scores were divided by the number of items answered, giving a mean score for each respondent. Scores can reach a theoretical maximum of four, which would mean that the participant held a strong perception of hegemonic masculinity.

Analysis

Transcribed interviews were entered into AQUAD for coding and analysis (Huber, ver. 5.9 2001). This software package permitted nested coding and facilitated the management of large amounts of narrative data.⁵ Specific emotion displays, norms that guide emotional expression, instances of deviant emotional behavior, and other relevant concepts that emerged from the interviews were coded. Keyword searches were also used to identify particular terms that may have been overlooked in the initial coding of the data; for instance, keyword searches on the terms “should,” “ought,” and “expected” were conducted to identify other instances of norms in the data. Findings from the interviews were used to paint a description of men’s emotion culture, highlighting both significant discoveries and suggestions for further exploration. Then, coded incidents and concepts were compared across class in order to discern potential differences among men

⁵ Nested coding refers to the ability to label a particular passage or excerpt with more than one code.

that covaried with socioeconomic status. In this way, I was also able to explore the compensatory masculinity model.

Several specific hypotheses were explored with the interview data. Obviously, the first proposition is that men share a basic, hegemonic cultural view about emotions, regardless of their own degree of conformity to such a view. Next, differing patterns of beliefs about emotional experiences, expressions, and expectations existed depending on the participant's class position. Finally, to begin to explain any class-based variations in emotion culture, the study drew upon the compensatory model. To compensate for limited opportunities for expressing masculinity through achievement, financial success, breadwinning, or autonomy, working class men should exaggerate the masculine emotion culture of stoicism and aggression. Beyond these hypotheses, other findings emerged that were not necessarily anticipated prior to the study, and these results are discussed in chapter five.

The validity of the concepts rests on their face validity to the reader, but they can be confirmed through further analysis and triangulation. Triangulation provides a means by which subjective influences (both on the part of the respondent and of the researcher) can be discerned and used to paint a more complete understanding of the research question. Qualitative interviews yield indispensable information about men's emotion culture, heretofore uncaptured by any methodology, as well as subtle insights as to how emotion culture operates alongside issues of class and masculinity. Hopefully, future studies utilizing survey data will contribute a robust quantitative analysis of the relationship between class, masculinity, and emotions in men, as well as a refined look at

whether and how the compensatory model of masculinity affects men's views of stoicism and aggression.

In conclusion, this study is intended to contribute to our knowledge of emotion culture. Such research is essential to empirically fill in the content of men's "emotion culture," in order to understand how emotions operate in shaping our daily interactions with one another. Beyond direct scholarly concerns, findings from the study could potentially be used to better understand pressing social problems such as higher incidence of homicide or high-school drop-out rates among working class males, as well as more mundane interactions among workers, families, and other social relationships. I discuss the implications of this research in the final chapter. First, however, I look at emotion culture in the next chapter. Then, chapter four considers an analysis of the compensatory model, and chapter five outlines additional patterns and findings that emerged from the data. Finally, in the concluding chapter, I discuss the implications of this study as well as identify several caveats and areas regarding further research.

CHAPTER III

EMOTION CULTURE(S)

This chapter describes emotion culture as depicted by the respondents. Subsequent chapters deal with the masculinity model and other issues, but I begin by cataloguing men's emotion culture to provide the necessary foundation. What norms and beliefs govern men's emotion culture, and are "secondary" emotion cultures also operating that apply to only one class of men? Chapter three begins with a broad look at emotions in general and then zeroes in on particular emotions. For each specific emotion—sadness, fear, happiness, and love—I first identify the dominant, hegemonic views about issues such as how the feeling is typically expressed, cause of the emotion, and any norms or beliefs that are consistently mentioned by the respondents. Next, I delineate any secondary views about the particular emotion.

Recall that "beliefs" and "norms" are closely related and often overlap or depend on the phrasing of the response. Whenever an idea was consistently described in terms such as "ought" or "should," I coded the response as a norm. Pure ideas or "truths" were coded as beliefs. For instance, some respondents said "hitting women is wrong," a belief; others explained "you should never hit a woman," a norm. In the final analysis, however, I often looked at related norms and beliefs and simply chose the dominant form of expression (norm or belief) to report the content of the idea. Finally, the emotion culture of anger and aggression is not outlined here because I discuss that emotion in detail in chapter four; references to "hiding" fear in particular are also analyzed in chapter four

because they speak to the issue of stoicism, in order to assess the compensatory model of masculinity.

Emotion in General

Hegemonic View of Emotion

I open this chapter by considering emotional expression in general, regardless of the specific feeling. To begin, respondents offered occasional definitions of what the term “emotion” meant to them. With no class differences apparent in answering this question, the men in this sample define emotions accordingly:

As far as being sad...angry, happy...your goods and your bads.(Max, Manufacturing Coordinator, age 48)⁶

Happy, sad...anger...scared, freaked out.(Andrew, Laborer, age 26)

I guess I’m thinking about...like crying, sadness, anger. Is that what you’re talking about, emotions?(Baxter, VP of Business Development Corporation, age 44)

Basically, for the respondents, emotions are feelings, or what emotions researchers recognize as “primary” or “basic” emotions. But other respondents also added what emotions are *not*, namely, reason. These next definitions of emotion highlight this distinction between feeling and logic:

Um, reactions that are not cerebral or intellectual, ones that you don’t control. They emerge on their own.(Charlie, Computer Programmer, age 37)

Intangible feelings that are not based on logic. When someone says something, it’s the way you feel...not necessarily good or bad.(Alan, Attorney, age 40)

⁶ All names are pseudonyms.

Well, I do think of feelings. I think of the way that I respond not intellectually in terms of reason, but how it generally is my first response to a situation is the emotional one. But, you know, the second response is the more reasoned or intellectual approach. Usually I'm using that to deal with the emotions. (Robert, Attorney, age 35)

A few respondents raised the issue of whether emotions are learned or innate, while others spoke about gender differences in emotion between men and women. An occasional respondent also spoke about the ephemeral quality of emotions. Others dabbled with the belief that emotions in general need to be controlled. However, as I discuss further in the next chapter, quite a few respondents spoke of the importance of “controlling” specific feelings in particular situations. For now, I continue with a look at normative expectations and beliefs about expressing emotion in general for these men.

Expressing emotion takes on the form of “talking” about emotions and “showing”⁷ emotions. Charlie makes this distinction:

Researcher: When you say “express” you emotions, do you literally show them?

Charlie: No, I talk about them. Discuss them. Like saying, “I’m really angry about this.” Maybe once in a while, when I get on a roll and talk about it, I’ll get angry and I’ll feel the anger. The anger will be visible in my tone of voice.

Respondents were specifically asked both if men were expected to show emotion and if they were expected to talk about emotions; during the interview, if the respondent focused on talking about an emotion, the interviewer followed up with probes about other

⁷ A handful of men expressed confusion about “showing emotion,” by perceiving it as a form of demonstration or exaggerated display rather than simply as a visible expression of emotion. Offering respondents a definition of what is meant by “showing” in future studies should curb this complication.

ways of expressing the emotion as well. Thus, I analyzed normative ideas about showing emotion separately from verbal expressions of emotion.

Overwhelmingly, respondents operate under the normative expectation that men are not supposed to show emotion. Several illustrations of this norm came as direct responses when asked if men were expected to show emotion:

Not really. Men are expected to be strong (Max, Manufacturing Coordinator, age 48)

In general, no, men don't show their feelings. (Jeff, Production Technician, age 48)

If they are...sad or disappointed about things, they'll say, "Hey, I'm really bummed out over..." as opposed to saying, "Man, I'm really sad." I think it's because society doesn't really expect men to...well, there's still a feeling that men should be stronger or show less emotions and make more decisions. (Lawrence, Software Architect, age 52)

Only 12 men, compared to 51, argued that men *are* socially expected to show emotion.

Most of the remaining men were more ambiguous, suggesting that expression norms depend on setting, gender, or to whom one would show the emotion. For instance, several men held the belief that emotions did not belong in the workplace, but that they are expected in the home. Others argued men are not expected to show emotion, except for anger.

Other beliefs about showing emotion in general were scattered throughout the data. Most commonly, the belief that showing emotion shows weakness or vulnerability punctuated interviews from both classes. Lucas, a night manager at the Dollar General (age 23), gave the following response when asked if men are expected to show emotion:

"Nah, Not at all. In fact, Dana says she looks down on a man that cries. It's like a sign of

weakness.” Kip, a construction litigation attorney and former engineer (age 47), explained the weakness belief this way:

I still have that tendency not to cry. A specific occasion was when one of my grandmothers died, and there’s no rational reason as to why you should try to hide it, because nobody’s going to laugh at you about it. But it’s that recorded message that men should not cry. If I’m about to start crying, don’t ask me if I’m okay, because it irritates me. If I’m being honest, it irritates me because, number one, it’s a recognition that I’m showing emotion. And, by asking me if I’m okay, from her standpoint, that’s her saying...Can I help you, what can I do? But I’m taking it as...You are acknowledging that I’m showing weakness or something, and I want to express my emotion and have nobody recognize it.

Some respondents raised the belief that emotion is contagious, indicating the need to hide negative emotions but show positive emotions. The following exchange with Cameron, a Navy diver and attorney (age 37), reflects on this belief:

Cameron: No, no, cause the only people I would tell would be the other divers, and that would definitely be a violation of the code of manhood. In the military, you don't tell other guys that you're afraid.

Researcher: What do you mean?

Cameron: It's just the code. You just don't. You don't express your fear.

Researcher: Do they teach you that?

Cameron: Yeah, yeah, they teach you that. They tell you.

Researcher: What do you think is the reason behind that?

Cameron: 'Cause I think fear is contagious. It'll spread.

On further analysis of the positive / negative distinction, I found that over half of the respondents saw showing positive emotion as more acceptable behavior for men. Noah’s (Business Analyst, age 28) comment demonstrates both the belief that emotion is communicable and the greater social acceptability of showing positive emotions:

Like I said, it's...for me it's an issue of influencing others and their emotions. If you're happy, people tend to be happy. If you're sad, you tend to pass that off to other people. If you're nervous, you tend to make other people nervous. It's contagious, I guess.

Only ten men viewed showing negative emotions as the dominant expectation. And roughly one-fifth of the sample argued that directionality made no difference in whether or not emotion should be shown. The remaining men spoke about specific emotions or did not make the positive / negative distinction at all.

Data for *talking* about emotion yield similar results. Again, most men upheld the norm that men are not socially expected to talk about or verbally express their feelings. David (Geologist, age 51) explains, “Historically men don't show their feelings except through actions. They do show them but only through actions, but they're not supposed to sit around and talk about it.” Similarly, this exchange with Lawton (Vice President of Operations, age 37) affirms the expectation of not talking about feelings:

Researcher: Does this include just talking about [emotions]?

Lawton: Uh, men don't talk about emotions. I don't talk about them.

Researcher: So I guess my next question is, do your male friends usually discuss their feelings with you?

Lawton: Not typically, but I don't seek it. I'm not saying, “How are you doing emotionally?” I say, “How's life,” but I expect a shell answer. You know, “Good.”

In contrast, a handful of men suggested the opposite, that men are expected to talk about their emotions. Some tempered this norm with the belief that talking about emotions in the home is acceptable, but not in the workplace. Nick, a public information director (age

49), made the distinction this way when asked if he is comfortable talking about his feelings:

I think it depends on who they are. I don't think I do that widely. I think I do that with a select few people, but with those folks, yeah. It depends on the context...I'm pretty open with my immediate family, with my wife and kids. But then there may be some areas where I wouldn't talk with them about that I would talk with my best friend about. I don't probably talk with people I work with. They would say I'm reserved in expressing my feelings around them.

Others said that men are more likely to talk about their feelings in the presence of other men, without women present. Further analysis of this gendered point yielded an interesting class distinction described in the next section. In sum, norms and beliefs emerged such that men are not expected to show or talk about emotions, especially in the workplace. Showing emotion is also seen as a sign of weakness, and many respondents believe feelings are contagious, further affecting whether or not men choose to express them.

Secondary Views of Emotion in General

A separate analysis of “who” men talked with about their emotions provided an interesting class distinction. Men of both groups expressed comfort in talking with their wives. However, only upper-middle class men focused on verbalizing their feelings with male friends; the working class respondents offered more resistance to talking to their friends about emotions. Compare these two excerpts, the first by Peter, an attorney (age 36), and the second by Richard, a cook (age 26):

One thing, and I don't know how many paths you want me to go down, but one thing about your close friends, even if you're not showing your emotions, I think it's more you would talk about how you felt about something more than you would really show that emotion at the same time. I mean, I think you would feel safe to be really sad if something really bad happened, but if something makes

you really mad, something happens that you're upset, you say, "This is..." whatever, and you rant a little but it wouldn't be- you may not necessarily get that worked up. It's just that you would talk about it.

I mean, they might ask advice, but they don't talk about it in depth. Like, if you were in this situation what would you do. But they don't really get too much into depth. It's just, "Did you see the game last night..." stuff like that.

It appears, then, that the belief that men are more likely to discuss feelings in the presence of other men may be class specific, even though men from both groups mentioned the belief.

Another secondary belief emerged, this time regarding social expectations about showing emotion. One-quarter of the upper-middle class men introduced the idea of a generational shift in norms governing emotional expression in men. The following exchange with Baxter (VP of Business Development Corporation, age 44) demonstrates the generational change in society's expectations:

Researcher: Are men expected to show emotions?

Baxter: No.

Researcher: How about to talk about them?

Baxter: No. I think that's changing though. I think you deal with emotions with other guys that you feel close to. You don't feel as vulnerable as you did in childhood.

Researcher: So do you mean it's changing within your own lifetime, from boyhood to adulthood?

Baxter: Yeah, but I also say probably generational. I would think my dad's generation...they always had to be the tough guy. I guess other generations that I've heard it's considered a weakness to show your emotions.

The generational norm, then, insinuates a more complicated emotion culture for men. Generations past were expected not to show emotions, while current generations find more social ambiguity or sometimes more acceptability in expressing emotion. Baxter's remarks also speak to another potential trend in men's emotion culture, maturational differences. These generational and maturational trends, and others, are the subject of chapter five. First, however, let us look at emotion culture as it emerged from questions about specific feelings.

Sadness

Hegemonic View of Sadness

In this section, I begin with a broad look at sources of sadness and the men's dominant views about the emotion and then narrow my focus to examine ideas about crying behavior more specifically. First, respondents offered a variety of sources of grief when asked to recall particular instances of feeling sadness. Death was the single most often mentioned cause of sadness for the respondents. However, marital problems, and serious illnesses were also frequently cited reasons for feeling "down." Other more minor grounds for sadness included the loss of pets, dramatic movies, or being disappointed by someone. Respondents of both classes agreed that crying and talking through sadness were two acceptable and familiar ways of dealing with the emotion. However, the overwhelmingly most common means of coping with sadness for these men involved withdrawing, internalizing, or otherwise being alone. The following three excerpts from different respondents describe this method of coping:

Just be quiet and withdrawn. Usually that...I think my reason for doing that is, the reason I want to be quiet and not talk about it is because further dialogue can make it worse. it usually resolves itself. I mean, rarely...do I go to bed angry or do I wake up feeling sad.(Alan, Attorney, age 40)

To tell the truth, I just want to be alone. I jokingly tell people that if it wasn't for my wife, I would be a hermit. (Lawrence, Software Architect, age 52)

I like to go walk in the woods where I live. I live down at the end of a dead-end road and I got all kind of space out there. Basically just to get away sometimes is a good way to get over sadness. Sometimes if you're in that kind of a mood and somebody else is wanting to talk with you, even if they're trying to help you or whatever, sometimes it gets on your nerves. You just want to tell 'em to shut up sometimes. (Kevin, Industrial Maintenance Worker, age 44)

Almost 45% of the sample cited some form of seclusion as their typical means of dealing with sadness. It is perhaps noteworthy that more working class respondents mentioned the seclusion method of coping (14 upper-middle class, 21 working class), but overall this method seemed important to many of the men. By secluding themselves, they are in effect not showing this emotion to others.

Interestingly, the respondents introduced very few beliefs or norms about sadness. A few individuals did make statements that, when taken together, point to the belief that men "limit" their expressions of sadness. One norm governing duration of sadness did emerge: the degree of sadness depends on the circumstance. Consider the following responses to the question of whether there is a "time limit" on how long men can be sad:

There's still people who, when they missed that field goal in the Superbowl-I don't know. I think it depends. It's probably on a scale based on how close to them the bad thing is that happened. If you have something that's a big, terrible thing, they can be sad for a long time and nobody's gonna fault them for it. If it's you didn't get that promotion you wanted or your horse didn't come in at the track or whatever, people are going to say, "Okay, you need to get over that now." I mean, it's just...it's in relation to how close it is to home and how bad it is, if you were to plot it on a graph. (Peter, Attorney, age 36)

Yeah...it would depend on what it was that was making you sad. If it's sort of...I mean, length of time and intensity is proportionate to whatever's going on. Logic, reasonable sadness...I mean, sometimes it just gets out of whack. (Cameron, Attorney, age 37)

It all depends on who it is or what the circumstances is or whatever. Like I say, he died with cancer, and he was eat slap up and nobody never knew it. It's just one of them things. (Jeff, Production Technician, age 48)

This expectation that sadness depends on the cause, therefore, basically suggests that the length of time appropriate for grieving is determined by how serious the sad event is and the closeness or intimacy of the persons involved. Thus, the experience of death for the respondents almost always involved grieving for at least a year, with many men finding that the sadness never ends. A few respondents did add that grieving too long or over a superficial event—in other words, violating the “it depends” norm—seemed to be a sign of depression or as Cameron stated above, to be “out of whack,” consistent with Thoits’ argument that deviant emotions are interpreted as symptoms of psychological disturbance (1985).

Before considering secondary ideologies about sadness, I want to concentrate on crying behavior in particular. Many ideological statements surfaced in the data about crying. It is also a visual, obvious display of emotion that directly relates to a lack of stoicism, which will be important for assessing the compensatory model in the next chapter.

Respondents were asked to recall instances of concealing sadness, and many of them volunteered occasions in which they “choked back” tears or otherwise refrained from crying, while still others revealed situations in which they freely cried in public settings. In order to better assess the compensatory masculinity model in chapter four,

respondents were ordinally coded into three groups that capture their perspectives on crying in public. First, “criers” were those who viewed crying as perfectly natural and acceptable and who engaged in the behavior. Slightly more than one-quarter of the men were overt “criers.” In opposition, “non-criers” were those who did not typically cry regardless of the situation or who viewed crying as a form of weakness. Slightly less than one-quarter of the men were “non-criers.” The “middle” category, which comprises most of the sample (50%) were less extreme about crying. They accepted crying as normal, even if they usually did not engage in the behavior, or they engaged in the behavior but expressed discomfort in doing so. In some cases, respondents in this middle category identified very specific circumstances in which crying is acceptable or not.

The following excerpts illustrate each of the three positions. Brent (Engineer, age 30) typifies the crier category, while Joe (Security Guard, age 29) highlights the non-crier group. Ty (Brick Mason, age 29) falls in between the two extremes.

Brent: Society has all these impressions, but individuals don't want those things. Majority of individuals want to communicate with someone on a personal level. In order to be accepted in society, though, you have to act a certain way. That's where all this duplicity comes out in people. Why men can't have emotions, why men can't be caring, why I can't go and hug my wife, why I can't kiss her whenever I want, why at our wedding I was the one crying at the alter and she's sitting there all stoically next to me. This is me! There was no problem for me to cry at my own wedding. When she walked down the aisle, it was the most beautiful thing in the world, and I was like, “this is really fricken' cool!” When I talk about my dad, I get teary-eyed. This is just me. If you can't deal with the raw me, then go off and deal with all your fake friends that you want to deal with.

Joe: A lot of people look at me like I'm crazy because I didn't cry at my mother's funeral. There's a time and a place for that....During a situation like that, my opinion is you need to go off somewhere by yourself and confront your demons. It wouldn't be cool to break down in the middle of a Waffle House somewhere crying. People tend to think you're nuts, and you'll wind up at [the mental institution] or whatever.

Ty: It takes a man to [cry] I think. A man can express his feelings in public or wherever he is. He ought to be able to do that. You're human, you know. But you got your little guys that think they're so tough over here [motions left] and you got your other little old soft guys over here [motions right] and I'd be between them. I mean, I don't say nothing when somebody expresses theirself. I don't think nothing less of 'em.

The majority of the sample held a moderate attitude toward hiding tears. Most importantly, there were no major class differences among these groups, such that neither class was more stoic about crying than the other. Furthermore, members of both classes were virtually identical in understanding crying as a very situation-specific type of behavior for men and in which occasions were deemed acceptable or not. The two most often mentioned situations in which crying was seen as unacceptable were over sad movies or songs and over job related problems such as job stress. In contrast, the overwhelmingly most acceptable occasion for crying was, of course, at the funeral or death of a loved one. Respondents often specified devastation over the loss of a child as well. Chronic illnesses of others or vicarious tears for friends and family who were suffering were two additional circumstances in which men deemed crying to be acceptable.

Respondents were also asked questions about crying on happy occasions, in order to assess whether crying itself or the negative emotion of sadness contributed more to the importance of hiding tears for men. Of the 53 men who responded to this question, most men either felt that crying in response to sad events was more acceptable than over happy occasions (38%) or that crying in response to either happy or sad events was equally acceptable (38%). Slightly fewer men held that crying in happy circumstances, rather than sad occasions, was more socially acceptable for men (24%). It is also important to highlight that two of the most "acceptable" occasions for crying that respondents

mentioned included crying over the birth of a child or at a wedding. It seems, then, that the circumstances over which men cry are less important than the behavior of crying itself in relation to concealing sadness.

A distinct, hegemonic ideology about crying was also apparent in the interviews. The most commonly mentioned norm is that men should not cry when they are expected to be strong for others or are in leadership positions. Respondents also identified norms about appropriate “lengths” of crying by highlighting that “crybabies” or “whiners” are deviants who cry chronically or over minor things. This exchange with Baxter (VP of Business Development Corporation, age 44) illustrates the distinction:

Interviewer: Are there things that wouldn't be acceptable to cry over?

Baxter: I guess if it's something silly, like getting a raise at work, I don't think you should cry over that.

Interviewer: Is it more acceptable to cry over happy or sad things?

Baxter: I think it's acceptable either way. I guess I'm getting confused between crying and being a crybaby.

Interviewer: What's the difference?

Baxter: Crybabies are just emotional about everything. I think there's probably some underlying problems there if you're crying too much. I've never been around anybody very emotional, crying like that.

Another norm that emerged is that crying over major life events, especially death, is perfectly acceptable and according to some men, is very much expected. Finally, some respondents mentioned gender norms about crying, such that men and women have different rules that govern crying; these results are described in detail in chapter five.

As far as beliefs about crying, men often described a perception that there has been a generational shift in society that makes crying more acceptable for men today than

in years past. Others discussed more of a maturational shift within themselves such that they find crying as older men to be more acceptable or easier than when they were younger. These beliefs and others, though, will be explored in detail in chapter five. The most commonly discussed--and complicated--belief surrounds the connection of crying to weakness. Many of the respondents held the belief that society's view of men who cry is that they are weak individuals (31 respondents). While men from both groups introduced this belief into the data, I highlight a subtle class difference that surfaced about the way the men talked about crying as weakness in the next section.

Secondary Views of Sadness

Respondents introduced a variety of class-specific, secondary views about crying in particular and sadness more broadly. As mentioned a moment ago, both groups of men expressed the belief that society equates crying with weakness. The interesting class difference here is that the working class men were far more likely to add that despite such a belief, they themselves did not perceive crying to be a form of weakness; the upper-middle class men rarely distanced themselves from the dominant social view. Contrast these two excerpts, the first from John, an engineer (age 39), and the second by Kevin, a maintenance technician (age 44) from the working class.

Interviewer: Do you think guys who cry are considered weak?

John: In general, yes. There are maybe some men who would and in some context it's probably acceptable, a borderline type of thing, but in general I don't think men are very open to that. It's something I recognize that I don't find easy.

Now, Kevin's response to the same question follows.

Kevin: No. Like I said, I don't consider myself weak in any way. That's just an emotion that I guess everybody has. Any guy that denies that is denying being human.

Interviewer: Is it something that you think society as a whole thinks is weak?

Kevin: Yeah, I mean, the mentality of a lot of guys out there...they don't think the same way I do. The majority, I think, of guys out there think guys aren't supposed to cry. Guys are supposed to have these big, tough exteriors to get through.

Furthermore, eleven working class men (compared to only 6 upper-middle) explicitly stated that crying is not a form of weakness. Therefore, in terms of beliefs about crying, most of the sample shared the dominant male view that crying shows weakness, but the working class men distanced their own personal view from that, thereby making crying more socially acceptable among the working class men.

