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Abstract

For years, researchers have predominantly focused on the angry person, their triggers, reactions, and the consequences of these episodes in the workplace. More recently, research has begun to emphasize receivers’ workplace anger experiences within the specific contexts of conflict, conflict and negotiation, bullying, and abusive supervision (Carlson, Ferguson, Hunter, & Whitten, 2012; Geddes & Stickney, 2012; Samnani, 2013). Results reveal numerous individual and organizational outcomes primarily related to job satisfaction, health wellbeing and turnover intention outcomes. In this thesis, I argue that gaining a better understanding of the receivers’ internal (i.e., cognitive and affective) processes when faced with workplace anger is essential. More specifically, I propose that understanding the receivers’ attributions made and emotion regulation (ER) strategies chosen when others express anger will shed light on how they interpret intense sender anger and respond to these incidents.

To date, research has not developed a broad model outlining receivers’ interpersonal and intrapersonal processes during workplace anger interactions. To better explore this phenomenon and to make a theoretical contribution to the field, I have developed the ‘relational anger model’ (RAM). This model is based on two foundational theories: attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998). Attribution theory (Heider, 1958) encompasses an individual’s interpretation of events and causation. It is used in this research to understand the attributions receivers make to explain workplace anger. The process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998) explicates the effects of sender anger on the receivers’ affective experience and expression in the workplace.

This research program aims to provide a better understanding of the receivers’ (direct target or observer) attributions and emotion regulation strategies used in the face
of workplace anger expressions. To address this aim, the relational anger model was used to develop the following research questions:

**RQ1:** What attributions do receivers (direct targets or observers) of anger make of perceived sender anger intensity?

**RQ2:** What emotion regulation (ER) strategies do receivers of anger use in response to sender anger: a) directed at themselves, or b) directed at others?

**RQ3:** How do ER strategies and particular attributions interact?

**RQ4:** How do different attributions and ER strategies combine to effect receivers’ individual and organizational outcomes?

This thesis comprises two studies. Study 1, presented in Chapter 4, is a qualitative study that addresses Research Questions 1 and 2. The study outlines a series of in-depth interviews conducted with 30 participants from the medical, mining, legal, manufacturing, and banking industries to capture rich insights from their experiences of workplace anger using the day reconstruction method (Kahneman, Krueger, Schkade, Schwarz, & Stone, 2004). Participants made attributions around the appropriateness, effectiveness, and the frequency of sender anger intensity. Many senders described the anger they witnessed as inappropriate, as per the dual threshold model of anger (exceeding the impropriety threshold) (Geddes & Callister, 2007). Based on the data, attributed inappropriate expressions of anger in the workplace were viewed as violating the norms or accepted behavior patterns for that organization. Overall, the main ER strategies used by both targets and observers alike in this study were situation selection, cognitive reappraisal, expression, and suppression of emotions. However, clear distinctions arose concerning receivers who were direct targets of anger and those who were observers, and between targets who were managers and those who were employees.
Study 2, presented in Chapter 5, is a quantitative study that builds on Study 1 and addresses Research Questions 3 and 4. The sample comprised 122 employees working in a range of industries (for example, education, information technology, mining, medical, and manufacturing industries) who indicated they had been the direct targets of workplace anger in the last two years. The survey was administered using a split administration design and held two weeks apart. Times 1 and 2 of the survey assessed the independent variable of anger intensity, the mediating variable of attributions (sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency), the dependent variables of target health and wellbeing (positive and negative health) and target turnover intention, and the moderating variable of ER strategies (target expression, suppression, and reappraisal).

In Study 2, the overall results indicated that greater anger intensity attributions were associated with lower target positive health (e.g., lower work functionality). The targets’ attributions were directly associated with their positive health. Attributions of higher sender anger intensity appropriateness were associated with better health for targets, while inversely, attributions of higher sender anger intensity effectiveness were associated with poorer positive health. Concerning negative health, although workplace sender anger intensity did not predict targets’ negative health, the results revealed that the targets’ attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness were directly associated with their negative health. Targets’ attribution of lower sender anger intensity appropriateness was associated with the targets’ experience of higher negative health. Finally, higher sender anger intensity did not predict turnover intentions. Further results are discussed in Chapter 5, and in relation to the RAM.

In terms of theoretical contribution, I argue my research and proposed theoretical model, the RAM, furthers comprehension of receivers’ internal cognitive and affective processes in the face of workplace anger manifestations in organizations. The model
also contributes to a better understanding of how internal processes impact receivers of anger and how this affects organizations. The findings have practical implications for organizations that are also discussed, along with opportunities for future research in this area.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 CHAPTER INTRODUCTION

To date, research on anger has focused mostly on the angry person, their triggers (Booth & Mann, 2005; Fitness, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001), and the consequences of this anger for the offender (Booth & Mann, 2005; Callister, Geddes, & Gibson, 2017; Fitness, 2000; Gibson & Callister, 2010; Lindebaum & Gabriel, 2016; Lindebaum, Geddes, & Gabriel, 2017; Moreo, Cain & Chang, 2020; Stickney & Geddes, 2016). Given that the negative consequences of sender anger for receivers (targets and observers) are prominent in the workplace, researchers have begun to concurrently research the angry person and receivers’ experiences (Hershcovis & Bhatnagar, 2017; Moura, Troth, & Jordan, 2015; Porath & Pearson, 2012; Salin, Tenhiälä, Roberge, & Berdahl, 2014; Sloan, 2004). The receivers’ anger experience has been examined within the contexts of conflict (Geddes & Stickney, 2012), negotiation (Van Kleef & Côté, 2007), bullying (Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2008), and abusive supervision (Lin, Wang, & Chen, 2013). A few of the main research results identified that individuals, receivers of anger, suffer lower job satisfaction (Glomb, 2002), poorer health and wellbeing (Miers, Rieffe, Terwogt, Cowan, & Linden, 2007), and experience a higher desire to leave the workplace (Harlos & Axelrod, 2005). This emphasis on receiver outcomes does not consider a deeper examination of how receivers (i.e., direct targets or observers) make sense of and respond to the anger incident. To date, theories and models applicable to workplace anger such as the dual threshold model of anger (DTM) (Geddes & Callister, 2007) or emotions as social information (EASI) (Van Kleef, 2009) do not appear to have studied the receivers’ experience of and response to workplace anger (see Section 2.2) within one model. To address this fundamental issue, I have developed a theoretical framework, the relational anger model (RAM), which is
discussed in Chapter 3. The RAM has its foundation in two theories: attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998). Attribution theory clarifies the receivers’ interpretation of events providing causal explanations for why a phenomenon occurs (Heider, 1958); while the process model of emotion regulation helps to explain the affective experiences and responses to emotion at work and allows for a better understanding of the receivers’ emotional regulatory process when faced with workplace anger (Gross, 1998).

I argue that an improved appreciation of the mechanisms through which receivers make sense of and deal with anger within the workplace extends understanding of the role that the receivers’ attributions and emotional regulation strategies play in individual and organizational outcomes. Besides, by using the RAM framework, further light will be shed on how and when the receivers’ internal processes (i.e., attributions and emotion regulation strategies) in the face of workplace anger predict positive or negative outcomes. Practically, with a better understanding of the processes involved, more efficient programs and courses can be implemented in organizations to help those who face anger at work.

1.2 ANGER IN ORGANIZATIONS

Anger is a multidimensional construct containing mental assessments, action tendencies, and physiological reactions (Frijda, 1986), varying in intensity from irritable to hostile (object-oriented) (Glomb, 2002). It has gained significant attention in research for decades due to its contradictory nature (resulting in both positive and negative outcomes) and the significant influence on self (sender), receivers (targets and observers), and objects (Geddes, Callister, & Gibson, 2018; Lindebaum et al., 2017). Anger is a global phenomenon with significant consequences for all stakeholders in the anger incident (Bachoo, Bhagwanjee, & Govender, 2013; Khan, 2014; Peralta, Saldanha, & Lopes, 2020; Wang, Mao, Wu, & Liu, 2012).
Overall, researchers have described anger as mostly disruptive in the workplace, an emotion to be regulated and brought under control (Geddes et al., 2018; Glomb, 2002; Moura et al., 2015). Anger is associated with feelings of hostility (Begley, 1994), blame (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001), harmful organizational climates (Aquino, Douglas, & Martinko, 2004), interpersonal revenge (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Bies & Tripp, 1998), and aggression (Fox & Spector, 1999). Negotiation studies have determined that the receiver of anger generates an unwillingness to interact with the adversary, disrupting working relationships (Allred, Mallozzi, Matsui, & Raia, 1997; De Dreu & Van Kleef, 2004; Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006), and diminishing the desire to work together again in the future (Allred, 1999). The impact of anger on the receiver during negotiations has also led to the rejection of business proposals (Pillutla & Murninghan, 1996) and to an increased desire to quit one’s job (Harlos, 2010).

There are some, often overlooked, positive aspects of anger. Research has recognized that individuals who are part of a conflict generating event (i.e., often anger provoking) asked questions and spoke to matters of unfairness and bias (i.e., being an advocate in the workplace) (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997; Stickney & Geddes, 2016), which often contributed to dispute resolution (Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005). In negotiation research, solution seeking was encouraged when goals were impeded (Frijda, 1986). Individuals were also able to realize their objectives (Callister, Gray, Schweitzer, Gibson, & Tan, 2003; Keltner & Gross, 1999) and meet deadlines (Steptoe, Cropley, Griffith, & Kirschbaum, 2000), maximizing profits. However, unlike research on the angry person, where the individual interpretation of events and the impact of triggers on the angry individual have been studied extensively (Booth & Mann, 2005; Fitness, 2000), this is not the case for receivers of anger. The RAM specifically created for my thesis is foundational to both Study 1 (Chapter 4) and Study 2 (Chapter 5).
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The overall aim of this research is to more deeply comprehend the receivers’ internal processes, namely, their attributions (Heider, 1958) and emotion regulation (ER) strategies (Gross, 1998) used in the face of workplace anger. Thus, four research questions (RQs) were developed to guide this program of research.

**RQ1:** What attributions do receivers (direct targets or observers) of anger make of perceived sender anger intensity?

**RQ2:** What emotion regulation (ER) strategies do receivers of anger use in response to sender anger: a) directed at themselves or b) directed at others?

**RQ3:** How do ER strategies and particular attributions interact?

**RQ4:** How do different attributions and ER strategies combine to effect receivers’ individual and organizational outcomes?

These questions are addressed through two studies. Study 1, a qualitative study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), addresses RQs 1 and 2. The first research question seeks to identify and understand the receivers’ attributions of a workplace anger interaction. Attributions refer to the causal explanations given for why a phenomenon occurs, concerning questions commencing with ‘why’ (Heider, 1958). The second research question aims to identify the ER strategies receivers report using in response to anger directed at them or others in the workplace. ER strategies relate to the process through which an individual influences existing emotions, that is, how they understand and express them (Gross, 1998, p. 275). For example, in the face of sender anger intensity, receivers of anger might suppress or hide their emotions (e.g., anger and fear). I argue that a greater understanding of receivers’ attributions (Heider, 1958) and ER strategies (Gross, 1998) used in the face of workplace anger could contribute to improved individual health and wellbeing and better organizational workplace retention.
Study 2, a quantitative study (Norkett, 2013), examines RQ3 and RQ4. Based on the RAM, RQ3 seeks to establish the links between attributions and ER strategies. In addition, RQ4 aims to ascertain whether the type of attributions that receivers make of workplace anger and the ER strategies used in response to it determine individual and organizational outcomes. Using the RAM, I argue that attributions mediate the relationship between sender anger intensity and the receivers’ outcomes with ER strategies moderating this relationship. For example, receivers who view sender anger as inappropriate (type of attribution) and use higher suppression (type of ER strategy) might experience increased negative health.

An outline of the method and philosophical underpinning of this research is discussed below.

1.4 METHODOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS

Debates on using mixed methods (a combination of quantitative and qualitative research) are no longer as prevalent as they were between 1950 and 1980 (Sieber, 1973; Small, 2011). There is currently a consistent understanding and agreement amongst researchers regarding the value of mixed methods (McKim, 2017). Qualitative and quantitative approaches differ in ontology (i.e., nature of reality, a study of being, “what is”) (Crotty, 1998, p. 10; Gelo, Braakmann, & Benetka, 2008) and epistemology (nature and forms of knowledge, “what it means to know”) (L. Cohen, Manion, Morrison, & Morrison, 2007, p. 7; Creswell, 2009). Qualitative paradigms see realism as a varied, collective, and psychologically composed phenomenon, where the “knower and the known are inextricably connected” (Gelo et al., 2008, p. 270). Conversely, quantitative paradigms view reality as distinct and concrete, where the “knower and the known are considered as relatively separate and independent” (Gelo et al., 2008, p. 270). Combining these methods enables a deeper understanding of research issues (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Creswell & Tashakkori, 2007).
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Qualitative research aims to study behavior in locum, using more of a naturalistic design (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The natural context is where behavior is best comprehended (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Examples of these naturalistic designs are case studies (Abma & Stake, 2014), focus groups (Kandola, 2012), and ethnographic designs (Walle, 2016). Study 1 explores receivers’ workplace anger experiences, their attributions, and the ER strategies used to deal with this anger through a series of questions. These questions aim to investigate the anger event using the day reconstruction method (DRM) (Kahneman et al., 2004). The DRM enables participants to systematically reconstruct their activities and experiences of the preceding events with procedures designed to reduce memory biases (Kahneman et al., 2004). In other words, through questioning, participants were asked to unpack the events leading up to the anger incident they experienced. They were asked to expand on what they did before the event, how they felt during the event and explore why they felt that way. In Study 1, I use a Social Constructivist approach that enables a better understanding of social issues within their context. More specifically, it permits a greater understanding of the meaning people ascribe to their relational encounters (Merriam, 2009). There is a tendency in qualitative research to appreciate personal perspectives, experiences, and an understanding of individual actors (Gelo et al., 2008; Hancock, 2004). The starting point is the observation of phenomena, leading to theories.

On the other hand, research based on a positivist paradigm includes experimental and non-experimental designs (Piantadosi, 2017). Experimental designs posit inferences on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables by manipulating the independent variable (Gelo et al., 2008). When the independent variable cannot be manipulated, a non-experimental design is used (Gelo et al., 2008; Steiner & Wong, 2018), and this was deemed to best suit Study 2. The survey for Study 2 was administered using a split administration design (Samnani, 2013), with Times 1 and 2
held two weeks apart. Quantitative methods lend themselves to hypotheses and a more deductive examination, as hypotheses result from theory and are then supported or not supported (Gelo et al., 2008; Hancock, 2004). Research designs (a structure that connects philosophical foundations and methodological assumptions) seek to provide reliable and valid answers to the research questions (Gelo et al., 2008).

Also, mixed methods provide an opportunity for increased validity of research as it is conceptualized differently in quantitative and qualitative methods (Brown, Stickland-Munro, Kobryn, & Moore, 2017):

i) Concerning the qualitative approach, the four main areas of validity are: i) descriptive validity (the descriptions of settings and events); ii) interpretative validity (the reports of significance or viewpoints held by participants); iii) explanatory validity (the validity of assertions about procedures and relations containing both constructs and causal validity); and iv) generalizability and transferability validity (the extent to which result are transferable across population, persons, situations or backgrounds) (see Maxwell, 1992).

ii) For quantitative approaches, both internal and external validity are critical. Internal validity is reached by: i) conclusion validity (from the sample to the population); ii) construct validity (of the theoretical constructs used); and iii) causal validity (of the cause-effect relationship between the observed variables). External validity is achieved by the generalizability of results across societies, locations, and periods (see Johnson & Christensen, 2000).

Although generalizability is common to both quantitative and qualitative methods, there are clear differences between these. On the one hand, qualitative research aims not to generalize but to understand the context of the human experience (Polit & Beck, 2010). It is related to sensemaking, to the depth of understanding
(Maxwell, 1992). For example, does the explanation of a phenomenon make sense for a large percentage of the population? On the other hand, generalizability in quantitative research is seen as “an act of reasoning” that aims to draw inferences from certain observations (Polit & Beck, 2010, p. 1451). Ensuring that validity for both studies is effective strengthens the overall validity of the results.

Within mixed-methods, there are three types of research designs: a one phase approach where methods are applied simultaneously, concurrently, a two-phase approach where quantitative and qualitative methods are applied one after the other, and a triangulation approach where qualitative and quantitative methods are implemented in the same timeframe (Gelo et al., 2008). A two-phase approach is used in this research. Both the qualitative and quantitative methods enable better understanding of the research problem, bringing together the different strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses of both methods (Brown et al., 2017; Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003). This research’s ontology and epistemology are outlined below including a brief overview of Studies 1 and 2.

1.4.1 Ontology

Ontology is a branch of philosophy concerned with the nature of what is and how realism is organized (Blaikie, 2007; Crotty, 1998). The research questions are answered in Studies 1 and 2 using a pragmatist paradigm (Pierce, 1978) that encourages mixed methods. A pragmatist paradigm is interested in the interaction between knowledge and action (Goldkuhl, 2012). Put differently, the pragmatic approach denotes a primary concern for the results of one’s actions (Hjorland, Sundin, & Johannisson, 2005). To inform the design of the studies, I use two different approaches. For Study 1, a qualitative study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) I use social constructivism (see Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Merriam, 2009; Palincsar, 1998) and for Study 2, a quantitative study, positivism (see Piantadosi, 2017; Sarantakos, 2005).
Social constructivism allows for exploring the subjective nature of the anger relationship (Merriam, 2009). The ontological assumption of social constructivism is founded on the individual’s interpretation of the events and the meaning attributed to the relational experience (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The social constructivist paradigm has shaped the collection and interpretation of the data in Study 1. More specifically, the systematic process used to identify themes and sub themes was based on the rich data collected from participants’ responses to workplace anger based on their interpretation and construction of the social interaction.

Study 2, on the other hand, used a positivist paradigm based on an assumption of realism. Realism suggests that reality is external and objective and can be measured on this basis (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Lowe, 2002; Tashakkori, Teddlie, & Teddlie, 1998). It seeks to find patterns, symmetries, reasons, and significance to explain social experiences (Grix, 2010). In Study 2, behavior was measured and reported through a split design survey drawing on the gathered data results (Samnani, 2013).

1.4.2 Epistemology

Epistemology is the science of knowing (Blaikie, 2007). The central question in epistemology is, “How do individuals discover what they want to know?”. An individual’s response to an event indicates their comprehension and understanding of the event’s meaning and their capacity to speak this meaning using language (Blumer, 1969). An epistemological presupposition supports the social constructivist paradigm. In other words, the development of knowledge is contingent on the information surrounding the object in question (Creswell, 2003), the reason for using participants’ experiences in this research. More specifically, it seeks to understand the receivers’ experience of workplace anger. While every individual has a unique knowledge set and social groups have shared knowledge, this knowledge is constructed during social interactions within unique and specific contexts (Knapp, 2019). The strength of Study 1
lies in its qualitative and interpretative nature (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Imageries of real-life anger scenarios using the DRM (Kahneman et al., 2004) contribute depth to the study and increase personal understanding that might be lacking in quantitative findings. Participants were recruited through purposive (nonprobability) sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994). During face to face interviews they provided greater detail about their responses to workplace anger telling their stories of experiencing anger in the workplace.

The second epistemological framework I used is the positivist approach. Positivism assumes that empirical testing generates knowledge (Sarantakos, 2005). The strength of the positivist methodological approach is that it investigates, describes, assesses, envisages, and advances or tests theories (Sarantakos, 2005). Study 2 used a split administration cross-sectional research design based on a positivist approach through purposive (nonprobability) sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I chose information-rich cases, those that postulated the most significant insight into the research questions. In other words, participants were able to write and talk about a specific anger event targeted at them (experienced in the last two years). Survey questions were directly related to the target’s experience of workplace anger.

Using both the social constructivist paradigm (Creswell, 2003) in Study 1 and the positivist methodology (Sarantakos, 2005) in Study 2, research can be framed to ensure that one type of data balances the other. For example, in social constructivism, the results are generated as the investigation occurs, and the investigator and the investigated are in interaction with each other (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), while in positivism, the data is studied without the direct influence of the investigator, in other words, a more objective approach (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Using both the interactive approach (social constructivist) that provides understanding and reconstruction of the
data and the objective (positivist) perspective that brings verified hypotheses, a better understanding and integration of the data is achieved (see Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

1.5 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THEORY AND PRACTICE

Theoretically, this research program aims to contribute by generating a greater understanding of the anger process in its entirety through the RAM (described in detail Chapter 3), which may enable the development of more effective human resource management practices. More specifically, the RAM provides a framework for current and future research that examined both the interpersonal and intrapersonal processes (i.e., the examination of receivers’ attributions and ER strategies) receivers used when dealing with workplace anger, providing a more holistic approach to target research. The model could potentially embrace other areas of emotional research (i.e., fear in the face of physical abuse, stress in the workplace, and bullying) (see Carlson et al., 2012; Jones, 2017; Mayhew, 2000).

Practically, it is envisaged that the results will contribute to developing a more productive organizational environment, increasing personal wellbeing within organizations, potentially adding to greater work satisfaction and staff retention. More specifically, this research’s findings will enable human resource managers to be more effective in their support of managers and employees who are dealing with conflicting situations involving workplace anger directed at either themselves or others (see Callister et al., 2017; Lindebaum & Gabriel, 2016). In essence, the hope is that the knowledge gained through this research contributes to developing more effective programs and processes to support those who encounter anger in the workplace. The examination of receivers’ internal processes can permit the design of more exact pathways so more positive outcomes to sender anger within the workplace are achieved (see Chapter 3) (Booth & Mann, 2005; Frijda, 1986; Stickney & Geddes, 2016).
In summary, this research aims to provide a significant contribution to existing research findings regarding the receiver of workplace anger by i. adding to existing findings; ii. more clearly establishing the attributions made and ER strategies used by receivers of anger; iii. ascertaining relevant links between attributions and ER strategies within a context of anger; iv. determining associations between attributions, ER strategies, and individual and organizational outcomes; and v. by developing a holistic model, the RAM, to assess receivers’ experiences and responses to workplace sender anger directed at them.

1.6 OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

Chapter 1 provided a brief overview of the research program and introduced the theoretical framework and research questions.

Chapter 2 introduces the key constructs related to this research and reviews the relevant literature on workplace anger, specifically discussing extant research on the receiver of workplace anger.

Chapter 3 expands on the model developed for Studies 1 and 2, namely, the relational anger model (RAM), examining it in detail. This chapter also presents the two key underpinning theories of RAM: attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of emotion regulation theory (Gross, 1998).

Chapter 4 presents Study 1, a previously published qualitative study focused on determining attributions and ER strategies of workplace anger receivers and their relationship (Research Questions 1 and 2).

Chapter 5 presents Study 2, a quantitative study specifically designed to quantitatively test and examine some of the relationships established in Study 1 (Research Questions 3 and 4). It also studies whether different attributions and ER strategies predict individual and organizational outcomes.
Chapter 6 discusses the main findings from the combined two studies. The limitations of the research and future research directions are also presented. Finally, this research’s significant contributions to theory and practice are provided in the conclusion to the thesis.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, I review the relevant literature on emotions, and more specifically, on anger. First, I provide an overview of affect and emotions and other related constructs. Second, the historical progression of emotion theories is discussed, followed by a more specific focus on the emotion of anger and the main theoretical underpinnings of this research. Third, I discuss current literature on workplace anger focusing on the interpersonal (receiver attributions about the sender’s behavior) and intrapersonal (receiver emotion regulation strategies) processes receivers use when encountering workplace anger. Finally, a summary and conclusion are provided, followed by an outline of the content of the following chapter.