One final aspect regarding crying was evaluated: whether or not the respondent actually shed tears during the interview. Roughly the same number of men from both classes teared up in front of the researcher, for a total of eleven men (14% of the sample). While only a handful of men engaged in this behavior, two interesting class patterns emerged. First, upper-middle class men teared up when describing both positive and negative emotional situations. Secondly, they cried much more freely than the working class respondents. Three of the five upper-middle class respondents cried more than four or five times during the same interview for a total of fifteen crying instances; only one of the six working class men cried more than once for a total of seven instances. For example, Mike was an attorney who shed tears five times during the interview while discussing his son, the death of his mother-in-law, the adoption of another son, loving his children, and his role models. Thus, although roughly the same number of men from each class cried during the interview, the upper-middle class men did so more openly, repeatedly, and about a wider range of events. Interestingly, this pattern of more open crying among the upper-middle class interviewees contradicts the earlier pattern found

that working class men tended to be the ones who distanced themselves from the social view that men who cry are weak.

In the next chapter, I assess the implications of these views about crying on the compensatory model, but here I expand my focus to consider secondary ideologies about sadness more generally. The norm that the length of grieving depends on situational severity certainly governed duration of sadness for both groups. However, the working class respondents also ascribed to another norm regarding duration: men should move on from their sadness. Although part of the upper-middle class group, Robert (Attorney, age 35) most clearly articulated this norm:

I think somebody who's lost say a spouse or a child can be expected to go up and down in emotional response over time, so long as there's progress towards stabilization. You would expect to see a widening of the curve, of the time between positive and negative moments. But rather than saying a day or two or ten, it's important that there is just movement towards that. If I see that the person has just gotten stuck in a rut of sadness, that would be a cause of concern. Or if I felt their highs and lows were too long, too protracted, to extreme, I think that would cause me concern.

In other words, the “move on” norm suggests that improvement or becoming less sad over time was a more important consideration than setting some arbitrary time limit. Men from both classes did mention this norm, 18% of the sample, but it was more prevalent among the working class group. A further distinction between the classes relates to duration as well. I have said that the hegemonic view understands death to warrant long grieving periods of a year or more. For the working class men, however, serious job related problems (such as job loss) also warrant similar durations of sorrow. It appears that the loss of a loved one and the loss of a job hold similar degrees of severity for the working class men that may not play a role for the upper-middle class men.

One final qualification of the hegemonic view of sadness relates to how men cope. One dominant way all respondents dealt with sadness was to talk through it with someone. However, the data suggest that upper-middle class men are more likely to talk with a spouse while working class men talk with close friends. Bryson (Physician, age 43) illustrates one side of this distinction, while Ty (Brick Mason, age 29) demonstrates the other:

I think [men] should try to express themselves, their sadness, whatever they do to their spouses. It may be of lesser importance for the children to know that you're feeling some things, but I think it's important for your spouse. As far as Cathy goes, and I think maybe women in general...spouses in general...like to know what's going on inside the head of their husbands. So that takes a little work for some people. It takes a little work for me. But I think that's still important to try and do because it's part of the marriage. It's what you have to do.

I just talk it out if I can...talk to another man. I mean, I just feel more comfortable talking to another man than, like, talking to a woman. My...I talk to my brother-in-law. I think a man understands a man better than a woman understands.

I will have more to say about gender and emotions in chapter five, but first, let us look at the ideology of another emotion, fear.

Fear

Hegemonic View of Fear

Wimp. Chicken. Wuss. Baby, scaredy cat...girl! Men from both classes certainly identified the same terms to describe those who demonstrate fear, at least those who show fear for what respondents viewed as inappropriate circumstances. I describe some of the norms and beliefs that govern hiding fear in the next chapter, because they relate largely to stoicism. Here, however, I go into more detail about the sources of fear, methods of coping with it, and other ideological statements regarding the emotion of fear.

When asked to recall instances of being afraid, major sources of fear reported by both groups included water related issues, animals (spiders, snakes, etc.), health or mortality, and something happening to their children. Military combat and other confrontations were also key sources of fear among the men. Confrontations ranged from muggings to fights, and there will be more to say about this momentarily with respect to “bravery.” How men dealt with these fears and others, though, seems reducible to three primary ways: talking through it with others, facing it, or avoiding it altogether.

Roughly one-fifth of the sample mentioned talking through their fear as a basic means of coping. Another fifth explained that the best or only way to overcome one’s fears is to engage in the behavior itself. For instance, Lawton described defeating his claustrophobia and fear of heights while in the military:

Lawton: Claustrophobia. Let me tell you how I got it. Never was claustrophobic before in my life. I was on a field exercise, and as a joke these guys tackled me and taped me up with duct tape from my feet to my head, and I couldn't move at all. I was like-they did this for a meeting, and I stayed like that for an hour. That being unable to move or do anything kind of screwed with my head. So sometimes after that I've been sort of pseudo-claustrophobic like on planes or in tight environments.

Researcher: How long has this been going on?

Lawton: A few years.

Researcher: Did you get over it...how?

Lawton: I said...I just talked myself through it. I said, “I'm not in any danger.” Nothing's going to happen here, and if it does it's out of my hands.

Researcher: Did you talk about it with your wife or...

Lawton: No, not really. I just dealt with it myself. I typically deal with stuff like that myself. [pause] Fear of heights. With that being said, I've jumped out of airplanes and helicopters. Jumping out of airplanes, you're so high up, it doesn't really matter. It's really a faith in the equipment or trusting the equipment. Rappelling out of helicopters is definitely odd because you've got to lean out over

the side of a helicopter-same thing with cliffs when you're rappelling down cliffs. Just have faith in the training, knowing that you've got a hand on the rope.

Lawton's comments regarding heights continued to describe "competence obstacle courses," an institutionalized way of helping build confidence—and alleviate fears—among soldiers in basic training. In other words, not only did a significant portion of respondents mention the importance of facing fears, but it also appears that there are socially embedded practices, such as in the military, that reinforce this method of coping.

Several working class respondents mentioned the importance of facing one's fears as a method of coping as well. Jeff, a construction worker, expressed coping with his fear of heights stating, "Probably the worst thing I ever had was a fear of heights when I was building buildings....I just continued to do it, until I overcame it." Kevin similarly explained his fear of spiders:

Spiders! I don't like spiders because the size...they're so small. You don't know if you're getting into a nest of poisonous spiders. [laughing] I mean, I'm not afraid of snakes or nothing, but spiders...see, I've been bit by a black widow before and I've been stung by a bunch of scorpions. That's why I hate doing heating and air conditioning stuff up under people's houses. When I have to do it under my house, I'll put overalls on and duct tape around the bottoms of my pants and wear gloves and tape around there and wear a hat. I mean, I don't like spiders.

Among the working class, respondents commonly described fears associated with their occupations, but were quick to add that they simply dealt with the fear to keep the job. Of course, in the example above, Kevin was actually engaging in instrumental or problem-focused coping as one means of "dealing" with the emotion.

Alternatively, about another fifth of the sample declared avoidance as their primary way of handling fear. Simon, an accountant (age 62), gave the following story:

Well, I'm afraid of...I'm afraid of heights. I don't know if that's the type fear you... Yeah, I have a fear of getting at the edge of a tall building. I express that fear by

staying away from them. I'm not comfortable doing that. For example, I remember being on an elevator in a tall building in Atlanta--I try to avoid that--but the side of the elevator was glass. It was fine until it started up and shot out in the open and had an open wall there. When it shot out in the open, then I moved to the far side, to the back side of the elevator.

Richard, a production line cook for a local textile factory (age 26), likewise identified avoidance as his method of coping with a fear of water before going into the military:

I just never went near water. I wouldn't go swimming at swimming parties. I wouldn't go to the lake with my friends, or go to the river whatnot. If I did, I'd always make up an excuse, "Well, I don't want to get sunburned," or "I don't have any swim trunks." I mean, I was deathly afraid of water. Now it doesn't bother me because I guess I overcame it.

Beyond these behavioral similarities among respondents of both classes, several hegemonic beliefs also emerged from the data. However, normative statements regarding fear were sparse. In the next chapter, I introduce the expectation that men hide fear to protect others, because it relates to stoicism and hiding fear; beyond this, however, there were no other frequently noted norms. A series of individual statements, taken together, could be construed to suggest the norm that fear should be addressed to some extent; it is essential, however, to point out that the expectation that men should hide fear is the dominant view. Therefore, the normative expectations that men should address fear would only pertain to a minority of the sample. For example, some men explained that a fear of death should be addressed so that the person can prepare for it. Others suggested fears should be voiced in order to avoid getting hurt. Still others simply stated that men should show fear or even that society no longer expects men to hide fear.

A considerable number of respondents did identify a consistent ideology of beliefs about fear. First, although some fear is okay, letting the emotion dictate one's

behavior or prohibit one from responding is an unsatisfactory sign of weakness. Mike

(Attorney, age 48) explained:

It's okay to have fear for rational things, but you can't let it dictate what you do. I can respect somebody who's fearful, but I couldn't respect somebody who let fear dictate what they do.

Or Sam, a firefighter (age 45), offered this illustration:

I think of our performances...I mean, there have been guys that have gotten to the front door of a house and been so scared they couldn't go in. So they will claim there was equipment malfunction or they had to go back and get something or...that's a little bit different. There you could criticize someone for fear, and it's not so much because they're scared that you're criticizing them. It's because they're scared and it's keeping them from performing their job. Our job is to serve the people that we go out. That's a problem. They're counting on somebody to come in and get them out. They're counting on somebody to go in and fight the fire, put it out, save lives, save property. In our job, if you're scared, you can't do it, then really you're not providing the service that you're charged with as far as your occupation. There's a time when fear can actually cause you problems.

Thus, the belief that fear should not paralyze or keep one from reacting was common among members of both groups of men.

Another hegemonic belief proposes that having a little fear can be a positive thing because it can provide the necessary adrenaline or caution required for the person to properly respond to a situation. Sam continued his discussion above by adding the following belief about the benefits of some fear:

Well, like I say, a lot of times when you get to a particular incident, when you're moving through the smoke, you're scared, but you can't let that drive you. You gotta kind of hide that scared feeling most all the time, because you got to keep a clear head on what your mission is, what the objective is. You kind of look at the big picture. Every time you go out, especially when you're going to a structural fire, you gotta be scared. That's what keeps you on your toes.

Notice that Sam's comments embody the belief about not letting fear paralyze you as well, suggesting that these two ideas work in tandem to legitimate the feeling of fear for men. In contrast, the men were also asked to recall instances of being "criticized" for feeling fear or of criticizing others for doing so. Here, a belief surfaced in the data such that men often chastised each other as kids, and often as adults as well, in order to "toughen up" each other and help each other to overcome the emotion. Consider the following exchange with Cameron, an attorney (age 37):

Cameron: I've been criticized sometimes during diver training when I was obviously real nervous about something or didn't complete it, and the instructor would yell at me. I've criticized people like during high school wrestling matches. I'd say, "You should have done this...you were just scared to do it. You're scared of getting hurt..."

Researcher: Why did you do that?

Cameron: I think you do that in those kind of situations to correct the guy. I think there's a long...it's the same way as men's humor. The public defender's office is about half male, half female, and it's such a rough environment, that you didn't watch what you say in front of women. So male friends of mine and I would be saying stuff about each other and it sounded like we absolutely hated each other. We'd really be insulting each other very badly. One time a girl named Jill got really upset with a friend of mine thinking that we didn't like each other anymore. But there's a long tradition of men toughening other men up...with the humor.

Likewise, David (Geologist, age 51) recalled being teased as a child:

Researcher: All right, have you ever been criticized for feeling afraid?

David: I've never been criticized for feeling afraid. But do you mean like calling someone chicken?

Researcher: Yeah.

David: Well, of course! You do it all your life as a guy. You...I've grown up probably a little different than you, but as a kid, you just criticize everything. "Come on, chicken! Come on across. You can do this." You've been in that situation, one side or the other. We used to get sawhorses that carpenters use to lay their wood on. We put boards on them, and we'd start out with a 12-inch board and we'd ride our bikes up one side and as we got to the other side, the board

would jump down and we'd ride on across. Well, we would do that sort of thing until we got down to 2 x 4. Whoever didn't do it was chicken! We had some really nice cuts and bruises by running off the board and hitting the sawhorse, but what the hell? It's that kind of thing when you're growing up. Those are the kind of boyish things that we did.

Notice also that David needed a bit of clarification regarding the question about criticism.

I will have more to say about the wording of this question in the final chapter, but for now we see that men expect teasing and censuring of fear as part of the hegemonic ideology among these respondents.

Finally, one belief emerged in the form of the opposite of fear, bravery. A number of men put forth the idea that standing up for what one believes in demonstrates bravery. Thus, retreating or backing down from one's beliefs is the implicit fear that most men spoke of shunning. Edward (Political Consultant, age 50) talked about being involved in a difficult legal battle that had direct personal and business costs:

I think it was a brave act on my part and a sacrificial way. It cost me business to stand up for my client that way. We won that fight. It's a floodplain and that's why ultimately we won and there were many more people than me. There were many volunteers and stuff, but everyone in town had been hired. It was a huge gravy train for a lot of law firms and politicians and stuff like that that made me an unpopular figure, and it cost me some relationships. Some of my public stands have cost me relationships.

For several members of the upper-middle class, the belief that men do not retreat took the form of standing up for someone in a physical confrontation. That respondents viewed such fights as acts of bravery further supports the point that confrontations are a major source of fear for men.

In sum, a number of hegemonic beliefs about fear were evident from the data. Beliefs about not allowing fear to paralyze you, having a little fear is good, teasing and

censuring other's fear will toughen them up, and facing opposition is a form of bravery formed a common ideology for men from both groups. Nevertheless, a few secondary perspectives about fear also exist in the data.

Secondary Views of Fear

Regarding bravery, the upper-middle class respondents added the belief that men do not view things as "brave" until after the fact; actions are taken without expectations of being seen as brave or courageous. The next account by David illustrates the belief that bravery is modest that was evident in several upper-middle class responses:

Yeah, two times. I used to canoe a lot, and was on a canoe trip with 15 or 20 other people, and some of them had not really canoed a lot. When you're in a black water river, the water doesn't really look swift, but sometimes it can be pretty swift. There was a tree...a big, huge tree that had recently fallen into the river. They call those strainers because they have lots of limbs and they just catch stuff. Well a couple of guys got caught up in the tree. Next thing you know, their canoe had flipped over and they're in the middle of the tree. I see what's happening. The person that's in the canoe with me knows how to canoe, so I said, "I've got to go get these guys." So I go help pull them out. I mean, I don't think anything about it. It's just, you know, I'm going to go help somebody. Then I helped pull the canoe out and-you've got a full river flowing against a canoe pushing it against a tree, so it's very difficult to do. I didn't think anything about it. I got in the water, go in the canoe, with the water pushing on you, you tie it off, and then you pull the canoe out. But I had several people say that I was a big hero. It didn't look like anything heroic to me. It's just you did whatever came at hand. I had a couple other little things like that, but you just don't think about them when you're doing them. You don't think that you're jumping in and doing some courageous act. You just see something and you do it.

Even though this modesty about bravery was found primarily in the upper-middle class, pride and bravery intersected elsewhere in the data. I elaborate on this intersection shortly, in the section on happiness and pride.

For now, the only other secondary idea regarding fear relates to sources of the emotion. Members of the upper-middle class group frequently added a fear of failure and

of public speaking (often as part of their occupation) to their list of major sources of fear. On the other hand, working class respondents included more trivial sources like scary movies, flying, and roller coasters. This distinction may go to the heart of a bigger issue, namely that some men expressed complicated definitions of fear. Various “types” of fear were introduced. For instance, some respondents clarified their responses by distinguishing between “emotional fears” like a fear of death, versus “physical fears” like a fear of heights. Others used different categories like “peril fears” versus “phobias” or “fear of the unknown” versus “fear of the physical.” The thrust of these distinctions, however, suggests that at least some men find fear to be too broad as a category to address, which would account for the wide range of sources of fear introduced in the data. I reintroduce this point in the final chapter when considering suggestions for future research.

Happiness and Pride

Hegemonic View of Happiness and Pride

The emotions of pride and happiness were initially analyzed separately to capture any patterns, but none were evident in the data. Men tended to lump together things that made them happy with those that made them proud, and indeed, happiness is a logical corollary to situations that produce pleasure and satisfaction. Peter’s statement demonstrates the merger of these two emotions:

I just...like with my kids I'll just tell them. I don't think it's something you actively try to show or hide. I think it just happens. If you're proud, you come in with a little half-smile. But it's...I don't think it's so much... I guess it's an emotion tied up with happiness...happiness for somebody else or happiness that you're associated with that person or that thing, whatever it is. It's vicarious, I guess, in some ways.

When asked how men should express happiness and pride, responses regarding these emotions showed a great deal of class similarity. Hugs, smiles, laughter, and even tears of joy were the most frequently introduced means of expressing happiness by both groups of men; likewise, both groups identified celebratory parties or dinners as a primary way of conveying pride. Additionally, a hegemonic means of sharing happiness or pride involved telling other people (as opposed to celebrating through parties, or other more overt means of expressing pride and joy). Consider the following accounts, the first by Jimmy, a computer programmer (age 50), and the second by Mario, a night shift cook (age 22):

Oh, yeah, I tend to share good things with anybody that'll listen...conversation, often just comments. Like with my wife, I'll say, "You won't believe what happened...I had this job and it turned out to be good. My boss liked it..." I tend to be pretty chatty if I think something's good.

And Mario's reaction to his child learning to walk:

Yes, [I told] everybody that I came into contact with. I was constantly telling them about it. I probably told the same people more than once.

So what things make men happy and proud? Here again, there was not much class variation.

Success at work, children, and wives were the leading sources of happiness and pride.

Other sources included sports victories, graduations, and financial success.

Like the behavioral responses, norms and beliefs about happiness and pride also revealed a hegemonic ideology common to both groups. In fact, no major secondary beliefs or norms surfaced from the interviews. One principal norm about happiness involves limiting displays of one's joy if it comes at the expense of others or if they are

hurting in some way. Over 21% of the sample affirmed that one should be considerate of others when expressing joy, as depicted in the following passages; the first two are from respondents in the upper-middle class and the latter two are working class responses:

I suppose there have been times where-I know there have been times-when I didn't want to seem too exuberant. Most often because I didn't want it to be a negative for some other folks who had not...who did not have the same cause for joy. You can win all night at poker, but leave them laughing. (Drew, Director of Administration and External Affairs, age 65)

I got a promotion at my previous job and one of my coworkers who I was friendly with didn't. I had to make sure I didn't share. They told her it was a title improvement, not a monetary office, but I got a level increase and also got a salary increase...more vacation, better 401K reimbursement. So I had to placate it with her a little bit...tell her it's not a great deal, more responsibility, whatever. I had to play it down a bit. Otherwise it would have made us uneasy. (Noah, Business Analyst, age 28)

Usually situational stuff with my friends, like if I kick their ass in pool or I do something better than they do at that point, a part of me wants to have that pride and joy, and then the same time you feel bad because they're not doing so well. (Dusty, Retail Worker, age 27)

I think of this girl I know that's been trying to get pregnant, and sometimes I'll think that I'm sitting here talking about my little boy might make her feel bad cause she hadn't been able to have a child yet, for whatever reason. I try to hold that back a little bit. I don't want her to feel bad, but sometimes it's still hard to do, because if you're proud of something, that usually comes out. Sometimes you can't help it. (Micah, Hospital Supply Technician, age 37)

A second leading norm expressed in the interviews centers on the importance of not bragging. Respondents occasionally articulated the importance of limiting expressions of pride as a belief instead (e.g., I don't believe in bragging). A few men even elevated the idea to the point that they spoke of it as a value, emphasizing the importance of not boasting. The first segment below represents an upper-middle class response, while the second two come from working class respondents:

I think being proud is something that is about...and accomplishment that...I'm not one to boast about myself. I would boast about, "Hey, my daughter just got a scholarship," or something like that. Mostly to the people that know me. I don't like to be a braggart. I like for actions to speak for themselves. As far as when I changed jobs, I let people know who I thought needed to know where I was so that they could reach me or whatever, but it wasn't like, "Hey, I'm a big shot over at this company now!" (Charlie, Computer Programmer, age 37)

I'm not really that much of a showboat, that much of a showoff. I don't really...there's a lot of times I do have a lot of pride, but I really don't show it, cause I don't want to be like a showoff. (Kevin, Industrial Maintenance Technician, age 44)

Like, when we practice music and we get together, I enjoy that. Everybody's there to have a good time and we drink coffee and we talk. We don't always agree on how something should be arranged or who does a turnaround or something, but it all works out, and I'm proud of that. When we get on stage and it comes together and you hear the audience, that makes you feel good. I'm proud for that. I'm proud...if you help somebody that needs help, I'm thankful that I can do that, and I don't think you should tell anybody when you do that...you don't tell nobody. Nobody needs to know about that except you and the Lord and that person...and that person doesn't necessarily have to know. (Harry, Maintenance Technician, age 45)

Paul, a systems analyst for a major insurance company (age 44), also upholds that men should not boast with the following story from his daughter's theatrical performance.

Shortly after this account, he extolled the value of not bragging as well:

I hate to talk about the same kind of thing, but two years ago, at school, my daughter was in a play there. She...whenever I saw her onstage and she finished and she got a standing ovation at the end of her play, I was very, very proud, but I did not want to be over the top, because I noticed that within a couple of rows away from me was the parents of a little girl who had tried out for the same role but didn't get it. I felt for them, so I didn't want to...kind of go overboard so to speak.

Then, when asked to identify any role models, Paul offered the following:

I don't know if I can really name any particular...well...golly I can't remember the guy's name, but when I was in my early 20s, there was a guy who played professional football, and what I admired about him was whenever he caught a touchdown pass or did something good, he didn't have to get up and do some sort

of celebration or some sort of dance or any kind of in the camera thing. The announcers would consistently mention the fact that he would catch the touchdown, give the ball back to the official as if that was his job. I always admired that about him...was the fact that he could go about it and not have to say, "Ra-ra, look at me, look how good I am!"

In short, being considerate of others when expressing joy and not boasting were two frequently identified norms or beliefs presented by both groups. As mentioned earlier, a handful of respondents from both groups also drew connections between bravery and pride in their comments. This intersection often upheld the "no boasting" norm as well. Richard (Cook, age 26) illustrates this combination in the following excerpt:

I felt brave when I finished boot camp. It was just a real good feeling about myself. I felt proud. It's just something a lot of people said, you're probably not going to be able to do it, and I did accomplish it. I had an uncle that was in the army. He's passed away now, but he said, "You'll never make it through that marine corps boot camp...it's too hard." I don't know why he said that. I just said, "We'll see...I'll prove you wrong."

Harry (Maintenance Technician, age 45) adds:

Harry: There's times you need to show fear or tell people, "This bothers me...I'm really concerned about this." Maybe it should scare me, but I'm really concerned. In health problems or anything like that...yeah.

Researcher: Have you ever felt courageous or brave?

Harry: Sure but I try not to think about it cause that's kinda like tooting your own horn and I don't like a braggart. If you do something you're proud of, you don't have to tell nobody nothing. Don't let your right hand know what your left hand's doing, so to speak.

These exchanges and others remind us that the norms and beliefs about specific emotions interact with one another to form much more complicated reactions in emotional situations. Accordingly, although this chapter outlines ideologies governing particular

feelings, we need to appreciate the complexity of emotion culture by recognizing that these norms and beliefs often operate in conjunction with one another.

Although the interviews did not yield any class-specific norms or beliefs, a few differences as to sources of happiness and means of expression were evident.

Secondary Views Happiness and Pride

Fixing up cars and engaging in other hobbies contribute to happiness and pride for a number of the working class respondents. In fact, almost half of the working class sample introduced these as sources of pleasure. I also mentioned above that wives and children are two sources of happiness evident in both groups. However, upper-middle class respondents often specified that the “achievements” of their wives and children brought happiness. Conversely, the working class men either did not specify the importance of achievement or equally mentioned other factors like the birth of a child (rather than an accomplishment that the child attained).

The interviews offered one last distinction among the respondents regarding happiness and pride. Even though excessive displays of pride and joy were considered unacceptable by both groups, the working class men were relatively more effusive in the number and types of ways they demonstrated these emotions. In their recollections of happy events, working class respondents added whistling, laughing, and joking around to their repertoire of expressing joy. Regarding pride, working class men admitted to smiling, showing off pictures of children or job sites, or even creating “brag videos” to share with their friends. Succinctly put, the upper-middle class respondents were a little more reserved even in sharing happy events.

Love and Affection

Hegemonic View of Love and Affection

When asked about the importance of expressing love, Baxter, the vice-president of a business development corporation (age 44), responded, “It depends. It’s good to a point. I mean, unless it doesn’t mean anything. I think it’s more in your attitude, outward expression.” Or Chuck, a firefighter (age 30), offered, “It’s definitely important at home with your family, because you can say it all day long, but until you show actions that you really mean it, it really doesn’t have any bearing. It can be repetitive just saying it.”

These comments illustrate the belief that actions not words prove one’s love. As we will see, most respondents do vocalize their love toward family members, but several men did mention that just saying “I love you” can become routine.

Over 21% of the sample described that men are expected to use caution or limit affection shown to women, whether in the workplace or with friends. For example, Mike, an attorney, described showing affection in the workplace as follows:

I'm affectionate with people around here. I hug Max. I hug Lucas. I like to put my hand on people's shoulder. You have to be careful. You can't do that, especially to young, attractive women, until they know you well enough to know that is not what you're about. Otherwise they'll start seeing everything you do as that. So you have to be sort of standoffish with those folks. To be touchy feely, you have to understand them pretty well first.

Or Harry, a product technician at a local plant, reveals the “gentleman” norm in this exchange:

Researcher: Do you show affection differently toward female friends?

Harry: I think you're expected to. Well...no...not now that my female friends...you have to be careful. You don't want the wrong idea to be taken about things, so I think it's best you be friendly, nice, respectful, but don't get in trouble.

Researcher: Do you hug your female friends?

Harry: No. Just in kidding or something I'll give them a one- arm hug or something.

Their concerns centered on women misinterpreting their affection as unwanted advances or sexual harassment. Indeed, this was the most robust finding about love in the data.

Next, arrays of comments about hugging coalesced to suggest the belief or norm that hugging is strange for men, making it a restricted behavior. Three major exceptions to this norm entail hugging at church, hugging spouses, and hugging children—all of which are deemed acceptable. Hugging friends yields an even more complicated dimension to social expectations for men. Given these specifications, perhaps beliefs that hugging is awkward implies hugging *friends*, not family members for whom giving hugs presented fewer problems. Richard succinctly summarizes the complexity of this norm in response to the question, “Is hugging another man an acceptable way to show affection?” He says:

I think that would be a case by case thing. If another guy was comfortable hugging his guy friend, that would be fine if that's what they want to do. But society may look at that and say that's not right. I don't know.

If we consider the responses about behaviors made in the interviews, we begin to understand hugging more clearly. Most respondents obviously mention hugging and kissing their wives and children. They add that giving material gifts and performing acts of service are two common ways of showing love to wives, while roughhousing and spending time with children demonstrates love as well. On the other hand, men commonly limit affection with friends to giving high-fives, handshakes, and pats on the back. They do list hugging as a primary way of showing love to friends, but again, they describe a wide range of types of hugs given and sometimes limit them to major

circumstances such as not seeing someone for a long time or the birth of a child. For instance, over 21% of the men restrict friend hugging to the “occasional hug.” See Jimmy’s comment below about acceptable ways for men to show affection to one another:

The old stand-by pat on the shoulder...the occasional hug. It's odd, but if you get in a group of men and they're watching a football game and their team scores, they're all going to hug. But it's going to be short and it's going to end up with hard back slaps. It's not going to be perhaps what you might see women do. (Computer Programmer, age 50)

Jimmy’s observation also alludes to a different “type” of hugging altogether, what some men describe as a “half-hug” or a “manly hug.” Reese (Firefighter, age 38) describes showing affection with male coworkers:

Reese: Yes, we do it a lot here actually. We tell each other that we care about each other. I mean, I've told several of the guys here that I love em, care about em. It's pretty much the norm around here. There's a lot of slaps on the back and bear hugs...things like that.

Researcher: What would be too much affection for guys? What's crossing the line?

Reese: I'd say probably kissing. I don't want to be kissed by any of these guys.

Researcher: Do you recall a time when someone showed love but it made you feel uncomfortable?

Reese: There's been times where there's someone I don't know real well and they show affection. The hugging and over friendly gestures makes me feel a little bit uncomfortable. It's something that I can deal with, but it's just...it's getting into my comfort zone, so it's not that comfortable anymore.

It is still important to recognize that roughly 18% of the sample identifies hugging friends on a regular basis as a normal means of showing affection. Thus, hugging was widely

exercised by men of both classes, but ranged from being a behavior that was only engaged in occasionally or half-way, to being a regular greeting between friends.

Before moving on to consider secondary views about hugging and other beliefs, norms, and behaviors, there are a few more aspects of affection and friendship to reflect on. Some men presented definitional concerns during the portion of the interview focused on love. Many of them asked for clarification about what love is. Some defined it as having physical connotations (touching, kissing, etc.) or as being romantic. Others distinguished it from camaraderie, affection, friendship, caring, and even gratitude. Such an assortment of terminology, then, indicates that questions about love need to be more specific in future studies. Anticipating this complexity to some extent, I asked additional questions specifically about friendship to clarify our understanding of sharing love among friends.

Interviewees were asked to describe what constitutes a “good friend.” The assumption here is that what characteristics and aspects of friendship are important will shed light on how friends should treat one another. In other words, if one believes good friends help out one another in a time of need, then we might expect that one way men show affection to friends is by helping them out. Several aspects of friendship were dominant among both groups of men. Good friends listen, share their problems or thoughts, are trustworthy, are reliable, share experiences, and do, in fact, help out each other. Therefore, we might assume that men show affection to their friends by confiding in one another, being there for each other, and doing things together that create shared experiences. These findings are consistent with Cancian’s *Love in America* (1987), which

describes the importance of working or interacting with one another as a masculine way of showing love.

Interestingly, respondents answered questions about friendship with far greater ease and comfort than those about love in general. Perhaps this speaks to the belief that actions not words show love originally introduced in this section. Men would often rather describe their love in terms of what they do with one another, rather than by saying it.

Secondary Views of Love and Affection

Love was the only emotion for which value statements were rather frequently mentioned, but these statements were made primarily by the upper-middle class group. Evidence of love as a valued emotion to these men was apparent in comments made, role models admired, and occasionally in a normative remark that they “should show more” love or affection to loved ones. Nick, a public information director, offered both normative and other comments that spoke to the value of affection for at least some respondents:

I show my kids a tremendous amount of love. I go out of my way to do that. I'll tell-even my 16 year old-I'll tell them I love them. I probably don't show it to my wife as much as I should, but I do. I mean, I tell her I love her. I express it, but probably not as much as I ought to.

Nick later added:

To me that's the most basic element of being human. It's the most basic emotion is love. If you cannot love other people then you have very little to live for.

Other men described their admiration of people who expressed love openly. For example, Baxter (VP of Business Development Corporation, age 44) applauded Ronald Reagan as one of his role models in part because, “he was not afraid to show his affection to Nancy.”

Beyond being a valued emotion for several upper-middle class interviewees, there were several norms or beliefs about love unique to this class. First, many proposed the belief that there are national or regional differences in showing love. In response to a question about how important his perception of love was, Abe (Executive Director of a state agency, age 56) explained:

Abe: I think it's critical. If you can't show love for others, I don't know how you can love yourself. I think that's probably one of the biggest shortcomings of male America is people being repressed about their feelings of love. It's a shame.

Researcher: What are acceptable ways for men to display affection?

Abe: In Muslim societies, men hold hands that aren't homosexuals. In France, men kiss each other when they meet each other. It's in culture. I...I...would encourage people to get beyond the bounds of their particular culture, especially in America where our culture is so rooted in materialism that we've lost the...spirituality and romantic relationship to life and relationships.

Leonard (Marketing Director, age 56) expressed some discomfort with hugging other males. In response to a probe about his perception, he also introduced cultural differences, in this case, regional variation:

Depending on who you ask...I think it depends regionally. It certainly depends, I think you go out west and they probably won't even think twice about it. The midwest, I think, would be more of a hand shake. They're more conservative. The south I think would be more of a handshake. The northeast is really screwed up. It depends on where you go there. Maine would be a handshake...New York would be a hug, and they wouldn't think twice about it. Massachusetts would be a hug. New Hampshire, Vermont, would be a handshake. It just depends. It depends on how conservative of an area you are, how conservative a person you are, and it has nothing to do with the fact that I think the person hugging the other person is a homosexual or is leaning that way. That doesn't bother me. I could care less what he does. I just don't want to hug a guy. Unless I'd just gone through some truly emotional experience like a battle or something that I was so happy to see that they were still alive, then I could see that. But just to walk up to somebody and hug them I think is a little weird.

The tone of Leonard's passage and the final sentences also speak to another norm commonly found in the upper-middle class interviews. A number of respondents maintained that men are taught that they are not supposed to show much affection; additionally, others described instances that brought them discomfort when too much affection was shown. Jason's remarks embodied the belief about regional differences as well as the norm of that displays of affection should be limited. In explaining interactions with his son who had moved to Arizona, Jason (Director of Information Technology, age 42) admitted to being annoyed at the frequency of his phone calls home. He also explained the following:

You're supposed to show affection to your wife. Women need that a lot. When you have sons, however, it's less necessary. It almost shows that weakness that I was talking about. You also don't want them to get too used to that because people aren't really accustomed to showing men a lot of emotion, and you don't want your children to become emotionally needy. They can't expect that from their guy friends, from their buddies at work or whatever. They can't expect a strong show of emotions, so you don't want them to get dependent on that, I guess.

Jason's interactions with his friends also revealed the "limited displays of affection" norm, as well as cultural differences. When asked how he shows affection to friends, Jason offered:

Well, hand shake, a half-hug depending on who it is and how long it's been since I've seen him, but no, you won't see me walking down the road with my arm around a friend of mine. That's...that's...it's not good to be like that. But maybe that's a cultural thing more than...than a personal thing, because I've got a few friends in Iraq right now that said that Iraqi men stand very close to each other when they're talking. They're very physical with the conversation. Even being in Germany for a little bit, you notice they're a little bit different in how they're relating to each other... Maybe that's the way it is around here, but that's the way it is in my relationships.

One final comment in Jason's interview addresses a third norm distinct to the upper-middle class. He introduces the norm of "professional affection" such that men are expected to maintain emotional distance in the workplace:

You want to maintain that professional relationship. You don't want to bring it too much into the workplace because of times like this when things do get cut back. You don't want to be too emotionally attached to those people. At the same time, when you've worked one office down from a guy five years or so, ten years or so, you tend to develop a friendship. You know about his family, or you know about his girlfriend. You know about his kids or his new car. You hear about these things, so you become more than just coworkers. If they have to be let go, you definitely want them to understand, "I don't hate you. I'm not firing you because I don't like you." But it's always restrained...it's restrained affection I should say...um, professional affection that is apparent.

The norm suggests that showing too much love at work is unprofessional and should not be done. Almost one-quarter of the upper-middle-class respondents adhered to this norm.

Consider Noah's response to whether he shows affection at work:

No. I separate the two very much. Having gone through two layoffs, I don't see any reason to get emotionally involved at work. I have friends who I work with, but things change without your control and there's no point in getting emotionally attached. (Business Analyst, age 28)

The dialogue with Douglas (Financial Advisor, age 30), below, again illustrates the norm of not showing love in the workplace:

Douglas: It would be inappropriate here. Everyday since I've been out of college I've had a suit and tie on, so I think it's always been inappropriate.

Researcher: Do you think it's different in places like in a fast-food restaurant?

Douglas: Sure there'd be more affection shown. I think in different places that may be more open. I think if you work really close with the opposite sex especially, in different work environments, that could be different. I've just never been in a situation where that would be the case. In the situation in an office like this, everything is very proper.

Here, Douglas explicitly touches on the possibility of a class-based difference in emotion culture. It is more important to point out that the respondents' behaviors at work also supported the norm that men should not show affection at work for the most part.

Interestingly, men from both groups did not describe many encounters with affection in the workplace, but those who did so are consistent with the norm that affection at work should be restrained. Hugs were often client initiated or not engaged in with staff members, or expressions of affection were limited to compliments and pats on the back. There were not enough comments to draw clear class based patterns of difference in behaviors at work, but it is noteworthy that at least one of the working class respondents met his now-wife at work; also, working class respondents were more open in showing interest in the private lives of their coworkers as a means of expressing love on the job.

Behaviorally, the upper-middle class respondents again appeared less emotional than did the working class. For instance, I noted earlier that the hegemonic norm of hugging as strange or inappropriate held an exception for hugging one's children. However, even with their children, upper-middle class respondents acknowledged hugging them less as they grew older or explicitly stated that they would not verbalize their love to their sons, only to daughters. Also consistent with the stoicism of the next chapter, the upper-middle class group was less varied in how they expressed love compared to the working class. Working class respondents included kissing children, protecting them, and helping them out when needed as principal ways of showing them love. With wives, working class respondents added that buying flowers and teasing or pranks are key ways of expressing affection. Similarly, with regard to friends, working class respondents mentioned pulling pranks, buying beer or food, hanging out, and

helping out friends as means of showing love as well. Some upper-middle class men did reference three qualities of good friends that were not evident among the working class: respect, common interests or worldviews, and the ability to pick up where they left off (when friends have not seen one another in a long while). Yet, in short, it appears that the working class respondents had a much more varied palette of behaviors or ways of sharing affection compared to the upper-middle class.

* * *

This chapter outlined the primary norms, beliefs, and occasionally even values that emerged during the interviews. Essentially, men's emotion culture suggests that they are not supposed to show or talk about emotions, particularly about negative emotions.

Beliefs—such as emotions are contagious or concerns about misinterpreting the expression of affection on the job—place limitations on how and which feelings are shared. While a significant hegemonic emotional ideology emerged, there were also some interesting class-based differences in emotion as well. The table in Appendix D summarizes the dominant emotion culture of men, while Appendix E condenses the secondary ideologies. What do these similarities and differences tell us about the nexus of class and masculinity? The next chapter explores this junction by assessing the compensatory masculinity model.

CHAPTER IV

ASSESSING THE COMPENSATORY MODEL OF MASCULINITY

As explained in the opening chapter, emotion culture is an area of study that is much larger than gender or masculinity. But according to the existing research outlined earlier, emotions form an integral part of masculine identity; hegemonic masculinity is frequently understood to contain the traits of anger or aggression and stoicism in addition to non-emotional traits such as autonomy, heterosexuality, or pursuit of financial success. The compensatory model adds that in the absence of one or more of these attributes, men will “compensate” by exaggerating another attribute. Accordingly, the theoretical model would predict that working class men (who often face financial and occupational barriers) might exaggerate aggression and stoicism as an expression of masculine identity. Men’s emotion culture sketched out in the previous chapter, and further analysis of anger and stoicism here, will assess this theoretical model. I begin chapter four with an examination of anger and aggression beliefs and the degree to which aggression is valued differentially by class, then do the same for stoicism, and end with an evaluation of the meaning of these findings for the compensatory model of masculinity.

Anger and Aggression

Perhaps more than any other emotional description, anger elicited the most consistent symbolic depictions among men. Images of bombs exploding, pots stewing or boiling, flaring fires, and pushed buttons abound. Given these similar symbolic illustrations, do men, in fact, understand and define anger in the same way? Many of the

norms and beliefs about anger were constant across class, but there were a few interesting discrepancies as well. As will become evident, some norms governing the duration and intensity of anger were similar, while issues regarding the social acceptability of fighting, means of communicating anger, and anger displays in the workplace presented far more variation by class.

Expressions of Anger

Respondents were asked to explain how they and other men typically expressed or communicated their anger. Obviously, fighting is one means of showing anger, and it will be discussed in detail shortly, but men from both classes identified a range of behaviors including: breaking things, withdrawing, smarting off to others, and working out anger through physical exertion such as running or manual labor. There were, however, class differences. Upper-middle class men identified changing the tone of their voices, yelling, or talking out the source of the anger as their primary means for communicating the emotion. Upper-middle class men also claimed more frequently that they did not show anger at all. On the other hand, working class men were much more likely to say they express anger by cussing, hitting, or physically leaving the situation. In fact, in over one-third of the instances they recalled about showing anger, the description fell into one of these three means. Working class men were also more accepting of showing anger in general.

A subtle difference between the groups involves how they qualified statements about the “importance” of showing anger. The men were asked how important anger expression is for men. On the surface, the groups did not differ as to whether or not anger was deemed to be an important emotion to express. Slightly more than half of the men

who addressed this question felt anger was an important emotion to show in general, while slightly less than half felt it was not important. However, for the approximately 30 men who discussed the importance of communicating their anger (beyond simply stating that it was or was not important), the upper-middle class respondents were careful to qualify *when* or the context in which expressing anger mattered. Working class respondents, however, focused on *how* such anger was communicated instead (yelling, hitting, leaving, etc.). Two passages from Don, a real estate entrepreneur (age 39), and Kevin, an industrial maintenance technician (age 44), exemplify this distinction.

Don: I think it's good to show your anger when you...sometimes I show my anger to people—just like an animal would—to make sure they know you're serious. I used to do that with...with kids that I used to work with. If they know you're angry and you show that by shouting, as long as you don't do it too often, they realize and then they straighten up and are able to listen to you better. But if you don't, if you do it too often, then it becomes benign, and they don't listen anyway, and they just go, "Look at the fool ranting and raving." They don't take you seriously.

Kevin: Yeah...just like I said to make it known that you are mad about something...without being physically violent. A man should vent it somehow to get the anger out. Be loud, argumentative, whatever, is better way than just being physical with it.

Working class respondents, regardless of whether they valued anger expression or not, often articulated a distinction between arguing and other, more violent types of expression. In other words, showing anger by yelling might be important, but expressing it by hitting or fighting may not. Upper-middle class respondents did not emphasize this distinction when asked if showing anger was important. This finding could point to a class difference in defining what constitutes the emotion of "anger." For working class men, ways of expressing anger were more varied, ranging from talking things out to fighting. Yet, for the other men, physical violence was so far removed from a basic

understanding of how to “show anger” that the upper-middle class men simply did not even mention this distinction, perhaps reserving such actions as expressions of “rage” or some other type of emotion.

Indeed, men from both groups mentioned the phenomenon of “road rage,” where some type of physical violence or danger is involved in driving. About one-eighth of the respondents mentioned road rage. However, in their discussions, the working class men expressed either engaging in the behavior themselves or condoning it in others. The upper-middle class men described it as “out of proportion” to the situation, such that the dangers surrounding road rage far outweighed expressing one’s anger on the highway.

One final class difference in expressions of anger surfaced and centered on expressing anger in the workplace. All respondents described instances of feeling and usually expressing anger to some degree at work. Still, the hegemonic norm for the men is that anger should not be shown at work, or at most that anger at work should only be expressed by talking it out calmly, getting red in the face, or withdrawing from the situation when possible. It is important to point out, though, that one-third of the working class men reported deviating from this norm by swearing, hitting, or having similar reactions on the job. Conversely, the more common upper-middle class response was to either show no anger at all or to talk out their anger instead. Thus, while most men agreed that anger should not be shown at work, actual behaviors suggest that working class men more often violated this norm. This finding held regardless of the target of one’s anger. In other words, if the incident involved coworkers, bosses, employees, or clients, the norm of not showing anger held, and instances of deviance were not limited to any one type of target.

Before considering ideological concerns about anger other than expression norms, I want to point out the subtle relationship between sadness and anger that emerged from the data as well. Approximately one-quarter of the working class sample, when asked about expressing sadness, described behaviors that are more typically considered expressions of anger. George, a laborer who sets tile (age 34), offered the following as a socially acceptable way for men to reveal sadness:

Sadness sometimes turns to anger because...um...sadness might feel like hopelessness and not being able. See, men want to be able to fix it. If you can't fix it, then you get angry because there's nothing you can do. You might tear the place apart.

Men from both classes suggested the belief that showing anger is more acceptable than showing sadness for men. But related to this, working class men also suggested that sadness is transformed into anger when they cannot simply "fix" or resolve the situation causing the grief. The next three excerpts further illustrate the idea that sadness and anger are related for some men:

A lot of people do it through anger. To me, that's no longer an option. I went through most of my life dealing with emotions through anger, and...with age I've mellowed. (Albert, Mechanic, age 49)

If I ever get to tears, it's usually because so many things have overwhelmed me so badly that it's just a natural reaction. The anger starts to mix with the sadness because depression is the mirror image of anger. So I think I don't necessarily cry, but I feel at that point. That's when I start realizing...Okay, it's time to calm down...Nothing is this serious that you should feel this bad. (Dusty, Retail Worker, age 27)

Normally [men] only express anger, not sadness. I get mad. (Daniel, Technician, age 44)

We are reminded by this belief that emotions and their norms do not exist independently of one another. Accordingly, how men cope with a particular emotion often is not simply

a straightforward reaction to a social expectation. This type of complexity arises again in chapter five, but for now, I continue with more on the ideology of anger and aggression.

Duration of Anger

Men's emotion culture held a very consistent view of the appropriate duration for feeling anger. The appropriate length of anger for almost all respondents was usually very brief, meaning less than a day. For example, Baxter (VP of Business Development Corporation, age 44) explained, "I think it really should be done and over. You shouldn't yell that afternoon, and then again that night, or the next morning. You shouldn't keep yelling about it." Similarly, Joseph (Back-Hoe Operator, age 27) stated, "I'll get mad and say a few choice words, throw a wrench or something. I'll sit down for a minute, and I'll smoke a cigarette." However, respondents were quick to add that the length of anger depends largely on situational severity. "It depends on what it is," added Lucas. "If it's like someone hurting you emotionally, it could be months, years. If it's like a death in the family, it could be never. But things like...say I had a bad day at work, rude customers...like an hour, the max. It's all relative." Finally, identifying the source of anger and resolving the problem seemed to be fundamentally more important than any sort of norms governing duration. Kenny (Engineer, age 30) illustrates the significance of resolving the anger as follows:

Until you feel right. Because until you can accept what has happened, if that's what it takes to resolve the issue, or until you can calm down enough to rationally talk to someone else as a human being, much less whatever they are to you, whether they are a counterpart or spouse or just a friend...if you can't talk in a rational manner and think logically or without too much being influenced by biased emotions, there's no reason to talk. So you're still going to be angry until that happens. Until you can calm down enough to do that—some people may take an hour, some may take five minutes, some people may not get angry at all and just blow it off. It all depends on your...I guess your pride and your ego can accept at the time.

In other words, as long as men are trying to resolve the situation causing the anger, there is no time limit. The norm of a brief, 24-hour time limit is to govern venting or ruminating about anger, rather than one's attempt to constructively resolve anger-causing issues.

Regretting Anger

Interviewees were asked to recall instances in which they regretting expressing—or not expressing—their anger. It is important to acknowledge that some men very easily recalled instances of regretting anger, but that many men searched and searched their memories without success. Rather than concluding that men do not seem to regret anger, however, there may be a problem with connotations surrounding the use of the term “regret.” Upon being asked to recall instances of regret, several interviewees launched into the cultural belief that men never “regret” their actions. This is, perhaps, tied to the importance of reason and controlled emotional expression as discussed elsewhere. For now, it is important to recognize that a term that is less loaded than “regret” might facilitate recall among men in future studies.

The men suggested that if anger is expressed, it should be done in a controlled manner. Uncontrolled anger is believed to cause mistakes or to worsen existing problems. Evidence of this belief often permeated respondents' discussions about regretting particular incidents of anger in the past. Slightly more than one-quarter of respondents in each class described regret in showing anger. Only one respondent (upper-middle class group) expressed regret over *not* showing more anger. Instead, most men primarily regretted anger when they felt they had overreacted (intensity of anger shown was too

high), when anger expression was not constructive or left matters unresolved, and when anger was “unprofessionally” displayed in a workplace setting.

Instances of regret tell us about emotional deviance experienced by the respondents. As such, these violations of norms indirectly point to the norms that they are breaching. It is possible to infer, then, that anger norms exist that suggest the following: a) the intensity of anger shown should be in proportion to the severity of the situation, b) simply venting anger is not acceptable because anger should be constructive or resolve the issue at hand, and c) anger should not be displayed in the workplace.

One class difference did emerge from the data. Upper-middle class respondents more often spoke of regretting “yelling” instances as moments of overreaction. In contrast, respondents in the working class regretted engaging in more violent reactions. For instance, Mike, an attorney, lamented yelling at his son in the following incident:

I remember I blew up at Jack one time when he was about 14. At the time at work, I was doing some things that were really dicey and hard to do. Jack, at the time, he had two brothers then. We had a fourth one on the way—Evan. So I was very frustrated, had a bad day. But I came down and I overreacted at something. I can't even remember...he left his clothes on the floor...left lights on...something. But I just blew up at him. I yelled at him, and I'm not a yeller by nature. So I just yelled, blew up, said a couple things, walked off. I thought about it. About 30 minutes later, I went back down stairs and I said “Listen, son, I overreacted. You did the wrong thing, but I shouldn't have yelled at you like that. So I apologize.”

On the other hand, Buck (Retired Textile Worker, age 70) explained, “I remember one time I got so angry I hit the door of a cabinet and broke my hand. Well, from then on, I didn't hit cabinets.” But violent or more physical expressions of anger were often *not* a source of regret for the working class respondents. As I expand upon in the next section, fighting behavior was much more prevalent and acceptable among working class respondents.