2.1 UNDERSTANDING EMOTIONS: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

In popular parlance, affect, mood, and emotion have historically been used interchangeably without considering the conceptual differences (Batson, Shaw, & Olesen, 1992). However, more recently, there has been a more precise explanation of each concept (Beedie, Terry, & Lane, 2005; Russell, 2003). These distinct concepts and definitions are presented below.

2.1.1 Affect

Affect is the all-encompassing term for mood and emotions (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Affect denotes an apparent positive or negative propensity to consistently react to stimuli over time and across situations (Judge & Hulin, 1993). Affective states can influence an individual’s attitude and behavior at work (Ashkanasy, 2002). Also, affective dispositions impact how a situation is perceived and understood (Blaney, 1986; Griffin & Ross, 1991; Schacter, 1996).
Affect contains state and trait components (Diener & Emmons, 1984; Spielberger, Reheiser, & Sydeman, 1995). State affect is an emotional response to an immediate stressor that can vary equally in intensity and duration (Spielberger et al., 1995). Temporary mood oscillations characterize state affect (Grandey, Tam, & Brauburger, 2002). A negative state affect has a strong connection to sadness emotions (disappointed, depressed, unhappy). On the other hand, a positive state affect is related to job contentment and is only weakly associated with positive emotional reactions at work (Bruehl, Liu, Burns, Chont, & Jamison, 2012).

In contrast, trait affect suggests the tendency to certain states, measured by an individual’s explanation of how they feel (Diener & Emmons, 1984). Studies conducted by Bruehl et al. (2012) found evidence to support the idea that a trait approach impulse relates to anger and aggression-related responses, suggesting a greater tendency towards anger (Deffenbacher et al., 1996). A positive relationship exists between negative trait affect and negative mood states. Furthermore, there is a positive relationship between positive trait affect and positive mood states.

### 2.1.2 Mood

Mood is considered a state of mind containing positive and negative moods, with both of these playing a functional role in relationships (Frijda, 1988, 1993; Lench, Tibbett, & Bench, 2016). A positive mood indicates that all is going well and that the environment is problem free (Fiedler, Asbeck, & Nickel, 1991; Schwarz & Clore, 2003); it is vital for daily function and cooperation, enhancing flexibility, facilitating creativity, and inductive reasoning (Isen, Daubman, & Nowicki, 1987).

On the other hand, a negative mood can indicate that something is not going well and that issues need to be addressed (Schwarz & Clore, 2003). It can also impact the work environment (Sy, Côté, & Saavedra, 2005) and organizational outcomes (Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004). For example, subordinates may catch their leader’s
negative mood (Sy et al., 2005). Furthermore, a negotiator’s mood or emotional reaction may affect their negotiation style and potentially impact organizational outcomes (e.g., disengagement, low motivation) (Van Kleef et al., 2004). On the other hand, a negative mood can have a positive functional effect by facilitating deductive thought and evaluative and comprehensive views (Salovey, Hsee, & Mayer, 1993), and it can serve as an indicator of probable danger-prompting behavior (Larsen, 2000; Spoor & Kelly, 2004). It can also help individuals address issues and deal with them (George & Zhou, 2007). For example, a negative mood is critical to an individual’s reaction to survival situations, as it can be an indicator of probable danger prompting behavior to ease the negative stress (Larsen, 2000; Spoor & Kelly, 2004).

2.1.3 Emotions

Researchers have found it challenging to define emotions due to the controversies around their duration, subjectivity, or objectivity, and their role concerning cognition (Alpert & Rosen, 1990). Efforts to describe emotions have considered them adaptive responses to the environment (Ekman, 1992; Scherer, 1984). Emotions act as a social guide (Elfenbein, 2007; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), notifying, and preparing individuals to respond to social situations (Keltner & Haidt, 1999). For example, a comment can trigger anger if seen as harmful to one’s social position (Mesquita & Frijda, 2011). Ekman and Cordaro (2011) defined emotions as “discrete, automatic responses to universally shared, culture-specific and individual-specific events” (p. 364). Stephen Fineman (1993), author of the book, Emotions in Organizations, encapsulated emotions as expressive arenas to capture organizational life action. In some instances, emotions have been confused with feelings. According to Frijda (1986), emotions prompt us to do something, not only to feel. For example, an individual might feel upset and do nothing about it. On the other hand, they might feel upset and say something. This action forms part of the emotional response.
Often encased in a “whole body phenomena” (Gross & Thompson, 2007, p. 4), emotions contain neurophysiological activity and facial expressions (Izard, 1977). For the most part, emotions should be under the control of the actor (Carr, 2001), although, in some instances, compulsions to act or not in specific ways relate to auto and neuroendocrine changes (Gross & Thompson, 2007). The utility of emotions can also vary depending on the person’s emotional maturity (i.e., childhood and adult emotional reactions differ). Furthermore, emotions alter as the significance of events changes (Gross & Thompson, 2007). Situational (Fineman, 1993; Van Kleef, 2014), cultural (Gibson & Callister, 2010; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dofman, & Gupta, 2004; Lutz & White, 1986) and linguistic (Jaggar, 1989) factors complicate the understanding of the use of emotions in the workplace even further. For example, organizational cultures might contain unspoken rules and expectations about which emotional expressions are acceptable in the work environment (i.e., organizational display rules) (Ekman, 1992; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Due to the existing plethora of discrete emotions, researchers have attempted to narrow these down to a workable number (Ekman, 1992; Izard, 2007; Izard & Malatesta, 1987; Plutchik, 1994).

Discrete emotion theory posits that there are only a small number of core emotions (Ekman, 1992; Izard, 2007). Researchers have diverging views on the number and type of discrete emotions. On the one hand, Izard and Malatesta (1987) identified seven to ten core emotions and thousands of emotion-related words, synonyms of these core emotions: happiness, surprise, sadness, anger, disgust, contempt, and fear. In contrast, Ekman (1999) suggested an extended list of sixteen basic emotions: amusement, anger, contempt, contentment, disgust, embarrassment, excitement, fear, guilt, pride in achievement, relief, sadness, distress, satisfaction, sensory pleasure, and shame. My research supports Izard and Malatesta’s (1987) framework with a more prominent discussion of the anger emotion.
Several theories have been developed throughout the years to explain and address the complexity of emotions (Geddes & Callister, 2007; Gross, 1998; Heider, 1958; Hochschild, 1983; Lazarus, 1984). A few of these are discussed below.

2.2 A HISTORICAL VIEW OF MAIN EMOTION THEORIES

This section aims to identify theories and models that are useful in understanding emotions. The selection of theories to include was challenging due to the plethora of theories and models on emotion. After examining numerous theories, only those deemed to contribute to a greater understanding of anger were included.

The study of emotions gained momentum in 1872 with a book published by Charles Darwin, *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. He proposed the evolution of emotions, affirming their importance to both individuals and animals’ survival and reproduction. In the late 1920s, American psychologist Walter Cannon stated that fear or anger can lead to a ‘fight or flight’ response (Cannon, 1929). Both physical and mental threats can activate this reaction (Wilhelmsen, 2000). The fight and flight response can be further explained in terms of ‘approach’ (fight) and ‘avoidance’ (flight) behaviors (Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004). A part of the brain named the amygdala controls this physiological flight or fight reaction to a threat. It activates the sympathetic nervous system sending the ‘threat’ information to the hypothalamus (Lacroix, Spinelli, Heidbreder, & Feldon, 2000). More recently, there have been some questions as to whether those who encounter threatening situations (e.g., receivers of workplace anger) experience the flight first and then the fight (Bracha, Ralston, Matsukawa, Williams, & Bracha, 2004) as researchers argue that the typical response to a threat for mammals is first to flee. Since this time (1920s), the study of emotions has attracted numerous researchers (e.g., Geddes & Callister, 2007; Gross, 1998; Heider, 1958; Hochschild, 1983; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The most prominent theories relate to the physiological (views the body as responsible for emotions) (e.g., Lange &
James, 1922), neurological (suggests that the brain instigates emotional responses) (e.g., Bard & Cannon, 1936), and cognitive (thinking and the mind are crucial to emotion generation) (e.g., Heider, 1958) areas.

2.2.1 Physiological and Neurological Theories

Physiological theories became increasingly popular at the start of the 1920’s. However, as early as the 1880s, two authors William James (1884) and Carl Lange (1887), established similar emotional theories. Their theories developed separately and simultaneously, and due to their similarities, were later combined into the James-Lange theory of emotions (Lange & James, 1922). This physiological theory of emotion suggests that emotions are the result of physical alterations in the body. The body’s responses to an emotional event (i.e., a racing heart) form part of the emotional experience. The sequence of events established by this theory is that an individual will experience an emotional stimulus followed by a physiological response pattern that leads to an affective experience (Cannon, 1987; Dror, 2014). Concurrently, in the same year, another physiological theory originating from neurological responses, the Cannon-Bard theory of emotion (also known as the thalamic theory of emotion), gained attention (Bard & Cannon, 1936). First proposed by Cannon in the 1920s (Cannon, 1927) and extended by physiologist Philip Bard during the 1930s (Bard, 1934), it posited that exciting events activate physiological reactions such as perspiring, shaking, and muscle tension that occur concurrently and independently. In other words, the physical reaction is not reliant on the emotional reaction, and vice-versa.

The Cannon-Bard theory of emotion (Bard & Cannon, 1936) explains that responses occur instantaneously in the thalamus (a small brain organ responsible for obtaining sensory data). When an eliciting event occurs, the thalamus may send signals to the amygdala (responsible for managing strong emotions such as fear and anger) and the cerebral cortex (the area that controls conscious thought). The nervous system
receives these signals, and skeletal muscles regulate physical reactions such as muscle tension, sweating, and nervous twitches (Bard & Cannon, 1936). The James-Lange theory of emotions (Lange & James, 1922) and the Cannon-Bard theory (Bard & Cannon, 1936) differ in a few areas. As mentioned earlier in this section, the James-Lange theory (Lange & James, 1922) suggests that emotions result from physical alterations in the body. On the other hand, the Cannon-Bard theory (Bard & Cannon, 1936) implied that people could experience physiological reactions connected to emotions without actually sensing those emotions (i.e., a person’s heart may race when in love and not because of fear or anger). It also proposed that emotional responses occur far too quickly to be merely products of physical conditions (i.e., feeling fear before experiencing physical symptoms of a racing heart).

2.2.2 Cognitive Theories

In 1939, Jean-Paul Sartre, one of the leading philosophers of the time, launched his book *The Emotions: Outline of a Theory*. The premise of Sartre’s (2000) book is that emotions are a means of cognizance to capture the world, attempting to solve or diminish internal struggles, enabling the individual to escape from having to act. Similarly, he suggested that emotions are orderly and have meaning, with the functional role of resolving internal conflict.

The 1950s saw the upsurge of attribution theory with Fritz Heider’s 1958 book on *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. Although not strictly dealing with emotions, attributions were identified as the result of basic cognitive processes through which people determine cause and effect, solve problems, and become more effective in their interaction with the environment (Heider, 1958). The focus of Heider’s (1958) work was mostly on perception. In the mid-1960s, attribution theory was expanded by the writings of Jones and Davis (1965) (intentional behavior), and further developed by Kelley’s (1967) covariation model. Furthermore, in the 1970s Weiner (1972) made
significant contributions to attribution theory, focusing mainly on the causal factor of success or failure, seen as internal (e.g., personal characteristics) or external (e.g., environmental characteristics) to an individual. The focal point of attribution theory is causation, an attempt to determine the reasons for an individual’s motivation towards success or failure (Seel, 2012; Weiner, 1972). Attribution theory explains that attributions made for behaviors or outcomes contribute to shaping emotional and behavioral responses (Weiner, 1985). As this theory is fundamental to this research, it is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

In a similar trend, researchers Stanley Schachter and Jerome E. Singer created the Schachter-Singer Theory (1962), also known as the two-factor theory or attribution of emotion. Similar to attribution theory (Heider, 1958), the two-factor theory (Schachter & Singer, 1962) concentrates on attributions and the automatic nervous system, stating that a psychological stimulation ensues, followed by identifying an arousal. This arousal engenders a reaction that is interpreted cognitively and named, subsequently leading to emotions. Comparable to the Cannon-Bard theory (Bard & Cannon, 1936), the Schachter-Singer theory (1962) assumes that similar physiological responses can produce varying emotions. For example, during an accident, heart racing might be associated with the ‘fear’ emotion, while heart racing during a date with a girlfriend might be designated as a ‘love’ emotion.

The 1980s saw a rise in the concept of emotional labor, which gained momentum with Hochschild (1983), who defined emotional labor as the creation of a “standard visual facial and physical display” (p. 7). These organizational requirements of employees towards customers termed organizational display rules (Ekman, 1992; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987) potentially encourage individuals within workplaces to suppress emotions, faking more positive ones. The impetus to comply with organizational display rules triggers acting (Grandey, 2000; Gross, 1998; Hochschild,
1983), possibly generating internal dissonance (difference between felt and expressed anger) (Callister, Gray, Gibson, Schweitzer, & Tan, 2007). For example, doctors and nurses might be expected to behave politely towards patients at all times, even when stressed, frustrated, and tired. Given organizational demands on employees (e.g., acting friendly towards customers when one does not feel like it), two emotion regulation processes come into play: deep acting (antecedent focused emotion regulation) or surface acting (response focused emotion regulation) (Grandey, 2003; Hochschild, 2012). The process of regulating emotions in deep acting seeks to alter inner feelings, while surface acting seeks to adjust facial expressions (Grandey, 2003). Even today, more and more organizations expect employees to portray particular acceptable behavior in front of customers, which is often detrimental to their health (Gray, 2009; Kruml & Geddes, 2000).

Following the surge of Hochschild’s (1983) emotional labor theory, another theory that had previously gained attention in 1966 with Richard Lazarus’ book on *Psychological Stress and the Coping Process*, regained impetus through the development of the cognitive appraisal theory (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). This theory conceptualizes how a person responds to and construes life stressors (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). More specifically, it is the process of considering whether an event threatens an individual’s wellbeing, whether there are adequate individual resources for handling the demand of the situation, and whether one’s strategy for coping with stress is effective (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988; Lazarus & Folkman, 1987). Stress will vary significantly depending on individual interpretations of events and their perception of stress (Lazarus, 1991). Folkman, Lazarus, Gruen, and DeLongis (1986) described two types of appraisals: primary and secondary. Primary appraisal refers to the set of cognitions that determine the significance of the event to the individual (e.g., “Is it a threat to my wellbeing?”), while secondary appraisal relates to resources and
alternatives an individual has to deal successfully with the situation (e.g., “Do I have the skills to cope with the problem?”) (Chang, 1998, pp. 1111; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Like the emotional labor theory (Hochschild, 1983), the cognitive appraisal theory can engender individual emotional dissonance, prompted when stress generates an imbalance between individuals’ demands and their coping reserves (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

The mid-1990s saw the rise of the affective events theory (AET) (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). The AET is a communication-based theory that presents a structure to investigate potential causes and consequences of affective experiences in the workplace (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). According to AET, emotions play an essential part in how daily workplace situations and decisions are handled. This theory acknowledges that diverse situations such as job demands, minor hassles, tasks, and emotional labor can accumulate within the workplace to determine an individual’s affective states and impact workplace attitudes and behavior. These states can similarly affect job performance and job satisfaction (Ashkanasy, 2002; Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008). Furthering AET, Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) explained that emotions and job satisfaction are affected by both positive and negative events during a working day (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000). The accumulation of positive and negative affective events can lead to positive and negative states in employees, potentially resulting in diverse attitudes and behavioral responses (Dasborough, 2006).

In 1998, the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998) gained momentum. ER represents an individual’s attempts to “influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions” (Gross, 1998, p. 275). According to Gross (1998), controlled emotions are vital for individual and organizational effectiveness. Within the workplace, people use various ways to regulate emotions based on their tendencies, organizational setup, and
understanding of the organization (Callister et al., 2007; Gross & Thompson, 2007). This regulation of emotions can be deliberate, motivated by clear goals, implicating conscious effort and attention; and automatic, covertly goal-oriented, without thorough assessment or care (Mauss, Bunge, & Gross, 2007). Since its inception, the theory has been refined and further developed and is now known as the extended process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 2015; Sheppes, Suri, & Gross, 2015). As this theory is fundamental to the RAM, it is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

In 2001, Bernard Weiner published a paper presenting two distinct yet interrelated theories of motivation from an attribution perspective (see Chapter 3 for more details). The intrapersonal theory of motivation is described as “self-directed thoughts and feelings” and the interpersonal theory of motivation as “other-directed thoughts and feelings” (Weiner, 2000, p. 17). Theories before 2001 had a significant emphasis on one of these aspects only. They either focused on the intrapersonal or interpersonal aspects of emotions, in line with Weiner’s (2001) definition. Weiner (2000, 2001) demonstrated an apparent prominence of both aspects, even though his paper’s theories were distinct. The dual threshold model of anger (DTM) (Geddes & Callister, 2007) and emotions as social information (EASI) (Van Kleef, 2009) are also examples of this combined focus shift, and these are examined in the next section.

2.2.3 Anger Theories and Models

The DTM (Geddes & Callister, 2007) emphasizes a social constructionist perspective of emotion. It posits that organizational norms create emotional thresholds that can be crossed when employees feel anger (Geddes & Callister, 2007). The theory contends that for relationships to be maintained, it is essential to determine at what threshold the receiver perceives sender anger to be considered inappropriate. Two thresholds occur when individuals experience anger in organizations (Geddes & Callister, 2007). The first one is named the “expression threshold” (Geddes & Callister,
2007, pp. 722-723), and it refers to an individual being able to convey their experienced anger to persons within the organization, who can address the anger event. The second is named the “impropriety threshold” (Geddes & Callister, 2007, pp. 722-723), which refers to situations when the sender’s anger goes too far, and workplace personnel find it inappropriate. These thresholds also distinguish between suppressed anger (does not cross the expression threshold), expressed anger (crosses the expression threshold), and deviant anger (crosses the impropriety threshold and “deviates from organizational norms of tolerable emotion displays”) (Geddes & Callister, 2007, p. 202).

Van Kleef first proposed EASI in 2009. Rooted in a social-functional approach (Frijda, 1986), EASI explains that the communication of emotions in interpersonal relations offers evidence to receivers about viewpoints and intents of the sender (Keltner & Haidt, 1999). Inferences made by receivers can impact their conduct. Inferential processes and affective reactions may influence an individual’s behavior and provide pertinent information about a situation (Van Kleef, 2009). For example, envisage a person talking to a manager who expresses his anger at them for not delivering their work on time (inferential process). The anger manifestation might inspire the receiver to do their work and get the work in on time next time (behavior).

More recently, Schwarzmüller, Brosi, and Welpe (2018) proposed an extension to the dual threshold model of anger (DTM) (Geddes & Callister, 2007), considering concepts outlined in the EASI model (Van Kleef, 2009, 2014). In other words, an affective mechanism was added to the DTM (Geddes & Callister, 2007). Schwarzmüller et al. (2018) explained that by demonstrating how adverse reactions also originate from reciprocal feelings of anger (Van Kleef, 2009), they have contributed further to the current DTM (Geddes & Calllister, 2007) explanation that negative outcomes originate from perceptions of intense anger displays (Schwarzmüller et al., 2018).
Table 2.1 below provides a visual depiction of the main theoretical focus of the theories. Researchers have more recently focused on the intrapersonal ("self directed thoughts and feelings") and interpersonal ("other directed thoughts and feelings") processes (as defined by Weiner, 2000, p. 17) when addressing emotions. Investigators who have successfully combined both aspects have concentrated on processes related to the angry person within the workplace (i.e., an episodic model of anger in organizations, see Gibson & Callister, 2010). In this research, I aim to combine the intrapersonal and interpersonal processes within one model to address the receivers’ experience and response to anger at work. To do this, I have created a model foundational to this thesis: the relational anger model (RAM), which is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3. To fully comprehend the importance of addressing both the interpersonal and intrapersonal processes receivers’ use when they encounter workplace anger manifestations, it is vital to understand the anger emotion and its impact on organizations.
Table 2.1: The main theoretical focus of emotion theories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Contribution to Emotion Theory</th>
<th>Main Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary Theory of Emotion</td>
<td>Charles Darwin</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Book on ‘The expression of emotions in man and animals’. Darwin proposed the evolution of emotions, affirming their importance to an individual’s survival and reproduction.</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James-Lang Theory of Emotions</td>
<td>William James and Carl Lange</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Physiological theory of emotions, emotions as outcomes of physical changes in the body.</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon-Bard Theory of Emotions</td>
<td>Walter Cannon and Phillip Bard</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Thalamic theory of emotions. Exciting events activate physiological reactions that occur concurrently and independently.</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of the Emotions</td>
<td>Jean-Paul Sartre</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Emotions as a means of cognizance to capture the world, attempting to solve or diminish internal struggles. Functional role of emotions to resolve internal conflict.</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution Theory</td>
<td>Fritz Heider – developed further by Edward E. Jones and Keith E. Davis (1965), Harold Kelley (1967) and Bernard Weiner (1972)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Focus on perception and attributions as cognitive processes through which people determine cause and effect, solve problems, and become more effective in interacting with the environment.</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Two Factor Theory</td>
<td>Stanley Schachter and Jerome E. Singer</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Attributions and the automatic nervous system. Arousal from a psychological stimulation followed by the identification of the arousal leading to a reaction and cognitive interpretation that leads to emotions when named.</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor</td>
<td>Arlie Russel Hochschild</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>The management of emotions for greater public visibility of facial and bodily presentation.</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Appraisal Theory</td>
<td>Richard Lazarus and Susan Folkman</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>The process of considering if an event threatens an individual’s wellbeing and whether there are adequate resources to address the situation’s demands.</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Events Theory</td>
<td>Howard M. Weiss and Russell Cropanzano</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Communication based theory. Structure to investigate potential causes and consequences of affective experiences in the workplace.</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Process Model of Emotion Regulation</td>
<td>James J. Gross</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Emotion regulation refers to a person’s attempt to “influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions” (Gross, 1998, p. 275).</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Theories of Motivation</td>
<td>Bernard Weiner</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Intrapersonal, the examination of “self-directed thoughts and feelings” and Interpersonal, the examination of “other-directed thoughts and feelings” (Weiner, 2001, p. 17)</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Threshold Model of Anger</td>
<td>Deanna Geddes and Ronda Roberts Callister</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>A greater understanding of the experience of anger. Organizational anger expression thresholds: expression threshold (ability to convey experience anger effectively) and impropriety threshold (anger expression goes too far and found to be inappropriate).</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions as Social Information</td>
<td>Gerben A. Van Kleef</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Emotional expressions offer evidence to observers that could impact their conduct.</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each theory’s prominent main focus (as defined by Weiner, 2001) in Table 2.2 has been bolded.
2.3 THE ANGER EMOTION

Glomb (2002) defined anger as an emotional state that encompasses feelings varying in intensity from “mild irritation to fury to rage, physiological and cognitive reactions, and behavioral tendencies” (p. 22). Considered a subjective feeling (Domagalski & Steelman, 2005), anger is linked to anxious, motivated thoughts and a tendency to confront or want to confront receivers of anger, both orally and non-orally (Averill, 1982; Fitness, 2000) sometimes with an urge to injure them (Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004). It involves evaluating accountability for actions by another individual or entity and often includes correcting the perceived wrong (Gibson & Callister, 2010; Weiss, Suckow, & Cropanzano, 1999). In some instances, anger is also considered a moral emotion. Moral anger is defined as “an aroused emotional state stemming from a primary appraisal of a moral violation that impacts on others more than oneself motivating corrective behavior intended to improve the social conditions, even in the face of significant risk” (Lindebaum & Geddes, 2016, p. 743). Its main characteristic is a concern for benefitting others (Haidt, 2003; Lindebaum & Geddes, 2016).