Fighting

Questions that focused specifically on physical displays of anger or aggression (i.e., fighting) yielded results about the appropriate intensity of anger that were considerably more variable by class. Nevertheless, a hegemonic understanding of fighting was evident among these men. The overall norm is that fighting should be a last resort when possible. However, there are very clear exceptions to the rule that make fighting not only acceptable, but even expected by most men. Only a handful of respondents designated physical fighting as wrong under any circumstances. Rather, several conditions transform physical aggression into the appropriate response across classes: a) defending someone, especially a family member, b) as part of one's duty in war or occupation, such as a police officer, or c) when principles are compromised, such as the importance of honor and respect. Lewis (Business Consultant, age 65), for instance, elaborated on when it is deemed acceptable for a man to fight:

When protecting one's self, one's property, one's loved one...I think that it's not only expected but super-expected. In other words, if someone's kicking your dog, then you're expected to knock the crap out of the person who's kicking your dog. If someone's beating on your kids, you're expected to protect your children. If someone's beating on your wife, your mother, your loved ones—yes, the answer to your question is absolutely. We're expected to do that.

Class variations did exist, however, regarding other conditions deemed worthy of breaking the norm that fighting should be a last resort. Working class men were far less likely to see self-defense as an acceptable reason for physical aggression, unlike Lewis and others in the upper-middle class group. Half of the upper-middle class men compared to only one quarter of the working class men identified self-defense as an appropriate reason to fight. Instead, working class men emphasized fighting as a legitimate, and perhaps unstoppable, result of losing one's temper, helping friends in fights, or drinking

too much alcohol. Men from both classes believed alcohol to be a contributing factor leading to fights, but where upper-middle class men typically ridiculed such behavior, working class men often saw intoxication as a justification for the behavior. Dusty's (Retail Worker, age 27) comments regarding a recent fight he had engaged in highlights this distinction:

You know, I think normally I tend to say what I feel, and if I do bottle it up, then I deal with it the same way I've mentioned. I've never had the urge to get a gun and go cap anybody. I don't really like fighting. If I hadn't been drunk in Four Corners that night, it would have never happened with me and Steve that way. So, I mean, I definitely think that I'm one of those people that if I have too much stress, there's nothing like a good bottle of rum and just chilling out. It seems to make everything fade away after that.

The way Dusty concluded the above account suggests drinking is typically a way to "mellow out" for him, but he clearly recognized that alcohol was a major contributing factor that explained why he lost his temper and fought with Steve.

Working class men also distinguished between "fighting" and other phrases such as "shoving matches," "scuffs," or "wrestling." The term "fighting" for many working class men was restricted to instances requiring the use of fists or punches. Upper-middle class respondents did not make such definitional distinctions. Unlike upper-middle class respondents, working class men believed fighting to be more of an uncontrollable, natural instinct. Ironically, many of them explicitly stated the norm that men should never hit women—as though that behavior could be controlled—no matter how much they wished to. Joe's (Security Guard, age 29) recollection of an angry incident with his wife illustrated this norm:

Yeah, I got angry at my ex-wife one time. She made the mistake of just...she was nagging, nagging, nagging, nagging, nagging. At the time, I probably drove 500, 600 miles a day...come home, cook, clean, the whole nine yards, and then she had the nerve to complain about something. To actually keep from hitting her, I

picked up the front end of my work vehicle and set it back down. I worked out my frustration. I go lift weights...go read a book. Something, anything to keep from—if you knew my ex-wife, she’s built like a linebacker, and well, she hits like a man. I really didn’t want to get in a fistfight with her because I was raised not to hit a female.

In contrast, upper-middle class men viewed fighting as a demonstration of losing control, rather than as an uncontrollable reaction.

The upper-middle class group expressed two beliefs about fighting that were not as prevalent among working class respondents. First, fighting was explicitly regarded as an outlet for releasing energy or emotion. The implication, in light of the norm that fighting should be a last resort, is that using fighting as such an outlet is often inappropriate and should be handled differently in most situations. The second belief expressed by many upper-middle class respondents is that fights are usually reserved for immature, uneducated, or ignorant members of society—in other words, for working class men. A lengthy statement from Peter (Attorney, age 36) described this belief; it also speaks directly to the purpose of this study:

I would say there’s some—this sounds elitist—but there’s probably some class nexus between—an educational basis between—how far you’re willing to negotiate or talk before you resort to some other means. You know there’s that saying, “War is the failure of diplomacy.” It is not...I mean, really, it doesn’t...if you can always avoid that and work out something else, most of the time it’d be better. Because...negotiating a solution that’s honored by both sides would be preferable usually to violent confrontation between civilized people. I think...this is me, a graduate of college, I would sometimes think people with not very much education, whose lives are probably more difficult, to...you know...I probably just watch too much TV. You know, you just think, you think bar fights are something that’s typically going to happen to people...like a biker bar where everybody’s sitting around drunk. You’re hanging around guys with eighth-grade educations and stuff like that, you just think the likelihood of something like that happening would be sooner because there’s probably a greater need for showing you’re macho or whatever. They probably lack the skills to resolve it some other way.

With respect to immaturity, almost all of the men in both classes either ascribed to the belief that fighting is “typical boy stuff,” or admitted to fighting themselves as boys. Fighting while young and immature is, therefore, a normative expectation. About 36% of respondents described specific instances of fighting as a child. However, upper-middle class men were quick to point out that men should outgrow such reactions as they mature. Interestingly, however, many working class men described instances of fighting as adults. Over half of the working class respondents described fighting in adulthood, compared to only a quarter of their upper-middle class counterparts.

Indeed, many of the respondents, 30%, explicitly tied beliefs about being a man or masculinity to fighting. An equal number of respondents from both groups made this connection, but it is important to note that about half of the working class men who did so maintained that physical aggression is a natural and acceptable manifestation of masculinity. None of the upper-middle class respondents personally ascribed to aggression as a part of expressing “real” masculinity. For the most part, however, most of the respondents agreed that though there are a lot of men for whom fighting is a “macho” way to assert themselves, fighting is really not acceptable or necessary behavior. Regarding fighting, Jeff explained, “It makes [men] think they [sic] big...makes them think they tough and everything. That’s all it is...it’s just a role.” Most of the respondents also discussed the belief that fighting is a result of immaturity and just part of the way that boys are raised, but that men are expected to behave with more restraint. Larry (Construction Worker, age 52) noted the following:

To me, that’s a idiot trying to impress somebody. You don’t act like a man—you’re either a man or a boy, and boys do childish things. Like you mentioned a guy comes up in a bar talking crap...it’d take a man to just brush him off. A boy would just sit there and fight him, trying to prove something to somebody else.

In short, fighting is not an integral part of masculinity for most respondents, but a handful of working class men did acknowledge its importance; perhaps they are the “boys” to which the other respondents alluded.

Norms and beliefs about the intensity of anger expressed by fighting, therefore, were more complicated among the respondents. A secondary perspective shared by working class men tempers the hegemonic view of fighting as a last resort under the conditions described earlier. Both groups of men believed that fighting does not resolve anger; no one really “wins” a fight; and fighting is often used as a means of establishing dominance or prestige. Yet, only the working class men seemed to positively sanction such an intense expression of aggression among adult males and under more circumstances.

If upper-middle class men view fighting as uncontrolled aggression, often resulting from immaturity or ignorance, how then do they communicate or release intense anger? In many ways, sports appear to be the upper-middle class equivalent to fighting among the working class. Certainly, respondents from both classes made the same types of references to sports, namely that they are a means of “controlled aggression” or that they offer a release for displaying anger that does not involve fighting. However, class similarities regarding sport end here.

First, working class men made far fewer references to sports in general. Upper-middle class respondents watched more sports on television. In fact, they watched twice as many televised sporting events than did the working class respondents. With respect to hobbies, exercising, golfing, and playing sports such as basketball and baseball were the most prevalent uses of leisure time by upper-middle class males. On the other hand,

working class respondents classified hunting or fishing and playing with computers as their primary hobbies. While the definition of what constitutes a sport may vary, activities such as football and basketball offer very distinct team-oriented recreation that differs from fishing or hunting. Upper-middle class men were also the only respondents who explicitly made reference to notions of “competition.” They emphasized the importance of controlling their anger during competitions as well as the need to hide their anger from competitors to avoid allowing them to gain the upper hand.

To conclude this section, the tables in Appendix F provide a concise look at the hegemonic and secondary ideologies of anger and aggression. Before moving on to discuss the implications of these findings for our understanding of aggression and the compensatory masculinity model, I turn our attention to stoicism, a second key attribute of hegemonic masculinity. Obviously, fighting would be a public display of anger that is counter to the value placed on stoicism. The overall culture by men of both classes is that fighting is not normally acceptable, suggesting support for the importance of stoicism for both groups. But, their behavioral differences suggest the working class men are more accepting of aggression, hinting at less value on restraining emotion, at least with respect to anger. In the words of Heise and Calhan (1995), it seems that the “reactive norms” governing aggression do reveal a class difference among the respondents even though both groups ascribe to similar “proscriptive norms” of fighting. What, then, were the respondents’ views about stoicism and did real class differences emerge?

Concealing Emotion

Stoicism can be understood to mean an endurance of pain or hardship without complaint or an indifference to pleasure or pain (Webster's Dictionary 1990). In this study, stoicism refers to a value or normative expectation that men should conceal their emotions. Early in the interview, respondents were asked to recall a circumstance in which they felt the need to "hide" emotion. Periodically throughout the remainder of the interview, the men were also asked to describe instances in which they refrained from sharing the specific emotion being discussed. References to hiding emotion in general are described first, and then I consider hiding fear in particular because of the emphasis men placed on concealing that emotion. Next, I sketch out the relationship between stoicism and positive emotions and also take a look at how the men's ideologies about crying and fighting shape their views about stoicism. Following this discussion of how interviewees responded to questions about hiding emotions, I discuss three additional codes that emerged from the data as potentially better ways to tap into the relevance of stoicism among the men. These indicators include respondent's views about the "health" effects of concealing emotions, "strength" as an important value among men, and "control" over emotions as another value held by many of the respondents.

Hiding Emotion in General

Recall from the previous chapter that respondents generally asserted that men are not supposed to show or talk about emotion, especially negative emotions. This suggests that stoicism is an influential aspect of men's emotion culture. The most commonly cited reasons for hiding emotion were shared by members of both classes. The importance of hiding emotions in order to shelter others from pain and suffering was the most prevalent

justification mentioned. Eight upper-middle class men and twenty working class men introduced this belief. As Harry (Maintenance Technician, age 45) explained, “I bottle it up. It’s better for one person to hurt than two people...a man’s logic. Not like a woman. She’ll say, ‘Oh, I want to get this out.’ A man will just bottle it up.” Another quite common explanation for hiding emotion centered around the workplace, such that showing emotion is considered nonprofessional. Alan (Attorney, age 40) explains, “It may even go so far as to—and I think a lot of lawyers do this—is to go ahead and write that letter saying exactly what you’re feeling, but don’t send it out until that afternoon or the next day, because your professional side will have taken over. Rarely is it to your client’s advantage to just act on those emotions. It can’t be.” Twelve upper-middle class respondents and nine working class respondents echoed this perception of the relationship between professionalism and hiding emotion. Finally, norms and beliefs tying stoicism to masculinity were the third most common reason given for why men hide emotions. Mac’s (retired Parole Board Administrator, age 72) response to whether he could recall ever hiding emotion illustrates this link:

Mac: There’s a number of things. I guess one of the things I remember is when I had to take a baby away from the mother because we had just arrested her and were fixin’ to put her in jail.

Interviewer: Why didn’t you show your feelings?

Mac: I guess it was unmasculine. It was part of the job, but we just tried to be as calm and cool and collected as we could be in that particular situation.

Eight upper-middle class men and eleven working class men affirmed the link between stoicism and masculinity as a key reason why men hide emotions.

Other rationales for stoicism were mentioned. Upper-middle class respondents often emphasized two additional beliefs or norms about stoicism. First, those in

leadership positions are expected to hide emotions and, second, men often hide emotions because strangers do not genuinely care to hear or see such expressions. In their interviews, working class respondents basically maintained the belief that showing emotion is a form of showing weakness.

Finally, there were no class differences regarding explanations about how men achieve stoicism. Some men simply maintain that they are “wired” not to show emotion, such that stoicism is an involuntary part of their identity. Others, however, describe withdrawing or internalizing the emotion as the primary means by which they maintain a stoic front. Mark (Production Technician, age 52) describes how he hid emotion over the death of a loved one: “You have to be strong. You just support the family. You don’t want them to see you blubbering like a two year old, so you got to sneak off by yourself and do it.” A significant number of men also mention taking a jovial approach to the situation, making a joke, prank, or somehow interjecting humor into the situation to avoid showing their negative emotions. Other ways men achieved stoicism included drinking alcohol, attending church, writing letters that were never sent, or engaging in work to expend accumulated energy.

Despite some variations in rationales and strategies, the overwhelming majority of the respondents believed men are not supposed to show emotion. As a quantitative “check” on this finding, I analyzed the six items composing the stoicism subscale of the masculinity survey offered at the end of the interviews (see Appendix C). Table 4.1, below, summarizes the scores by class for each of the items.

Table 4.1: Mean Scores for Stoicism Items by Class

Item	Upper-Middle	Working
In order to become successful, it is important to avoid showing emotional weakness. (reverse coded)	2.3	2.1
Men who cry in front of others are considered “weak” or “soft”. (reverse coded)	2.3	2.1
It is acceptable for a man to show fear when he is afraid.	2.1	2.1
Expressing emotion is a sign of strength in a man.	2.1	2.1
A man should not show too much affection to those he loves. (reverse coded)	1.7	1.6
It is important for men to share their feelings with others.	2.0	2.0
Average Stoicism (Total of Items)	2.1	2.0

(Response Categories: 1=Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree, such that higher scores represent higher acceptance of stoicism)

On each item, the working class respondents scored the same or slightly lower than their upper-middle class counterparts, making the average working class score slightly less than that of the upper-middle class (none of the items yielded significant correlations with class). Nevertheless, the consistency among all of the men as only “minimally stoic” at most is the obvious and relevant result. The quantitative subscale alone would suggest that stoicism is not even an integral part of the identity of the respondents. But as demonstrated by the qualitative results, to be a man is to be unmoved.

How does one make sense of this discrepancy between a minimally stoic ideology in the quantitative measure and the much more stoic emotion culture that emerged from the data on hiding emotion? I propose that men’s emotions have stereotypically been considered in simplistic terms, but that they are really more nuanced, especially in light of the “crisis of masculinity” I will describe in chapter five. This discrepancy underscores the need for in-depth interview methodology to provide a more authentic, systematic

understanding of men's emotion. In other words, if we consider an item from the masculinity scale, such as "It is acceptable for a man to show fear when he is afraid," it will become evident from the interview data in the next section that many men would have difficulty responding. Instead, they would need more information: in what context? in a leadership role? in a confrontation? are others in need of protection?

Hiding Fear

Fear was the most often cited specific emotion in reference to remaining stoic or hiding emotion. Certainly a number of specific situations in which the expression of fear was acceptable and unacceptable were described. However, the most common situations in which men agreed that fear should be hidden include the following: a) in leadership positions, b) during confrontations, and c) in the military setting. The importance of hiding fear when acting as a leader was more pervasive among the upper-middle class respondents, but members of both groups mentioned it. When asked if hiding fear was ever important, Lawrence, an architect, stated: "I think in certain situations, yes, it is important. Again, if you're in a leadership position or you're trying to be a role model, when you're trying to accomplish something in which your fear is going to impact the confidence that people have in you in trying to lead...then...yes, I think you ought to. You really need to hide it." Men of both groups also describe the importance of masking fear in confrontations, but here, working class men more often made reference to hiding fear in altercations or conflicts. Mario (Night Shift Cook, age 22) provided the following example:

I mean, you can avoid fights by not acting like you're afraid. Say you're getting in a bar fight, and you're acting like you're afraid. They're just gonna fucking pulverize your ass...more than they would if you were like, 'Come on, mother fucker! Do you want to fuck with me?' They'd back down more, you know.

Often, masking fear in this way resulted in showing anger or aggression, the opposite of stoicism. Finally, respondents of both groups maintained that hiding fear in military training or combat was expected of men.

The single, most robust and consistent finding among the respondents was that fear must be hidden in order to protect others or to help them stay calm in problem situations. In other words, the general emotion norm that one should shelter others from pain also extends specifically to sheltering others from fear, and this norm moderates whether or not men show fear in relatively minor or more serious circumstances. Ten upper-middle class men and eight working class men spoke to the norm that men should protect others. The following account by David, a geologist (age 51) and father of three, illustrates this well:

I took the boys sailing in Charleston one day when they were little, probably 7, 9, and 11, something like that. You're just kind of sailing along in the harbor. We were in a 25-foot boat, nothing big, just something kind of cool. All of a sudden, I look up behind me, and I hadn't been paying attention behind me. You always look in front of you where you're going. Right behind me is a submarine coming out of the Charleston Naval Shipyard. Well, it scared the be-Jesus out of me. I guess I had to keep it to myself because I didn't want the kids to know that I was afraid, because they were afraid [weeping noises mimicking children]. I had to figure out a way to steer and get out of the way of the submarine. They were paying attention to me, but I wasn't paying attention to what's going on behind me. I had the right of way, actually, but still it's one of those things you see and you go, "Holy s---!" [respondent self-censored the remark]

He shortly thereafter added that "bravery is the act of doing what you need to do while you're scared shitless." In short, regardless if the situation is relatively minor or life-threatening, men are expected to hide fear and resolve the problem when others are depending on them.

That fear should be hidden under certain circumstances or to protect others was consistent across classes. But, *why* such fear should be hidden differed depending on the class position of the respondent. Men from the working class highlighted norms or beliefs about masculinity and weakness as the reasons that men are expected to hide fear. The “code of manhood” as one respondent stated, demands that men hide fear. The following excerpts are from Andrew (Laborer, age 26) and Billy (Sales Associate, age 27), respectively, both working class respondents:

I think that’s a, uh, a social thing, more than anything. Guys just ain’t supposed to show fear. You watch movies, you hear, “You don’t show no damn fear!” Whether or not my daddy has any fears, I don’t know, because he never showed ‘em if he did.

I think, again, the hiding...hiding an emotion like fear, I think that’s actually the main emotion that guys are supposed to hold back to look brave and strong or make a firm standpoint. I don’t think it’s really that important, but I know it happens. Every guy knows to hide their fear.

Twice as many respondents in the working class as in the upper-middle class ascribed to hiding fear as part of a masculine identity. Similarly, working class men often equated showing fear with a demonstration of weakness. In contrast, upper-middle class respondents made more reference to the belief that “fear is contagious” or that “fear breeds fear” as their most consistent explanation for why men needed to hide fear. Thus, there was no class difference regarding what situations warranted fear, but rather in the rationales behind why fear should be hidden in those situations.

A Word about Hiding Positive Emotions

Although many definitions of stoicism refer strictly to withholding negative emotions, such as grief or fear, one might also consider instances in which men hide positive emotions as well. It is interesting to note that there were far fewer descriptions of

hiding positive emotions, but a couple of beliefs and norms were presented. Regarding affection, the belief that men show love differently than women was present. Again, as Harry (Maintenance Technician, age 45) articulated,

Mama knows I love her. I think men show their love different than a woman does. A woman is more verbal a lot of times, where a man is not. A man will give you room. He'll give you space. If a woman's had a bad day, a man will think... Well, they need a little space to unwind. They need to be by themselves. They don't want to be crowded. But then, the woman's thinking... If you love me, you'll get over here and hug me. A man's doing what he's thinking is right. A woman don't think so. Then the man gets in trouble because he didn't come over there and hug her.

Here we see that this method of expressing love appears outwardly as a form of stoicism even though the respondent considers his actions to be an expression of love. Other men explained that they limited their displays of affection out of a fear of rejection or so that their actions would not be misunderstood. For instance, some respondents lamented not being able to show any form of affection toward former spouses so that current spouses would not become jealous or misconstrue the situation. When asked to recall a time that he hid love or affection, James explained, "Yeah, at my mother's funeral... my ex-wife was there, and I felt that she was asking for affection, consoling, and I didn't offer it because... out of respect for my wife. That's the only time I can think of."

Regarding hiding pride and happiness, one consistent norm emerged from the data. Eleven men suggested that excessive displays of joy or pleasure were not socially acceptable and are viewed as "gloating." Men from both classes adhered to this norm. They referred to those who showed excessive pride or happiness as "showboats" or as "yanking their own chain," and frowned upon such behavior. In short, very few men described the importance of restraining displays of affection or pride and happiness, perhaps indicating that stoicism pertains primarily to negative emotions. One further

indication that positive emotions are less subject to stoicism is evident in Table 4.1, above. Note that the fifth item on love (“A man should not show too much affection to those he loves”) received the least stoic response from both groups.

The Opposite of Stoicism: Crying and Fighting

Crying behavior was discussed at length in chapter three, and I outlined fighting behavior earlier in this chapter. These two behaviors are overt, visible expressions of sadness and anger, respectively. Therefore, ideological beliefs and norms that encourage these behaviors are counter to endorsing an ideology of stoicism. Conversely, beliefs and norms that discourage crying and fighting affirm stoicism. In this section, I reiterate the findings on crying and fighting to incorporate what they contribute to our understanding of stoicism.

Recall that only two minor class differences were teased out of the data about crying. First, it appears that working class men did not endorse the belief that crying is a form of weakness to the same extent as the upper-middle class men. Secondly, upper-middle class men teared up more openly in front of the researcher during the interviews. The first finding would imply that the working class men placed less value on stoicism, while the second would suggest the opposite. Yet, the more important finding regarding crying with respect to an ideology of stoicism is that overwhelmingly, the two groups were virtually identical in their views (see Appendix D). There were no major class differences and most respondents endorsed an ideology that affirmed the importance of not crying—restraining emotion—even if they personally behaved in ways inconsistent with that ideology or were not especially critical of others doing so.

With respect to fighting, remember that respondents in both groups embrace an ideology that makes fighting socially unacceptable, except for particular circumstances. However, the findings also reveal that working class men more readily deviated from this norm and embraced more physical expressions of anger and aggression overall. Thus, it seems that upper-middle class men affirmed the importance of stoicism to a greater extent than did the working class men with respect to fighting.

In sum, a comprehensive analysis of hiding emotion suggests that men from both groups embrace an ideology of stoicism and recalled events in which they refrained from showing emotion. In some ways, the upper-middle class group appeared slightly more stoic in their beliefs, norms, and behaviors than did the working class men. I consider the implications of these findings for the compensatory model at the end of this chapter, but first I turn our attention to a different way of understanding stoicism.

Emergent Indicators of Stoicism

So far I have described results from the measures initially employed to assess cultural views about stoicism. Yet, the more interesting findings regarding stoicism came about in the respondents' own words in three areas: health, strength, and control.

It's Not Healthy

As Mike (Attorney, age 48) explains, "We're given license by a lot of what we see on TV to be more emotional. We're taught, nowadays, the old sort of stoicism men supposedly show in their 40s, 50s, and 60s is not all that attractive and not all that healthy and not all that helpful." In other words, the question of whether or not stoicism is good for men is one that quite a few respondents raised (30% of sample). The vast majority of those who introduced the concept of "health" into their interview spoke about "bottling

up” emotions as an unhealthy action. For instance, Peter (Attorney, age 36) described the benefits of sharing emotions with his family:

Yeah, it’s just...it’s kind of starting to be a big family with lots going on and lots of chaos...sometimes crying, sometimes some yelling. I don’t think any of that is really unhealthy. Although, I think one of the most important jobs a parent has is to teach a kid how to manage emotion. I don’t mean like keep a lid on it, but I mean, how to recognize what they’re feeling and recognize how to deal with it, not to keep it in the bottle, but like, uh, if you’re feeling angry or frustrated, how do you deal with that in a constructive way versus having a tantrum.

Others explained that anger itself is not a healthy emotion to suppress. Micah (Hospital Supply Technician, age 37) described the importance of showing anger. “I think it’s kind of healthy. [pause] Most guys are just too stupid or too afraid to discuss how they feel so they can really get it out, I think, by getting mad.” Men of both classes introduced the concept of health as it relates to hiding emotion, but one minor class variation did come about. Upper-middle class respondents spoke about unhealthy stoicism in terms of restraining emotion in general while the working class men spoke about the detrimental effects of repressing anger specifically. It would seem, therefore, that a significant portion of the sample view stoicism as an unhealthy, if normative, attribute of masculine identity.

The Strong Silent Type

Strength emerged as a clearly valued trait for the respondents. First, 50 out of 80 men (63%) explicitly mentioned “strength” without a direct question or interviewer prompting. Also, several respondents used the language of “value” within their descriptions. The issue of strength was spontaneously introduced by respondents at various points in the interview, such as in reference to hiding fear, holding back tears, or describing what it is to be a man. Peter, whom we just heard from in the segment about

the health benefits of sharing emotion, said the following in response to a question about fighting:

It's like a yes and no kind of thing. You always want to be able to take care of yourself, and you want to be strong, but at the same time, you don't want to engage in stuff that's clearly beneath you and pointless and dangerous, you know? So I think there is a value, the best way to say it, in being able to defend yourself, and maybe not such a desire to employ it. I think that—it's not a quote—but the luxury of being gentle or being compassionate comes from being strong in some ways. Nobody can mistake it for a sign of weakness. But also, you can't be taken advantage of. There's a lot of truth...it's kind of a luxury that you develop the opportunity to be that way and take care of yourself and choose not too. I think that's the ideal.