Anger is a complex emotion because it can produce both positive (Haidt, 2003; Solomon, 1993; Thoits, 1989; Van Kleef et al., 2004) and adverse outcomes (Davidson, Fox, & Kalin, 2007; Solomon, 2003; Waldman, Balthazard, & Peterson, 2011). On the one hand, it can signal that objectives are blocked, that an individual’s autonomy is being invaded or obstructed, and it can activate shielding physiological variations and behavior to deal with the apparent threat (Frijda, 1986). On the other hand, it can be found within various actions such as aggression (Grandey, Dickter, & Sin, 2004), bullying (Mathisen, Einarson, & Mykletun, 2008; Rayner & Hoel, 1997; Townsend, 2016), and physical abuse (Mayhew, 2000; Roche, Diers, Duffield, & Catling-Paull, 2010). Anger has many characteristics. Depending on the situation at hand, its target can
change, and conflicts can be resolved, reduced, or aggravated (Lindebaum & Gabriel, 2016). It can disperse quickly, and it can “mutate, migrate, and metamorphose” (Lindebaum & Gabriel, 2016, p. 906). In addition, it serves to inform the receiver to some extent about the angry person’s emotions, beliefs, and intentions (Keltner & Haidt, 1999).

Within this thesis, anger is defined as an emotional state varying in intensity from irritable to hostile, containing physiological, cognitive, and behavior propensities, involving evaluating accountability for others (object-oriented) (Gibson & Callister, 2010; Glomb, 2002). Table 1 contains the Anger Intensity Scale, based on Glomb’s (2002) progression definition, used in this research to determine the receivers’ perceptions of workplace anger intensity.

Table 2.2: Anger Intensity Scale (object-oriented) (Glomb, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anger Intensity Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irritable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anger occurs in the workplace in many forms (e.g., aggression and frustration) (Kent, Jordan, & Troth, 2014) and contexts (e.g., abusive supervision and bullying) (Walker & Jackson, 2017). Mounting concerns about the impact of the senders’ anger have led organizations to supply internal mediators and human resource professionals to support employees (Lipsky & Seeber, 2003). Sadly, up to 75 percent of those impacted choose not to use a mediator, despite their desire to do so (Bingham, 2004). The choice not to use a mediator could be because voicing one’s concern over abuse and
mistreatment at work could be problematic (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998), potentially impacting performance ratings and turnover (Klaas & DeNisi, 1989) and leading to silencing and self-repression. Moreover, there is also the added concern of potential punishment (Harlos, 2010) and the fear of losing one’s job (Cortina & Magley, 2003).

Receiver research has examined anger in a few workplace contexts (Harlos, 2010; Moreo et al., 2020; Tepper, 2000). As research on the receiver is sparse, I have included a discussion of results from the abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000), aggression (Schat, Frone, & Kelloway, 2006), and bullying contexts (Baillien, Neyens, De Witte, & De Cuyper, 2009), with a larger focus on results that apply to the anger context.

### 2.3.1 Abusive Supervision

Abusive supervision research is defined as “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which their supervisors engage in a sustained display of hostile, verbal and non-verbal behavior, excluding physical contact” (Tepper, 2000, p. 263). Abusive supervision can border on bullying and aggression, yet it differs in that abusive supervision per se does not define the manager’s intents or aims (Martinko, Harvey, Brees, & Mackey, 2013; Tepper, 2007). It has influenced and caused anger and abuse receivers to become more abusive to those under their leadership (Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007; Harris, Harvey, Harris, & Cast, 2013). The evidence shows this repetition of abuse by receivers occurs even if the person witnessing the abusive behavior is not a direct target of the abuse (Harris et al., 2013; D. Liu Liao, & Loi, 2012; Mawritz, Mayer, Hoobler, Wayne, & Marinova, 2012).

Abusive supervision has attracted interest from researchers in various parts of the world (Hoobler & Hu, 2013; Khan, 2014 Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012). Research in the USA (Martinko, Sikora, & Harvey, 2012) and Korea (Kernan, Watson, Chen, & Kim, 2011) identified that abusive supervision impacts individuals with an achievement orientation and human values more negatively. For example, within the Chinese culture,
those with a strong respect for authority were less inclined to identify abusive behavior (i.e., workplace anger manifestations) from leaders (J. Liu, Kwong Kwan, Wu, & Wu, 2010). Abusive supervision contains anger components, yet it is not restricted to anger alone (Wang, Restubog, Shao, Lu, & Van Kleef, 2018).

Anger research within abusive supervision has established results mostly related to power distance influence in anger relationships. A study conducted by Tepper (2007) identified that subordinates whose managers were more abusive recounted higher attrition and less favorable attitudes concerning work, life, and organization. Also, individuals experiencing abuse (including anger) by supervisors are impacted psychologically. They experience stress, emotional exhaustion, burnout (Carlson et al., 2012; Tepper, 2007), anxiety (Tepper, Moss, Lockhart, & Carr, 2007), and lowered self-esteem (Rafferty & Restubog, 2011). In Australia, research conducted in the medical industry established that verbal abuse (i.e., the sender’s anger manifestation), including expressions of physical forcefulness and intimidation of violence, were faced by more than a third of employees (Mayhew, 2000), with expressions of anger often bordering on the mistreatment of others (Nixon & Spector, 2015).

### 2.3.2 Aggression

Aggression is intentionally directed to physically or psychologically hurt workers in organizations (Schat et al., 2006). Like bullying, the direction of aggression can be from co-workers, supervisors, or outsiders, such as customers (Hershcovis & Barling, 2006). In England, a National Health Service staff survey found that 15% of frontline staff faced physical violence from patients or their families (Health Care Commission, 2009). Similarly, a Canadian National Survey of the Work and Health of Nurses held in 2005, established that 34% of nurses caring for patients reported physical attacks, and 47% reported emotional maltreatment (Shields & Wilkins, 2009). In Australia, the situation is no different. A survey of nursing personnel from 94 wards in 21 hospitals in
two Australian states found that verbal abuse, including expressions of physical forcefulness and intimidation of violence, were faced by up to 38% (Mayhew, 2000), with verbal abuse going beyond anger and insults into the mistreatment of others (Nixon & Spector, 2015). Likewise, this ensues in numerous industries such as farming, meat works (Richards, Signal, & Taylor, 2013), and television (Linder & Gentile, 2009) industries.

More specifically, results related to anger within aggression indicate that higher intensity of expressed, uncontrolled anger can lead to provocative verbal and aggressive attacks (Friedman et al., 2004), disruption of relationships, output (Glomb, 2002; Glomb & Hulin, 1997), and obstruction of negotiations (Allred et al., 1997). Rage-associated emotions have caused severe, disparaging behavior such as threats, vandalism (impacting on objects), theft, sabotage (Bies & Tripp, 1998; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), planned retaliation, and even physical violence (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002; Deffenbacher, Lynch, Oetting, & Swaim, 2002). Employees also experienced reduced job satisfaction and augmented workplace stress (Glomb, 2002).

2.3.3 Bullying

Bullying denotes ongoing intentional uninvited behavior (see R. T. Lee & Brotheridge, 2006) towards another in which several outrageous acts transpire with the bully’s intent of gaining power over the bullied (Einarsen, 1999). Bullying can occur in various industries such as the arts (Quigg, 2011), hospitality (Ram, 2018), and food services (Kitterlin, Tanke, & Stevens, 2016), and can potentially lead to physical assault, considered a form of aggression. Bullying literature also explains that the receiver has difficulty defending themself against the bully’s actions (Hoel & Cooper, 2001). The source of bullying can vary (e.g., manager, colleague, subordinate) (Tepper, 2007). Twenty-one percent of frontline staff (in the National Health Service) in England experienced bullying, provocation, and maltreatment from patients or their families
Bullying in the workplace poses a situation where there is an imbalance between the receiver and the wrongdoer (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003).

Bullying can include expressions of anger but is not limited to this emotion (i.e., vengefulness and self-pity) (Borg, 1998). Research related to anger within bullying established that the position of power within organizations could generate openings for the bully to act (Jennifer, Cowie, & Ananiadou, 2003). In other words, the receiver (target and observer) might experience anger directed at them of a potentially bullying nature from their manager or supervisor (e.g., recurring workplace anger manifestations) (Agervold, 2007; Baillien, Neyens, De Witte, & De Cuyper, 2009). Bullying research established that receivers experienced verbal harassment and being yelled at and belittled (Djurkovic, McCormack, & Casimir, 2005; Fox & Stallworth, 2006). Furthermore, they also experienced intimidation and threats (Von Bergen, Zavaletta, & Soper, 2006).

A few individual and organizational outcomes of workplace bullying (including anger) indicated the receivers’ absence from work (Namie, 2007) augmented workplace mistakes (Paice & Smith, 2009) and poorer health (Randle, Stevenson, & Grayling, 2007), including increased costs to organizations through workers compensation claims (Macintosh & Stevens, 2013) and lawsuits for unfair dismissal (Gardner & Johnson, 2001). Receivers also experienced a diminished desire to engage in teamwork, and lowered organizational commitment (Baillien et al., 2009). Bullying continues more when organizations do not address it when it happens (see Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Jones, 2017). In other words, by being silent, organizations allow the bullying behavior to continue.
2.4 ANGER IN ORGANIZATIONS

Anger within the workplace can be directed at an individual, the direct target of anger (Desivilya & Yagil, 2005; Harlos, 2010; Van Kleef et al., 2004) and also towards observers, viewers, and witnesses of the incident (Geddes & Callister, 2007; Miron-Spektor & Rafaeli, 2009). Given that research on the angry person has been conducted for many years, I thought it appropriate to consider how sender research might contribute their current findings to receiver research. In this section, I explain commonalities between the sender and the receiver, followed by a discussion of anger triggers and outcomes potentially applicable to both senders and receivers. Finally, I conclude this section with considerations around gender.

2.4.1 The Angry Person: Sender and Receiver Considerations

Given that the receiver can potentially experience anger in response to the sender, it is pertinent to say that the receiver of anger can become the angry person. Research has established the incidence of emotional reciprocity (the process through which individuals experience similar emotions) (Van Kleef et al., 2008). For example, when an angry person expresses their anger towards another within the organization, the receiver may respond with a similar emotion (i.e., anger) (see Baldwin, 1992).

Besides, outcomes identified for the angry person might also apply to the receiver. For example, research has identified that when an angry person suppresses emotions, they can experience high strain (Côté, 2005), stress, and severe health issues (Alexander & French, 1946; Friedman, 1990; Glomb & Tews, 2004). Research has also found that anger suppressed for an extended period might return with greater intensity, leading to negative consequences to the individual and the organization (Gibson et al., 2009). Receivers might also experience these established outcomes when they suppress emotions (e.g., suppression in the face of the angry person’s anger towards them) (see Côté, 2005). When the difference between felt and expressed emotion occurs, emotional
dissonance can occur, leading to burnout and other health factors (Salovey, Detweiler, Steward, & Bedell, 2001; Schaufeli & Buunk, 2003; Zapf, 2002). The angry person also experiences lowered wellbeing, burnout, and other health factors such as hypertension and coronary heart disease (Glomb & Tews, 2004; Jorgensen, Johnson Kolodziej, & Schreer, 1996; Salovey, Hsee, & Mayer, 2001; Schaufeli & Buunk, 2003; Zapf, 2002). This has been confirmed for receivers in aggression research. Individuals who were asked to think of experienced anger specifically reported increased health issues, such as unbalanced sleeping patterns, intensified apprehension, and augmented substance abuse (Hogh, Mikkelsen, & Hansen, 2011; Lutgen-Sandvik, 2008).

Concerning emotional expressions, psychoanalytic theory inspired a belief that expressing one’s anger was beneficial to health and wellbeing (Siegman, 1993). Research on the sender of anger established that there is significant evidence that expressing anger can be a way to influence others (Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006; Van Kleef, 2009) and realize objectives (Callister et al., 2003), allowing a person to speak to matters of unfairness and bias (Bies et al., 1997) through their anger communication. Receivers’ expressions of their anger emotion in the face of the sender’s anger might achieve similar results. Given the above, it seems safe to conclude that some of the results identified within sender anger research can be generalizable to the receiver of anger. Therefore, where applicable, results on sender research (e.g., their anger triggers and consequent outcomes) are discussed below in addition to current research results established for the receiver.

2.4.2 Triggers to Anger

Triggers to sender anger in the workplace can be internal (Barclay, Sharliki, & Pugh, 2005; Booth & Mann, 2005) and external (Grandey et al., 2002). Examples of internal triggers are perceptions of unjust treatment (Barclay et al., 2005; Booth & Mann, 2005; Gabriel, 1998; Grandey et al., 2002), and a threatening of one’s identity,
Examples of external triggers are intentional and unwarranted provocation from another (Averill, 1982, 1983) and external interferences with the sender’s ability to achieve the assigned task and goal (e.g., delayed shipment) (Grandey et al., 2002). Other triggers that could be both internal and external are communication breakdowns (Stickney & Geddes, 2014), interpersonal conflict (Fox & Spector, 1999; Gibson & Callister, 2010), and immoral actions (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). In this research, I suggest that if individuals (receivers of anger) face similar triggers, they might respond in anger when confronted with workplace anger expressions.

### 2.4.3 Anger and Gender

Although research has not identified any significant differences in men and women’s anger, there is considerable evidence that stereotypical emotion norms relating to gender impact workplace anger outcomes (Gibson & Callister, 2010). For example, anger episodes were perceived to be more favorable for men than for women who expressed anger (Gibson et al., 2009). Studies indicate that men are more likely than women to vent their anger through verbal and physical aggression (Spielberger et al., 1995). I propose that there might be a gender effect on which expressions are more acceptable within the workplace. More specifically, I argue that sender anger receivers will view anger originating from men within the workplace in a more favorable light than women who show anger.

### 2.5 RECEIVERS’ ATTRIBUTIONS MADE AND THEIR ER STRATEGIES USED IN THE FACE OF WORKPLACE SENDER ANGER

Suppositions about the other person’s responsibility (i.e., interpersonal context) are often steered by internal (dispositional) versus external (situational) causality, with internal causality frequently seen as controllable, and external, as uncontrollable (Allred et al., 1997; MacGeorge, 2001). Research has established that individuals differentiate
between deliberate and involuntary harmful actions (Allred et al., 1997; MacGeorge, 2001). Considerations around responsibility (in abusive supervision research) (Bowling & Michel, 2011; D. Liu et al., 2012) found that receivers (employees, direct targets of abusive anger) who saw themselves as responsible for the mistreatment (i.e., they made a mistake at work) reacted more optimistically to it. On the other hand, when attributions of abusive supervision were linked to organizational issues, receivers were more prone to use organization-focused nonconformity (i.e., complain about the organization) (Bowling & Michel, 2011). One hundred and fifty-five managers enrolled in a Master of Business Administration (MBA) program at the University of California, Los Angeles were asked to recall two instances in which somebody at work “did something that had a strong negative effect on you” (Allred, 1995, p. 13). The results indicated that the more responsibility they attributed to the angry person, the angrier they felt (Allred, 1995). Judging the other party to be responsible for harmful behavior also increases anger compelled retaliatory responses (Allred, 1995, 1999). Furthermore, findings suggest that a leader’s anger tends to decrease subordinate perceptions of leader efficacy (Lewis, 2000).

2.5.1 The Role of Status in Attributions

The context of negotiations potentially contributes to an understanding of whether or not anger is seen as appropriate (Van Kleef & Côté, 2007; Wirth & Wentura, 2019), with personal cultural differences influencing the degree of ‘felt’ anger (Eid & Diener, 2001). Research shows it is imperative to measure the angry person and receivers’ positions in anger relations (Sloan, 2004). Status has considerable implications for how people feel, think, and act in social situations (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; De Dreu & Van Kleef, 2004; Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2003). Given that interpersonal interactions with co-workers and supervisors can be the most potent source of anger (Kramer & Hess, 2002; Waldron, 2000), one can accept that differences in how
individuals attribute meaning to workplace anger will occur depending on who is angry with whom (Fitness, 2000; Sloan, 2004). Tepper (2007) noted that variances could be linked to context, with military and health care industries seemingly particularly susceptible to abusive behavior (e.g., anger manifestations) due to the hierarchical nature of those organizations. Researchers have found that subordinates (receivers) who attributed blame to others for their failures tended to classify their supervisors as abusive (Martinko, Harvey, Sikora, & Douglas, 2011), while high power respondents were more inclined to think that anger incidents were successfully resolved (Fitness, 2000). In addition, proximal subordinates viewed supervisors who engaged in high conflict levels as more abusive (Harris, Harvey, & Kacmar, 2011). When assessing the influence of a negotiator’s anger on their counterpart, researchers found that a negotiator’s (receiver) felt anger reduced mutual benefits, as well as the desire to work together (Allred et al., 1997).

2.5.2 The Role of Trust in Attributions

Anger expressed during negotiations impacts the receivers’ trust of the negotiator (sender), drawing attention away from the goal of attaining an agreement (Allred et al., 1997). It also leads to negating proposals (De Dreu & Van Kleef, 2004; Kopelman et al., 2006; Pillutla & Murninghan, 1996) and a greater likelihood of the receiver engaging in aggressive strategies (Forgas, 1998). In addition, research on the impact of anger and compassion on a negotiator’s objectives has revealed that distrust (a negative expectation of the other person’s behavior) leads to the receivers’ desire to protect themself, lessening joint benefits leading to a win-lose result (Allred et al., 1997; M. Liu & Wang, 2010).

On the other hand, in a negotiation where trust and compassion are present, the receiver attributes more importance to the relationship, which leads to a win-win approach, generating a willingness to maximize profits for both parties (M. Liu &
Wang, 2010). More recent research has identified that anger used in negotiations produces more outstanding results (such as a win/win outcome) from counterparts than more neutral emotional expressions such as cheerfulness or joy (Adam & Brett, 2018; Cropanzano, Becker, & Feldman, 2012). I assume that this could be one reason why many angry individuals continue to express anger within the workplace without major consequences to themselves or their position (see Johnson, 2000).

2.5.3 The Receivers’ Regulation of Emotions During Anger Interactions

A major aim of this research is to identify the reasons for the receivers’ use of various ER strategies (i.e., how receivers manage and respond to workplace anger) in the face of workplace anger directed at them. Specifically, I seek to understand the receivers’ use of different ER strategies in response to the attributions made about the causes of sender anger. Within the workplace, individuals use various ways to regulate emotions based on their tendencies, organizational setup, and understanding of the organization’s norms (Callister et al., 2007; Gross & Thompson, 2007). There are three overriding styles of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998, 2015): expression (expressing felt emotion); suppression (inhibiting expressed felt emotion); and re-appraisal (reframing an event to change felt anger). Receivers of anger can regulate their affective state (e.g., emotions and moods) and affective expressions, pursuant to their situation. For example, an employee might suppress their emotion (e.g., disgust or anger) in the face of the sender’s anger directed at them in fear of losing their job. Alternatively, an employee might distance themselves from the angry person when they feel threatened (see EASI by Van Kleef, 2009).

Research on the power of negotiators found that low power individuals hesitate when they speak (Holtgraves & Lasky, 1999; Hosman, 1989) and limit their expression of thoughts (Hall et al., 2006) and emotions (Keltner & Kring, 1998). In other words, subordinates are less likely than superiors to confront the angry person (Fitness, 2000).
More specifically, subordinates tend to prefer the ER suppression strategy. According to Gross and John (2003) this ER suppression of emotions does not necessarily mean that the individual does not use the ER reappraisal strategy. However, individuals who suppress emotions tend to use ER reappraisal strategies as a latter intervention at a significant cost to themselves (e.g., lowered health and wellbeing) (Alexander & French, 1946; Friedman, 1990; Glomb & Tews, 2004; Gross & John, 2003).

2.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING CHAPTER

In conclusion, individuals can experience emotions and be directly impacted by them (Egloff, Schmukle, Stefan, Burns, & Hock, 2003; Peralta et al., 2020; Weiner, 2001). This research considers the specific influence of workplace anger directed at receivers, both targets and observers (Geddes & Callister, 2007; Van Kleef & Côté, 2007). The relational anger model (RAM) introduced in Chapter 3 seeks to develop a framework for understanding receivers’ attributions made toward sender anger, and the ER strategies receivers use to deal with workplace anger. I aim to identify the links between attributions and ER strategies, examining these in light of the RAM and current literature (see Chapter 3).

This chapter provided a conceptual analysis of emotions and related concepts and discussed the historical progression of emotion theories with a brief overview of the foundational model for this research, the RAM. I also focused on discussing the anger emotion and presented the impact of anger that considered the receivers’ attributions and ER strategies used in the workplace and deliberated the impact on individuals and organizations.

In Chapter 3, I discuss the model developed for Studies 1 and 2. First, I present the background and foundational theories for the RAM. The discussion outlines the
broad propositions. I then consider the theoretical and practical implications of this model and conclude with a summary of the main points and an outline of Chapter 4.
Chapter 3: The Relational Anger Model (RAM)

3.1 CHAPTER INTRODUCTION

When examining the emotion theories and models discussed in Section 2.2, it became clear that extant singular emotion theories and models are only partly adequate to assess the full impact of anger on receivers. The literature review (see Chapter 2) suggested that it would be useful to develop a model that combines an examination of the receivers’ interpersonal and intrapersonal processes within one model to address their experiences of workplace anger. To address this theoretical gap in workplace anger research this chapter presents and discusses the overarching conceptual model for this thesis, the Relational Anger Model (RAM).

Two theoretical frameworks underpin the RAM: attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998, 2001, 2015). Where appropriate, I discuss the contributions to RAM from other theories and models throughout this chapter. Although other theories and models discussed in Section 2.2 contain essential aspects that contribute to a greater understanding of emotions, and more specifically, to anger, they do not provide a comprehensive examination of the attributions and emotions regulation strategies used by receivers of workplace anger. Thus, the purpose of this section is to clarify and justify the importance of having both theories within one model when addressing workplace anger relationships. To do this, I draw on an analogy of a well-known story told by artists worldwide. This story describes the creation of the first humans and subsequent separation from God found in Genesis and the reconciliation to God through a Savior described in Isaiah 53 and the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Great artists have depicted this story through song (e.g., Messiah by George Frideric Handel in 1742; see Burrows, 2016),
writings (e.g., Paradise Lost classic poem by John Milton in 1667; see Shitaka, 1990), and art (e.g., The Rebuff of Adam and Eve by Domenichino of 1626, see Petcu, 2020; and the Risen Christ by Michelangelo of 1521; see Wallace, 1997). Various emotions are portrayed in the biblical narrative and in the works of art that depict Adam and Eve’s emotional experience in the Garden. Emotions such as fear (see Genesis 3:10), shame (see Genesis 3:6-7), reprimand (see Genesis 3:13), and a feeling of separation, namely God banishing Adam and Eve from the Garden (Genesis 3:23). This story and the emotions in it led me to think of the reasoning behind combining two theoretical frameworks within the RAM. A more detailed description of this analogy and its meaning to the RAM is discussed below.

3.1.1 The Role of Emotion Regulation Strategies in Good Working Relationships

Michelangelo Buonarroti (Renaissance artist; 1475–1564), in his painting The Creation of Adam, displayed on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel in Rome, Italy (Blech & Doliner, 2008; Campos, 2019), portrays a well-designed relationship between God and Adam (see Genesis 3) (Campos, 2019). In good working relationships (De Beer, 2014) like the one described in the illustration, individuals monitor their experience and expression of emotions (Gross, 1998) increasing positive emotions and decreasing negative ones (Gross, 2013).

3.1.2 The Role of Emotions Regulation Strategies When Relationships Go Wrong

ER strategies have the functional role of solving internal conflict (Blanchard-Fields, 2007), intending to bridge the gap between the existing purpose and actuality (Carver & Scheier, 1990). Given this information, it seems that ER strategies not only assist well functioning relationships; they also play a role when relationships go wrong (e.g., conflict in organizations) (Gross, 2015).

Michelangelo’s painting Expulsion from Paradise displayed in the Sistine Chapel marks the moment when Adam and his partner Eve overstepped the boundary set by
God in the Garden of Eden, distancing themselves from Him (see Genesis 3) (Carver & Scheier, 1990; May, 2005). Notably, Adam and Eve’s use of ER strategies underwent a focus change. ER strategies previously fixated on building relationships (i.e., Adam and Eve communicating with God) shifted to a more prominent focus on self (e.g., hiding, distancing from God, suppressing emotions). In a similar way, I propose that (in relation to ER) when the receivers’ status quo is challenged (e.g., the experience of strong emotions), the intrapersonal process (focus on the management of self, of one’s emotions) potentially takes on a more prominent focus than the interpersonal one (building relationships). In other words, ER strategies seek a return to internal stability by attempting to decrease negative emotions (Gross, 2013). This is exemplified in the illustration. Adam and Eve distanced themselves from the relationship by hiding, suppressing their emotions and later by expressing them, attempting to justify themselves. The interpersonal, relational process seemingly takes second place in face of the imminent challenge to self (Clark, Pataki, & Carver, 1996). Similarly, I propose that individuals who encounter a challenge to their status quo within the workplace (such as the one faced by Adam and Eve when the relationship was challenged) will first focus more on decreasing negative emotions (i.e., the impact to self) as opposed to attempting to work at the relationship (see Gross, 1998; 2013).

3.1.3 The Role of Attributions in the RAM

*The Fall of Man* by Michelangelo demonstrates that humanity “necessitated the work of redemption carried out by Christ” (Brazier, 2015; May, 2005, p. 314). I propose that when ER strategies are more focused on self as opposed to the relationship, a ‘savior’ (mediator) is required to ensure the interpersonal process is provided for. In other words, according to the story depicted by Michelangelo, the Savior (i.e., redeemer and mediator) was focused on the relationship restoration (Brazier, 2015, p. 285). Comparably, I propose that attributions can fulfill the mediating role during
interpersonal conflict relations (see Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992). To better comprehend the role of attributions in interpersonal conflict relations, it is essential to understand attribution theory (Heider, 1958). Attribution theory explains how people make causal descriptions and respond to questions commencing with ‘why?’ concerning other people’s behavior (Kelley, 1973). Attributions play a significant role in interpersonal conflict relations (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992), often acting as problem solving mechanisms. Similar to ER, attributions are focused on managing self and the environment. “The attributor is not simply an attributor, a seeker of knowledge; his latent goal in attaining knowledge is that of an effective management of himself and his environment” (Kelley, 1971, p. 22). It seems that in anger interactions, attributions act differently from ER strategies when the ‘status quo’ is disrupted. Instead of focusing on self, attributions seek to determine causes for the incident and ways to understand what is happening (see Heider, 1958).

The RAM posits that attributions permit a greater focus on the ‘relationship’ (i.e., for receivers, the anger relationship), freeing ER strategies to pay more attention to self, potentially enabling a return to receivers’ internal stability (see Kelley, 1971). I propose that having both the intrapersonal and interpersonal processes available to deal with workplace anger relationships within RAM enables a more holistic approach. More specifically, I propose that attributions mediate between sender anger intensity and individual and organizational outcomes and, in concert with emotional regulation strategies, determine whether outcomes will be positive or negative.

In summary, the RAM is therefore based on both attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998) to enable a more comprehensive assessment of workplace anger interactions. This chapter discusses the foundational concepts for the RAM, providing a detailed overview of the main theoretical frameworks of attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of
emotion regulation (Gross, 1998; 2001). I also outline general propositions throughout the chapter. Following this discussion, I provide a brief overview of Studies 1 and 2, discussing how RAM increases understanding of receivers’ experiences and anger outcomes.

3.2 THE DIRECT IMPACT OF SENDER ANGER ON RECEIVERS

The RAM, described in Figure 3.1 below, begins when an angry person expresses their anger towards a receiver. In my model, receivers of sender anger can be direct targets of anger or observers of anger directed at another person or object; which directly affects individual and organizational outcomes. As shown in Figure 3.1, the receivers’ attributions can mediate the relationship between sender anger intensity and individual and organizational outcomes capturing the receivers’ attempts to understand the reasons behind workplace anger directed towards them, another person, or object (see Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2008). In the model, I argue that the receivers’ attributions mediate the relationship between sender anger intensity and individual and organizational level outcomes. Finally, in the model, I propose that the relationship between the receivers’ attributions and the dependent variable (individual and organizational outcomes) is moderated (i.e., strengthened or weakened) by the receivers’ emotion regulation (ER) strategy for that situation.

In terms of control variables for this model, I acknowledge that the receivers’ gender, age (Birditt & Fingerman, 2003), status (Sloan, 2004), and national culture (Eid & Diener, 2001; Ekman, 1992; Gibson & Callister, 2010) might influence their perception of anger-laden situations (Fridlund, 1994). Besides, while not tested in my research, I acknowledge that many other factors may influence this relationship, such as individual differences (Calkins & Hill, 2007), context (Thompson & Lagattuta, 2006), display rules (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987), and adulthood changes (Charles & Carstensen, 2007). It is important to acknowledge that limitations may arise from not examining
these aspects in more detail. For example, context (Thompson & Lagattuta, 2006) and
display rules (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987) in the construction industry might differ from the
banking industry, with displays of anger seemingly more acceptable in the former than
the latter. Therefore, context and display rules might have played a part in the receivers’
choice of ER strategies, yet this remains to be further examined.
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* Note P2 is a mediated proposition

Figure 3.1 The Relational Anger Model (RAM)

**3.2.1 The Sender’s Anger and the Receiver’s Outcomes**

As mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2, workplace anger can have both positive and
negative outcomes (Lindebaum & Jordan, 2014). In terms of positive outcomes, anger
can contribute to individual and organizational efficacy (Gross, 1998; Peralta et al.,
2020), harmony (Stearns, 1986), group unity, and goal accomplishment (Callister et al.,
2003). Anger can also positively influence decisions and resolutions made by top
management (Amason, 1996). Research shows that those who were part of a conflict-
generating event in which anger was involved asked questions, challenged group
thought processes, and promoted innovation (Amason & Schweiger, 1994).
As also noted in Chapters 1 and 2, workplace anger does not always yield positive outcomes. When established social boundaries are crossed (see Geddes & Callister, 2007) there can be a subsequent impact on relationships. The DTM explains that two thresholds occur when individuals experience anger in organizations (Geddes & Callister, 2007). The first threshold is the “expression threshold” (Geddes & Callister, 2007, pp. 722-723), and it refers to achieving a minimal level of anger towards persons within the organization. The second is the “impropriety threshold” (Geddes & Callister, 2007, pp. 722-723); this threshold refers to situations when the manifestation of sender anger goes too far, and others find it inappropriate contravening organizational and social norms for expressions of anger. The impropriety threshold is based on the observation that a greater intensity of uncontrolled anger potentially leads to the disruption of relationships, individual output (Glomb, 2002; Glomb & Hulin, 1997), and obstruction of negotiations (Allred et al., 1997). The RAM suggests that receivers’ attributions of inappropriateness (i.e., crossing the impropriety threshold) made of higher levels of sender anger intensity can potentially lead to negative outcomes for the individual and the organization (see Adler, LeardMann, Roenfeldt, Jacobson, & Forbes, 2020).

Workplace anger directed at receivers can be challenging (Aquino et al., 2004; Begley, 1994; Fox & Spector, 1999). For example, the greater the intensity, the more negative the impact on the receiver. Receivers’ encounters with these types of anger manifestations have produced greater workplace stress and diminished workplace satisfaction (Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison & Pinneau, 1975; Glomb, 2002), often leading to a desire to resign from their job (Harlos, 2010). Given this information, I propose that:

**Proposition 1** – Perceptions of higher sender anger intensity lead to poorer individual and organizational outcomes for the receiver.
However, this direct relationship does not work in a vacuum. Many cognitive and emotional processes are involved in this interpersonal exchange. Receivers of workplace anger primarily make attributions of the sender’s anger to make sense of the incident (Kelley, 1971). These attributions are discussed in more detail below.

3.2.2 The Mediating Role of the Receiver’s Attributions in the Face of Workplace Anger and Individual and Organizational Outcomes

This section provides a review of how researchers have considered attributions. As mentioned in Chapter 2, attribution theory explains how people make causal descriptions and respond to questions commencing with ‘why?’ concerning other people’s behavior (Kelley, 1973). It originated with Fritz Heider’s 1958 book on The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. Five ways researchers have considered attributions are discussed below: i) correspondent inference theory; ii) covariation model and causal dimensions of attributions; iii) attribution styles; and iv) attribution biases. These aspects are considered throughout the discussion, with a larger focus on the causal dimensions of attributions.

i. Correspondent Inference Theory

In 1965, Jones and Davis developed the correspondent inference theory determining that an action could be attributed to personal characteristics (internal) or environmental (external) ones. They explained that when people describe others’ behavior, they seek to ascribe lasting dispositional or internal attributions (e.g., personality traits). In contrast, when individuals try to justify their behavior, they are inclined to make external attributions, such as situational or environmental ones (e.g., delay in delivery of goods as a reason for not completing their work on time) in order to maintain the self-image desired (Martinko & Gardner, 1987). It is also natural for people to move towards a positive self-image and view of themselves, even if there is information to contradict this position (Snow, Kern, & Curlette, 2001).
ii. Covariation Model and Causal Dimensions of Attributions

In a relatively early contribution to attribution theory, Kelley (1967) proposed the covariation model. Specifically looking at anger, the receiver (target or observer) of workplace sender anger might have information from multiple observations, while on the other hand, they may only have information from a single observation. In the first instance, the attributor observes and responds to the covariation of the observed effect and its possible causes, and in the second instance, the attributor responds to the conditions present at a given time (Kelley, 1973). Kelley (1972) presented a three-dimensional model to determine causal attributions:

i. Consistency – the extent to which the present behavior is consistent with past behavior. For example, an employee might become angry every day (more likely to be seen as an internal attribution).

ii. Distinctiveness – the level of contextual difference that surrounds the behavior. For example, an employee is angry because the order for the client has not arrived on time. The context would suggest the likelihood of an external attribution (e.g., work pressure).

iii. Consensus – the extent to which others behave similarly when in the same situation. For example, everyone in the group is always angry during meetings. If this is the case, then there probably is a situational cause of this anger; thus, an external attribution is more likely to explain their behavior.

Similar to Kelley’s (1967) covariation model (yet different in some aspects, as described below), Weiner (1979, 1985) argued that attributions could contain three causal dimensions:

i. Locus of causality – whether the cause is internal, specific to the person, or external, situationally influenced. For example, receivers’ attributions of
sender anger intensity related to the sender’s character, attitude, or personality, are considered internal attributions (dispositional). In contrast, receivers’ attributions of sender anger intensity related to the angry person’s external experiences, such as the death of a close family member (see Heider, 1958), are understood as external attributions (situational).

ii. Stability – whether the cause is constant or variable over time and circumstances. For example, the receivers’ experience of frequent intense sender anger that is considered constant over time and across circumstances is stable. On the other hand, the receivers’ experience of sender anger intensity that is not predictable or regular over time and across situations is unstable. In my research, I propose that stable patterns of sender anger behavior potentially lead to more negative outcomes for the receiver (see Weiner, 1972).

iii. Controllability – whether or not the cause is under the control of the person. More specifically related to this research, controllability establishes whether receivers perceive that the angry person can control their anger intensity (either attributed internally or externally) or not (Weiner, 1979).

Attributions affect motivation, functioning, and emotions, leading to either future success or failure (Schunk, 1991).

It is pertinent to discuss similarities and differences between the covariation model (Kelley, 1967) and the causal dimensions of attributions (Weiner, 1979, 1985). While in Weiner’s (1979) theory, the locus of causality is viewed as internal (attributed to the individual) or external (attributed to the context), ‘distinctiveness’ in Kelley’s (1967) theory studies the level of circumstantial variance that surrounds the behavior. Stability (Weiner, 1979), on the other hand, corresponds to ‘consistency’ in Kelley’s theory (1967). The significant difference between theories is that Weiner’s (1979) dimension of ‘controllability’ focuses on defining whether the reason is under the
control of the person or not, while Kelley’s (1967) ‘consensus’ dimension investigates
the magnitude to which others act comparably when in the same setting. Given the
impact of anger on individuals within organizations, Weiner’s (1979, 1985) causal
dimensions of attributions provide ample room for discussion and analysis in this thesis
by enabling the exploration of internal and external attributions, identifying whether the
cause of anger is constant or varied over time, and by determining whether the cause of
anger is under the control of the angry person.

iii. **Attribution Styles**

Attribution styles are constant and dependable prognosticators of human behavior
and help understand individual actions (Martinko, Harvey, & Douglas, 2007). Various
factors can influence attributions made, such as optimistic versus pessimistic attribution
styles. Optimistic styles tend to attribute success to intrinsic and stable dynamics and
attribute disappointment to external and unstable elements, such as fate and chance
(Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978). Pessimistic styles attribute external and
unstable elements to success and intrinsic and stable attributions to failure (Abramson et
al., 1978). General attributions made about behavior differ from attribution style, in that
general attributions provide causal explications for specific situations, whereas
attribution style is the inclination towards establishing attributions across situations
(Kent & Martinko, 1995). For example, an employee might attribute anger to the angry
person’s internal characteristics or personality (attribution). When the receiver has a
positive attribution style, they are more likely to dismiss the anger incident, excusing
the angry person for reasons such as having a busy, tiring day.

iv. **Attribution Biases**

Finally, it is essential to acknowledge that workplace anger receivers are not
exempt from biases, such as the actor-observer bias (Epley, Savitsky, & Gilovich, 2002;
Miyamoto & Kitayama, 2002) and hostile attribution biases (Crick & Dodge, 1994).
The actor-observer bias describes the tendency for observers to attribute the other person’s behavior to internal factors and attribute their behavior and results to external environmental factors (Epley et al., 2002; Miyamoto & Kitayama, 2002). According to Jones and Nisbett (1972), actors tend to have a variable view of themselves, knowing that they will sometimes behave according to internal emotions and attitudes and other times not. On the other hand, observers are not fully aware of actors’ circumstances or the meaning they attribute to situations, underestimating variability, and overestimating consistency. Research has determined that people are inclined to view themselves as more alterable and less predictable than others in different instances (Sande, Goethals, & Randloff, 1988). Within the context of workplace anger, receivers might put themselves into the angry person’s situation and determine that they would have acted differently (e.g., not angered).

The hostile attribution bias relates to some individuals’ tendency to interpret another person’s behavior as hostile, even when it is not (Crick & Dodge, 1994). It has played an essential part in studies of aggressive and antisocial behavior. Hostile attribution bias can instigate complicated social interactions and generate aggressive conduct, creating difficulty in social relations (Crick & Dodge, 1994). There is an indication in research studies that hostile attribution bias might be a contributing factor to the persistence of long-term behavior problems (Lobbestael, Cima, & Arntz, 2013), which impact this study. Employees, receivers of workplace anger, might interpret the anger as hostile even when it is not and react to it. In other words, the receiver may interpret anger directed at them negatively even when this is not the angry person’s intention.

Researchers have tried to understand this social bias (hostile attribution bias) better. Studies focused on children found that interpretation leaning towards hostile intent triggered aggressive reactions instead of thoughtful responses when the intent was
perceived as benign or unintentional (Dodge, Pettit, McClaskey, Brown, & Gottman 1986). Research has also confirmed negative relations concerning behavior and verbal intelligence. Reduced cognitive ability is determined as one factor triggering hostile attribution (Huesmann, Eron, Lefkowitz, & Walder, 1984). These hostile attributions were stronger when participants viewed themselves as personally entangled in the situation (Dodge & Frame, 1982) and frustrated by injustice (De Castro, 2000). Examining how individuals respond to an angry person may provide insight into more difficult workplace interactions leading to more aggressive behavior and violence from receivers of anger towards the angry person (Fox & Spector, 1999; Kent et al., 2014). Based on these arguments relating to attributions above, I posit the following:

Proposition 2 – The type of attribution the receiver makes towards the angry person will mediate the impact of the sender’s anger intensity on receivers’ individual and organizational outcomes.

3.2.3 The Moderating Role of Receivers’ Emotion Regulation Strategies in the Face of Sender Anger Intensity

Recapping, “emotion regulation refers to the processes by which individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions” (Gross, 1998, p. 275). Emotions typically arise when individuals pay attention to a situation and find it relevant to their goals (Gross, 1998, 2015). They develop from “valuation systems” (Gross, 2015, p. 130) that usually function concurrently. These valuation systems can also interact, support each other, or pull in opposite directions (Gross, 2015). They are a means of understanding the world and have the functional role of resolving internal conflict, aiming to bridge the gap between the current aim and reality (Carver & Scheier, 1990). Individuals frequently pursue a strategy of minimizing negative emotions and an intensification of positive ones to evade hurt and seek pleasure (Gross, 1998). In other words, they work to restore normality by resolving internal and external conflict as quickly as possible.
Within the workplace, individuals use various ways to regulate emotions based on their tendencies, organizational setup, and understanding of the organization’s norms (Callister et al., 2007; Gross & Thompson, 2007). For example, employees can recognize that their workplace norms inspire hostility and express anger in response to irritation, as it might be useful in that context (Aquino et al., 2004). Organizational display rules can render diverse practices of suppressing, de-intensifying, masking, or spur-of-the-moment expression (Ekman & Friesen, 1974). Individuals can choose several ER strategies, such as expressing their emotions by verbally articulating their responses (Spielberger et al., 1995); suppressing expressive behavior by inhibiting emotion (Gross, 1999; Pinder & Harlos, 2001); and reappraising, by assessing the emotion-generating event (Gross, 1998; 2015). Recently, response tendencies, which suited past situations, have changed dramatically and are often no longer acceptable in the present social environment (Gross, 1998). For example, an employee expressing their anger verbally to a colleague is less likely to be tolerated in today’s workplace (Eid & Diener, 2001; Ekman, 1992). Based on the RAM, I posit the following:

**Proposition 3** – ER strategies moderate the relationship between receiver attributions made of sender anger intensity and the receivers’ individual and organizational outcomes.

Gross (1998) argued that the experience and expression of emotions can be modified in five ways:

i. Situation selection – attempting to influence exposure to the emotion-eliciting event (e.g., attempt to avoid the person one has previously had conflict with, within the workplace).

ii. Situation modification – modifying aspects of the situation (e.g., being supportive and understanding towards the angry person attempting to modify the situation).
iii. Attentional deployment – influencing one’s perception by distraction: drawing attention away from a situation or towards its emotional aspects (e.g., when the receiver of anger guides the sender to focus on elements external to the anger event) and concentration: drawing attention to the emotional aspects of the situation (e.g., when the receiver focuses on the unfairness of the anger event drawing attention solely to this aspect).

iv. Cognitive change – appraising a situation to change its emotional meaning (also known as reappraisal). By changing the meaning of the event, the emotion attached to it can be altered. Doing this is typically used to diminish negative emotion (e.g., an employee might find that the sender’s anger is unacceptable yet say to themselves that their boss is having a bad day and does not mean what he/she is saying).

v. Response modulation – openly attempting to regulate physiological, experiential, or interactive responses. Response modulation “occurs late in the emotion-generative process, after response tendencies have been initiated” (e.g., an employee might suppress their emotions in an ongoing manner after encountering workplace sender anger) (Gross, 1998, p. 285).

i. The Extended Process Model of Emotion Regulation, and Anger Interactions

In 2015, Gross developed the extended process model of emotion regulation, where the author outlined three different stages of the model:

i. Identification – deciding whether to regulate emotions or not.

ii. Selection – deciding what emotion regulation strategy to select.

iii. Implementation – implementing the emotion regulation tactic selected.

Thus, Gross’ model (2015) suggests that the perception of greater anger intensity (i.e., identification) may immobilize the receivers’ thoughtful emotion regulatory
processes (Gross, 2015). An individual’s experience and regulation of emotions can vary (Mauss et al., 2007). Conscious ER can range from effortful to controlled, and unconscious ER, from easy to involuntary (Shiffrin & Schneider, 1977). An example of conscious ER is rumination. Rumination refers to focusing one’s attention on repetitive thoughts and behaviors (Nolen-Hoeksema, 2000). An example of unconscious regulation is repression, which refers to an automatic guard against hostile stimuli containing increased attention to pleasant thoughts (Boden & Baumeister, 1997). ER is generally conscious (Gross, 1998), such as deciding not to bite back when a manager yells at an employee.

While the extended process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 2015) stages (i.e., identification, selection, implementation) may be useful in managing low-intensity anger relationships, high-intensity anger relationships may be more geared towards “self-preservation”. They (high-intensity anger relationships) may, therefore incur a different ER process. In this case, the receiver may be more focused on protecting themselves from intense anger outcomes, such as provocative verbal and aggressive attacks (Friedman et al., 2004). Given the above discussion on emotion regulation, I propose that:

**Proposition 4** – The receivers’ use of emotional regulation strategies will moderate the mediated relationship between sender anger intensity, receiver attributions, and individual and organizational outcomes.

### 3.3 RESEARCH OVERVIEW

The RAM model described in this chapter provides the relevant foundation for examining the receivers’ internal processes in the face of workplace anger and addressing the research questions. This program of research contains two studies, one qualitative and one quantitative. The qualitative study (Study 1) examines attributions and ER strategies used by receivers (targets and observers) of anger in the workplace
The quantitative study (Study 2) examines the effect of sender anger intensity on the direct target and its impact on individual and organizational outcomes mediated by attributions and moderated by ER strategies (presented in Chapter 5).

3.4 CONCLUSION AND OVERVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING CHAPTER

In conclusion, this chapter integrated the theoretical frameworks of attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998) within the RAM model. The roles attributions and ER strategies play within the context of receivers’ workplace anger experiences were discussed, and a series of general propositions were presented. A brief overview of Studies 1 and 2 was also provided.