Finally, a number of men cited strength as an admirable quality in others or in the role models with whom they identified.

So what do they mean, then, by “strength,” and how does it relate to stoicism?

Obviously strength refers to having power of some kind, be it force, vigor, toughness, etc.

For purposes of this study, I differentiated between thoughts about physical strength and those about emotional strength. References to emotional strength almost always referred to hiding emotions, but occasionally the men equated strength with showing emotion.

Given that both physical attributes as well as stoicism are important qualities associated with hegemonic masculinity, I outline the results of both physical and emotional strength, but focus primarily on emotional strength as it relates to stoicism.

References to physical strength usually addressed issues about fighting. A small portion of respondents (12 men) specifically focused only on the physical aspect of strength, and no class differences among them were present. Respondents identified physical strength as an important part of male socialization and emphasized the importance of being able to defend oneself physically, even if fighting was never engaged in. Furthermore, physical strength displayed through fighting was considered to

be one way that men gain status in the hierarchy, while others suggested that demonstrations of physical strength are indicators of other types of strength present in an individual.

For purposes of understanding stoicism, however, I shift our attention to discussions of emotional strength—being unemotional. Most respondents who introduced the concept of strength focused on emotional strength. The most prevalent norm about strength is that men are expected to be emotionally strong, in other words unemotional, especially when they are in leadership roles. As Jack (General Manager of a large restaurant chain, age 56) succinctly stated in his response as to whether men are expected to show their feelings, “No. By tradition, men are strong and reserved.”

A couple of norms that tie strength to restraining fear were also evident in the data. Clearly, men are expected to hide fear. Billy (Sales Associate, age 27) pointed out that, “To act like a man is just to put on a front...be really brave and strong about whatever situation you got in front of you. I think being a man is just a front. Every man’s got a soft side.” Further support for the importance of this norm lies in the fact that several respondents mentioned sanctioning in response to norm violations. Cameron (Attorney, age 37) told about criticizing or teasing others in response to fear in his depiction about military life:

Oh, pranks! I remember in the Navy we had “Second Tuesday.” The second Tuesday of every month, you’d pick somebody and you’d beat the crap out of him. Get somebody, and everyone would jump on him and beat the shit out of him. It’s just to toughen him up. I think it’s the same thing about criticizing guys for fear. Men play off each other and try to toughen each other up.

Finally, a second related norm regarding strength and fear is that men are expected to take charge in dangerous situations; again, the norm that men should protect others from fear emerged, this time as a demonstration of strength for masculine identity.

Men also discussed strength in relation to remaining unemotional in sad situations. Similar to fear, men are again expected to be strong for others who are dependent on them. In response to how men should express their sadness, Jason (Director of Information Technology, age 42) offered:

I guess it may not be a direct expression of emotion, but you can kind of tell when that situation is present. When you feel that sadness, it automatically makes you look for it in others I guess. So when you're doing that, you know, certain family members or someone nearby, it makes you more sensitive to protecting them. So, you notice it more than if they were depending on themselves. You'll be more attentive. I guess that's the way you show it. By showing that you're that attentive, you're showing that, yes, this has affected me too. But you're still presenting that strong front for them to kind of draw on.

One quarter of the sample discussed sadness with reference to strength, usually equating strength with not showing grief at a funeral or during a serious illness. However, four respondents maintained that strength to them actually referred to showing sadness.

Contrast Sam's position about crying to Jason's thoughts above about expressing sadness:

Interviewer: Are men who cry considered weak?

Sam: I don't think so. I would think they'd be considered stronger because they're more in touch with themselves. They know what's important to them. If you lose something important to you, and you're not saddened or distraught by it in one form or another, you're pretty much non-living.

In short, the interviews suggest that showing emotional strength is clearly a value shared by most men, and no real class differences were evident. Discussions of sustaining the image of strength typically referred to being able to fight or to hide emotions, but in a

handful of cases, some men did focus on not fighting or on showing emotion as the more valued dimension of strength. In either case, though, “being strong” is how the respondent preferred to be perceived. Why then does strength seem to be such a valued and important trait for men? Of the 50 respondents who explicitly introduced the concept of strength, 56% of them tied strength directly to masculinity or to references about “being a man.” A comprehensive look at how respondents defined masculinity follows in the next chapter, but here I look at the link between emotional strength as a type of stoicism and how it was associated with identity.

The relationship between emotional strength and masculinity echoes the tie between stoicism and masculinity. Only three out of twenty-eight respondents who introduced strength in response to the question about “being a man” concentrated on the physical strength component of masculinity. Rather, most of the respondents referred to the macho, stoic, unemotional aspects of strength and their relation to male identity. Furthermore, of those men, only five viewed the “strong, silent type” as a myth or disagreed with that definition of masculinity. Overall, the majority of men described stoicism as the norm or dominant characteristic necessary for being a man. Johnny (Cashier, age 25) summarized social expectations about men and stoicism by stating, “I don’t think they’re expected to show sadness at all ‘cause they’re men. They’re supposed to be strong...arrgh!” Men of both classes repeatedly affirmed the link between strength and masculinity.

In sum, the respondents in both classes clearly value strength and consider it to be an important dimension of masculinity. Being strong by not showing emotion suggests

that stoicism is important for a lot of men or at least that it is a normative expectation they face.

Don't Just Vomit it Out

Control over one's emotions is the third value that emerged in the data. Half of all working class men made reference to the term "control" while almost two-thirds of upper-middle class respondents made such references. Again, respondents volunteered references to "control" in response to a number of questions, such as when recalling stories about getting angry, refraining from crying, or as a respected characteristic in describing men whom they admired. Therefore, control was an important issue for most of the men, and especially to those in the upper-middle class. Only three of the 48 respondents who introduced the term "control" were speaking of limiting expressions of positive emotions. So control typically referred to remaining stoically unemotional in negative situations, to maintaining the upper hand in conflicts, and to not allowing emotion to dictate the outcome of a given situation (i.e., not losing control over one's temper).

Several respondents tied issues of control to fear, crying, fighting, and anger, or to expressing emotion in general. With respect to the latter, all of the respondents suggested that emotions are things that need to be controlled. Many of them held the belief that too much emotion gets in the way of reason or good judgment, with a few going so far as to identify controlling emotion as a necessary part of their job performance. Thirteen men tied control to fear, emphasizing the importance of "channeling" fear so that one can maintain control over circumstances especially when the protection of others is required. In considering what situations warrant showing fear, Alan (Attorney, age 40) explained,

I think situations beyond your control. When the situations are within your control, then I think a better reaction is to appreciate whatever the situation is, but then exercise whatever control over it you can. I don't mean you have 100% control, but if you have as much as...say...you know, you kind of channel your fear. I mean, I'm scared when I go to court, oddly enough. I mean, I've done it a zillion times. I'm actually afraid of losing. You just channel that and you focus.

This notion that fear can be helpful by providing the necessary adrenaline to get through a situation seemingly contradicts the earlier notion that emotions impair one's logic or judgment. But if we recognize that it is not fear itself that is lauded but rather the use or control of it, then the two findings are consistent. Recall also that a little fear is believed to be a good thing by some men, as discussed in chapter three, precisely because it can make one ready to react in a given situation.

Respondents did show some class differences in terms of control and crying or fighting. The working class men suggested that crying and fighting are very difficult emotional expressions to control, while the upper-middle class respondents extolled the need to control both. Two working class respondents described crying as being an involuntary reaction that one cannot control. In contrast, the upper-middle class men suggested that crying is evidence of "losing" control and that if men do happen to cry, they are still expected to maintain control over the situation. Lewis (Business Consultant, age 65) offered the following effect of teaching himself not to cry or lose control in expressing emotion:

The irony of that was that later on, like in Vietnam and places where I saw some things that were tearful, just absolutely, brutally sad, that emotion kept me probably alive. I mean, that control of my emotion kept me alive. What I found was that in critical situations, the more critical the situation, the more tense the situation, the more relaxed I'd become. In other words, when I see imminent danger, I no longer react emotionally. I become very, very controlled and very logical...very...ready to make a decision. My fear of flight hardly exists. I totally control my stress level.

Jason (Director of Information Technology, age 42) also alludes to the importance of controlling anger and aggression. Having dealt with anger earlier in this chapter, here I focus on ideas about controlling the emotion. Almost half of the respondents specifically mentioned control in conjunction to anger. All of them, regardless of class, agreed that anger is a difficult emotion to control. The working class men basically resolved that anger is difficult to control but a few suggested it is still important to try to do so. Conversely, the upper-middle class men never simply stopped at suggesting it is difficult to control but rather emphasized the importance of trying to. Once again, contrast the position of Andrew, a laborer who repairs water pipes, to that of Charlie, a computer systems designer:

Andrew: I've seen guys get mad over a damn dog. People are strange. Anger...anger...it don't really matter if you show it or not. If you're mad, you're gonna respond to it, whether it's yelling or throwing something or hitting somebody. Anger is so hard to control. I don't know anybody who can...male or female.

Charlie: There's a real misconception that you ought to just let your anger out, just vomit it out whenever you want to. That's not good for anybody. But it is appropriate in the sense that you have to be true to what you're experiencing. To deny your emotions and to keep things down over and over again is toxic in the long run. I've recognized that toxicity building up in myself. It often, like I said, it has prevented me from functioning optimally as a leader.

Again, the upper-middle class value on controlling anger suggests a more stoic image is also valued.

One-third of the respondents who introduced notions of control related issues of fighting to control. Most of the working class respondents suggested fighting is either an instinct or something that should be controlled but typically cannot be because it is necessary. Conversely, most of the upper-middle class men suggested fighting is something that should be controlled and that fighting shows a loss of control or

insecurity. Compare what Zac, a tool maker (age 40), said about fighting to what Jason maintained:

Zac: I don't know...some sort of a...instinct. I don't know, it's just...I don't think [men] can help themselves.

Jason: When you allow your anger to get the better of yourself in that way, then you stop your ability to rationally think. If you allow anger to get a hold on you like that, it gives you weakness. The person who's in the most control of themselves is ultimately going to have the upper-middle hand. So even if you're in a direct confrontation, person-to-person, like that, that first person that resorts to violence is the one that's the least on their guard. Generally if you're collected and in control of yourself enough, you can work yourselves through that before it ever leads to physical violence.

Finally, one-third of the respondents introduced the topic of control in conjunction with masculinity. Almost all of these were upper-middle class men. Each of them basically suggested that controlling emotions and self-control are essential components of being a man. Again, Charlie offered an insight into the relevance of control for men:

You read stuff like Robert Bly, and it's interesting. You're supposed to be a manly man, yet you're also supposed to feel emotion. That's a conflict in a lot of men's minds. The two don't go together. They feel at some deep level, our socialization teaches that to be a man fundamentally means that you are in control of your emotions, rather than giving your emotions free rein. I haven't thought about this in great depth, but I'm making up as I go along. I think it's a matter of being in control of one's self. It's a matter of discipline, self-knowledge, self-mastery...sort of a form of stoicism in the classical Greek sense, where you take what life has thrown at you and you behave. You bear it. I still think there's a very strong thrust to it in the socialization of the male.

Various respondents did admit to instances of "failing" to control their emotions or they did not necessarily ascribe to the link between control and masculinity, but all of them acknowledged the prevalence of this normative expectation for men in society.

Assessing the Compensatory Model of Masculinity

To reiterate, the compensatory model maintains that men will exaggerate certain traits of masculinity in the absence of other traits. Existing research identifies hegemonic masculinity as including stoicism, physical strength, sexual prowess, economic success, competitiveness, autonomy, and occupational achievement. Assuming, then, that working class men face structural barriers to many of these masculine attributes (such as financial gain or autonomy), one might expect these men to exaggerate aggression and stoicism, as the model would suggest. So far, I have noted several class similarities and differences in men's emotion culture. I now consider whether working class men actually appear to compensate for limited opportunities for expressing masculinity by exaggerating their adherence to a masculine emotion culture of stoicism and aggression. Then, in the chapter five, I outline how the respondents understand masculinity beyond the dimensions of aggression and stoicism.

Anger and Aggression

Respondents from both groups hold many similar beliefs and norms about anger. Anger should be felt and expressed only briefly. Resolving the source of the anger is more important than whether or not--or how--anger is expressed. Both view fighting to be a last resort and even share agreement on some situations that are exceptions to this rule. Fighting is also seen as something young people do, and fighting does not really resolve anger. Men express their anger in variety of ways including conversing, throwing things, fighting, even road rage, and they regret such displays when they are not constructive or are the result of overreacting. Showing anger in the workplace is also considered "unprofessional." These similarities would suggest a common emotion

culture, at least surrounding anger. On the surface it would seem that so many similarities between members of both classes would contradict the compensatory model. But, to some extent, having a shared understanding of anger among men is a prerequisite for permitting some of them to exaggerate this emotion as a means of demonstrating masculinity. Thus, a common, hegemonic emotion culture sets the stage for being able to evaluate compensatory masculinity.

Support for the Model

Unlike the findings for stoicism, there is a great deal of support for the theoretical model in terms of anger. First, despite sharing a number of norms and beliefs about anger with upper-middle class respondents, the working class men revealed a number of exceptions to the social rules or behavioral deviations that are in the direction that the model would predict. Working class respondents viewed fighting as less controllable, were twice as likely to engage in acts of physical aggression, condoned road rage, expressed a great deal of anger in the workplace, and many concluded that showing anger is simply healthier than suppressing it.

The data also yielded additional norms and beliefs that varied by class and were consistent with the model. Upper-middle class respondents viewed fighting as an inappropriate release of energy, as an activity for uneducated or ignorant people, and as behavior that should be outgrown by adulthood. Ultimately, upper-middle class respondents frequently reported hiding their anger and typically had milder means of showing anger when doing so, such as yelling, changing one's tone of voice, or talking out the irritation.

There also seem to be fundamentally different definitions of “anger” held by the two groups of men. As noted, the working class men often differentiated among types of aggressive behaviors, using terms such as “shoving match,” “scuffs,” or wrestling. Fighting itself was viewed as distinct from these other behaviors. It may be, then, that my questions about fighting—which yielded responses consistent with the model—might have produced even stronger results in support of the model had I made references to “milder” types of aggressive behavior in the interview questions. Just as the proverbial “Eskimos have a thousand words for snow” implies that snow is a central part of their lives, having a “thousand” words for fighting might imply the significance of fighting among working class men. In contrast, the upper-middle class men made no such distinctions. In fact, with regard to their discussions of the importance of showing anger, recall that the upper-middle class group focused on “when” showing anger mattered while the working class men centered their responses on “how.” Working class respondents made the distinction that “arguing” is a valuable way of showing anger but that more violent forms of expressing anger were not advantageous. Upper-middle class respondents raised no such distinction, possibly hinting at a different understanding of what constitutes anger. Again, it is possible that upper-middle class men ascribe to a much narrower definition of what constitutes anger, such that violent reactions do not even enter into the realm of options for expressing this feeling; perhaps for them, violent or aggressive expressions are reserved for some other emotion such as fury.

In sum, a host of class differences in norms and beliefs about anger emerge from the data that lend support to the theoretical model. Furthermore, many of the respondents’ actual behaviors and deviations from these norms were also in the predicted

direction of the theoretical model. Disparate understandings of what constitutes anger pervaded the interviews, suggesting that anger holds a much more exaggerated, aggressive component for the working class respondents. Taken together, then, these findings provide copious support for the compensatory masculinity model in terms of anger expression. And, as the next section suggests, there is very little information to indicate otherwise.

Challenges to the Model

Only one issue obscures the model regarding anger. We might have expected to see sports play a bigger role for the working class men as a means of demonstrating “controlled aggression.” Yet the working class introduced “sports” less in their interviews, watched fewer televised sports and, other than hunting or fishing, did not list sports as a primary hobby. Some upper-middle class respondents explicitly acknowledged using sports as a legitimate outlet for aggression. This finding, that upper-middle class men actually referred to sports in much more detail and with greater frequency, runs contrary to the model’s prediction—at least on the surface. In other words, the upper-middle class respondents articulated a need to express anger and aggression in some socially acceptable way. However, their means of doing so would also appear much more controlled or “stoic” when compared to other ways of demonstrating anger such as fighting, swearing, hitting, or throwing things. We also see that the working class modes of expressing anger are more exaggerated, visible, and forceful, consistent with what the model would predict.

This finding leads to an interesting caveat about the theoretical model itself. The behaviors of stoically hiding feelings and those associated with displaying aggression are

fundamentally opposed to one another. Yet the model suggests that men denied the opportunity to express masculinity via one avenue will compensate by exaggerating other traits. But men cannot be both more stoic and more aggressive, by definition. To resolve this logical problem, the model would be enhanced by specifying the factors that lead men to compensate by showing more aggression versus by refraining from showing emotion. I discuss this idea further in the final chapter, but for now, I look at how the compensatory model fits with the findings on stoicism.

Stoicism

Support for the Model

Unlike anger and aggression, very little data from the interviews supports the compensatory model regarding stoicism. Most men endorsed the importance of remaining unmoved or emotionally strong. The most relevant support for the model is the finding that, of the handful of men who cried during the interview, the working class men did so more stoically, with more restraint, less often, and less openly than did their upper-middle class counterparts. However, only 14% of the sample teared up during the interview, making this finding tenuous at best. Support for the model also appears in the beliefs about hiding fear. It appears that working class men more closely tied masculinity to a stoic approach to fear, and they also emphasized the importance of hiding fear in confrontations. However, these results are tempered by the fact that most respondents of both classes adhered to the emotion culture that fear should be hidden in particular circumstances, making both classes seem equally stoic on this front. Finally, the expectation about hiding fear when one is responsible for sheltering others was the most common norm to emerge from the data and was prevalent in both classes.

Challenges to the Model

Accordingly, it seems that there is much more evidence in the interviews to suggest that there are no class differences with regard to stoicism, or that the upper-middle class group is slightly more likely to adhere to stoic ideals than the model would predict. The most obvious class difference that did occur was minor and in the opposite direction from the theoretical model: it was among working class respondents that we saw an ideology that was more accepting of fighting, which suggests that the upper-middle class men are more stoic with respect to showing anger and aggression. We are again made aware of the model's inherent contradiction between being stoic and showing anger as well.

It is equally noteworthy that the emergent themes of strength, control, and health all point to something beyond stoicism as integral to masculinity for these respondents. A more complete theoretical model would need to integrate these concepts. Strength is clearly valued by men regardless of class, suggesting that there is still an importance placed on stoicism. But strength also includes the physical component, which points to the need to better understand the role of fighting and power for defining masculinity. Nearly one-third of the respondents (30%) introduced the idea that maintaining stoicism is an unhealthy characteristic. Even if stoicism is still part of masculine identity, it appears that for a significant portion of men it is not an important or valued part. This issue is considered further when we look at differences by age and generation in the next chapter. Lastly, the importance of controlling emotion contradicts the model in that the upper-middle class men viewed refraining from crying and fighting as more imperative

than did the working class men. Indeed, the working class respondents often believed these behaviors to be uncontrollable, especially when referring to expressions of anger.

In short, there is little support for the compensatory model with regard to stoicism. Although few if any class differences are evident, the respondents do adhere to an emotion culture that affirms the importance of stoicism overall.

Refining the Model...and Beyond

With respect to anger, there is some support for the compensatory model in the data, but this support is only partial at best. The men's similarity in views about stoicism—regardless of class—contradicts the model. Furthermore, apparent class differences in aggression may reflect differences in structural circumstances that lead to fighting, rather than some type of compensation by the working class men. It is possible that working class men face greater exposure to situations that provoke aggression. The data hint at other mechanisms that may be operating, too. The inherent contradiction between being stoic and being aggressive insists that something besides compensation may determine what qualities men look to in defining their masculinity. Future research is needed to specify the conditions under which one masculine trait will be exaggerated over another.

Additionally, perhaps what I have been examining as “stoicism” is really a part of something larger and more important to masculinity: keeping control. Restraining emotion, which I have considered “stoicism,” is only one part of control. Might men who explain that they “choose” to fight actually be demonstrating a form of control as well? Is exerting control a more valued trait than stoicism in defining masculinity? These are issues that will also need to be explored in future research.

Finally, it is possible that stoicism is losing some value in today's culture. The next chapter considers the presence of a generational shift in defining masculinity. Or perhaps the findings on stoicism that contradict the model, as well as those on fighting that support the model, are merely artifacts of age differences among the respondents. The upper-middle class men average about eight years older than the working class men. Therefore, I also consider maturational change and age differences as they relate to masculine identity in chapter five. These and other ideas that join emotion culture and masculinity are explored next.

CHAPTER V

CRISIS, CHANGE, AND OTHER RESULTS

I shift the focus away from the compensatory model and emotion culture to look, instead, at masculinity more broadly and at other findings that surfaced from the data. Of course, these findings have implications for men's emotions, and they introduce alternative explanations for changes in emotion culture. This chapter begins with a discussion of findings about masculinity, where the results of the short questionnaire are also reviewed. Then I look at men's views on gender differences and their gender biases as they emerged during the interviews. But other factors are at work in the data besides sex or gender. The second half of this chapter looks at maturational and generational trends as potential explanations for a changing emotion culture. Finally, the notion of a social "crisis of masculinity" is introduced from the respondents' perspective.

Take it Like a Man...

In this study, notions of masculinity permeated the interviews despite the focus on emotion. Typically at the end of the interview, the respondents were asked to specify their ideas about masculinity by answering the question "what does it mean to 'be a man.'" Moreover, respondents identified any heroes or role models, further indicating what values or attributes of masculinity they admired. Following these qualitative measures of masculinity, the men also completed a brief questionnaire to tap seven

dimensions of masculinity. The results of both the qualitative and quantitative measures, interestingly, indicate very few class differences among the respondents.

What does it mean to "be a man?" According to the respondents, six traits consistently answer that question. Men demonstrate responsibility, protect others, provide for their families, stand up for their beliefs and morals, offer strength, and do all of this with a stoic demeanor. Both classes of men presented these six qualities as a hegemonic definition of masculinity through their comments. Several working class men did distance themselves from attributes of stoicism and strength even though they acknowledged the attributes' importance to most of society. Contrast these descriptions of being a man, the first from Cameron, an attorney (age 37), and the second from Hank, a retail clerk at a local pharmacy (age 37):

Cameron: To act within certain unwritten, understood social codes out there...like...don't cry in public...don't show fear or weakness, except in certain very, very, certain allowable situations.

Researcher: Do you ascribe to that?

Cameron: I'd like to say no, but I probably do act that way more than I would say I like to.

Now Hank said this:

Hank: I'll give you two examples...one is the world, the other is being a man spiritually. Being a man in the world's eyes, I'm talking the majority of the world, is not being a wimp. What is a wimp? Why does what the world think matter anyway, but it's you don't cry, you don't admit to failure, you don't show weakness in any way. That's some of the ways the world sees what a man's supposed to be. You don't give into women or feminine thoughts. You're just...especially today, being a player makes you a man. No, that makes you a boy. The spiritual side, and I'm not just talking religiously, but being a man is being a good son, being a good father, being a good husband. When I say being "good," being in touch with your feminine side. I'm very in touch with my feminine side. I cook, sew, iron. You shouldn't let what the world thinks stop

you from being...writing poetry, writing love songs. Don't let the world stop you from being who you want to be as a man.

Both Cameron and Hank acknowledge the social expectation than men hide emotion, but Hank more adamantly rejects this social rule. While these six qualities compose the respondents' view of hegemonic masculinity, each group offered a few additional, class-specific traits as well. The upper-middle class men introduced leadership, honesty, respect, and perseverance as important masculine attributes. Working class respondents added having a good work ethic and not being childish to their response of what constitutes "being a man."

Definitions of masculinity also arise in the respondents' choices of heroes or role models. The individuals and traits that they admire provided evidence of the attributes of masculinity to which the respondents aspired. Of the 64 men who identified particular role models, 63% listed their fathers or another close male relative (grandfather, stepfather, uncle). A small portion referenced political figures, like George Bush, and four men included John Wayne as a heroic figure. Also, although the question asked respondents to identify "role models, heroes, and heroines," only 17% included a female in their response, and typically the female was their mother. Analysis of the admired traits associated with the figures revealed that men admired the same traits in the women they listed as in the male role models. The most typically respected traits of the role models included having a strong work ethic or providing for the family, overcoming adversity or standing up for one's beliefs in the face of opposition, and raising the respondent well. Other traits mentioned included generosity, helping others, intelligence, honesty, and compassion. No class differences were evident in either the role models or

the admired traits presented by the respondents. In sum, most of the traits mentioned mirrored the main attributes included in “being a man” as discussed a moment ago.

The short questionnaire presented at the end of the interviews offered a quantitative look at masculinity. The questions tap seven dimensions of masculinity: financial success, stoicism, achievement, athleticism, autonomy, aggressiveness, and sexual prowess. As is apparent in the following table, only two marginal differences emerged from the quantitative data.

Table 5.1: Comparison of Means for Masculinity Scale

	UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS MEN		WORKING CLASS MEN		LEVEL
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	<i>p</i>
Stoicism Subscale	2.10	.403	2.01	.383	.325
Athletic Subscale	2.34	.603	2.18	.526	.203
Sexuality Subscale	1.95	.519	2.14	.407	.070
Autonomy Subscale	2.18	.387	2.14	.361	.656
Aggression Subscale	1.85	.528	2.05	.500	.080
Provider Subscale	2.21	.449	2.23	.401	.861
Achievement Subscale	2.72	.372	2.62	.372	.233
Overall Masculinity	2.17	.283	2.17	.231	.930

(1=Low Perception of Hegemonic Masculinity to 4 = High Perception of Hegemonic Masculinity)

Means for each group were significantly different at the $p < .10$ level for both the sexuality and aggression subscales, indicating that the working class men were more likely to endorse traditional beliefs about sex and aggression. While only marginally

significant, these results should be examined in future work with larger, representative samples to verify these differences. The overall masculinity scores were identical for both groups of men, and there were no significant differences for any of the other subscales. Three of the items on the scale had more than five percent missing data, possibly suggesting that these were the most obscure or difficult questions for respondents to address. Six men (7.5%) did not respond to the item, “Expressing emotion is a sign of strength in a man.” Seven men (8.8%) avoided replying to the statement, “Spending time with others at home should be more important than working overtime for more money.” Finally, eight men (10%) skipped or did not know how to reply to the item, “Other than having sex with men, homosexual men can be just like other men.”

Based on the scale, the men have an overall view of masculinity that only minimally matches hegemonic stereotypes. In other words, it seems that the other attributes found in the qualitative responses held more meaning to definitions of masculinity for the respondents. Inconsistent findings between the quantitative and qualitative indicators of stoicism were discussed in chapter four regarding stoicism; here, I simply reiterate the need for further qualitative research to capture terminology and nuances of men’s emotion culture from their perspectives in order to create more meaningful questions for broader survey research.

...Not Like a Woman: Gender Differences

Another way of understanding how men view masculinity is to consider how they compare themselves to women, or to what men are "not." Recall that the purpose of this study is not to provide a comparison of men's and women's emotions, and no questions

directly comparing men's and women's emotions were raised by the interviewers.

Nevertheless, a host of men drew comparisons with women in explaining their perceptions of emotional expression. Most obviously, when women were mentioned in the interviews, the respondents did so as a means of contrast; thus, sex differences were mentioned more frequently than were sex similarities, but a handful of men did explicitly note that there were no gender differences in certain areas. Over one-quarter of the sample identified the most commonly occurring gender norm in the data: society expects women to show more emotion than men. For instance, Micah (Hospital Supply Technician, age 37) described limited crying in public settings:

It's like in a movie theater, I remember when that movie "Ghost" came out. You sitting in the theater and look around and you see all these guys just...they're rubbing their lips and they're looking around and girls are bawling. But guys, you can tell it's affecting them emotionally, but they're not expressing it outwardly like the women. They're holding all that in.

Given the cultural belief that women are expected to be more emotional, then, it is not surprising that a number of respondents supplied "gendered" labels for expressions of fear or tears. Kenny (Engineer, age 30) admitted this:

You should be not scared of animals, critters, spiders, snakes...but sometimes...I mean, sometimes people have fear of heights and people think that men are "wusses" or "girls" if they can't climb a ladder. But some people just have that phobia that bad that they cannot do it. So that's a dependency on society that most people do not face their fears, and they don't show it because they don't want society to say, "Well, I'm a man but I'm scared of heights, and if I do that, then everybody's going to think I'm a girl."

Earlier we heard from Hank, a very large, intimidating man. He added this about crying:

I'll watch Regis and cry. I'm like that. I've been accused of being a girly man. There again, can you kick my ass?

Another frequently mentioned gender belief suggests that men and women have a different "emotionality" or approach to emotions. Some men explained that different sex roles result in differences in emotionality; as "nurturers" women are expected to be caring and effusive, while men are to be strong "protectors" of the family. Harry (Maintenance Technician, age 45) had this to say:

Harry: I think it depends on how you're raised, how you're brought up. My opinion, I think a man should shoulder the load of the work. The man should be the supporter...as far as money, work, stuff like that. I know it don't always work like this. Sometimes it don't let it happen this way. But a man's supposed to do that, and a woman is more emotional. A man is logical with his thinking. A woman is emotional. A woman is there for the caring. A woman has-when you was a little girl when you got sick, did you go to your mama or your daddy?

Researcher: Probably my mama.

Harry: Exactly. Cause the woman...it's just built in. They just got that caring thing about 'em. Where a man has the fixing thing about him. If a man can put his hand on it, you know, he can fix it. But now, don't ask him to fix something emotional. He can give you some words of wisdom, but he's not going to give it to you just like that. He's gonna have to think about it for a while and come back to you later. Whereas a woman, it's just automatic...you know, "Oh, baby, come here, let me kiss it..." Emotions are something a man really has to think about. It's harder for a man.

Also evident in Harry's comment, some men made the distinction that women are more emotional while men are expected to be logical. Noah (Business Analyst, age 28) drew on a movie to illustrate this point:

To me it's very black and white. It's very logic-based. I always laugh because Jack Nicholson in "As Good As It Gets" is an author and the woman stops him at his editor's office. She's like, "You're such a great author. How do you write women so well?" He says, "I think of a man, and I take away logic and accountability." That's kind of how I think. You know, training in my first job out of college, they were real good with trying to teach employees how to deal with success. One of the examples was that guys are goal oriented, and women are more team oriented, and the means is much more important to them. Guys

just want to get the job done and they don't care how it has to go, if anybody gets their feelings hurt, whatever. Women are much more making sure that everybody feels good about everything on the way to accomplishing the goal.

Despite these class similarities in gendered norms about emotion, some class-specific gender beliefs also emerged. Working class respondents often added the belief that men should never hit women, a statement that was never part of the upper-middle class discussions about fighting. The upper-middle class men, rather, introduced the gender norm that it is more acceptable for men to share emotions with women than to do so with other men. Upper-middle class respondents also tied feminization and changing sex roles to a "crisis of masculinity." This notion of a crisis will be considered further in the second half of the chapter. First, however, a methodological word about gender and reactivity is important to address.

Opening up to Women and Men: Gender Reactivity

As noted in the methodology chapter, half of the working class interviews and half of the upper-middle class interviews were conducted by a male research assistant in order to assess any reactivity problems or gendered patterns in the data. Essentially, to what extent does the sex of the researcher influence the men's responses about emotion? Given the normative expectations and beliefs about emotion and gender that I have just discussed, it is reasonable to examine whether these social expectations are suspended in the research setting or if the power of such norms shapes the men's answers regardless. To begin, the male research assistant's respondents were about seven years younger on average, a demographic which may influence the data as we will see. Beyond this

distinction, however, the overwhelming majority of coded excerpts showed no differences either in frequency or content based on the interviewer's sex.

There were no gendered discrepancies with regard to references about fighting or responses about love and affection. A few potentially noteworthy differences, however, did arise, and these cumulatively point to one major theme about stoicism. The male research assistant's sample supplied responses that were more favorable to showing emotion for three of the findings regardless of class: crying is not a sign of weakness; expressing anger is important; and, showing fear is human and can be a positive thing. Conversely, my sample gave much more stoic responses regardless of class in seven areas: men withdraw when sad, do not brag, do not show pride, do not talk about emotions, view crying as weakness, maintain that being a man includes being stoic, and believe that controlling emotion is important. Although my interviewees did admit to crying more often as a way of dealing with sadness, the cumulative pattern in the data suggests that the men in my sample appeared more stoic in reported behavior and ideology. Obviously, this finding could simply be a sampling artifact. But more likely it reflects the interactive situation and raises our awareness that norms do not operate individually or in vacuums. Conflicting norms create the need for people to prioritize or create "normative hierarchies" that then influence their responses. In this case, the norm that men should show less emotion than women apparently trumps the norm men should show their emotions to women. In light of the finding that the men gave more stoic responses to some questions with me than with a male assistant, then, it may be that the broader social norm overrides the belief that women want men to express more emotion.

A handful of other minor differences based on the sex of the researcher did materialize. Men in my sample more often attributed grieving over death to be the primary source of sadness. In contrast, the male interviewer's sample attributed grieving over divorce as the primary source of sadness. They also emphasized the necessity to resolve anger as more important than norms governing duration or time limits for anger expression, and they more frequently included being responsible as a primary attribute of masculinity or "being a man."

In sum, the analysis of gender reactivity in the data hints at the possibility that men may give more emotional responses to a male researcher and more stoic responses to a female, but this finding must also be tempered by the fact that most other comparisons of ideological beliefs showed no differences by interviewer sex. Indeed, several coded excerpts implied that my sex did not hinder men's expression of emotion. For example, there were no sex-based differences in stoicism codes for hiding fear, hiding anger, or hiding other emotions; so, when explicitly asked about hiding emotions, the men in both samples responded similarly. Moreover, respondents openly cried only in front of the female researcher during the course of the interviews. If interviewees were truly less comfortable with expressing emotion to a female interviewer, then we would expect them to have cried in the presence of the male assistant, not me. In short, I found no consistent evidence of gender reactivity in the data, with the exception of some sex-based differences for some codes about stoicism. What, then, could account for the somewhat more stoic "female researcher" sub-sample, or explain the contradicting norms and beliefs about gender and emotion culture more broadly? I suggest that the respondents' notion of a "crisis of masculinity" speaks to an uncertainty about how gender should

affect men's discussion of emotion. Furthermore, the age difference between the two sub-samples may also account for greater endorsement of stoic beliefs in my findings. We can now concentrate on these issues of maturational, generational, and social change.

Dirty Old Men and Young Punks: The Question of Age

A common theme that respondents introduced during the interviews centered on the issue of aging. For instance, some men described themselves as very different emotionally when they were younger, or others suggested they had “mellowed out” with age. Roughly 28% of the sample described some type of maturational change in general or regarding specific emotions. Due to the prevalence of this theme, I coded age statements and beliefs in the data to determine what influences maturation has on men’s emotion culture.

The respondents of both classes consistently referred to aging as a source of “softening” or calming down from youth. However, juxtaposed with this belief is the norm that older men are expected to show more affection, crying, and fear. In contrast, youth is a time of showing anger and aggression, actions that are sometimes even linked to masculinity or being “macho.” Mark’s (Production Line Technician, age 52) comments clearly illustrated this transition away from demonstrating anger and towards controlling it instead:

I just grew up. I realized that all that anger of breaking and hollering, didn't accomplish anything. It might have vented me and made me feel better at the moment, but later on I was sorry I'd done half of what I'd done.

Mark went on to add his view about fighting as well:

Like I said, since I decided things had to be done in an adult way...20 years ago,

when I quit drinking, I just started changing. There's really no way to explain it. It's just every individual male has to make that decision. He can either follow the stereotype that I'm gonna be the biggest the baddest, or I'm gonna be human. Being human is the easiest way. You don't have to go out there...every time you pass somebody...puff your chest out, draw your stomach in, and be uncomfortable. My stomach's done got way too big to try to keep pulled in!

Mark's comments also point to one of the explanations men offered for why this calming down occurs with age: drinking is associated with youth. Other explanations for diminishing anger and aggression included becoming physically weaker, learning to control one's temper over time, and realizing that problems are not resolved through fighting and that violence can lead to worse problems. Implicit in these explanations is the recognition that the aggression of youth that served as an outlet is no longer an option for dealing with anger as the respondent matured, requiring him to find other means of resolving situations or expressing anger.

Counterbalancing less anger and aggression is a shift toward showing more emotion in general, especially the emotions of love, sadness, and fear. The subsequent excerpts from Chuck, a retired textile worker (age 70), illustrated this trend:

I don't know just...if you're an older man, like in my case, I can hug a younger person, and nothing's thought about it. But if a younger person would have showed the same thing, do the same thing, like hug or do things, it would be misconceived. Older men can express it a lot better than a younger man.

When asked if he cried over his mother's death, Chuck responded this way:

I'm sure I did. [tears up] And I get weepy, teary-eyed thinking about it. I don't have that problem [of not expressing sadness]. I do that frequently. I can listen to a sad song. I read email and sometimes I see something that's emotional. TV...sometimes even a commercial can speak to you....I tried to hide it more when I was younger, trying to preserve that macho image I think. But now I'm older and I don't have to worry too much, 'cause as you get older, you get weepy anyway. Things will make you sad emotionally, I reckon. You look back and you

see things. I guess you're relating to things that might've been, could've been, would've been.

Chuck also recalls becoming more apprehensive with age:

I know my limitations, so I try not to put myself in position where I'm gonna be afraid. There are things you don't do because I guess you're afraid you'll fail. A lot of people just don't take chances. I was never one to take chances. I take that back. When I was a boy, we used to do some crazy things. They were boy things. Nowadays, I wouldn't do them. I'm not gonna do any rock climbing. There's some things I won't do because of the fear of getting hurt. I think that's just good sense.

Finally, Chuck's comments about anger highlighted that even though he is apt to show more love, grief, and worry as an older man, he tends to show less anger:

I'm not as apt to get angry and want to fight over things. I wouldn't want to go to war over things that aren't important. I have more sensitivity about things...as far as the way other people feel, the way I feel.

When asked to explain why age brought about more emotional expression, the respondents gave a variety of answers that basically revolved around four key reasons. Some men explained that younger men seek to gain control over others while older men seek self-control or are expected to have more control. Increased thoughts about mortality and role changes associated with becoming a grandfather were two additional reasons respondents offered to account for increased emotional expression. Others rationalized that being old is not about being macho, that expectations of what it is to "be a man" change with age.

Certainly, age is a central measure that should be at the heart of future studies. Analysis of the quantitative masculinity scale revealed no significant relationships between age and any of the masculinity indicators or subscales. Nevertheless, the

comments raised in the interviews signal the need to further tap this theme as it relates to men's emotion.

The Good Old Days? : The Question of Generational Change

Like maturational changes, arguments about a generational shift in masculinity and emotions abound. Thirty-eight percent of the sample initiated discussions about changes in men's emotion culture by comparing today's men to the WWII generation. No interviewer prompt motivated the responses about a generational shift. So, it is significant that over a third of the sample raised this idea during various points throughout the interview. For instance, some respondents launched into the generational issue in response to being asked about crying or showing affection, while others raised the issue in reference to showing emotion in general. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the upper-middle class respondents emphasized generational arguments at twice the rate as they mentioned maturational change; on the other hand, the working class respondents made roughly the same number of points about both types of change. The upper-middle class men also raised the issue of generational shift twice as often as did the working class men. Analysis of a possible interaction effect between the age of respondent and the type of change mentioned yielded no significant differences. Thus, it appears that all age ranges were making both types of arguments, so that the respondents' class difference in views is not simply an artifact of a slightly older upper-middle class sample.

Respondents described a generational change in which society is now more accepting of men showing emotion than in the past. Max (Manufacturing Coordinator, age 48) defined this generational shift:

I think we've had a change in society, so to speak. We've gone from the...typically you look back. My dad was in WWII and grew up in, I guess you'd say, the "John Wayne Generation," where everybody's supposed to be tough, macho man, not let your emotions show. I think we've kind of crossed a line a little bit where it's okay for guys to show their emotions.

Most respondents noted this generational shift toward expressing more emotion, but some men qualified the trend with other beliefs. Some suggested that although men can show more emotion today, they are still expected to show less emotion than are women. Others explicitly stated that showing emotion may be more customary today, but that it is perceived as a sign of weakness regardless. Still others noted that the trend may not be national but rather regional, such that showing emotion in the Midwest is less tolerable.

Beyond the trend that today's men are expected to show more emotion in general, some respondents focused on changes in showing specific emotions. A handful described more open expression of fear. For example, they expressed having more fear regarding children's safety by not permitting them to play outside alone or by giving them cell phones to check in, compared to members of prior generations who would let children play alone all day. But more men emphasized changes in showing sadness, such that crying is more acceptable today. A number of respondents noted that they had never seen their own fathers cry. Others proposed that we see more men crying on television and in the news today. Jerome (Physician, age 52) explained it this way:

I think there's a lot more acceptance of men crying. You see it more and more...in movies, at football games, soldiers in Iraq. I think it's a lot more acceptable than it used to be.

While most of the comments about generational change were certain about the direction of such change, a few upper-middle class men were more ambivalent about the current social expectations regarding men and emotional expression. In fact, substantial comments about a “crisis of masculinity” arose in discussing generational change. It is to this notion of a “crisis” that I now turn my attention.

Uh-Oh, John Wayne Meets Phil Donahue

Some respondents ventured explanations for the generational transition. In doing so, a small group of upper-middle class men also described the transition as more of a “crisis” or an ambiguous time for men. Respondents identified feminization or the feminist movement as one cause of increased emotionality among men who are now expected to be more feminine. Charlie (Computer Programmer, age 37) explained:

You’ve got this thing going on in the American culture where feminine qualities—and this is less true in the South, but the South is a bastion of traditional masculinity—especially on the West Coast, where feminine qualities, where men are told you need to be more feminine, meaning that you need to embody the qualities that were traditionally associated to females.

Others spoke in terms of changing “gender roles,” whereby women now exhibit more aggression or authority in the workplace while still expecting men to be more sensitive at home. One respondent, for example, explained that the economy now often requires both spouses to work so that men can no longer fill the “provider role,” thereby hindering women from focusing on the role of “nurturer” in the home. Yet another explanation for increased emotionality among men included the televising of the Vietnam War. This respondent suggested that compared to WWII depictions, visual displays of men weeping

and the horrors of death in Vietnam made open expressions of grief and anger more acceptable. Finally, several men pointed to a lack of male role models as another explanation for increased emotionality in men. For instance, Patrick (a retired state government employee, age 57) pointed to a lack of male role models as a result of single parent child rearing:

I think there are more men raised in single gender households, raised by women alone. There isn't a father there to say, "Come on, son, suck it up. Stop crying. You're a boy. Or stop crying...be a man." That sort of thing...like we heard in basic training all the time, "Come on, son! Act like you got a pair!" You know, that kind of...I think men growing up when there's just a woman present, there's that lack of a male image there. What kind of male image is there is this guy that took off from the family for some reason. They're raised more by women, alone, you know.

In sum, feminization, changing gender roles, media changes, and a lack of male role models were explanations men offered for the generational shift towards increased emotional expression among men. Patrick's comment above also alluded to the "crisis," or role ambiguity mentioned by several respondents.

The crisis that the men identified is one in which social expectations governing masculinity and emotion culture are in flux. Some men perceive society as *changing*, not as *changed*, such that they emphasized the uncertainty involved in being a man today, in part due to a lack of role models. Lewis (Business Consultant, age 65) defined the crisis this way:

We're in a transition. I think...speaking for my generation...my generation, I would say, is not expected to show their emotions. My observations are and my strong feelings are that two generations below me, i.e., the 18 to 30 year olds are in an emotional crisis. Because the role models that we present to them are not serving them well in the environment, the gender environment, that they find themselves in....

Lewis continued:

If you're not sure what your role is and you're not sure where you're going, and you're not sure how you're going to get there, and you're not sure what emotional baggage or luggage you carry with you, that's pretty disturbing. It's very unsettling. A man starts questioning... What am I? Where am I going? Why am I doing this? What difference does it make? Whereas, if you say, "Well, my model is there. If I do this, this, and this, then I have a better chance of going here."

A moment ago, we also read Charlie's comment about feminization. His statement went on to suggest the following:

There is a backlash against that scene in stuff like Robert Bly and Iron John and in movies like "Fight Club," where men are saying, "No, I don't want to be like Phil Donahue. I want to try and find some other model where, okay, there's some emotionality in my life, but there's also some ruggedness, hairy-ness, some guy-ness." Men are searching for that I think.

Coupled with role ambiguity, men also face conflicting role expectations from the women in their lives. As mentioned earlier, women expect men to show emotion and today's society expects men to show emotion with women. However, other men—particularly men of earlier generations—do not hold those same expectations of men. This conflict in expectations confuses men in the workplace, for example, where they are often trying to satisfy bosses and coworkers who are of both sexes and different generations. Charlie put it this way:

I think the expectation still exists, and I think that's part of the crisis that the young people have to deal with. The expectation is...the expectation of the older [men] looking to the younger is "be in control." The expectation of the younger looking sideward at the other gender is saying, "They ain't letting me be in control." I'm in crisis. I'm expected to do this...circumstances won't allow me to do that...what do I do? [laughs] So I cry! [laughs sarcastically]

In short, role ambiguity and role conflict accounted for a sense of “crisis” among several of the respondents who were trying to make sense of social change in men’s emotion culture. I discuss the theoretical implications of this crisis for studies of emotion culture in the final chapter.

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, over half of the respondents identified some type of maturational and/or generational shift in masculinity and emotion culture. In earlier chapters, without reference to any perceived change in society, other men simply affirmed that men are emotionally unguarded and socially expected to communicate their feelings. Still others ascribed to a more stoic ideology that men are not expected to show emotions. One trend emerged in the data that held across the board, however. Men are not supposed to go “overboard” in showing or talking about emotion. Thus, even in an era of “crisis,” the respondents seemed to agree that expressing emotion is not something that should be done to great excess. Robert’s (Attorney, age 35) thoughts indicated the importance of finding balance and avoiding extreme emotionalism in men. His comment began with an open expectation that men should express emotion:

I think emotion is God-given, and it is productive. It provides a lot of feedback to the individual. It provides opportunities for collection and relation with people around him, and so it is something that joins people together and also serves as a healthy indicator for them.

Shortly thereafter, he went on to make this much more stoic comment:

Men are by nature, in general, and there are always exceptions, but I think some of these roles include the warrior role, the provider roles, the leader roles. As you take away...or as you require the display of greater and greater emotion in a male, you reduce the effectiveness and the willingness to take on certain roles, such as warrior. You know, you can’t have a guy, a soldier, who weeps when someone else is injured. A soldier has got to be a soldier. If we deprive him of the ability to shield that emotion from himself, if we say culturally we will not allow you, and culturally we will not equip you, to compartmentalize and separate the emotion

from the action that you have to follow, how can they be an effective soldier? So, that has in smaller ways and in lesser extremes, has application in a lot of other areas in day to day life, family, government, and other areas of leadership.

Finally, however, he added this:

I think there's an identity crisis going on. The feminist movement and the sexual revolution have confused what it means to be a man. Throw into that the homosexual movement and it really gets confused. So there is a... what I hope we won't have is a backlash response to that feminization where men go back to harshness, stoic, those kind of things. I hope there will be a recognition that there's balance.

In conclusion, maturational and generational differences emerged from the data as central themes for the men. Aging diminishes aggressive displays of anger but encourages expressions of love, fear, and sadness. A generational shift toward men being allowed or expected to show more emotion is also evident, or at least such a movement is in the process of occurring. What are the implications of these changes and where does research on men's emotion culture go from here?

CHAPTER VI

TO CRY OR NOT TO CRY: CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

While further exploration of emotion culture is in order, this study has attempted to provide a foundation and a springboard for future research in the sociology of emotions. We have seen that men's emotion culture consists of a complex web of norms and beliefs. Many of these ideas reveal a dominant, common emotion culture for men, while others suggest more class-specific, secondary ideologies that influence their lives (see Appendix D-G for detailed outlines). Overall, men believe they are expected to limit their displays of emotion and should be selective about which emotions they show, although some respondents did raise the possibility of a generational shift toward less stoicism. Because the ideology of stoicism was held by both groups of men, these results contradicted the compensatory masculinity model. Other findings, however, demonstrated some support for the model, such that working class men did embrace an ideology of aggression more so than did the upper-middle class men.

Questions about specific feelings rather than emotion in general uncovered a more complex cultural ideology for the two groups. Both working class and upper-middle class interviewees explained that men are expected to hide their fear to protect others, in leadership positions, and in confrontations. The working class added the belief that fears should be hidden because showing it is not masculine and is a sign of weakness; alternatively, the upper middle class emphasized that fear should be hidden because it is

contagious or causes others to feel afraid. But we also saw the belief that a little fear is a good thing as long as it does not keep one from reacting to the situation at hand. Regarding sadness, men believe in coping by withdrawing, talking to others, or even crying, but crying still makes a lot of men uncomfortable and should not be done regularly or over minor concerns. Working class men emphasized the importance of moving on from sadness, and one additional means of coping for them entailed transforming sadness into anger. Indeed, statements about anger expression were much more frequent and dramatic for the working class group. Fighting, too, was more acceptable in a variety of circumstances. In contrast, the upper middle class men viewed fighting as being out of control or as behavior expected of the uneducated and immature. They emphasized sports as a different, more socially acceptable way of expressing aggression. Both groups, though, agreed that expressions of anger should be brief, controlled, constructive, and that they should not occur in the workplace.