Chapter 4 presents Study 1, a qualitative study focused on determining the attributions and emotional regulation strategies of receivers of anger in the workplace. More specifically, I examine the attributions made about anger by those who witness anger and the emotional regulation strategies they use to manage their response to such emotional displays.
Chapter 4: Study 1 - Inside Out: A receiver’s Experience of Anger in the Workplace

Study 1 (qualitative) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was published in 2018 by Moura, Jordan, and Troth, as a book chapter entitled, Inside Out: A Receiver’s Experience of Anger in the Workplace (In Lindebaum, D. Geddes, D., & Jordan, P.J. (Eds) Social functions of emotion and talking about emotion at work (pp. 20 – 45). London, UK: Edward Elgar). This publication is discussed here with minor changes made to the referencing style, and the addition of introductory and concluding paragraphs. It addresses two research questions: RQ1: “What attributions do receivers (direct targets or observers) of anger make of perceived sender anger intensity?” and RQ2: “What emotion regulation (ER) strategies do receivers of anger use in response to sender anger: a) directed at themselves, or b) directed at others?” The strength of interviews is found in their power to prompt particular, open, direct, and comprehensive stories (Di Cicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006).

The researcher approached organizations to participate in Study 1. Those who agreed to participate emailed their employees with the researcher’s contact email. Interested individuals emailed the researcher, and meetings were set up for the interviews to be conducted. To address the research questions for this study during the interview, respondents were asked to describe an anger episode experienced at work (Fischer, 1999; Fitness, 2000; Gibson et al., 2009). The DRM (Kahneman et al., 2004) enables the receivers’ moods to be captured during everyday actions with recollection. It also enables a daily assessment of thoughts and emotions (Diener & Tay, 2014). The strength of Study 1 lies in its qualitative and interpretative nature (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Its depth is found in its detailed description of the receivers’ experiences. By
enabling people to tell their stories of experiencing anger in the workplace, participants provided greater detail concerning their responses to the anger expression received.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Anger is prevalent in organizations today and therefore the focus of significant research (Callister et al., 2017; Gibson & Callister, 2010; Lindebaum & Gabriel, 2016; Lindebaum et al., 2017). An examination of the extensive research on this topic reveals that the majority of these studies center on the sender of anger expressions, their triggers, reactions (Booth & Mann, 2005; Fitness, 2000; Moura et al., 2015) and the consequences of these episodes in the workplace (Booth & Mann, 2005; Chen & Spector, 1992; Fitness, 2000). Recently, however, some researchers have addressed the impact and consequences of sender anger expressions on the targets of anger (Callister et al., 2017; Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2008). Our aim in this chapter is to contribute to this research by examining how receivers (targets and observers) of anger at work perceive and manage workplace anger. More specifically, we examine the attributions made about anger by those who witness anger (as receivers and observers) as well as the emotional regulation strategies they use to manage their response to such emotional displays. Overall, in line with the focus of this book, our research contributes to an increased understanding of how employees and managers use talk to explain their emotional experiences and reactions in the workplace. We then examine this talk in terms of dominant theories of emotion in the field.

Although anger expressions at work are often viewed in a pejorative way (e.g., Meier, Gross, Spector, & Semmer, 2013), Geddes and Callister (2007) identified through the dual threshold model (DTM) that anger expressions can result in both functional and dysfunctional outcomes with the key being how this anger is expressed (Gibson & Callister, 2010). They argue that the functionality of an anger expression is not only determined by personal individual interpretations of the event, but also by the
social setting in which both the sender and the target operate (i.e., organizational norms and display rules; Kramer & Hess, 2002). Given anger is a common experience in workplaces, several researchers studying anger have stressed the importance of understanding the impact of anger on the receiver (Gibson & Callister, 2010; Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2008; Stickney & Geddes, 2016). In this chapter, we contribute to this body of work by specifically examining the receivers’ attributions (i.e., how respondents talk about the perceived cause of anger) for anger expressions and the emotional regulation strategies they use (i.e., how the respondents talk about the methods they use to decrease, maintain or increase specific emotional experiences and responses) when dealing with anger expressions directed towards themselves and others. Simply, our aim is to better understand how employees experience and make sense of anger expressions by others.

4.2 CURRENT RESEARCH ON THE RECEIVERS OF ANGER EXPRESSIONS

To date, studies on receivers of anger expressions relate mainly to interactions between the sender and the target linked to specific contexts such as when dealing with conflict and negotiation, bullying, victimization and abusive supervision situations (Friedman et al., 2004; Geddes & Stickney, 2012; Harlos & Axelrod, 2008; Kopelman et al., 2006; Totterdell et al., 2012; Van Kleef et al., 2004; Walker & Jackson, 2017). Research demonstrates that differences in the interpretation of anger expressions occur depending on who is angry with whom (Fitness, 2000; Sloan, 2004). In other words, an employee’s status may affect the way in which an individual experiences and responds to events (Basch & Fisher, 2000), with some arguing that interactions between a co-worker and supervisor are the most powerful source of anger (Kramer & Hess, 2002; Waldron, 2000).
Studies indicate that receivers of anger expressions experience both positive and negative outcomes (Geddes & Callister, 2007; Lindebaum, Jordan, & Morris, 2016). Positively, anger expressions can act as catalysts for change by highlighting factors at work such as injustice (Geddes & Callister, 2007), problems of individual and organizational efficacy (Gross, 1998), and issues related to group unity and goal accomplishment (Callister et al., 2003). On the other hand, anger expressions have also been linked to employees experiencing reduced job security, lower work satisfaction, less organizational commitment (Harlos & Axelrod, 2008) and increased occupational stress (Glomb, 2002). Research additionally established that when an individual is challenged by an angry adversary during conflict and negotiation they can develop a negative impression of the sender (Van Kleef et al., 2004) and avoid interaction with them into the future (Kopelman et al., 2006; Van Kleef et al., 2004). Furthermore, when anger is associated to victimization and bullying in the workplace, individuals feel unwell (both psychologically and physically) at work (Kiecolt-Glaser, McGuire, Robles, & Glaser, 2002), detached from their organization and dissatisfied in their jobs (Harlos & Axelrod, 2008). Overall, there are significant negative outcomes associated with anger expressions at work. On this basis, a better understanding of how others perceive and react to anger expressions in the workplace may provide an insight into ameliorating these negative outcomes and understanding how positive benefits accrue.

4.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR EXAMINING ANGER AT WORK

A broad range of frameworks exist for examining emotion at work including affective events theory (AET) (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), dual threshold model of anger (DTM) (Geddes & Callister, 2007), social rules theory (SRT) (Domaglaski & Steelman, 2007), attribution theory (AT) (Keashley & Neuman, 2008; Kelley, 1973), emotions as social information (EASI) (Van Kleef, 2009) and emotion regulation (ER) (Gross, 1998). In our study, two frameworks were chosen to explore the receiver’s
internal processes when confronted with anger: attribution theory (Kelley, 1973) and the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998). Attribution theory provides a framework for understanding causal explanations (Martinko, Harvey, & Dasborough, 2011), more specifically in this case, sender anger. The process theory of ER contributes to a greater comprehension of how emotions are generated, felt, and expressed (Gross, 1998) and is an important factor in responding to anger expressions.

Attribution theory is a theory that explains how people make causal descriptions and respond to questions commencing with ‘why?’ in relation to other people’s behavior (Kelley, 1973). There are a number of different ways in which researchers have considered attributions. For instance, in a relatively early contribution, Kelley (1967) proposed the Covariation model. This model consists of a three dimensional framework to determine causal attributions: (i) consistency – the extent to which the present behavior is consistent with past behaviors; (ii) distinctiveness – the level of contextual difference that surrounds the behavior, and (iii) consensus – the extent to which others behave in a similar fashion when in the same situation. For example, the recipient might attribute anger to the sender’s frequent anger (see Lindebaum et al., 2016). Frequent anger can be seen as high in consistency, low in distinctiveness and low in consensus suggesting a dispositional cause/internal attribution.

More recently, Weiner (1979, 1985) argued that attributions can be organized into three causal dimensions: (i) locus of causality – whether the cause is internal (specific to the person) or external (situationally influenced); (ii) stability – whether the cause is constant or variable over time; and (iii) controllability – whether the cause is under the control of the person or not (Weiner, 1979). Although we use Weiner’s attribution theory (1979) as a framework for our analysis, it is important to make note of a few similarities and differences found between Kelley’s (1967) and Weiner’s (1979) theories to justify our decision to use one specific theory (1979).
In terms of overlap, ‘consistency’ in Kelley’s theory (1967) can be linked to Weiner’s dimension of ‘stability’. Similarly, both theories explore the context of attributions, but in slightly different ways. The dimension of ‘distinctiveness’ in Kelley’s theory examines the level of contextual difference that surrounds the behavior while ‘locus of causality’ determines whether the cause is internal to the person or external, attributed to the situation or context. The significant difference between theories is Kelley’s ‘consensus’ dimension which explores the extent to which others behave in a similar fashion when in the same situation, while ‘controllability’ from Weiner’s theory focuses on determining whether the cause is under the control of the person or not (distinct from locus of causality that determines whether the cause of anger is attributed internally or externally to the individual). In our study, we use Weiner’s (1979) attribution theory as it better encompasses our understanding of how anger was assessed by the respondents.

Generally, those witnessing expressions of anger in society and at work view it as appropriate or inappropriate. For example, a demonstration of anger by an employee who is almost involved in a workplace accident as a result of the organization’s poor work practices or the negligence of a fellow worker would be seen as quite appropriate (through external, variable, and uncontrollable attributions). On the other hand, a demonstration of anger by a manager in an organization where such displays are discouraged via specific organizational display rules that prescribe that managers should avoid confrontation and display positive emotions (Ekman, 1992; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987), would be deemed inappropriate (through internal, stable, and controllable attributions). Interestingly, Lindebaum and his colleagues (2016) conducted a study in the United Kingdom Military on the positive and negative reactions to expressions of anger at work. They noted that the UK’s military outlook on anger is altering.
Participants in that study saw frequent expressions of anger as emerging from an internal deficiency of the sender that was internal, stable and controllable.

Our aim in this study is to examine recipients’ ER strategies when observing and experiencing anger. We note that these emotional experiences and responses to someone else’s anger are closely linked to attributions made and may involve a range of emotions. Analyzing the data from our study, we draw on both attribution theory and on the process model of emotion regulation to frame our insights.

4.4 METHOD

4.4.1 Participants

To examine the topic broadly, we undertook purposive sampling across a range of industries. Respondents were drawn from the medical, mining, banking, legal and manufacturing sectors in Australia. A total of 30 participants were interviewed. To be included in our sample, participants needed to have experienced anger directed at them (target) or directed at another person or an object (observer). Twenty participants experienced anger as targets and ten as observers. Sixteen participants were female and fourteen male, with the sample including twelve managers and eighteen employees. Participants described twenty targets of anger as established in their work role while ten were new to their position.

4.4.2 Interview Procedure

Approval was received through a university ethics committee prior to the interviews with participants. Interviews lasted 45 to 60 minutes and were semi-structured, one-on-one interviews (Di Cicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). At the start of the interview, respondents were assured of anonymity and confidentiality and asked to sign a consent form. Participants were asked to select a recent event they experienced, preferably within the last two years. In some instances, participants wanted to describe
an older incident and as it was more relevant to them, we allowed some flexibility in this area. Participants identified themselves as the ‘target’ or ‘observer’ of that specific anger event.

Table 4.1: Study 1 – Participant demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Experience of Anger</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Target Work Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>New Worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To improve event recall, the day reconstruction method (DRM) (Kahneman et al., 2004) was used. Through DRM, participants systematically reconstructed their activities and experiences preceding the event that they were recalling. The process was a guided exercise facilitated by the first author and designed to reduce memory biases and improve recall. DRM is intended to enable a more accurate assessment of thoughts and
emotions that occurred in the past (Diener & Tay, 2014). Participants were then given an opportunity to describe their experience in more depth by answering a set of twelve key questions about that event. These questions included “Why do you think the person was angry?”, “What was going through your head to make sense of the anger?”, and “What was your response to the angry person?”

All interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed. Interview transcripts were initially analyzed by the first author and broad themes and sub-themes around attributions and emotion regulation were established. Themes were then entered into the NVivo Software (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013; Guest et al., 2006). Two other coders further tested themes and sub-themes for consistency, reliability and accuracy (Olson, McAllister, Grinnell, Walters, & Appunn, 2016). The unit of analysis chosen for this study was response phrases (Downe-Wamboldt, 1992), or phrases long enough to allow for an understanding of the information being coded. Results are discussed below.

4.5 RESULTS

The interviews provide insights into the attributions made by receivers of anger and their ER strategies used in response to this anger expression by others. In outlining our findings, we initially examined the respondent’s attribution of sender anger in light of Weiner’s (1979) three causal dimensions: locus of causality, stability and controllability. Subsequently, we assess the ER strategies used in response to this anger using the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998) as a guideline.

4.5.1 Attributions

Attributions are discussed below in relation to locus of causality (internal or external), stability (stable or unstable) and controllability (controllable or uncontrollable; Weiner, 1979).
Locus of Causality

Locus of causality determines whether the cause is internal (specific to the person) or external (situation dependent) (Weiner, 1979). Our participants made a number of internal attributions of anger expressions based on the status or position of the individual expressing the anger. For instance, in terms of the status of individuals, participants talked about the internal locus of causality of leaders and managers of their organization in the following way: “if you’re in a leadership role you can’t afford to be childish” (Six, Observer, Manager), “it’s not appropriate for a senior manager to act in that way and especially in the HR role you’re in” (Eight, Target, Employee). One participant saw a business partner angry at the computer software program and stated: “an inappropriate response to something so small … he did have quite a stature in the company … you’re meant to be quite sophisticated, knowledgeable, intelligent and then this is how you’re behaving when your computer isn’t working properly!” (Five, Observer, Employee). We note that the majority of participants who made these internal loci of control leadership observations were employees. For those participants, individuals in senior positions had a set of behavioral norms that their subsequent expression of anger appeared to contravene and on this basis they ascribed internal attributions for the anger.

Other examples of attributions where internal locus of causality was involved infer that the expression emerged from some internal deficiency with responses such as: “inappropriate responses to staff member’s behavior” (Two, Observer, Employee), “inappropriate response to something so small” (Five, Observer, Employee), “uncalled for” (Ten, Observer, Employee) and “wasn’t warranted” (Fifteen, Observer, Manager). These responses emerged when the sender’s anger appeared to cross the impropriety threshold as defined by Geddes and Callister (2007). In these cases, sender anger was directly related to organizational and professional norms/expectations, and internal
causality established if the anger was seen to contravene those organizational and professional norms. Thus, participants viewed sender anger as internal, originating from the angry person’s lack of personal control. Participant Fourteen (Observer, Employee) outlined a situation where a team member who had not delivered his work to the manager [sender] in a timely manner experienced aggressive and inappropriate sender anger:

I just don’t think you should deal with people in that manner in an open forum, there’s a certain way you talk to people regardless of what’s going on, without belittling or humiliating people or creating a stress level that’s effectively unwarranted.

When behavioral norms were clearly contravened (inappropriate behavior), our participants in this study generally assessed sender behavior in relation to their moral behavior: “I would have probably supervised more appropriately all the way through the project, but when, if I was faced with the situation, like she was faced with, I don’t think I would have exploded the way she did” (Two, Observer, Employee).

On the other hand, when expressed anger behavior fell within the norms of the organization and was within the bounds of the expression and impropriety thresholds of anger as defined by Geddes and Callister (2007), different attributions were made in relation to locus of causality. Specifically, participants described some angry individuals as being justified in their anger, especially when attributions made were around a situational (external) issue. Responses included “all the right to be angry” (Twenty, Observer, Employee), “I don’t think she did anything wrong” (Thirty, Target, Manager) and “fair enough … a fair call” (Nine, Target, Employee). Although eight participants described sender anger as appropriate to the situation, they generally disapproved of the anger expression itself. This is illustrated by Participant Two (Observer, Employee),
I said, I understand what’s happened and … you are absolutely well within your rights to be absolutely outraged at how this has gone down … but I’m not happy with the way in which it played out, and I’m not happy with the way in which it played out in front of other team members.

ii. **Stability**

Stability refers to whether the cause is constant or variable over time (Weiner, 1979). During the interviews, when discussing the specific anger incident, participants repeatedly made comments about the past behavior of the angry person. They made sense of the anger on the basis of how frequently the individual expressed anger. In terms of attributions, this is linked to their perceptions of the stability and consistency of the individual’s angry behavior and whether they were angry on a frequent basis. All 30 participants made attributions that were linked to the angry person’s anger frequency, with 22 participants mentioning it as frequent and eight as a ‘once only’ single occurrence in response to the event.

Of those who identified frequent sender anger, the comments supported the notion that the anger expression was seen as a stable pattern of behavior. The initiator of the anger was described by participants as having “a hot temper and a reputation for it around the firm” (Five, Observer, Employee), “a bit of a history of doing things like that” (Ten, Observer, Employee), “tendencies to be overly sort of angry” (Thirteen, Target, Employee) and “a continuous circle for a while” (Fourteen, Observer, Employee). Distinctly, participants made attributions around frequent displays of anger as a stable behavior.

Three participants explained that when they were dealing with an individual who had frequent (stable) expressions of anger, they were fearful for their physical and/or psychological safety as illustrated by Participant Twenty-Nine (Target, Manager), “… it
was frightening to see someone change totally when the anger came… I was afraid and I thought he wanted to kill me, he wanted to punch me … I thought he wanted to choke me”.

On the other hand, those who recalled events where there were ‘once only’ (situationally generated) anger expressions made unstable attributions. These participants talked about the sender anger as “… completely out of character” (Twenty Six, Target, Employee), ‘a one off event’ (Nine, Target, Employee), “haven’t seen him angry” (Twenty Five, Observer, Employee) and “I [observer] hadn’t seen her [sender] actually scream at her [target] like that …” (Fifteen, Observer, Manager). These attributions, where the individual’s expression of anger was unstable over time, encouraged a greater consideration by the observer/target of why the anger event occurred. This is in line with Van Kleef’s (2009) arguments around the propensity of emotions to encourage others to seek information. Overall, frequent expressions of anger (stable attributions) tended to encapsulate internal locus of causality while individuals who were seen as being angry less frequently were ascribed unstable attributions which tended to coincide with an external locus of causality. We note that these dimensions also overlap considerably with Kelley’s Covariation model (1973), where low distinctiveness (stability) leads to specific dispositional attributions.

iii. **Controllability**

Controllability differs from locus of causality. Locus of causality determines whether the attribution of anger is internal (stimuli from within) or external (stimuli from outside) to the individual while controllability establishes whether the anger expression (either attributed internally or externally) can be controlled by the individual or not (Weiner, 1979). In our study, all participants viewed anger as controllable, that is, within the volition of the individual. This is illustrated by Participant Five (Observer,
Employee) who encountered an angry senior partner who was unable to make a dictation software program work:

I was thinking, this is ridiculous. Obviously when I looked at his response to that [computer dictation software not working well] it just made me think of a child throwing a big tantrum, obviously because you would think he’d know better. I think there were many solutions available but he was just so focused on making it [the software] work himself, that he wasn’t interested in exploring other options.

Display rules that exist in the workplace in relation to anger – what is acceptable behavior and what is not – are clearly illustrated by participant comments. All participants seemed to agree that the angry person could and should control their anger as described by Participant Twenty Four (Target, Manager). This participant encountered anger when she approached a new manager to request that the sender take on some work the previous manager had undertaken: “I was taken aback. I was shocked. I thought it was very unprofessional. I was a little bit disgusted really because there are so many expressions you can use to somebody, if you don’t think that’s your role, than to say what she said”.

When anger crossed the impropriety threshold (DTM) (Geddes & Callister, 2007) and it was a ‘once only’ occurrence, participants made excuses for the sender’s anger as described by Participant Twenty Six (Target, Employee). She encountered a ‘once only’ anger expression when she forgot to add an important aspect to the PowerPoint presentation she had designed. Although the anger was controllable by the sender and was seen as crossing the impropriety threshold (DTM) (Geddes & Callister, 2007), it was dismissed: “I think he [sender] was probably annoyed at something else [personal issues] and just took his anger out on me”.
Controllability was also associated with the regularity and appropriateness of sender anger, rather than only being linked to display rules. When participants encountered ‘once off’ expressions of anger, they expressed concern and compassion towards the angry person as described by Participant Twenty Five (Observer, Employee): “I was worried about him, when he put his hands down on the keyboard I thought, okay, let me make sure he is okay, that he’s not going to injure himself”. This concern for the angry person did not diminish the immediate impact of expressed anger on the target nor lessen the belief of the inappropriateness of sender anger as illustrated by Participant Twenty Six (Target, Employee): “I got quite upset, and went to the bathroom and had a cry … I think it is definitely not appropriate to react in that way”.

Another important aspect to consider is that when the target was a new worker, they blamed themselves for the sender’s anger. Doing this seemingly ‘neutralized’ the effect of deviant anger, as described by participant Nine (Target, Employee) who was new to the organization and broke a machine due to oversight:

I was new, I’d only been there for about a month or so … you knew the reasons why he was angry and it was probably fair enough … I knew it was my fault, I just really thought, I’ve got to sit here and cop it … I knew I was wrong so I just sort of sat down and copped it and moved on really.

In summary, all participants viewed anger as being within the control of the sender. When anger was a ‘once only’ occurrence, the aspect of controllability was ignored or downplayed. On the other hand, when anger was regular, controllability was highlighted and anger was more likely to be attributed to internal deficiencies in the individual.
Emergent Themes – Attributions

Based on our analysis, two broad themes emerged from our data around the appropriateness of the anger expression and the frequency of sender anger. In terms of appropriateness, the data supported the dual threshold model in that many senders described the anger they witnessed as inappropriate (exceeding the impropriety threshold) (Geddes & Callister, 2007). Based on our data, it appears that perceived inappropriate expressions of anger in the workplace are linked to the norms or accepted patterns of behavior for that organization. Our respondents talked about expressions of anger that challenged those norms as being inappropriate. Extending this in a minor way, we also found that there were different norms established for leader behavior by employees, with some indication of a higher standard of behavior being set for those in senior and management positions. On the other hand, appropriate sender anger appears to be directly related to events as opposed to display rules.

The other issue that emerged and is suggested in other research (e.g., Lindebaum et al., 2016) was the overriding impact of frequency. For those participants who described the anger of the sender as being a frequent experience, there was almost a universal view that the cause of the anger expression was unwarranted. Indeed, considering the window between the expression and impropriety threshold outlined in the dual threshold model, frequency appeared to cut across the consideration of norms in making attributions about the anger episode. Those who expressed frequent anger, even for what appeared to be a minor episode, were seen as out of control and, on that basis the anger was determined as inappropriate (i.e., the window between expressed and impropriety thresholds for these people is smaller). Participants, on the other hand, seemed to be somewhat forgiving of people who they described as being involved in a ‘once only’ expression of anger. The attributions they made provided justifiable explanations for those individuals with the anger episode being described as external.
and unstable and controllable ‘once only’ anger expressions, that is, the window between expressed and impropriety thresholds for these people is larger. Again, this may be indicative of a level of flexibility in the thresholds at which anger is identified as inappropriate (Geddes & Callister, 2007; Lindebaum et al., 2016).