Norms and beliefs surrounding positive emotions also revealed a great deal of class similarity. Regarding pride and happiness, respondents of both groups upheld the importance of not bragging or showing excessive joy, especially when it comes at the expense of others or when others are hurting. The respondents also agreed that love should be expressed vocally and through expressive behaviors such as giving gifts or helping others. Displays of affection should be limited in the workplace and toward non-familial women. Also, hugging behavior, especially hugging male friends, was viewed as uncomfortable or awkward for many of the men. Other more commonly acceptable ways of showing affection with friends included high-fives, handshakes, and pats on the back.

Finally, upper middle class men added that men should not show too much affection, especially at work, and that doing so brought them discomfort.

Many of the interviewees also alluded to a social transition or crisis in what masculinity and emotion means today. The notion of a “crisis of masculinity” has been evident in the work of a number of scholars (see, for instance, Shields 2002; Stearns 1990; Coltrane 1995; Levant 1992). As established in the first chapter, these studies cite rising divorce rates, increased participation by women in the labor force, and other structural changes as sources of this crisis because these changes challenge conventional definitions of masculinity. The findings of the present study lend support to this notion of crisis. Moreover, the meaning of masculinity that emerged from the data moves us beyond standard definitions of hegemonic masculinity to include different dimensions. Recall that dominant, hegemonic masculinity typically entails seven attributes: stoicism, aggression, autonomy, achievement, sexual prowess, financial success or providing for others, and strength. However, six attributes of masculinity emerged from the data, some of which challenge the traditional definition. Recall that the men defined masculinity in terms of responsibility, protecting others, providing for their families, standing up for their beliefs and morals, offering strength, and remaining stoic. While further research will be necessary to ascertain the content and extensiveness of changes in definitions of masculinity, I draw some conclusions here about aggression and stoicism regarding how the crisis may be unfolding and how it relates to emotion culture.

The nexus of masculinity and emotions lies in the attributes of aggression and stoicism. Like Connell (1987; 1993) and others (see, for instance, Shields 2002), the current study found that some men embraced anger and aggression as an exception to the

general rule of remaining stoic, but this finding was specific to the working class men only. These findings are in line with what the compensatory model would predict, at least on the surface. But in order for the working class men to truly be “compensating,” they would need to value aggression as an attribute of masculinity worthy of exaggerating. However, aggression was not identified as part of the definition of masculinity by respondents of either class. Two possible explanations for this discrepancy exist. First, as a means of compensating, men may be exaggerating other traits of masculinity that result in the *appearance* of anger and aggression. Alternatively, the compensatory model may underestimate the importance of structural position in shaping men’s identities.

Considering the first possibility, recall that respondents identified “protecting others” and “standing up for one’s beliefs” as two key attributes of being a man. It is possible that defending these values might lead one to display anger or aggression. For instance, the norm of fighting as a last resort is trumped by the norm that men should fight in defense of someone else. Consistent with the “protector” aspect of masculinity, these norms might easily coalesce into a display of aggression: we might imagine a man physically intervening to help a friend who was being bullied as such a circumstance. Rather than extolling the virtue of aggression, he would be fulfilling or even exaggerating the “protector” role of masculinity. This happens to look like a value placed on aggression instead. Thus, beyond what appears to be an endorsement of aggression, attributes such as “protecting others” may more accurately reflect how the respondents themselves define masculinity.

On the other hand, something beyond compensation may be going on. The heart of the compensatory model suggests that men aspire to some dominant image of

masculinity. This presumption of a shared definition of masculinity may be misleading. Structural factors (such as class) may produce sub-cultural differences in masculinity and anger norms. The data in my study reveal a secondary emotion culture whereby expressions of anger are far more acceptable or even expected among men in the working class. But rather than making up for some “deficiency” in masculine attributes, the working class men may simply have a sub-cultural view that makes expressing anger a normal part of their identity. As Kemper’s (1979; 1981; 1987) emphasis on structural emotions suggests, members of lower status groups experience more negative emotions than their higher status counterparts. Perhaps situational differences exist such that working class men more often find themselves in situations that warrant fighting than do members of the upper-middle class. This structurally different reality, then, necessitates more displays of aggression and results in a more acceptable cultural meaning for the behavior. In short, my study has demonstrated class differences in respondents’ beliefs, but further research that examines both the structural and cultural elements of the compensatory model will be needed to unravel the complexities of how these differences come to be.

Scholars have long treated stoicism as a standard part of what it means to be a man, even though they also point out that displays of anger and aggression are frequently the exception to suppressing emotion in general (see Connell 1987; Jansz in Fischer 2000; Snell 1986; Stearns 1990; Shields 2002). Similarly, the respondents of both classes in this study suggested that stoicism is still a key part of masculinity. The majority of the respondents endorsed an ideology that upheld stoicism. However, it is also important to recognize that only a quarter of the sample held *extreme* views about stoicism in either

direction. Other scholars have proposed that upper class men are more likely to cry—thus behave less stoically—because they have already established their identities through financial success and prestige (Ross and Mirowsky 1984 ; Messner 1993). However, the findings of the current study largely dispute this claim. First, there were no class distinctions in the norms and beliefs that govern crying. Secondly, it was the working class respondents who explicitly distanced themselves or their own behaviors from the perceived norms that men should not cry or the belief that crying is a form of weakness. In sum, indicators of stoicism yielded little, if any, evidence of a class difference among the men.

But an ideology that encompasses stoicism was not embraced by all of the respondents. Indeed, those who focused on the “crisis of masculinity,” introduced norms and beliefs that made *showing* emotion a more natural and expected part of masculinity today. Perhaps, then, what the crisis represents is not an abrupt change in norms about showing emotion, but rather a weakening from that of “taboo” or social “*moré*” to that of “norm.” Buck, a retired textile mill worker (age 70), made a comment regarding social change in masculinity that heralds this shift:

I think that’s changing. I hear more people talk about it. With so much information available, things now that were *taboo* when I was growing up are acceptable now. For instance, boys, male children, playing with dolls...those things weren’t done. You had a tractor, a ball or something. [emphasis added]

The shift is not that boys are now expected *to* play with dolls, or that they *should* play with dolls, but rather that they *can* play with dolls without receiving severe negative sanctions. Likewise, it is not so much that men were supposed to be stoic in generations past but are now expected not to be stoic; instead, it is that showing emotion today is not negatively sanctioned as much as it has been in previous eras. Thus, the “crisis” does not

reflect an abrupt switch in norms so much as it represents a weakening of the social constraints governing stoicism. It appears, then, that stoicism is still an attribute of masculinity but one whose importance may be diminishing.

Alternatively, something other than stoicism may better capture the relationship between emotions and masculinity. In chapter four, I broached the possibility that maintaining control is more valuable to men's identity than is stoicism. Shields (2002) also appraises the worth of control in her conceptualization of "manly emotion." While often conflated with stoicism, control is really a much broader concept. It encompasses restraining emotion, but it also connotes exercising power and influence over the actions of others. As such, fighting might be seen as a form of control over a situation that also carries a very overt form of emotional expression. Understanding control as more central to masculinity than stoicism might allow us to overcome the inherent contradiction of the compensatory masculinity model, by keeping the attributes from being mutually exclusive of one another. In other words, one cannot be both stoic and aggressive but one can be aggressive and in *control*. Thus, in addition to looking at how structure and culture intersect to inform the compensatory model, future research is necessary to directly address the contradiction between exaggerations of aggression and stoicism that are currently part of the model.

Limitations of the Study

While this study contributes to our understanding of the relationship between class, masculinity, and emotional control, it is not without its limitations. Obviously, the findings are based on a non-representative sample of Southern, white, heterosexual,

married men. But in-depth interviewing was indispensable for beginning to establish a catalogue of men's emotion culture in their own terms. Subsequent studies can harvest the information here to create studies with different methodologies that permit more generalizable results. For instance, some research finds more motivation for aggression or violence in the South resulting from a frontier heritage that engaged in slavery and that valued self-protection (see Cohen 1996).

Next, the study faced the possibility of reactivity as a result of my sex as a female researcher studying men's emotion. However, this limitation was circumvented by including a male research assistant who conducted half of the interviews. The comparison of our data in chapter five revealed that gender reactivity was minimal at most, thereby transforming this expected limitation into an asset for understanding norms about emotions. It seems that the social role of "researcher" largely trumps that of "female" in men's discussion of their emotions regardless of the respondents' socioeconomic status.

Finally, this study relies on cross-sectional data, which restricted more sophisticated analysis of the maturational and generational trends that many of the respondents mentioned. The age factor and maturational trends plead for a deeper analysis of the norms, beliefs, and values that vary by age cohort or perhaps historical period. Several other avenues for potential research opportunities are discussed in the following section.

Suggestions for Further Research

The purpose of this study was to explore how emotion culture connects to class position and masculinity, largely because much of the existing research focuses on emotion differences *between* men and women. However, an analogous study on women's emotion culture and femininity is also necessary to catalogue the ideologies and vocabularies of emotion and other nuances particular to women of different class positions. Such research might also contribute to debunking the cultural myth that depicts women as irrational, "emotional" creatures, just as my study helps us understand how men employ emotional ideologies in addition to reason and logic in their daily interactions.

Future research that pays sharper attention to the importance of context is also imperative. Hochschild (1983) defines emotion norms as rules that govern feelings and their display in specific situations. Thus, in examining women's or men's emotion culture, we cannot lose sight of the fact that many norms are context-specific. For example, some respondents spoke of "emotional demands" or expectations associated with their particular occupations and a number of norms and beliefs particular to the work setting were described. The norm that anger should not be shown in the workplace—and its frequent violation by many working class respondents—offers just one avenue for exploration. What circumstances lead employees to break this norm? What sanctions are in place to maintain "good" behavior? How does management deal with displays of anger? How do employees deal with anger in the workplace when it is not expressed there? For instance, Sloan (2004) explores how occupational status influences experiences and expressions of anger in the workplace. She concludes that

higher status workers tended to confront the target of their anger, unlike other employees who were more likely to discuss their anger with someone other than the target. Future research on emotion culture in the workplace could also explore the norm that men should limit affection with females while on the job. Concerns about misunderstandings and sexual harassment colored much of the discussion of workplace behavior by the respondents of my study. How do men express affection with coworkers? Does this limited affection norm extend from females to their male colleagues? What are the ramifications for occupational mobility and success that result from restrictions on displays of love and affection between male and female coworkers?

Moreover, chapter five explained that being a good “provider” was considered an essential part of masculine identity. This attribute begs for further research in the area of emotion culture and work as well. As outlined in the first chapter, McMahon (1999) and other scholars (see, for instance, Shields 2002) describe the image of the “new father” of the 1990s as able to be emotionally nurturing at home because he can simultaneously preserve other, more traditional aspects of masculinity in the workplace. The potential dichotomy of showing emotion in private but not in the workplace is one that was alluded to at various points in my work as well (for instance, references to the norms that men should not show affection at work, the belief that showing emotion is “unprofessional,” etc.). Thus, additional research that focuses on emotion norms of the home versus the workplace is essential to evaluate the notion of the “new father.”

Besides addressing the workplace setting, other studies are necessary to build on our understanding of the importance of context as it relates to emotion culture. Different types of fears, ranging from minor concerns like a fear of spiders to weightier matters

like fear of mortality or failure, present an area in need of clarification. Fear appears to be too broad a term to extract the nuances of this emotion. Future studies about the culture of fear might consider concepts such as phobias or terrors as distinct from ideas such as experiencing “anxiety,” feeling “nervous,” or being “worried.” It may be that some of these terms carry connotations that are more “gendered” than others; perhaps it is acceptable for men to say they feel “concern” but not “fear,” for instance. Another approach might include supplying the participants with descriptions of various fearful situations (facing a chronic illness, natural disaster, unknown outcome or risk, etc.) and then asking the participants to provide the terms that would best describe their feelings. Providing a context for the participant would help to unpack the different types of fears and their associated norms.

Similarly, the emotion of love carried a variety of connotations for the respondents, making norms difficult to ascertain without more contextual specifications. For some, love entailed a sexual or romantic component; others conflated it with camaraderie or thoughtfulness; still others distinguished it from friendship or feelings of gratitude. Future studies should specify the target of affection in order to bypass confusion about the various dimensions of love described by men. The contextual element of “who” is involved in the situation affects which norms are evoked and the exact emotion being described. It is important to note that men found it easier to talk specifically about “friendship” than about love in general. Their responses to questions about friends came much more effortlessly and comfortably, perhaps because the target of the emotion was supplied for them from the outset. Once again, we are reminded of the importance of context for understanding how norms and beliefs govern our interactions.

Implications of Emotion Culture Studies

I am optimistic that the burgeoning of emotions research will encourage scholars in other domains of sociology to recognize the important and often underrated ways that emotions influence social interaction. Below I highlight just a few areas that would benefit from further research in emotion culture.

In the area of mental health, studies about depression logically intersect with research in emotion culture. For instance, Thoits (2000) emphasizes the importance of social definitions of emotion in determining what constitutes the pathological. In her analysis of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders - IV, she explains that emotion norm violations are a key diagnostic criteria for many psychological disorders. Emslie et al. (2006) examine how hegemonic masculinity (characterized by emotional control and strength) inhibits some men from seeking help with depression, which is often associated with expressing emotional vulnerability. The authors found that in order to construct a positive sense of self, men who sought emotional help incorporated other values associated with hegemonic masculinity into their narratives. They emphasized ways in which they maintained control, strength, and responsibility. Another study by Simon (2002) found that contemporary men and women experience similar emotional benefits and costs related to marital status. In response to marital problems, women more often responded with depression, while men externalized their emotional response through drinking. She concluded that further research in the domain of emotion culture could shed light on understanding why and how some emotional

problems become sex-specific in their manifestations, perhaps as part of socialization processes.

An enhanced knowledge of emotion culture would also contribute to our understanding of social problems associated with violence. For example, in a study on violent offenders, Athens (2005) identifies three sub-types of violent behaviors ranging from “engagements” to “skirmishes” to “tiffs”; this finding is consistent with the working class respondents in my study who similarly distinguished fighting from terms like “wrestling matches” and “scuffs.” He concludes that in order for any theory to provide a complete explanation of violent crime, it must also account for these lesser types of violence identified in his study. Additional work regarding cultural definitions and the meaning of aggression might inform studies similar to that of Athens. A second possibility for research on violence and emotions rests in the growing trend towards video gaming. Jansz (2005) argues that violent video games offer an acceptable context for emotional expression among adolescents. He notes that game players are free to select emotions that both reinforce masculine identity (such as anger) and those that challenge traditional masculinity (such as fear) as part of the video game. Such research offers interesting methodological opportunities for experiments in emotion culture and would itself benefit from further data about the norms and beliefs that govern men’s emotions. Finally, much research has also been done on violence in the home or domestic abuse. As noted in chapter four, several respondents introduced the norm that women should never be targets of physical aggression. Of course, the prevalence of domestic violence in our society reveals that there must be conditions under which this belief is suspended. Elucidating on the norms, beliefs, and sanctions connected to gender and violence might

illuminate studies of domestic abuse, such as that of Atkinson et al. (2005), who identified a link between income and abuse in gender-traditional households. The authors found that in households where being a “provider” was a central value or belief for the husband, domestic abuse was positively correlated with the wife’s income because the men were less able to reinforce their masculine identity as “provider.” These men were more likely to use aggression to compensate for their lack of economic providership. These authors conclude their research with a call for a better understanding of the cultural forces governing marriage and gender relationships; they state, “We are more likely to understand our most intimate patterns of behavior when our research and theory considers our beliefs about the content of these socially constructed selves,” (1147).

Certainly a host of other domains in sociology could interconnect with emotions research. Further investigations of emotion culture might inform studies in education, marriage and the family, law, and work and occupations. For instance, Hatcher (2003) has begun to explore the importance of emotions in the workplace in her analysis of changing management practices, and Sloan (2004) considers how occupational status impacts expressions of anger in the workplace. Sargent (2000) examines how male elementary teachers balance masculinity with the gendered nature of early childhood education that encourages physical affection and nurturing. Emotional outbursts—or excessive restraint—in the courtroom would provide yet another arena for investigation (see Pierce 1995). In conclusion, while the current study adds to the groundwork of emotion culture research, much more remains to be done in order to appreciate how emotions shape and are shaped by the society around us.

Appendix A: Respondent Age, Occupation, and Sex of Interviewer

RESPONDENT	AGE	OCCUPATION	INTERVIEWER SEX
Charlie	37	Computer Programmer	F
Lawton	33	VP of Operations	F
Brent	30	Engineer	F
Lewis	65	Business Consultant	F
Max	48	Manufacturing Coordinator	F
Unnamed	53	Accountant	F
Mike	48	Attorney	F
Peter	36	Attorney	F
Simon	62	Accountant	F
Drew	65	Director of Administration and External Affairs	F
Alan	40	Attorney	F
Unnamed	34	Attorney	F
Lawrence	52	Software Architect	F
Robert	35	Attorney	F
John	39	Technology Manager	F
Cameron	37	Attorney	F
Unnamed	41	Physician	F
Bryson	43	Physician	F
Kip	47	Attorney	F
Baxter	44	VP of Business Development Corporation	F
Joseph	27	Back-ho Operator	F
Andrew	26	Laborer	F
Unnamed	59	Maintenance	F
Unnamed	60	Utilities Worker	F
Zac	40	Toolmaker	F
Buck	70	Textile Worker (retired)	F
Jeff	48	Production Technician	F
Unnamed	46	Turbine Technician (disabled)	F
Unnamed	65	Tool and Dye Maker	F
Hank	37	Retail Worker	F
Mark	52	Production Technician	F
Chuck	30	Firefighter	F
Richard	26	Short Order Cook	F
George	34	Tile Setter	F
Jeff	61	Machine Shop Supervisord	F
Unnamed	60	Hotel Manger	F
Unnamed	39	Short Order Breakfast Cook	F
Kevin	44	Industrial Maintenance Technician	F
Harry	45	Maintenance	F
Ty	29	Brick Mason	F
Lucas	23	Night Manger of "Dollar General"	M
Mario	22	Night Shift Cook	M
Unnamed	24	Newspaper Carrier	M
Unnamed	32	Garage Manager	M
Dusty	27	Retail Worker	M
Unnamed	22	Line Cook	M
Unnamed	24	Short Order Cook	M
Billy	26	Sales Associate	M

Unnamed	20	Retail Worker	M
Larry	52	Construction Worker	M
Joe	29	Security Guard	M
Unnamed	24	Installation Technician for Alarm Store	M
Reese	38	Firefighter	M
Sam	45	Firefighter	M
Unnamed	22	Shift Manager at Fast Food Restaurant	M
Micah	37	Hospital Supply Technician	M
Unnamed	44	Mechanic	M
Albert	49	Mechanic	M
Daniel	24	HVAC Technician	M
Johnny	25	Cashier	M
Kenny	30	Engineer	M
Don	39	Real Estate Owner	M
Jason	42	Director of Information Technology	M
Jack	56	General Manager of Restaurant Chain	M
Unnamed	43	General Manager of Major Insurance Company	M
David	51	Geologist	M
Unnamed	45	Nuclear Medicine Technologist	M
Paul	44	Systems Analyst	M
Mac	72	Parole Board Administrator/Program Coordinator	M
Abe	56	Executive Director of State Agency	M
Leonard	33	Marketing Director	M
Patrick	57	State Government (retired)	M
Unnamed	30	Engineer	M
Noah	28	Business Analyst	M
Jimmy	50	Internet Technician	M
Nick	49	Public Information Director	M
Jerome	52	Department of Mental Health	M
Douglas	30	Financial Advisor	M
Edward	50	Political Consultant	M
Unnamed	63	Economist	M

Appendix B: Outline of Interview Schedule and Sample Questions / Probes

- I. Introductory Comments and Signing of Consent Form
 - II. Demographics and Transition Questions
 - III. Questions Regarding General Emotion Expression
 - IV. Questions Regarding Specific Emotions
 - A) Sadness
 - B) Anger* (see below for sample of questions and probes)
 - C) Fear
 - D) Love
 - E) Pride / Joy
 - V. Respondent-Volunteered Questions or Thoughts Not Introduced by Researcher
 - VI. Subjective Masculinity Questions
 - VII. Brief Masculinity Questionnaire
-

*ANGER:

--Can you remember a time when you got very angry at home or at work? (*Prompt/ toward a close friend? ...a relative?*) Describe the situation to me (*Probes/ Who was present? What caused anger? How frequently does this happen?*) → How did you react or resolve the anger? (*Probes/ how let others around you know you were angry, did you hide anger*)

→ Recall **other times you've been angry that you responded differently?**
Why... (*Probes/ setting? who was present? In a hurry or tired?*)

--Are there any circumstances when you have felt **angry but felt you should not show it?**

→ Recall should have felt or showed anger but did not?

--Is it **important for men to show** their anger?

--**How should they express** their anger?

--**How long** is it okay to be angry?

--How **should men resolve** that anger?

--Is **aggression or violence sometimes a necessary response to feeling angry? When?**

--**What role does fighting play for men?**

Appendix C: Operationalization of Masculinity in Quantitative Scale

Masculinity Concept Measured	Question Number	Operationalizing Question
Aggression	7*	A man doesn't have to be aggressive to get what he wants out of life.
	5	It is important that men use peaceful ways to resolve problems.
	25	Fighting is a necessary part of life for a man. →
Stoicism	2+	In order to become successful, it is important to avoid showing emotional weakness. →
	12	Men who cry in front of others are considered "weak" or "soft". →
	9	It is acceptable for a man to show fear when he is afraid.
	22	Expressing emotion is a sign of strength in a man.
	23*	A man should not show too much affection to those he loves. →
	24*	It is important for men to share their feelings with others.
	13	Achieving goals should be important to a man. →
Achievement	16	A man does not have to be "#1" to be satisfied with his life.
	20*	Men should be competitive. →
	6	Men who ask for help often feel embarrassed or ashamed. →
Autonomy	11*	A man should be independent and not get too attached to others. →
	18	It is important for a man to be able to depend on others for help and support.
	21*	It is important for a man to have sex as often as possible. →
Sexuality	14*	A man should have sexual intercourse only in emotionally committed relationships.
	8	It is important for a man that other men know he is having sex. →
	17	Other than having sex with men, homosexual males can be just like other men.
	19	Spending time with others at home should be more important to men than working overtime for more money.
Provider Role	15*	Providing for a family should be a man's main goal in life. →
	4+	A successful career means more to a man than a successful love relationship. →
	1*	The best way a man can care for his family is to get the highest paying job he can. →
Physical Strength / Athleticism	10	For a man, being strong and muscular is important. →
	3	A man should be athletic or enjoy sports. →

(Response Categories: 1=Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree, such that a higher score represents a stronger perception of hegemonic masculinity.)

* Indicates item comes directly from MMIS (Doss and Hopkins)

+ Indicates item comes directly from MRI (Snell)

→ Indicates item was reverse coded

Appendix D: Summary of Hegemonic Emotion Culture

Beliefs / Norms	
General Emotion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emotions are defined as basic feeling states, often in opposition to logic/ reason. 2. Men are not expected to show emotion, especially in the workplace. However, it is more acceptable for men to show positive emotions than to show negative ones. 3. Men are not expected to talk about emotion. 4. Showing emotion is a sign of weakness. 5. Emotions are contagious; therefore, men are expected to hide negative emotions but to express positive ones.
Sadness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Death is the most common source of sadness. Marital problems and serious illness are also acceptable sources of grief. 2. The most acceptable means of coping with sadness involves withdrawing, internalizing, or otherwise being alone. Crying and talking about sadness are also acceptable means of coping. 3. The appropriate length of time to grieve depends on how serious the sad event is and the closeness of persons involved in the event. 4. Crying makes men uncomfortable or is something men hide even if it is considered normal by larger society to do so. 5. Many men believe crying is a form of weakness. 6. Crying is unacceptable of sad movies and songs or over job related problems. 7. Crying over a death, over someone's chronic illness, or as vicarious grief for others who are suffering are acceptable times for men to cry. 8. Crying in response to happy events is less acceptable than crying over sad events for most men. 9. Men should not cry if they are in leadership positions or if they are expected to be emotionally "strong" for others. 10. Men should not cry chronically or over minor things.
Fear	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Military combat and other confrontations are acceptable events for experiencing fear. 2. Men believe talking through one's fears, facing one's fears, or avoiding the source of one's fears are socially acceptable ways of dealing with the emotion. 3. Showing some fear is okay, but allowing fear to keep one from reacting is unacceptable. 4. Having a little fear can be a good thing by providing adrenaline necessary to react. 5. Boys and men tease or censure fear in others in order to toughen up one another. 6. Bravery includes standing up for one's beliefs.
Happiness and Pride	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Success at work, children, and wives are acceptable sources for pride and joy. 2. Men are expected to tell others when they are happy or proud, but they should not boast or brag, particularly about their own personal accomplishments or actions. 3. Men should limit their expressions of joy when it comes at the expense of others or if others are hurting in some way. 4. Gloating, or excessive pride, is not acceptable and negatively sanctioned.
Love and Affection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Men should vocalize their love to others, but actions prove love beyond simply stating it. 2. Men should limit the amount of affection shown to non-familial women, especially in the workplace, in order to avoid misunderstandings. 3. Hugging is awkward for many men and is often restricted to hugging at church, hugging spouses, and hugging children. 4. Hugging, high-fives, handshakes, and pats on the back are acceptable means of showing affection to friends.

Appendix E: Summary of Secondary Emotion Cultures

	Beliefs / Norms of Upper-Middle Class Men	Beliefs / Norms of Working Class Men
General Emotions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Talking about emotions with friends is socially expected (except for sadness). 2. A generational shift toward showing more emotion is occurring among men. 	
Sadness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Talking about sadness with one's wife is more acceptable than talking about sadness with one's friends. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is important and expected that sadness diminishes over time so that men can move on to other concerns. 2. Serious job related problems, such as job loss, warrant long durations of sorrow. 3. It is more acceptable for men to express anger, so men often transform their sadness into anger. 4. Talking about sadness with friends is more acceptable than talking with one's wife.
Fear	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Men should be modest about acts of bravery and should not expect their actions to be seen as courageous. 2. Fear of failure and fear of public speaking are acceptable sources of fear. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relatively minor fears such as scary movies and roller coasters are acceptable sources of fear.
Happiness / Pride	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The achievements of one's wife and children are sources of pride and joy. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hobbies such as fixing up cars are acceptable sources of pride and joy.
Love / Affection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Love is a highly valued emotion and basic part of being human. 2. There are national and regional differences in showing love. 3. Men are taught not to show much affection. 4. Too much affection makes men uncomfortable. 5. Showing too much affection at work is unprofessional. 6. It is expected that men hug children less as they grow older, particularly if they are sons. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is acceptable to express love and affection in a variety of ways beyond kissing, hugging, and vocalizing. Teasing, buying flowers, and playing pranks on one another are acceptable means of showing love and affection to friends and spouses alike.

Appendix F: Hegemonic and Secondary Ideologies Regarding Anger and Aggression

Hegemonic Norms and Beliefs:

Anger and Aggression	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anger should only last briefly, usually less than a day, in most circumstances. However, anger should be proportional to situational severity. 2. Men should focus on resolving the source of the anger or problem rather than on the duration of their anger. 3. Anger should be expressed in a controlled manner to avoid mistakes or worse problems. 4. Simply venting anger is not acceptable because anger should be constructive or resolve the issue at hand. 5. Anger should not be displayed in the workplace. 6. Fighting should be used only as a last resort. 7. Although fighting is a last resort, men are expected to fight if they are a) defending someone, b) as part of their duty in war or occupation, and c) when principles are compromised. 8. Fighting itself does not resolve anger and no one really “wins” a fight. 9. As a child, fighting is a typical part of growing up. 10. Fighting is one way of demonstrating masculinity, but it is a socially unacceptable way to do so for the most part. 11. Sports are a means of “controlled aggression” that does not involved actual fighting. 12. Showing anger is more acceptable than showing sadness for men.
----------------------	---

Class-Specific Norms and Beliefs:

	Beliefs / Norms of Upper-Middle Class Men	Beliefs / Norms of Working Class Men
Anger / Aggression	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yelling out of anger is often perceived as overreacting. 2. Fighting is acceptable if one is defending himself. 3. Fighting represents a loss of control. 4. Fighting is an outlet for energy or pent up emotion, but it is inappropriate behavior. 5. Fights are emotional behaviors engaged in by less educated, immature, or ignorant members of society. 6. Sports are an important outlet for expressing “controlled aggression” and “competition.” 7. Acceptable ways of expressing anger include changing the tone of one’s voice, yelling, or talking out the source of the anger. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yelling is not perceived as overreacting, but hitting someone or something might be considered extreme. 2. Fighting is acceptable when defending friends, if alcohol is involved, and if one loses his temper. 3. Fights are different from “shoving matches,” “scuffs,” or other behaviors that do not resort to punches or fists. 4. Men should never hit women. 5. Fighting is often an uncontrollable reaction. 6. Acceptable ways of expressing anger include cussing, hitting, or physically leaving the situation. 7. Road rage is an acceptable form of expressing anger.

Appendix G: Hegemonic and Secondary Ideologies Regarding Stoicism

Hegemonic Norms and Beliefs:

Stoicism	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Men are expected to hide emotions in general. 2. Hiding emotions is necessary for being professional. 3. Men should hide emotions in order to shelter others from pain and suffering. 4. Hiding emotions is part of being a man. 5. Acceptable ways of hiding emotion include withdrawing from the situation or isolating oneself and making jokes or adding humor to the situation. 6. Men show love differently from women, sometimes in ways that appear stoic (giving someone space, minimizing affection to avoid misunderstandings or sexual harassment, etc.). 7. Men should hide fear when they are in leadership positions, in confrontations, or in the military setting. 8. Fear should be hidden to protect others or to help them stay calm. 9. Men value emotional strength (i.e., remaining unemotional). 10. Emotional strength is part of being a man. 11. Men value controlling emotions especially in negative situations (such as not losing one's temper). 12. Uncontrolled emotion gets in the way of reason or good judgment.
----------	--

Class-Specific Norms and Beliefs:

	Beliefs / Norms of Upper-Middle Class Men	Beliefs / Norms of Working Class Men
Stoicism	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Men in leadership positions should hide emotions. 2. Men should hide emotions from strangers because they do not care to hear or see such expressions. 3. Fear should be hidden because it is contagious. 4. Restraining emotion is not healthy for men, even if they do so. 5. Crying and fighting are emotional behaviors that must be controlled even if it is difficult to do so. 6. It is important to try to control anger even if it is difficult to do so. 7. Controlling emotions and self-control are an important part of being a man. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Showing fear is weak and not masculine. 2. Suppressing anger is not healthy for some men, even if they do so. 3. Crying and fighting are difficult emotional behaviors to control; therefore, it is understandable when men lost control in those events. 4. It is difficult to control anger.

REFERENCES

- Algoe, Sara B., Brenda N. Buswell and John D. DeLamater. 2000. "Gender and Job Status as Contextual Cues for the Interpretation of Facial Expression of Emotion." *Sex Roles* 42(3-4): 183-208.
- Athens, Lonnie. 2005. "Violent Encounters: Violent Engagements, Skirmishes, and Tiffs." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 34(6) Dec.: 631-678.
- Atkinson, Maxine P., Theodore N. Greenstein, and Molly Monahan Lang. 2005. "For Women, Breadwinning Can Be Dangerous: Gendered Resource Theory and Wife Abuse." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 67(5) Dec.: 1137-1148.
- Barbalet, J.M. 1998. *Emotion, Social Theory, & Social Structure: A Macrosociological Approach*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Bem, Sandra Lipsitz. 1987. "Probing the Promise of Androgyny," Pp. 206-225 in *The Psychology of Women: Ongoing Debates*, edited by Mary Roth Walsh. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Blau, P.M. and O.D. Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*, New York: Wiley.
- Burgess, Jane K. 1998. *The Single-Again Man*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Cahill, Spencer. 1999. "Emotional Capital and Professional Socialization: The Case of Mortuary Science Student (and me)," *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 62(2): 101-116.
- Cancian, Francesca M. 1987. *Love in America: Gender and Self-Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, Candace. 1990. "Emotions and Mircopolitics in Everyday Life: Some Patterns and Paradoxes of 'Place'," in *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, edited by Theodore Kemper. Albany, New York: SUNY Press.
- Clark, Candace. 1987. "Sympathy Biography and Sympathy Margin." *American Journal of Sociology* 93(2)Sept.:290-321.
- Cohen, Dov. 1996. "Law, Social Policy, and Violence: The Impact of Regional Cultures." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,70 (5) May: 961-978.

- Cohen, Orna. 1995. "Divorced Fathers Raise Their Children by Themselves." *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage* 23(1-2):55-73.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1986. "Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought," *Social Problems*, 33(6)Oct.-Dec.: S14-S32.
- _____. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Collins, Randall. 1981. *Sociology Since Mid-Century: Essay in Theory Cumulation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Collinson, David L. 1992. "'Engineering Humor': Masculinity, joking, and conflict in shop-floor relations," in Kimmel, Michael S. and Michael A. Messner, editors. *Men's Lives*. New York: MacMillan.
- Connell, R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- _____. 1993. "Men and the Women's Movement." *Social Policy* summer:72-78.
- Dagan, Kelly A. 2001. "Who's 'Allowed' to Get Angry? How Power Affects Emotion." Dissertation: Kent State University.
- Donaldson, Mike. 1993. "What is Hegemonic Masculinity?" *Theory and Society* 22:643-657.
- Doss, Brian and J. Roy Hopkins. 1998. "The Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale: Validation from Three Cultural Perspectives." *Sex Roles* 38(9-10)May:719-741.
- Duindam, Vincent and Ed Spruijt. 1997. "Caring Fathers in the Netherlands." *Sex Roles* 36(3-4):149-170.
- Duncombe, Jean and Dennis Marsden. 1995. "Workaholics & Whingeing Women: Theorizing Intimacy and Emotion Work—The Last Frontier of Gender Inequality?" *Sociological Review* 43(1)Feb.:150-169.
- _____. 1998. "'Stepford Wives' and 'Hollow Men'? Doing Emotions Work, Doing Gender, and 'Authenticity' in Intimate Heterosexual Relationships." Pp. 221-227 in *Emotions in Social Life: Critical Themes and Contemporary Issues*, edited by Gilian Bendelow and Simon J. Williams. New York: Routledge.
- EGGEBEEN, David J. ANASTASIA R. SNYDER and WENDY D. MANNING. 1996. "Children in Single-Father Families in Demographic Perspective." *Journal of Family Issues* 17(4)July:441-465.

- Eisenberg, Nancy and Randy Lennon. 1983. "Sex Differences in Empathy and Related Capacities," *Psychological Bulletin*, 94(1): 100-131.
- Emslie, Carol, Damien Ridge, Sue Ziebland, and Kate Hunt. 2006. "Men's Accounts of Depression: Reconstructing or Resisting Hegemonic Masculinity?" *Social Science and Medicine*, 62(9) May: 22-46.
- Erikson, Rebecca J. and Ginna M. Babcock. 1995. "Men and Family Law: From Patriarchy to Partnership." *Marriage and Family Review* 21(3-4):31-54.
- Fine, Michelle, Lois Weis, Judi Addelston, and Julia Marusza. 1997. "(In)Secure Times: Constructing White Working-Class Masculinities in the Late 20th Century." *Gender & Society*, 11(1)Feb.:52-68.
- Fischer, Agneta H. (ed.) 2000. *Gender and Emotion: Social Psychological Perspectives*. Paris: Cambridge University Press.
- Fivush, Robyn, Melissa A. Brotman, Janine P. Buckner, and Sherryl H. Goodman. 2000. "Gender Differences in Parent-Child Emotion Narratives." *Sex Roles* 42(3-4)Feb.:233-253.
- Flannagan, Dorothy and San Parese. 1998. "Emotion References in Mother-Daughter and Mother-Son Dyads' Conversation about School." *Sex Roles* 39(5-6)Sept.:353-368.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon.
- Francis, Linda. 1997. "Ideology and Interpersonal Emotional Management: Redefining Identity in Two Support Groups." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 60(2):153-171.
- Fry, P.S. and Jean Addington. 1984. "Professionals' Negative Expectations of Boys from Father-Headed, Singl-Parent Families: Implications for the Training of Child-Care Professionals." *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 2: 337-346.
- Gordon, Steven L. 1981. "The Sociology of Sentiment and Emotion." Chapter 18 in *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives*, edited by Morris Rosenberg and Ralph Turner. New York: Basic Books
- _____. 1989. "The Socialization of Children's Emotions: Emotional Culture, Competence and Exposure." Pp. 319-49 in *Children's Understanding of Emotion*, edited by Carolyn Saarni and Paul Harris. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- _____. 1990. "Social Structure Effects on Emotion." Pp. 145-179 in *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, edited by Theodore Kemper. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Gray, Stephen M. and Laurie Heatherington. 2003. "The Importance of Social Context in the Facilitation of Emotional Expression in Men." *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 22(3) June: 294-314.
- Greif, Geoffrey L. and Alfred Demaris. 1990. "Single Fathers with Custody." *Families in Society* 71(5)May:259-266.
- Greif, Geoffrey L. 1995. "Single Fathers w/ Custody Following Separation & Divorce." *Marriage and Family Review* 20(1-2):213-231.
- Griffiths, John. 1999. "Fathers as Mothers: Lone Parenting for Men." Pp. 103-110 in *Rewriting the Sexual Contract*, edited by Geoff Dench. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Haas, Jack. 1972. "Binging." *American Behavioral Scientist* 16(1)Sept.-Oct.:27-34.
- Hagan, John and Holly Foster. 2003. "S/He's a Rebel: Toward a Sequential Stress Theory of Delinquency and Gendered Pathways to Disadvantage in Emerging Adulthood." *Social Forces* 82(1): 53-86.
- Hatcher, Caroline. 2003. "Refashioning a Passionate Manager: Gender at Work." *Gender, Work, and Organization*. 10(4) Aug.: 391-412.
- Heath, D. Terry and Dennis K. Orthner. 1999. "Stress and Adaptation among Male and Female Single Parents." *Journal of Family Issues* 20(4)July:557-587.
- Heise, David and Cassandra Calhan. 1995. "Emotion Norms in Interpersonal Events." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58(4):223-340
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1979. "Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure." *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(3) Nov.: 551-575.
- _____. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. California: University of California Press.
- _____. 1998. "The Sociology of Emotion as a Way of Seeing." Pp. 3-15 in *Emotions in Social Life: Critical Themes and Contemporary Issues*, edited by Gilian Bendelow and Simon J. Williams. New York: Routledge.

- Hood, Jane C. editor. 1993. *Men, Work and Family*. London: Sage Publications.
- hooks, bell. 1989. *Talking Back*. South End Press.
- Huber, Gunter L. 2001. *Analysis of Qualitative Data with AQUAD Five for Windows*. Schwangau Germany: Verlag Ingeborg Huber. (Distributed by ProGAMMA, Inc.)
- Illouz, Eva. 1997. *Consuming the Romantic Utopia: Love and the Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jakupcak, Matthew, Kristalyn Salters, Kim L. Gratz, and Lizabeth Roemer. 2003. "Masculinity and Emotionality: An Investigation of Men's Primary and Secondary Emotional Responding." *Sex Roles*, 49(3-4) Aug.: 111-120.
- Jansz, Jeroen. 2005. "The Emotional Appeal of Violent Video Games for Adolescent Males." *Communication Theory*, 15(3) Aug.: 219-241.
- Kelly, Janice and Sarah Hutson-Comeaux. 1999. "Gender-Emotion Stereotypes Are Context Specific." *Sex Roles* 40(1-2).
- Kemper, Theodore. 1979. "Why are the Streets So Dirty? Social Psychological and Stratification Factors in the Decline of Municipal Services," *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 58(2) Dec: 422-442.
- _____. 1981. "Social Constructivist and Positivist Approaches to the Sociology of Emotion." *American Journal of Sociology*, 87: 336-361.
- _____. 1987. "How Many Emotions Are There? Wedding the Social and the Autonomic Components." *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(2) Sept.: 263-289.
- Kimmel, Michael S. and Michael A. Messner, editors. 1992. *Men's Lives*. New York: MacMillan.
- Kingston, Paul W. 2000. *The Classless Society*, California: Stanford University Press.
- Kohn, Melvin, Kazimierz M. Slomczynski, and Carrie Schoenbach. 1986. "Social Stratification and the Transmission of Values in the Family: A Cross-National Assessment." *Sociological Forum*, 1(1) Winter: 73-102.
- Langston, D. 1992. "Tired of Playing Monopoly?" Pp. 110-120 in *Race, Class and Gender: an Anthology*, edited by M. L. Anderson and P.H. Collins, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

- Leavitt, Robin Lynn and Martha Bauman Power. 1989. "Emotional Socialization in the Postmodern Era: Children in Daycare." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 52(1):35-43.
- Leidner, Robin. 1993. *Fast Food, Fast Talk: Service Work and the Routinization of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Levant, Ronald. 1992. "Toward the Reconstruction of Masculinity." *Journal of Family Psychology* 5(3-4)Mar-June:379-402.
- Lively, Kathryn. 2000. "Reciprocal Emotion Management." *Work and Occupations* 27(1)Feb.:32-63.
- Lombardo, William K., Gary A. Crester, Barbara Lombardo, and Sharon L. Mathis. 1983. "For Cryin' Out Loud—There's a Sex Difference." *Sex Roles* 9(9)Sept.:987-995.
- Lowenstein, Joyce S. and Elizabeth J. Koopman. 1978. "A Comparison of the Self-Esteem Between Boys Living with Single-Parent Mothers and Single-Parent Fathers." *Journal of Divorce* 2(2)winter:195-208.
- Marsiglio, William (editor). 1995. *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- McBee, Randy. 1999. "'He Likes Women More than He Likes Drink and That is Quite Unusual': Working-Class Social Clubs, Male Culture, and Heterosocial Relations in the United States, 1920s-1930s." *Gender & History* 11(1)Apr.:84-112.
- McEachern, Charmaine. 1999. "Comic Interventions: passion and the men's movement in the situation comedy 'Home Improvement.'" *Journal of Gender Studies* 8(1)Mar.:5-18.
- McMahon, Anthony. 1999. *Taking Care of Men: Sexual Politics in the Public Mind*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Messner, Michael. 1993. "'Changing Men' and Feminist Politics in the United States." *Theory and Society* 22:723-737.
- Mills, Rosemary S. L., Jan Pederson, and Joan E. Grusec. 1989. "Sex Differences in Reasoning and Emotion about Altruism." *Sex Roles* 20(11-12)June:603-621.
- Morman, Mark T. and Kory Floyd. 1998. "'I Love You, Man': Overt Expressions of Affection in Male-Male Interaction." *Sex Roles* 38(9-10):871-881.
- Myers, Kristen A., Cynthia D. Anderson, and Barbara J. Risman. 1998. "Introduction: Bridging the Gaps in Feminist Sociology." Pp. ix-xvi in *Feminist Foundations*,

edited by Kristen A. Myers, Cynthia D. Anderson, and Barbara J. Risman. Sage Publications.

- Neuman, W. Lawrence. 1997. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 3rd edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Newberger, Eli H. 1999. *The Men They Will Become: The Nature and Nurture of Male Character*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Perseus Books.
- Newton, Judith. 1998. "White Guys." *Feminist Studies* 24(3)fall:572-598.
- Peplau, Letitia Anne and Steven L. Gordon. 1985. "Women and Men in Love: Gender Differences in Close Heterosexual Relationships," Pp. 257-291 in *Women, Gender, and Social Psychology*, edited by Virginia E. O'Leary, Rhoda Kesler Unger, and Barbara Strudler Wallston. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Peterson, Gary W. and Suzanne K. Steinmetz. 2000. "The Diversity of Fatherhood: Change, Constancy, and Contradiction." *Marriage and Family Review* 29(4):315-322.
- Pierce, Jennifer L. 1995. *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pleck, Joseph H. 1995. "The Gender Role Strain Paradigm: An Update," in *A New Psychology of Men*, edited by Ronald F. Levant and William S. Pollack. New York: Basic Books.
- Prendergast, Shirley and Simon Forrest. 1998. "'Shorties, Low-lifers, Hardnuts, and Kings': Boys, Emotions and Embodiment in School." Pp. 155-172 in *Emotions in Social Life: Critical Themes and Contemporary Issues*, edited by Gilian Bendelow and Simon J. Williams. New York: Routledge.
- Pugh, Alison. 1998. "Mothering Emotions." Paper presented at the American Sociological Association meeting.
- Pugliesi, Karen and Scott L. Shook. 1997. "Gender, Jobs, and Emotion Labor in a Complex Organization." *Social Perspectives on Emotion* 4:283-316.
- Pyke, Karen D. 1996. "Class-Based Masculinities: The Interdependence of Gender, Class, and Interpersonal Power." *Gender & Society* 10(5)Oct.:527-549.
- Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Risman, Barbara J. 1986. "Can Men "Mother"? Life as a Single Father." *Family Relations* 35(1)Jan.:95-102.
- _____. 1987. "Intimate Relationships from a Microstructural Perspective: Men who Mother." *Gender and Society* 1(1)Mar.:6-32.
- Ross, Catherine E. and John Mirowsky. 1984. "Men Who Cry." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 47(2):138-146.
- Roy, Kevin. 1999. "Low Income Single Fathers in an African-American Community and the Requirements of Welfare Reform." *Journal of Family Issues* 20(4)July:432-457.
- Sargent, Paul. 2000. "Real Men or Real Teachers?: Contradictions in the Lives of Men Elementary Teachers." *Men and Masculinities* 2: 410-433.
- Schutt, Russell K. 1999. *Investigating the Social World*, 2nd edition. California: Pine Forge Press.
- Schwalbe, Michael, Sandra Godwin, Daphne Holden, Douglas Schrock and Shealy Thompson. "Generic Process in the Reproduction of Inequality: An Interactionist Analysis." *Social Forces* 79(2):419-452.
- Schwartz, Barry. 1967. "The Social Psychology of the Gift." *The American Journal of Sociology* 73(1):1-11.
- Schweder, Richard A. 1994. "'You're Not Sick, You're Just in Love': Emotion as an Interpretive System." Pp. 32-44 in *The Nature of Emotion: Fundamental Questions*, edited by Paul Ekman and Richard Davidson. Oxford University Press.
- Shields, Stephanie A. 2002. *Speaking from the Heart: Gender and the Social Meaning of Emotion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shields, Stephanie A. and Beth A. Koster. "Emotional Stereotyping of Parents in Child Rearing Manuals, 1915-1980." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 52(1):44-55.
- Simon, Robin W. 2002. "Revisiting the Relationships Among Gender, Marital Status, and Mental Health." *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(4) Jan.: 1065-1096.
- Simon, Robin and Leda E. Nath. 2004. "Gender and Emotion in the United States: Do Men and Women Differ in Self-Reports of Feelings and Expressive Behavior?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 109 (5) Mar.: 1137-1176.

- Simons, Ronald L. and Jay Beaman. 1996. "Father's Parenting." Pp.94-103 in *Understanding Differences Between Divorced and Intact Families: Stress, Interaction, and Child Outcome*, edited by Ronald Simons and Associates. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Sloan, Melissa M. 2004. "The Effects of Occupational Characteristics on the Experience and Expression of Anger in the Workplace." *Work and Occupations*, 31(1) Feb.: 38-72.
- Smith, Allen C. and Sherryl Kleinman. 1989. "Managing Emotions in Medical School: Students' Contacts with the Living and the Dead." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 52(1):56-69.
- Snell, William E. Jr. 1986. "The Masculine Role Inventory: Components and Correlates." *Sex Roles* 15(7-8)Oct.:443-455.
- Stearns, Peter N. 1990. *Be a Man! Males in Modern Society*, 2nd edition. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers.
- Stets, Jan. 1997. "Status and Identity in Marital Interaction." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60(3)Sept.:185-217.
- Thoits, Peggy. 1985. "Self-labeling Processes in Mental Illness: The Role of Emotional Deviance," *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(2): 221-249.
- _____. 2000. "Emotion and Psychopathology: A Sociological Point of View." Paper presented at the International Society for Research on Emotion, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada, August.
- _____. 2002. "Emotional Deviance: Social Antecedents, Psychological Consequences, and Variations by Gender Ideology." Paper presented at meeting of American Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- _____. 2004. "Emotion Norms, Emotion Work, and Social Order," Pp. 359-378 in *Feelings and Emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium*, edited by Antony S. R. Manstead, Nico H. Frijda, and Agneta H. Fischer. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tiedens, Larissa Z., Phoebe C. Ellsworth, and Batja Mesquita. 2000. "Stereotypes about Sentiments and Status: Emotional Expectations for High and Low Status Group Members." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26(5)May:560-574.
- Uttal, Lynet and Mary Tuominen. 1999. "Tenuous Relationships: Exploitation, Emotion, and Racial Ethnic Significance in Paid Child Care Work." *Gender and Society* 13(6)Dec.:758-780.

- Vistnes, Jessica Primoff. 1997. "Gender Differences in Days Lost from Work Due to Illness." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 50(2)Jan.:304-323.
- Weiss, Robert Stuart. 1994. *Learning From Strangers: the Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York: Free Press.
- West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender," *Gender and Society*, 1(2) June: 125-151.
- Wouters, Cas. 1998. "Changes in the 'Lust Balance' of Sex and Love Since the Sexual Revolution: the Example of the Netherlands." Pp.228-252 in *Emotions in Social Life: Critical Themes and Contemporary Issues*, edited by Gilian Bendelow and Simon J. Williams. New York: Routledge.
- Wright, Erik O., Costello, C., Hachen, D., and Sprague, J. 1982. "The American Class Structure," *American Sociological Review*, 47, 709-726.