4.5.2 Emotion Regulation

The next step in our interviews examined emotional experiences and reactions of targets and observers of the anger episodes. As anger is an emotion that generates a fight (approach) or flight (avoid) response in those witnessing anger (Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004), we sought to understand the emotional response to anger of our participants, as targets and as observers. To do this we used the process model of emotion regulation framework (Gross, 1998).

Our respondents identified four main emotion regulation processes: situation selection, cognitive re-appraisal, suppression and expression. Although Gross commonly uses these strategies in the literature when referring to the sender (Gross, 1998), we found these ER strategies to be present in receivers (both targets and observers) of anger expressions when responding to anger. We also note that respondents often talked about multiple responses to witnessing anger incidents and not just a single response. These four themes are described next.

i. Situation Selection

Situation selection is defined by Gross (1998) as a set of strategies used to approach or evade situations to regulate one’s emotions, such as moving away from an offensive incident. Use of this type of strategy was a common occurrence for 21 participants who intentionally distanced themselves, and sometimes others (i.e., team members), from the sender. The following participants exemplify this theme: “I was very protective of my staff, so I just wanted to get them [the team] out of the way” (Two, Observer, Employee), and by another participant: “I just went and made myself a
cup of coffee and just ignored him really for the rest of the day” (Thirteen, Target, Employee).

ii. **Cognitive Reappraisal**

Cognitive reappraisal entails changing one’s interpretation of events. This often took the form of cognitive reframing and reappraisal of a situation (Gross, 1998). In our study, cognitive reappraisal was a common occurrence, used by 19 participants. Recipients noted actions such as taking time to think things through and reviewing one’s emotional response as explained by Participant Ten (Observer, Employee):

“you’re sort of, your anger subsides quite quickly when you then go, well hell, this could get a little bit worse, you flick the switch and go along”. Two other examples also illustrate this strategy: “I tried to keep reminding myself, this is business” (One, Target, Manager) and, “Well I thought, I’ve got better things to do than be angry at this bloke” (Nine, Target, Employee).

iii. **Suppression**

Twenty-four participants talked about suppressed emotions. Suppression was described in various ways from not arguing, “not going to start conflict or have an opinion just yet” (Twenty-Four, Target, Manager) to a lack of response, “didn’t retaliate…didn’t say anything back” (Fifteen, Observer, Manager). Some did not speak at all, while others tried to hold back tears in an attempt to avoid conflict: “don’t cry, don’t cry, don’t cry” (Three, Target, Employee). Other participants who observed the anger interaction viewed recipient suppression as positive. This seems to be an indication of the unspoken organizational display rule that maintaining one’s control is more acceptable than not controlling oneself: “the other girl was very, very good actually, she just took it and didn’t retaliate, she just stared” (Participant Fifteen, Observer, Manager). Participant One (Target, Manager) wanted to react strongly, but
instead, suppressed her expression: “I didn’t at any time ever raise my voice, or show
that I was incredibly irritated and annoyed by the behavior”.

Three participants felt intimidated by the anger expression and suppressed out of
fear for their safety as described by Participant Nineteen (Target, Manager):

I thought he was going to hit me, but I tried to be calm … as it was
happening I just stared at him and stood firmly in front of him, with the
face that I wasn’t scared, as a poker face, but after that I was shaking,
scared and I just went to the office, sat down ...

iv. Expression

Twenty-three participants expressed their emotions. The expression of emotion
took on two forms: maintaining current emotion (by agreeing and/or downplaying the
significance of the event) and intensifying (taking charge). The most common type of
expression was maintaining emotions as described by Participant Sixteen (Target,
Employee). This participant forgot to include a colleague in a dinner invitation and
when the co-worker (sender) became angry, he downplayed the significance of the
event in an attempt to calm the sender down:

… next time we’ll include you, you know, it wasn’t really a big deal, it
was only, you know, it wasn’t a big team, it was with another team you
know, look, there wasn’t a lot of us there … in the future I’ll fix it and
make sure you’re included.

Intensifying occurred mainly when participants held a management position. This
is clearly illustrated by Participants Nineteen and Twenty Two (Target, Manager)
respectively: “Well, I just said to him, I said, look, you don’t need to be speaking to me
like that, go and do what you’ve been asked to do and we’ll talk about it later” and “I
just told him don’t touch me, if you touch me it can be a different scenario”.
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v. **Emergent Themes – Emotion Regulation**

Our examination of the ER strategies used during participants’ experience of the anger episode revealed two consistent themes. The first theme is the significant difference between targets and observers of anger in terms of how they responded to the anger. The second theme to emerge was a difference in the way employees and managers approached such experiences.

vi. **Targets of Anger – Managers**

Based on our data, it seems being the direct target of anger results in specific reactions around protecting oneself. This was common for those who were the direct targets of anger and who felt threatened by the angry person as described by Participant Nineteen (Target, Manager): “I thought he was going to hit me … I was just concerned that he would hurt me”. ER strategies were used to ensure that the target protected themselves from sender anger as described by Participant Nineteen (Target, Manager): “I tried to be calm and I just told him, don’t touch me, if you touch me it can be a different scenario”. This pattern of reactions emerged when targets attempted to correct sender behavior by expressing emotions as described by Participant Twenty Two (Target, Manager): “I sort of pulled him [sender] aside and said, you need to pull these reins in a little bit”. When targets felt that the situation had been brought under control and the sender responded and listened to them, communication flowed as described by Participant Twenty Two (Target, Manager): “once it all cooled down we sat down in my office and we were having a one on one discussion”. When the target was not heard and sender anger continued, however, they suppressed their emotions as described by Participant One (Target, Manager): “I didn’t at any time ever raise my voice, or show that I was incredibly irritated and annoyed by the [sender] behavior”.
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vii. **Targets of Anger – Employees**

Employees responded more by suppressing emotions as illustrated by Participant Three (Target, Employee): “my immediate feeling was to make everything okay, smooth the situation over, tell them what they want to hear, don’t say anything, don’t challenge what they’re saying so I responded something like, that’s fine”. When sender anger continued, the employee talked about continuing to suppress their emotion selecting to distance themselves physically and mentally from the sender (e.g., going to get a coffee; situation selection) as described by Participant Thirteen (Target, Employee): “I just went and made myself a cup of coffee and just ignored him really for the rest of the day”.

The five target employees who were new to their role expressed the tendency to suppress emotions when confronted with stable or unstable sender anger and to state that it was warranted and appropriate as described by Participant Nine (Target, Employee): “… it was my fault”. In these cases, targets blamed themselves for sender anger. Their response was to cognitively reappraise the situation and suppress their emotions, accepting sender anger. This is illustrated by Participant Nine (Target, Employee) who broke an important machine due to lack of knowledge on how it worked: “Well I thought, I’ve got better things to do than be angry at this bloke … I knew it was my fault … I’ve just got to sit here and cop this … so I just sort of sat down and copped it”. This suggests a taking on of responsibility demonstrating an attribution of internal locus of control.

viii. **Observers of Anger – Employees**

Whereas targets were generally focused on self-protection, the observers’ focus was on how the anger was impacting others who had witnessed the incident. According to Lindebaum and others (2017), morality contains a component that mirrors concern for others, going beyond one’s personal interests. This is clearly evidenced in observers
of sender anger who aimed to protect team members and clients from the impact of the anger episode. It was a common occurrence for observers who were not in a management position to feel frustrated with their powerlessness and commonly they expressed uncertainty about the role they played as external observers. This is illustrated by Participant Twenty Three (Observer, Employee) who observed an altercation between a manager and an employee and cognitively reappraised (i.e., antecedent-focused strategy) and suppressed (i.e., response-focused strategy) their own emotions:

Should I say something, like mate, you really can’t talk to people like that.
In the mood he was in at the time I thought he’s going to get angry at me … but I sort of thought that it’s outside of my [responsibility], cause I’m not a manager you know.

Employees generally distanced themselves from the sender. They expressed deep concern for the wellbeing of the target, team members and clients who might be confronted in some way by sender anger. Consequently, they took it upon themselves to work towards removing team members from the locality of sender anger (i.e., situation selection) as illustrated by Participant Two (Observer, Employee): “I was very protective of my staff, so I just wanted to get them [the team] out of the way”.

When the observer (manager or employee) established that the team, clients and the target were safe, the anger event lost significance as described by Participant Eleven (Observer, Employee): “I did speak to the associate later on to see how they were, and that made me feel a little bit better because he didn’t take it on board as much. Knowing that, that was okay”. On the other hand, if observers identified that the target was not okay, they tended to talk to the sender in an attempt to solve the problem as described by Participant Two (Observer, Employee):

I [observer] had a very stern conversation with her [sender] and said that
I didn’t think she dealt with it appropriately … I understand that you are
absolutely, absolutely well within your rights to be absolutely outraged at how this has gone down so I’m not discounting the reason for your anger, but I’m not happy with the way in which it played out.

ix. **Observers of Anger – Managers**

Managers talked about similar behaviors when confronted with anger as an observer but felt more responsibility to engage in approach behaviors. When not in the vicinity of sender anger, observers approached the location of anger to determine what was happening, clearly indicating an approach response (see EASI; Van Kleef, 2009). This is illustrated by Participant Fifteen (Observer, Manager): “What could possibly be going on to have her screaming at her, what could she possibly have said or done … I go over there to see what’s going on and ask, ‘Is everything alright?’” Observers in general noted that the anger episode attracted their attention and they moved towards the incident to try to make sense of what was happening. The increased ‘visibility’ of a problematic situation involving anger supports Van Kleef (2009) and Geddes and Stickney’s (2011) view of anger generating approach behaviors. The response that followed this visibility varied depending on the observer’s position in the organization. Managers approached the sender and acted as mediators, addressing the issue immediately and organizing to speak to both sender and target. They expressed concerns specifically related to the anger incident regardless of whether or not anger was stable in an attempt to resolve the issue and bring parties together. This is portrayed by Participant Six (Observer, Manager):

> So I had a chat to both of them and didn’t tell the other one that I was chatting to them…first of all I spoke to the aggrieved person [target]…and I said, “I noticed that there was a little bit of conflict today and you retaliated back”…and then I went to the other girl and said, “I
was a little bit disappointed that I noticed there’s conflict and you [sender] deserved what you got, the girl retaliating back.

In conclusion, the clear message that arose from the data related to the complexity of responses. There was no one typical response, but rather a mix of ER strategies used to respond to the anger episode. Some of the observers’ responses clearly mirrored the EASI (Van Kleef, 2009) framework as they approached the situation to better understand what was happening. Overall, main ER strategies used by both targets and observers alike were situation selection (21 participants), cognitive reappraisal (19 participants), expression (23 participants) and suppression (24 participants) of emotions.

4.6 DISCUSSION

Given the major impact of expressed anger on individuals and their workplaces, several researchers in the field of anger have stressed the importance of understanding the impact of anger on the receiver (Gibson & Callister, 2010; Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2008). Overall, this study has outlined how employees attribute anger (linked to position of sender, norms and behaviors) and ER strategies used by receivers of anger – whether targets or observers. Although results align with various dual threshold model propositions (Geddes & Callister, 2007), there are a number of insights we provide about the operationalization of this model in the workplace.

Previous research determined that people express anger differently depending on their status in organizations (Sloan, 2004) and an individual’s experience and the specific work events they are reacting to (Basch & Fisher, 2000). By focusing on how employees explain their attributions, we provide a deeper understanding of these phenomena. Our data suggest that when targets are dealing with individuals who express anger frequently (a stable attribution), the target maintains a consistent, generally negative view of that anger. On the other hand, ‘once only’ sender anger (an unstable attribution) generates target uncertainty and approach behaviors to help them...
understand how to address the sender’s anger. Interestingly, in the case of anger, it appears stability in behavior is not seen as a positive, whereas stable attributions that generally provide more certainty for individuals are seen as a positive when dealing with others. Our data also reveal that when targets were new to their job they often attributed themselves to be the external cause of sender anger. In this case, the uncertainty of how to deal with the sender was neutralized and the response was to suppress emotions, regardless of sender regularity or stability of anger.

Overall, targets talked about expressing as well as suppressing their emotions (e.g., anger, fear, surprise) in an attempt to control the situation, as they often felt threatened by expressions of anger. When in management, targets talked about modifying the situation by focusing attention on sender behavior or on the task to be completed. They did this by expressing emotions. When their attempt at modifying the situation by expressing failed, they suppressed emotions. Prior research confirms that the suppression of unpleasant emotions can lead to high employee strain (Côté, 2005), stress and serious health issues (Alexander & French, 1946; Friedman, 2010; Glomb & Tews, 2004).

For observers, attributions of sender anger frequency and appropriateness were considered in light of their impact on team members, clients and on the sender themselves and were used more specifically as a parameter to evaluate sender behavior in comparison to their behavior. The nature of the sender locus of causality did not seem to be of concern to observers although they expressed awareness of it. Similarly, the frequency or stability of anger was not viewed as a personal threat to the observers themselves, but was talked about as a threat to the target and team members or clients around the sender at the time of the anger event. Observers felt unsure of the role they played as external onlookers and described cognitively reappraising and distancing themselves from the sender (i.e., situation selection). This differed when observers were
managers. Whether anger was stable or not, managers engaged in approach behavior attempting to resolve the issue and bring parties together. They generally did this by cognitively reappraising and maintaining emotions.

The dual threshold model establishes that anger expressions can be deemed as functional or dysfunctional depending on how anger is expressed (Geddes & Callister, 2007). Considering the window or space between the expression and impropriety thresholds outlined in the dual threshold model, frequency appeared to mitigate the consideration of norms in making attributions about the anger episode. Those who expressed frequent anger were seen as out of control and their anger was described as inappropriate regardless of the situation. On the other hand, participants seemed to be somewhat forgiving of people who they described as being involved in a ‘once only’ expression of anger.

In relation to appropriateness, the data suggest that apparent inappropriate expressions of anger in the workplace are linked to the norms for that organization and that in some way these expressions of anger challenged those norms, confirming the dual threshold model. Those using the dual threshold model generally interpret the ‘placement’ of those thresholds as person and situation-specific to the observer, that they are fluid, depending on who is judging the “appropriateness” of the display (Geddes & Callister, 2007, p. 733). Our research, however, also identified that a higher standard of behavior was expected of those in senior and management positions suggesting that norms may differ depending on the status of the individual regardless of the situation. These findings concur with Callister, Geddes, and Gibson’s (2017) research. We also found data suggesting that appropriate sender anger can be directly
related to events regardless of display norms. In accordance to “Proposition 12”\(^1\) of the DTM (Geddes & Callister, 2007, p. 733), one could argue that the observer modifies space between thresholds ‘appropriately’ when circumstances warrant (i.e., in certain circumstances, we as observers give certain people ‘more space’). Although anger was attributed as appropriate or not by both targets and observers, this did not detract from the fact that the anger expression was generally not endorsed. Functionality was not linked to the anger expression itself but to the events surrounding the anger incident.

### 4.7 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A few limitations arise in this study. Research quality is closely linked to the researcher’s interviewing skills and biases can pose limitations to the research. Semi-structured interviews can also be susceptible to interviewee biases. To ensure biases and subjectivity were minimized, we took a number of steps in the design of the data collection. Initially, there is a large reliance on memory of past events, which could lead to oversimplification, rationalization, social desirability and hindsight bias (Dasborough, Sinclair, Russell-Bennett, & Tombs, 2008). To address these limitations, we made use of the day reconstruction method (Kahneman et al., 2004) a method to ensure a better recall of events and experiences by reminding the interviewees of their activities on that day. This method also enables a daily assessment of thoughts and emotions (Diener & Tay, 2014). Any concerns over interpretation of the data were dealt with by using multiple coders to ascertain the reliability of our conclusions (Olson et al., 2016).

Another limitation is related to the timeframe (last two years) of the recalled incident, ‘a time’ when they were target/observer of an anger incident. This was

---

\(^1\) Proposition 12: Expressed anger that organizational observers attribute to individual traits as dispositions more likely will be seen as crossing the impropriety threshold than expressed anger attributed to situational or external factors (Geddes & Callister, 2007).
intended to draw people to recall particularly ‘memorable’ (meaning ‘over the top’) types of displays. However, this might have encouraged interviewees to remember instances of ‘deviant’ anger where they felt the sender ‘crossed the line’ versus a selection of more or less appropriate responses at work. To overcome this limitation, we offered some flexibility when participants wanted to focus on an incident older than two years.

Given the focus of many researchers to date has been on the sender of anger, further qualitative research is needed to provide greater depth of understanding about anger, specifically focused on observers of this phenomenon. In addition, further research targeted at analyzing the integration of attribution theory and emotion regulation theory to explain the dual threshold model might provide deeper insights to anger expressions at work. Finally, we acknowledge our study is not a comprehensive examination of anger at work, and on this basis we encourage researchers to examine the contextual boundaries for the dual threshold model.

4.8 CONCLUSION

The aim of our study was to use qualitative interviews in order to establish a better understanding of the mechanisms through which recipients (targets and observers) make sense of and deal with anger expressions. More specifically, our goal was to examine how people talked about the attributions and ER strategies used by them in responding to an anger expression in the workplace. In line with the overall theme of this book, we examined this talk in relation to dominant theories of emotion to gain a deeper insight into the two different ways of examining emotion. The major strength of this study is its setting in the qualitative landscape. By having data originating from real scenarios within organizations, a clearer perspective is gained of the internal processes of receivers of anger derived by the richness of information gained for this study. This level of understanding can often be missed in quantitative research (Creswell &
Tashakkori, 2007). Our research contributes to existing research by providing a better understanding of the internal processes of receivers of anger expressions in the workplace specifically focusing on receivers’ attributions for expressed anger and subsequent ER strategies used in response. We trust these findings assist organizations in identifying ways in which to address difficulties and issues arising from anger workplace expressions.
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4.10 CONCLUSION AND NEXT CHAPTER

This study was examined in light of the relational anger model of anger (RAM). It studied the attributions and ER strategies used by receivers, both targets, and observers, in response to workplace sender anger expressions. Study 2 builds on Study 1’s findings; however, its focus is only on the direct target of anger. It further examines the targets’ internal processes in light of the RAM. First, it aims to determine whether target attributions and ER strategies are linked, followed by how these processes relate to individual and organizational outcomes.
Chapter 5: Study 2 - Testing the Model: Anger, Attributions, and Emotional Regulation Strategies

5.1 CHAPTER INTRODUCTION

Chapter 3 outlined the relational anger model (RAM) supported by attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998). In short, the RAM argues that the attributions made by targets (in response to anger expressions) mediate the effects of sender anger intensity on individual and organizational outcomes with ER strategies moderating this relationship (see Figure 5.1 below). To reiterate, attributions refer to basic thinking processes through which individuals establish cause and effect, solve difficulties, and develop a better interaction with the situations encountered (Heider, 1958). “Emotion regulation refers to the processes by which individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions” (Gross, 1998, p. 275). The RAM is foundational to both Studies 1 and 2.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 5.1 A Moderated Mediation Model of the Effects of Sender Anger Intensity on the Target of Workplace Anger**

The main variables in this study are sender anger intensity (IV), attributions (M – Mediator), ER strategies (W – Moderator), and individual and organizational outcomes (DV’s).
While Study 1, a qualitative study, focused on establishing main attributions and ER strategies used by receivers (targets and observers), Study 2, a quantitative study, focuses only on the direct target of sender anger. In Study 2, I also examine whether links exist between the targets’ attributions and their ER strategies. Furthermore, I observe whether the targets’ attributions and ER strategies predict individual and organizational outcomes. Study 2 answers Research Questions 3 and 4:

**RQ3:** How do ER strategies and particular attributions interact?

**RQ4:** How do different attributions and ER strategies combine to effect receivers’ individual and organizational outcomes?

Given that anger is an emotion expressed and experienced regularly in workplaces, numerous researchers examining anger have emphasized the significance of comprehending its effect on the receiver (Gibson & Callister, 2010; Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2008; Stickney & Geddes, 2016). Extant research is discussed below, followed closely by relevant propositions for each section.

### 5.2 MODEL DEVELOPMENT FOR STUDY 2

This section has used the RAM to develop specific hypotheses for testing the model in Study 2. In this model, I examined the direct and indirect impact of anger intensity on a target’s positive health, negative health and turnover intentions. While the RAM considers the impact of anger on both targets and observers, in this study, I specifically focused on targets for testing this model initially, as I anticipated the effects would be stronger for targets than observers of anger episodes. The model’s mediators were targets’ attributions of the appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency of the senders’ anger intensity. In terms of moderators, I focused on three broad emotion regulation variables, the target’s expression, suppression, and reappraisal of emotion. See Figure 5.1 for a visual depiction of the model.
5.2.1 Outcomes of the direct impact of sender anger intensity on the target

As mentioned in previous chapters, research to date has established various individual and consequent organizational outcomes such as the impact of anger on job satisfaction (Caplan et al., 1975; Glomb, 2002), health and wellbeing (Miers et al., 2007; Siegman, 1993), and turnover intentions (Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2005). Given that a large portion of research has already been conducted in the area of job satisfaction (Ashkanasy, 2002; Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000; Glomb, 2002; Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008), I sought to focus on different outcomes of anger to add to the body of literature around target anger research, specifically around health and wellbeing and turnover intentions. Also, these primary outcomes were chosen, given a close examination of the literature on the impact of sender anger intensity on the target. These outcomes and how they relate to sender anger intensity are discussed next.

i. **Health and Wellbeing**

Individuals who are targets of anger have previously reported feeling poorly at work, annoyed (Fitness, 2000), disconnected from their company, and unhappy in their occupations (Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Desivilya & Yagil, 2005; Harlos & Axelrod, 2005). The participants in Study 1 experienced lower work efficiency, which has been linked to poor health and wellbeing (Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Desivilya & Yagil, 2005; Harlos & Axelrod, 2005). Negotiation studies have found that anger targets are often reluctant to interact with the opponent, disturbing working relationships (Allred et al., 1997; De Dreu & Van Kleef, 2004; Kopelman et al., 2006). Besides, targets of anger expressions within the workplace have been shown to experience poor psychological outcomes such as stress, emotional exhaustion, burnout (Carlson et al., 2012; Tepper, 2007), anxiety (Tepper et al., 2007), and lowered self-esteem (Rafferty & Restubog, 2011). Thus, I examine both the positive and negative aspects of the targets’ health and wellbeing. First, I observe their positive health related to the targets’ ability to enjoy
work, concentrate, make decisions, feel useful, and be proactive at work in the face of senders’ anger. Second, I examine the negative aspects of the targets’ health such as loss of confidence, loss of sleep over worry, feeling strained, depressed, unhappy, worthless, and unable to overcome overall difficulties. Given the discussion above, and in line with the RAM shown in Figure 3.1, it is proposed that:

**Hypothesis 1a**: Perceptions of higher sender anger intensity are associated with lower target positive health.

**Hypothesis 1b**: Perceptions of higher sender anger intensity are associated with higher target negative health.

ii. **Turnover Intention**

Turnover intention is seen as a precursor of turnover (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Studies to date have established that anger-provoking situations are associated with adverse outcomes for organizations, such as the desire to leave the organization (Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2005, 2008). For example, verbally abused hospital administrators are more likely to plan to leave the workplace (Desivilya & Yagil, 2005). While the impact of anger on turnover intentions is important, anger can also affect the targets’ behavior, subsequently elevating their turnover intentions. For example, research shows the impact of anger on a target during negotiations can lead to their rejection of business proposals (Pillutla & Murningham, 1996), leading to a subsequent increased desire to quit one’s job (Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2005). Given the above, and in line with the RAM, I propose that:

**Hypothesis 1c**: Perceptions of higher sender anger intensity are associated with higher target turnover intentions.

**5.2.2 The Target’s Attributions of the Angry Person**

Attributions identified by participants in Study 1 centered on the angry person’s attributions, which were discussed concerning the locus of causality (internal or
external), stability (stable or unstable), and controllability (controllable or uncontrollable) (see Section 4.5.1) (Weiner, 1979). Chapter 4 noted that some emergent themes linked to attributions included the receivers’ assessment of anger appropriateness, effectiveness, and anger frequency. In other words, the more appropriate sender anger intensity was viewed as by the receiver, the better the outcome for that receiver. The results showed that receivers associated frequency of anger with stable attributions made about the personality of the sender. Study 1 indicated that frequency appeared to cut across the consideration of norms in making attributions about the anger episode (see Section 4.5.1 - i) locus of causality). Those who expressed frequent anger (even for minor episodes) were seen as out of control, and the anger was seen as inappropriate (see DTM - Geddes & Callister, 2007). I propose that the impact of frequent anger on the receiver could potentially lead to greater turnover intentions. Further information on these attributions is discussed below, followed by relevant propositions for this study.

i. **Sender Anger Appropriateness**

Appropriateness is understood and defined as views of whether another’s behavior breaches one’s expectations or sense of decency (Canary & Spitzberg, 1987). Attribution captures the ‘causes’ given for the angry person’s behavior (see Chapter 4, 4.5.1 Attributions). In Study 1, organizational norms were linked to inappropriate anger expressions and viewed as challenges to organizational norms. Studies conducted in the UK military found that anger was seen as an internal fault of the sender (Lindebaum et al., 2016). In other words, the angrier the sender, the more inappropriate the target perceives this as, which is in line with the predictions of the dual threshold model (Geddes & Callister, 2007). Communication is also viewed as inappropriate if adverse public sanctions are applied (Geddes & Stickney, 2011; Reason, 1995).
Furthermore, a higher level of appropriateness appeared to be related to the assessment of discrete events and not to broadly sanctioned display rules (Lindebaum et al., 2016). Van Kleef and Côté (2007) explained that context contributes to perceptions of anger appropriateness with distinct cultural differences (e.g., anger might be more acceptable in the military as opposed to the consulting industries), determining the level of ‘felt’ anger (Eid & Diener, 2001). Given the above and in line with the RAM, it is proposed that:

**Hypothesis 2a:** There will be a negative relationship between perceptions of higher sender anger intensity and the receivers’ attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness.

### ii. Sender Anger Effectiveness

In this research, effectiveness refers to whether the receiver considers that the angry person achieved the desired outcome. It also relates to the individual’s control in the exchange (Canary & Spitzberg, 1987). In other words, effectiveness captures whether the angry person achieved their communication goal (e.g., the angry person got what they wanted, such as getting a job completed on time). Cupach and Spitzberg (1981) explained that when communication is deemed effective, it meets specific wants, aims, or purposes for the actor involved – in this case, the sender. Study 1 (Chapter 4) identified that the communication of anger was not always effective when assessed through the receivers’ perspective. It is significant to note that anger behavior can be seen as effective even when it is not appropriate (Lindebaum et al., 2016). For example, a manager might get angry with an employee. The employee might then shut down. In this case, the individual’s work capacity is diminished, and they cannot complete the job in the allocated timeframe. Overall, in this example, intense anger is seen as less effective (Friedman et al., 2004). Given the above, and in line with the RAM, it is proposed that:
**Hypothesis 2b:** There will be a negative relationship between perceptions of higher sender anger intensity and the receivers’ attribution of sender anger intensity effectiveness.

iii. **Sender Anger Frequency**

Lindebaum and colleagues (2016) conducted a study in the United Kingdom military on the positive and negative reactions to sender anger at work and noted that the UK’s military outlook on anger is altering. Participants in that study saw frequent sender anger as emerging from an internal deficiency of the sender. Research suggests changes in how sender anger is viewed could be due to current alterations in the definition of what is acceptable or not within the workplace (Gross, 1998). For example, frequent sender anger directed at a colleague is less accepted in today’s workplace, particularly at higher intensity levels (Eid & Diener, 2001). In Study 1, participants explained that they attributed meaning to the angry person’s anger by considering it a frequent occurrence inherent to the individual (i.e., an internal attribution). Spielberger et al. (1995) found that anger frequency was associated with personality traits, such as believing that the angry person is ‘anger prone’. In other words, anger prone individuals seem to express more intense anger. In Study 1, there were considerations around the controllability of anger, with a higher frequency of sender anger intensity seen as being under the angry person’s control. Therefore, when the senders’ anger intensity was frequent, the anger was often seen as inappropriate and avoidable. Furthermore, sender anger intensity frequency was seen as a stable pattern of behavior. Given the above, and in line with the RAM, it is proposed that:

**Hypothesis 2c:** There will be a positive relationship between perceptions of higher sender anger intensity and the receivers’ attributions of higher sender anger intensity frequency.
5.2.3 Sender Anger, Target Attributions and Outcomes

The principal concern of attribution theory is identifying ways individuals recognize, describe, and action the causes of social events (Spitzberg & Canary, 1985). Research has established several instances where anger targets attempted to attribute meaning to anger expressions (Martinko et al., 2013; Weiner, 2001). For example, the more responsibility targets attributed to the angry person, the more upset they felt about the anger (Allred, 1995). However, in Study 1, when sender anger intensity was seen as more appropriate, although the anger expression itself was not condoned, the outcome appeared to be better for the receiver. Besides, there were considerations around one’s blame during anger interactions. In Study 1, new workers who blamed themselves for the anger (i.e., when anger was linked to a work oversight on their part), decided to tolerate it with no thoughts of leaving the workplace. Abusive supervision studies have indicated that employees (targets) who felt responsible for their ill treatment (i.e., they felt they were the cause of the anger) reacted more optimistically to anger expressions (Bowling & Michel, 2011; D. Liu et al., 2012). That said, research in the USA (Martinko et al., 2012) and Korea (Kernan et al., 2011) has identified that cultural differences such as achievement orientation and human values influence reactions to workplace anger. For example, within the Chinese culture, those with a healthy respect for authority were less inclined to identify abusive behavior (i.e., workplace anger expressions) from leaders (D. Liu et al., 2012).

On the other hand, when anger is attributed to external factors such as organizational issues, employees (targets) tend towards non-cooperation (i.e., criticize the organization) (Bowling & Michel, 2011; D. Liu et al., 2012). They also consider the other party accountable for hurtful behavior, which boosted reactive anger responses (Allred, 1995, 1999). However, in most instances, participants in Study 1 attributed meaning to the sender’s anger intensity directed at them or others regarding its
appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency. These judgments then had implications for the receiver in terms of individual and organizational outcomes.

Within the DTM (Geddes & Callister, 2007), there are two thresholds: the “expression threshold” and “impropriety threshold” (pp. 722-723). The expression threshold relates to an individual communicating their felt anger to persons within the organization who can address the anger event. The impropriety threshold indicates situations when sender anger goes too far, and workplace personnel find it inappropriate (Geddes & Callister, 2007, pp. 722-723). These thresholds also distinguish between suppressed anger (does not cross the expression threshold), expressed anger (crosses the expression threshold), and deviant anger (crosses the impropriety threshold and “deviates from organizational norms of tolerable emotion displays”) (Geddes & Callister, 2007, p. 202). I propose that direct targets of deviant anger will make attributions of sender anger intensity inappropriateness and possibly also of the sender anger intensity being ineffective depending on the angry persons’ context and goal. Thus, whether or not the target views the sender as crossing the impropriety threshold will lead to varying attributions of their intense anger appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, which will generate different individual and organizational outcomes.

Given the above and in line with the RAM, it is proposed that:

**Hypothesis 3a:** The attribution of sender anger intensity appropriateness mediates the relationships between sender anger intensity and the target’s positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions.

**Hypothesis 3b:** The attribution of sender anger intensity effectiveness mediates the relationships between sender anger intensity and the target’s positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions.
Hypothesis 3c: The attribution of sender anger intensity frequency mediates the relationships between sender anger intensity and the target’s positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions.

5.2.4 The Target’s ER Strategies in the Face of Workplace Anger Expressions

Anger is an emotion that can generate a fight (approach) or flight (avoid) response in those witnessing anger (Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004). As discussed in Chapter 2, and shown in Study 1, individual propensities, the organizational framework, and the targets’ understanding of organizational rules are a few of the factors that influence the way people regulate emotions in the workplace (Callister et al., 2007; Gross & Thompson, 2007). Study 1 results indicated that the targets of workplace anger used four main ER strategies to manage emotions: i) situation selection (strategies used to approach or evade situations to regulate one’s emotions); ii) cognitive reappraisal (changing one’s interpretation of events such as cognitively reframing a situation); iii) suppression (not arguing, not saying anything), and iv) expression (conveying one’s emotional experience through verbal means; for example, maintaining current emotion: agreeing or downplaying the significance of an event, and intensifying: taking charge) (Gross, 1998, 1999). These strategies were a means to manage the situation, and in some instances, an attempt to modify it. In Study 2, I examine three of these ER strategies: expression, suppression, and reappraisal. This choice was made based on the prominence of these three emotion regulation strategies in research. Studies have indicated that the most common way to regulate emotions is by controlling emotion expressive conduct with an additional large focus on suppression and reappraisal (Samson & Gross, 2012) and the contrast between these (Gross, 2013). An overview of each emotion regulation strategy is discussed below, followed by the hypotheses.
i. The ER Expression Strategy

The RAM proposes that the ER expression strategy used by targets of workplace anger expressions moderates the relationship between the target’s attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness and target outcomes of positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions. Expressions of anger can be beneficial to the individual and the organization or negative (Geddes & Callister, 2007). Expression prompts investigation into improving organizational procedures and efficiency (Lindebaum & Jordan, 2014); conversely, it can lower organizational returns and productivity (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001) as the expression can divert from task related performance. Individuals facing anger within abusive supervision by supervisors were impacted psychologically experiencing stress, emotional exhaustion, burnout (Carlson, Ferguson, Hunter & Whitten, 2012; Tepper, 2007), anxiety (Tepper, Moss, Lockhart & Carr, 2007), and lowered self-esteem (Rafferty & Restubog, 2011). I propose that the target’s expression in the face of low appropriateness attributions will lead to poorer health outcomes.

Most research on the ER strategy of expression has concerned itself with the sender of anger (Booth & Mann, 2005; Fitness, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001). However, I propose that the targets’ emotional expression (in response to sender anger intensity) also plays an essential role in moderating the relationship between the target’s attributions and their health and wellbeing and turnover intentions. For example, a target who responds with anger to the angry person (sender) can trigger psychological and physical danger (see abusive supervision and aggression in Chapter 2, Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2). As discussed in Chapter 2 (Section 2.4), the negative outcomes research has established for the angry person will potentially also be the experience of the target, who in turn also becomes the ‘angry person’. Given the above, and in line with the RAM, it is proposed that:
**Hypothesis 4a:** The target’s ER strategy of expression moderates the effects of their attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency on their positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions.

### ii. The ER Suppression Strategy

Research has found that in negotiations, low power individuals hesitate when they speak (Holtgraves & Lasky, 1999; Hosman, 1989) and keep their thoughts and emotions to themselves (Hall, Rosip, Smith Le Beau, Horgan, & Carter, 2006; Keltner & Kring, 1998). The model outlined in Figure 5.1 proposes that the target’s ER suppression strategy impacts the relationship between target attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, frequency, and positive health, negative health, and turnover intention outcomes. Research has established that the suppression of emotions could be detrimental to individuals leading to serious health issues (Alexander & French, 1946; Friedman, 2010; Glomb & Tews, 2004) such as hypertension and coronary heart disease (Jorgensen et al., 1996). In Study 1, the emotional impact of sender anger on the receiver differed between employees and managers. When employees, direct targets of anger, suppressed their emotions, they experienced lower positive health (e.g., lower work functionality), different from managers who experienced increased negative health (e.g., higher stress).

I propose that when targets of anger view sender anger as inappropriate and ineffective, they will tend to suppress their emotions rather than express them to the detriment of their health and wellbeing (e.g., lowered self-esteem) (Rafferty & Restubog, 2011). Besides, in the face of higher sender anger intensity frequency, I propose that individuals experience poorer health and wellbeing (Miers et al., 2007) and a greater desire to leave the workplace (Harlos & Axelrod, 2005). Given the above, and in line with the RAM, it is proposed that:
Hypothesis 4b: The target’s ER strategy of suppression moderates the effects of the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency on their positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions.

iii. The ER Reappraisal Strategy

The research model for this study, shown in Figure 5.1, also proposes that the ER reappraisal strategy impacts the relationship between the targets’ attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, frequency, and positive health, negative health, and turnover intention outcomes. Gross and John (2003) showed that individuals who use reappraisal tend to do so early in the emotion generative process. Their research also indicated that individuals who use reappraisal have a more optimistic outlook on situations, reinterpreting areas of stress to address bad attitudes. Furthermore, individuals who reappraise have greater self-esteem, are less prone to depression and have an overall positive outlook on life and wellbeing (Gross & John, 2003). In Study 1, participants engaged in rethinking their response to the angry person. Their main concern in doing this was to ensure the outcome of their response was more positive than negative. Considerations were made about personal health and wellbeing (“I’ve got better things to do than get angry with this bloke”; “well this could get a little worse”). Moreover, research has established an added concern of potential punishment (Harlos, 2010) and the fear of losing one’s job (Cortina & Magley, 2003), which could be the basis for the receivers’ use of the ER reappraisal strategy.

In an interpersonal setting, targets who use reappraisal when verbally pressured by an angry person demonstrate a lowered emotional response (Stemmler, 1997). I propose that the targets’ use of emotion reappraisal given attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency will determine a more positive emotional experience for them (Ray, McRae, Ochsner, & Gross, 2010), consequently engendering
better health and wellbeing outcomes and a lessened desire to leave the workplace.

Given the above, and in line with the RAM, it is proposed that:

**Hypothesis 4c:** The receivers’ ER strategy of reappraisal moderates the effects of the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency on their positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions.

Given the model, and the preceding propositions, the following hypotheses are also suggested for the full moderated mediation model.

**Hypothesis 5a:** The indirect effect of sender anger intensity on positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions will be mediated by the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency and moderated by ER strategies of expression.

**Hypothesis 5b:** The indirect effect of sender anger intensity on positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions will be mediated by the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency and moderated by ER strategies of suppression.

**Hypothesis 5c:** The indirect effect of sender anger intensity on positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions will be mediated by the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency and moderated by ER strategies of reappraisal.

### 5.3 METHOD

In this section, I provide an overview of the method used in Study 2. An outline of the sample, procedure, analysis, and coding are discussed below.

#### 5.3.1 Sample

In Study 2, I used purposive (non-probability) sampling, selecting the participants from both public and private organizations. Organizations were approached to
participate in Study 2. Once they consented, the organizational representative was asked to send an email to participants with Times 1 and 2 emailed two weeks apart. Individuals who wanted to participate selected the link and completed the online survey. A selection criterion was that participants needed to have experienced anger directed at them in the workplace. Respondents were from 22 organizations across various industries (e.g., banking and medical), with some of the main branches located in Brisbane, Sydney, and Melbourne, Australia. At Time 1, participants returned 350 surveys, and at Time 2, 122. One hundred and twenty-two participants completed both parts of the survey (Times 1 and 2). Seventy-five participants were female, and 47 were male. The sample included nine owners, two chief executive officers, 21 managers, nine supervisors, and 81 employees. The majority were full-time workers (102), followed by different types of casual and part-time workers. The mean for age was 42.64, with a standard deviation of 13.52 years. Participants had been in the organization, typically for a mean of 8.48 years.

5.3.2 Procedure

Survey methodology can raise issues concerning privacy and confidentiality (Singer & Ye, 2013). Before conducting the survey, Griffith University’s Human Ethics Committee provided ethics approval to collect the data (ethics approval number 12084). Before survey distribution, organizational and individual consent was obtained from participants and organizations in the medical, construction, mining, banking, retail, education, IT, religious, and manufacturing sectors. Diversification of industries enables an optimum collection of information and may help generalize any conclusions (Sandberg, 2000). In social sciences research, there has been a general decline in survey response rates (Tourangeau, 2004), and this may have been evident in this study, with several respondents declining to participate (Atrostic, Bates, & Silberstein, 2001). Although the study was of a sensitive nature (an experience of anger in the workplace)
and organizational time constraints could potentially be issues in data collection, responses were as expected (35% response rate) (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). This reasonable response rate could be due to incentives (e.g., a reason to participate in the survey) provided to increase response rates (Groves, Singer, & Corning, 2000). Participants in this study had the option to go into a draw to win a coaching package valued at $1,350.00. As the topic of ‘anger’ in organizations can be sensitive, great care was taken to ensure all data were collected according to the approved ethics protocol, which included organizational consent (Appendix 6), an information sheet (Appendix 7), and the participant information sheet (Appendix 8). Participants understood that the information collected would only be used for research purposes.

I organized a meeting with the organizations and went through the information outlined in the consent form with each organizational representative. In some cases, the meeting was held over the phone, providing organizations with a platform to ask questions. Organizational representatives understood that the information gathered would only be used for research purposes, and each organization would remain anonymous. Each organizational representative received a copy of the information sheet containing the same outline in the consent form. Once the agreement was signed, each organization received an email with information about when to email Times 1 and 2 survey links to potential participants.

Surveys can be administered in diverse formats, such as face to face (Maynard & Schaeffer, 2000), telephone, and web/computer-administered (Tourangeau, 2004). Due to the survey’s sensitive nature (anger expressions in organizations), the use of self-administered web/computer survey administration and online surveys was the preferred format. This ensured confidentiality and anonymity was maintained, and it provided a safe platform for participants to share their anger experiences within the workplace (Singer & Ye, 2013).
The survey was designed in Survey Monkey and conducted using a split questionnaire design (see Chipperfield & Steel, 2009) that enables the researcher to collect the survey data in two different timeframes (Times 1 and 2) with Times 1, and 2 collections held two weeks apart, each part taking a maximum of 30 minutes to complete. Having two collection points can guard against common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012), a bias that can transpire when participants are asked to consistently respond using the same anchor points in scales throughout the survey (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). In other words, having two parts to the survey protects results from being inflated or deflated (see Jordan & Troth, 2020; Williams & Brown, 1994).

The survey in Time 1 measured the control variables containing basic demographic questions such as gender and age. At Time 2, participants were instructed to describe an anger eliciting event at work during which they were targets of an expression of anger (for example, anger, frustration, annoyance) from a fellow worker/colleague in the last two years. Participants were also asked to describe who was involved, where the incident happened, when it happened, and what happened. To ensure a better recall of events and experiences, I used the DRM (Kahneman et al., 2004), enabling a daily assessment of thoughts and emotions (Diener & Tay, 2014). More specifically, participants were asked within the questionnaire to think about the series of events on the day they experienced workplace anger by responding to detailed questions on what happened, how it happened, and who was involved. There were also measures of anger frequency, anger appropriateness and effectiveness, sender anger intensity, and three questionnaires related to situational ER, general health, and turnover intention. Questions measured the independent variable of anger intensity relating to the specific anger situation they described, the mediating variable of attributions, and ER strategies’ moderating variable. Finally, the dependent variables of positive health,
negative health, and turnover intent were measured. Before administering the survey, it
was pilot tested to establish the clarity and effectiveness of questioning and ensure the
items’ construct validity (Stacks & Hocking, 1992). Surveys did not contain participant
names; however, a unique identifier code generated by the participant enabled matching
the surveys across Times 1 and 2.

5.3.3 Measures

i. **Sender Anger Intensity: Independent Variable**

   *Sender anger intensity* was measured using the Anger Intensity Scale based on
Glomb’s (2002) anger progression definition. The scale covered the following
progression: irritable, annoyed, frustrated, upset, mad, angry, furious, enraged, and
hostile. Each description within the anger intensity scale was rated on a 5-point Likert
scale ranging from strong to neutral. The Cronbach’s alpha was .83.

ii. **Outcomes - Dependent Variables**

   *Health and wellbeing* was measured using the General Health Questionnaire
(GHQ12) (Goldberg, 1972; Goldberg & Williams, 1988), consisting of 12 items, six
positive items (Cronbach’s alpha .89) and six negative items (Cronbach’s alpha .90).
Respondents were asked to describe how they felt after the workplace anger incident
they experienced, and they did this by rating several items listed on a 4-point Likert
scale (1 = More so than usual to 4 = Much less than usual). Positive items (e.g., “Able
to face up to your problems”) referred to the target’s ability to enjoy work, concentrate,
make decisions, feel useful, and be proactive at work in the face of the senders’ anger;
an indication of their overall ‘positive health’. Negative items (e.g., “Lost much sleep
over worry”) referred to the target’s loss of confidence, loss of sleep over worry, feeling
strained, depressed, unhappy, worthless, and unable to overcome overall difficulties in
the face of sender anger. These indications of overall ‘negative health’ impacted both
home and work life.
Turnover intention was assessed using Colarelli’s (1984) Turnover Intention Questionnaire consisting of three items (Cronbach’s alpha .92). Participants were asked if they intended to or were contemplating leaving their current job or position due to the anger incident they were asked to describe. Examples are “I am planning to search for a new job during the next 12 months” and “I frequently think of quitting my job”. Respondents indicated their choice by using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, and 5 = Strongly agree).

iii. Attributions: Mediating Variable

Attribution measures of appropriateness, effectiveness, and anger frequency enabled participants to explain how they made sense of their experience of workplace anger.

Anger appropriateness and effectiveness were evaluated using an adaptation of Canary and Spitzberg’s (1987) Communication Appropriateness and Effectiveness Questionnaire consisting of 33 items, 1-17 evaluating appropriateness (Cronbach’s alpha .91) and 18-33 assessing effectiveness (Cronbach’s alpha .82). Participants were asked to assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of the workplace anger expression they experienced. Respondents indicated their agreement with each item by using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree to 7 = Strongly agree). Examples of appropriateness items are “The angry person was a smooth conversationalist” and “Some of the angry person’s remarks were simply improper” (reverse scored). Examples of effectiveness items are “The angry person obtained his or her goal in the conversation” and “The angry person achieved what they apparently wanted to achieve in the conversation”.

Anger frequency was measured by asking participants to respond to the question, “How often did you experience that person’s anger before the event you described?” The question related to the frequency of sender anger manifestations receivers observed
in the workplace. Participants were asked to select one response from the following options: “Rarely, it was a one-off occasion”, “Sometimes. It happens every so often”, “Frequently. It happens every week”, “Very frequently, it occurs daily”, and “Other”. A space was available for participants to comment on the ‘other’ section.

iv. **Emotion Regulation Strategies - Moderator Variable**

*Emotion regulation strategies* were measured using the Situational Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (Gross & John, 1997; Gross & John, 2003; Kubiak, Wiedig-Allison, Zgoriecki & Weber, 2011) at Time 2 of the survey and comprised three main strategies: emotion reappraisal (Emotion Regulation Questionnaire - ERQ 6 items; Cronbach’s alpha .83), emotion suppression (ERQ 4 items; Cronbach’s alpha .63), and emotion expression (Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire - BEQ 4 items; Cronbach’s alpha .68). Participants were asked to answer questions about how they managed their emotions concerning the senders’ anger directed at them and asked to describe it. Sample items include emotion expression: “I told the angry person what annoyed me without being aggressive”, emotion suppression: “I kept my emotions to myself when interacting with the angry person”, and emotion reappraisal: “During the anger episode, I made myself think about the situation in a way that helped me stay calm”. Respondents indicated their agreement with each item using a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree to 7 = Strongly agree).

v. **Participant Gender and Age - Control Variables**

As demographic variables (i.e., gender, age) potentially impact the target’s interpretation of workplace anger expressions (Birditt & Fingerman, 2003; Domagalski & Steelman, 2007), information was also collected regarding gender (0 = male, 1 = female) and participant age (actual age) as control variables. For example, concerning gender, anger episodes tended to be viewed as more acceptable for men than for women who expressed anger (Gibson et al., 2009). Studies indicated that men more than
women potentially vent their anger through verbal and physical aggression (Spielberger et al., 1995). In relation to age, older adults report better ER and greater control over these emotions (Gross et al., 1997) and a more tempered response to interpersonal difficult situations (Birditt & Fingerman, 2003). Also, middle aged adults engaged in more proactive ER strategies than older adults, who used more passive ER strategies (Blanchard-Fields, Stein & Watson, 2004). Although data on the sender was collected, the focus of the control variables remains on the receiver throughout the thesis. Further research is required to explore results of the impact of sender’s gender and age on the target.

5.3.4 Analysis and Coding

Once the data collection was complete, the data from Survey Monkey were downloaded to an Excel file. The copy was then ‘cleaned’ by removing unnecessary characters from the data to ensure a smooth transition from the Excel file to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The SPSS is valuable because it provides a reliable and robust platform to organize and convert data making it easier to find value in large datasets (Pallant & Manual, 2007).

5.3.5 Initial Data Screening

Data screening for respondent inaccuracies and omissions was completed before analysis, with no missing data revealed. The data were checked for accuracy of input, and issues identified were corrected. Pairwise plots were checked for non-linearity and heteroscedasticity, with no abnormalities identified. Non-normal variables were identified, skewness and kurtosis, and probability plots were checked, and no changes were implemented. No significant outliers were found. Finally, variables were evaluated for multicollinearity and singularity (Tabachnick, Fiddel & Ullman, 2007), with no issues identified.
5.4 RESULTS

I first examined a series of Pearson correlation coefficient bivariate relationships between the independent variable sender anger intensity, the dependent variables of target positive health, negative health, and turnover intention, the mediating variable of target attributions of sender anger intensity, and the moderating variable of target ER strategies. Control variables, the targets’ gender, and age were also examined. Table 5.1 shows the means, standard deviations, and Cronbach’s alphas, and correlation results. The variables achieved satisfactory reliability coefficients, ranging from \( \alpha = 0.63 \) for emotion suppression and \( \alpha = 0.91 \) for appropriateness. I also conducted a hierarchical regression through a moderated mediation analysis using the PROCESS macro (Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). The PROCESS macro is the preferred option over Baron and Kenny’s (1986) traditional multistep method and the Sobel test (Sobel, 1986), as the latter assumes a normal sampling distribution of indirect effects while the PROCESS macro accommodates irregularities in the distribution with its bootstrapping procedure (Preacher et al., 2007). These analyses were based on 5,000 bootstrapped samples using bias-corrected and accelerated 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The independent variable was mean-centered before analysis to increase the significance’s interpretability and meaning (Hayes, 2017). The results are discussed below.

5.4.1 Pearson Correlation Results

i. **Control Variables: Gender and Age**

Table 5.1 below shows a series of correlation coefficients between sender anger intensity, target attributions of sender anger intensity, target ER strategies, and control variables. Preliminary results indicated that the targets’ gender was significantly and positively correlated to the target’s expression \( (r = .21, p < .05) \), with men being more comfortable with expression than women. Also, there was an inverse relationship
between target gender and target positive health \( (r = -0.23, p < 0.05) \), with men experiencing better health than women.

The results established that target age was significantly negatively correlated to the target’s turnover intention \( (r = -0.26, p < 0.05) \), the older the individual, the less turnover. Target age was also significantly negatively correlated to the target’s view of sender anger effectiveness \( (r = -0.21, p < 0.05) \), the older the individual, the less effective they viewed the sender’s anger expressions.

ii. **Anger Intensity and Outcomes**

Table 5.1 also shows a series of correlation coefficients conducted between sender anger intensity and target ER strategies and the consequent outcomes. Preliminary results indicated that greater perception of sender anger intensity was correlated to the target’s lowered positive health \( (r = -0.32, p < 0.01) \), providing preliminary support for hypothesis 1a. On the other hand, no significant correlation was established between sender anger intensity and the target’s negative health \( (r = 0.08, p = \text{n.s.}) \) and target turnover intention \( (r = 0.02, p = \text{n.s.}) \) initially disconfirming hypothesis 1b and 1c.

iii. **Sender Anger Intensity, the Targets’ ER Strategies and Outcomes**

Significant preliminary positive correlations were also established between sender anger intensity and target ER strategies of expression \( (r = 0.18, p < 0.05) \), reappraisal \( (r = 0.20, p < 0.05) \), and suppression \( (r = 0.25, p < 0.01) \). These results indicate that targets that reported higher sender anger intensity reported a greater use of ER strategies about the anger-based scenario described.

Preliminary results also indicated that the target’s higher use of the ER expression strategy related to poorer positive health \( (r = -0.31, p < 0.01) \). On the other hand, there were no significant correlations between target negative health \( (r = -0.02, p = \text{n.s.}) \) and turnover intentions \( (r = 0.16, p = \text{n.s.}) \). The results did not indicate a significant correlation between target suppression and their positive health \( (r = -0.10, p = \text{n.s.}) \).
negative health \((r = -.06, p = n.s.)\), or their turnover intention \((r = .02, p = n.s.)\). In view of sender anger intensity, the target’s greater use of reappraisal was associated with their lower negative health \((r = -.18, p < .05)\); however, it was not significantly correlated to positive health \((r = .00, p = n.s.)\) or turnover intentions \((r = -.10, p = n.s.)\).

Table 5.1 results indicate that, overall, targets that used more reappraisal were less likely to express their emotion in response to intense sender anger \((r = -.31, p < .01)\) and were more likely to suppress \((r = .28, p < .01)\). On the other hand, expression was not significantly correlated to suppression \((r = -.10, p = n.s.)\).

iv. **Anger Intensity, Attributions, and Outcomes**

Table 5.1 also shows the correlation results between sender anger intensity, attributions, and outcomes. The results indicate that with the perception of higher sender anger intensity, the targets attributed the anger to be more frequent \((r = .37, p < .01)\). The results also indicate that a greater perception of sender anger intensity meant that the targets attributed sender anger to be less appropriate \((r = -.43, p < .01)\) and effective \((r = -.36, p < .01)\), providing preliminary support for Hypothesis 2a and 2b, respectively. On the other hand, attributions of sender anger intensity frequency did not correlate to sender anger intensity effectiveness \((r = -.03, p = n.s.)\). In addition, sender anger intensity effectiveness did not correlate with the targets’ positive health \((r = -.04, p = n.s.)\), negative health \((r = .03, p = n.s.)\), and turnover intentions \((r = .03, p = n.s.)\). The results also indicate that the targets viewed more frequent sender intense anger displays as less appropriate \((r = -.22, p < .05)\). Finally, when the targets attributed sender anger intensity to be more appropriate, it was more effective \((r = .48, p < .01)\).

Table 5.1 shows that the attribution of sender anger intensity frequency was positively correlated to target turnover intention \((r = .22, p < .05)\). In other words, the more frequent the targets attributed intense sender anger to be, the more desire they had to leave the workplace, providing preliminary support of Hypothesis 3c. The more
appropriate the targets viewed sender anger intensity, the greater their positive health \( (r = .47, p < .01) \). On the other hand, the less appropriate the targets viewed sender anger intensity, the greater their negative health \( (r = -.24, p < .01) \) and turnover intention \( (r = -.28, p < .01) \). Targets who experienced better positive health had less desire to leave the workplace \( (r = -.32, p < .01) \). However, the targets’ negative health was not correlated to the targets’ turnover intention \( (r = .04, p = n.s.) \).

v. **Attributions and Emotion Regulation Strategies**

Results in Table 5.1 show that the targets’ attribution of sender anger intensity appropriateness was not correlated to the target’s ER strategies of expression \( (r = -.13, p = n.s.) \), reappraisal \( (r = .06, p = n.s.) \), and suppression \( (r = -.15, p = n.s.) \). The targets’ attribution of sender anger intensity effectiveness was not correlated to the target’s ER strategies of expression \( (r = .09, p = n.s.) \), reappraisal \( (r = -.01, p = n.s.) \), and suppression \( (r = -.00, p = n.s.) \). The targets’ attribution of sender anger intensity frequency was not correlated to the target’s ER strategies of expression \( (r = .14, p = n.s.) \), reappraisal \( (r = .04, p = n.s.) \), and suppression \( (r = .09, p = n.s.) \).
Table 5.1: Pearson Correlation Results - Study 2 (N = 122)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>42.64</td>
<td>42.64</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sender Anger Intensity</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediating Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sender Anger Intensity Appropriateness</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sender Anger Intensity Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sender Anger Intensity Frequency</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderating Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Target Expression</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Target Reappraisal</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Target Suppression</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Target Positive health</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Target Negative health</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Target Turnover Intention</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n = 122\) Gender: 0 = male  1= female  Cronbach’s alpha in parenthesis *\(p < .05\)  **\(p < .01\)
Hierarchical multiple regression was used to investigate preliminary findings further.

### 5.4.2 Hierarchical Regression Moderated Mediation Results

As shown in Tables 5.2 to 5.10, a series of hierarchical regressions were conducted. Separate PROCESS outputs using Model 14 (Preacher et al., 2007) were completed for each dependent variable (target positive health, negative health, turnover intention) and each moderating variable (target emotion expression, suppression, reappraisal). A discussion of the results is below. For a visual depiction of the model used, see Figure 5.1.

i. **Attributions of Anger Appropriateness, Effectiveness and Frequency as the Mediating Mechanisms Between Sender Anger Intensity and Outcomes of Positive Health, Negative Health and Turnover Intention, Moderated by Expression**

**Positive Health Outcomes.** Table 5.2 examines the mediating effect of the three attributions of sender anger intensity: appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, on the relationship between sender anger intensity on positive health outcomes and the moderating impact of the ER expression strategy. First, the results show that higher perceptions of sender anger intensity were associated with lower levels of targets’ positive health \((B = -.15, p < .05)\), supporting preliminary correlation results and Hypothesis 1a.

A higher perception of sender anger intensity was also associated with targets’ attributions of lower sender anger appropriateness \((B = -.56, p < .05)\) and effectiveness \((B = -.36, p < .05)\), in support of preliminary correlation results and Hypotheses 2a and 2b, respectively. In contrast, perceptions of higher sender anger intensity were associated with targets’ attributions of higher sender anger frequency \((B = .28, p < .05)\), in support of preliminary correlation results and Hypothesis 2c.
At this point, it is important to highlight that the results in this paragraph apply to all of the subsequent moderated mediation analyses that are reported. However, in the interests of parsimony, they do not appear in subsequent tables (i.e., Tables 5.3 and 5.10) and are not reported again.

In support of preliminary correlation results, the attribution of sender anger intensity appropriateness predicted greater positive health in targets \((B = .28, p < .05)\). However, contrary to preliminary results, higher attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness were associated with lower levels of targets’ positive health \((B = -.26, p = n.s.)\). Attributions of sender anger intensity frequency did not predict targets’ positive health \((B = .00, p = n.s.)\). In support of preliminary results, a higher use of target expression as an emotional regulation strategy in response to sender anger intensity was associated with poorer positive health \((B = -.16, p = < .05)\).

In support of Hypotheses 3a and 4a, Table 5.2 shows that attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness mediated the negative effect of target perceptions of sender anger intensity on positive health. This was statistically significant at all three levels of the target’s ER strategy of expression (at -1SD, IE = -.14; at mean, IE= -.15; at +1SD, IE= -.18). More specifically, Figure 5.2 shows that the strength of this indirect relationship was affected by targets’ use of the ER strategy of expression (i.e., low, medium or high) in response to intense sender anger directed towards them. In terms of low appropriateness attributions, Figure 5.2 shows targets more likely to use expression as a strategy reported the lowest levels of positive health outcomes. Those who reported using medium levels of expression also reported lower levels of positive health compared with those targets that reported the lowest likelihood of using expression in response to intense sender anger viewed as inappropriate. Figure 5.2 also shows that when targets attributed intense sender anger as more appropriate, the effects of different expression levels did not appear significant.
Table 5.2: Anger intensity, attributions, and positive health outcomes moderated by the ER strategy of expression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>(^{a}B/\theta ) (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>(t(df))</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator Variable Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.96 (.39)</td>
<td>1.19, 2.73</td>
<td>5.04 (119)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>-.56 (.11)</td>
<td>-.77, -.35</td>
<td>-5.24 (119)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.27 (.32)</td>
<td>.64, 1.90</td>
<td>3.98 (119)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>-.36 (.09)</td>
<td>-.53, -.19</td>
<td>-4.14 (119)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Anger Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.97 (.23)</td>
<td>-.14, -.83</td>
<td>-4.14 (119)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>.28 (.06)</td>
<td>.15, .40</td>
<td>4.30 (119)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Independent variable model: Positive Health** | | | | |
| Constant | 2.93 (.23) | 2.46, 3.39 | 12.48 (112) | .00** |
| Anger Intensity (AI) | -.15 (.06) | -.27, -.02 | -2.31 (112) | .02* |
| Appropriateness | .28 (.05) | .18, .38 | 5.82 (112) | .00** |
| Effectiveness | -.26 (.06) | -.38, -.14 | -4.34 (112) | .00** |
| Anger Frequency | .00 (.08) | -.15, .15 | .03 (112) | .97 |

**Direct Effect of X on Y**

| AI on Positive health | -.15 (.06) | -.27, -.02 | -2.31 (112) | .02* |

**Indirect Effects: Positive Health**

i) Mediation: AI on Positive Health through Appropriateness

| Expression | -.14 (.04) | -.24, -.06 |
| Medium expression | -.15 (.03) | -.24, -.09 |
| High expression | -.18 (.04) | -.26, -.09 |

i) Mediation: AI on Positive Health through Effectiveness

| Expression | .09 (.03) | .04, .17 |
| High expression | .06 (.04) | -.01, .14 |

i) Mediation: AI on Positive Health through Anger Frequency

| Expression | .01 (.04) | .08, .08 |
| Medium expression | .00 (.02) | -.05, .05 |
| High expression | -.00 (.03) | -.07, .05 |

**Indexes of Moderated Mediation**

i) Appropriateness

Expression | -.02 (.03) | -.08, .05 |

ii) Effectiveness

Expression | -.04 (.03) | -.11, .01 |

iii) Anger Frequency

Expression | -.01 (.03) | -.06, .04 |

\(N = 122\) *\(p < .05\) **\(p < .01\) \(N = 122\) *\(p < .05\) **\(p < .01\) \(B\) (Unstandardized coefficient) for outcome
Furthermore, in support of Hypothesis 3b and 4a, Table 5.2 shows that attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness mediated the negative effect of targets’ perceptions of sender anger intensity on positive health for targets who reported using low and medium levels of expression (at -1SD, IE = .13; at mean, IE = .09; at +1SD, IE = .06).

Figure 5.2 The effect of the target’s expression on the relationship between sender anger intensity appropriateness and the target’s positive health

Concerning attributions of low sender anger intensity effectiveness only, Figure 5.3 shows targets least likely to use expression as a strategy reported higher levels of positive health outcomes than those who described using moderate expression levels as a strategy. Those who reported using higher levels of expression described the lowest levels of positive health in response to sender anger intensity viewed as ineffective. Figure 5.3 also shows that when targets attributed sender anger intensity as high in effectiveness, the effects of different expression levels were less pronounced. No effects were found for frequency attributions.
Finally, Hypothesis 5a was unsupported. Support for the full moderated mediation model of the effects of targets’ ER strategy of expression on target attributions of sender anger appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency was not found, as per Figure 5.1. However separate paths within the model were as per the preceding analyses.

![Graph](image_url)

**Figure 5.3** The effect of the target’s expression on the relationship between sender anger intensity effectiveness and the target’s positive health.

**Negative Health Outcomes.** Table 5.3 examines the mediating effect of the three attributions of sender anger intensity: appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, on the relationship between sender anger intensity on negative health outcomes, and the moderating impact of targets’ ER strategy of expression. First, the results show that higher perceptions of sender anger intensity were not associated with targets’ negative health \((B = .00, p > .05)\), disconfirming Hypothesis 1b. Table 5.3 indicates that attributions of higher sender anger intensity appropriateness were associated with lower levels of targets’ negative health \((B = -.20, p < .05)\). Effectiveness \((B = .14, p = n.s)\), anger frequency \((B = .05, p = n.s)\), and expression \((B = -.09, p = n.s)\) were not associated with targets’ negative health.
Table 5.3: Anger intensity, attributions, and negative health outcomes moderated by the ER strategy of expression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>$^{+}B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.83 (.32)</td>
<td>2.19, 3.47</td>
<td>8.75 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>.00 (.09)</td>
<td>-.17, .18</td>
<td>.07 (112)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>-.20 (.07)</td>
<td>-.33, -.07</td>
<td>-2.97 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>.14 (.08)</td>
<td>-.02, .31</td>
<td>1.69 (112)</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Frequency</td>
<td>.05 (.10)</td>
<td>-.15, .26</td>
<td>.52 (112)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent variable model: Negative Health

Direct Effect of X on Y

AI on Negative health | .00 (.09) | -.17, .18 | .07 (112) | .94  |

Indirect Effects

i) Mediation: AI on Negative Health through Appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>$^{+}B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low expression</td>
<td>.10 (.07)</td>
<td>-.01, .26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium expression</td>
<td>.11 (.04)</td>
<td>.03, .22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expression</td>
<td>.12 (.06)</td>
<td>.02, .26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Mediation: AI on Negative Health through Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>$^{+}B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low expression</td>
<td>-.02 (.06)</td>
<td>-.15, .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium expression</td>
<td>-.05 (.03)</td>
<td>-.13, .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expression</td>
<td>-.07 (.04)</td>
<td>-.15, -.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Mediation: AI on Negative Health through Anger Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>$^{+}B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low expression</td>
<td>.02 (.06)</td>
<td>-.08, .16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium expression</td>
<td>.01 (.03)</td>
<td>-.05, .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expression</td>
<td>.01 (.04)</td>
<td>-.07, .10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indexes of Moderated Mediation

i) Appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>$^{+}B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low expression</td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>-.09, .12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>$^{+}B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low expression</td>
<td>-.03 (.04)</td>
<td>-.12, .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Anger Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>$^{+}B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low expression</td>
<td>-.00 (.05)</td>
<td>-.10, .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 122 \ *p < .05 \ **p < .01 \ B$ (Unstandardized coefficient) for outcome variables and $\theta$ (Effect) for indirect effects. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Anger Intensity: mean-centered.

In support of Hypothesis 3a and 4a, Table 5.3 shows that attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness mediated the negative effect of targets’ perceptions of sender anger intensity on negative health. This was statistically significant at all three...
levels of the targets’ ER strategy of expression (at -1SD, IE = .10; at mean, IE = .11; at +1SD, IE = .12). Figure 5.4 also shows that the strength of this indirect relationship was affected by the extent targets reported using the ER strategy of expression (i.e., low, medium, or high) in response to intense sender anger targeted towards them.

In terms of high appropriateness attributions, Figure 5.4 shows targets more likely to use expression as a strategy reported the lowest levels of negative health outcomes. Those who reported using medium levels of expression reported slightly lower levels of negative health compared with those targets that reported the lowest likelihood of using expression in response to intense sender anger. Figure 5.4 also shows that when targets attributed intense sender anger as more inappropriate, the effects of different expression levels were not present and were, therefore, less pronounced.

![Figure 5.4 The effect of the target’s expression on the relationship between sender anger intensity appropriateness and the target’s negative health](image-url)
Furthermore, in support of Hypothesis 3a and 4a, Table 5.3 shows the positive effect of target perception of sender anger intensity on negative health was mediated by attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness for targets that reported using all three levels of the ER strategy of expression (at -1SD, IE=-.02; at mean, IE=-.05; at +1SD, IE=-.07). In terms of attributions of high effectiveness, Figure 5.5 shows that targets more likely to use expression as a strategy reported the lowest levels of negative health outcomes. Those who reported using medium levels of expression reported slightly higher levels of negative health compared with those targets that reported the lowest likelihood of using expression in response to intense sender anger. At the low level of target expression, target negative health was at its highest level in response to intense sender anger viewed as low in effectiveness. Figure 5.5 also shows that when targets attributed intense sender anger as more effective, the influence of different expression levels was not present, and therefore less pronounced.

![Figure 5.5](image)

Figure 5.5 The effect of the target’s expression on the relationship between sender anger intensity effectiveness and the target’s negative health.
Hypothesis 3c was unsupported, and Hypothesis 4a was partially unsupported. The ER expression strategy did not moderate the relationship between attributions of anger frequency and negative health outcomes.

Finally, Hypothesis 5a was unsupported. Support for the full moderated mediation model of the effects of the ER strategy of expression on attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and anger frequency were not found, as per Figure 5.1. However, separate paths within the model were as per the preceding analyses.

**Turnover Intention Outcomes.** Table 5.4 examines the mediating effect of the three attributions of sender anger intensity: appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, on the relationship between sender anger intensity on turnover intention outcomes, and the moderating impact of the ER strategy of expression. First, the results show that higher perceptions of sender anger intensity were not associated with targets’ turnover intention \((B = -.20, p = n.s.)\), partially making Hypothesis 1c unsupported.

Table 5.4 also shows results indicating that higher attributions of intense sender anger appropriateness predicted turnover intentions in targets \((B = -.42, p = < .05)\). Attributions of effectiveness \((B = .19, p = n.s.)\) and anger frequency \((B = .32, p = n.s.)\), as well as the ER expression strategy \((B = .22, p = n.s.)\) were not significant predictors of turnover intentions in targets.

In support of Hypotheses 3a and 4a, Table 5.4 shows that the negative effect of targets’ perception of sender anger intensity on the turnover intention of targets was mediated by attributions of sender appropriateness for targets that report using all three levels of expression (at -1SD, IE = .13; at mean, IE = .24; at +1SD, IE = .34).
Table 5.4: Anger intensity, attributions, and turnover intention outcomes moderated by the ER strategy of expression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>aB/θ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variable model: Turnover Intention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.17 (.65)</td>
<td>1.87, 4.48</td>
<td>4.84 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>-.20 (.18)</td>
<td>-.56, .15</td>
<td>-1.12 (112)</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>-.42 (.13)</td>
<td>-.69, -.15</td>
<td>-3.11 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>.19 (.17)</td>
<td>-.15, .53</td>
<td>1.12 (112)</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Frequency</td>
<td>.32 (.21)</td>
<td>-.10, .75</td>
<td>1.50 (112)</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Effect of X on Y</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI on Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-.20 (.18)</td>
<td>-.56, .15</td>
<td>-1.12 (112)</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Mediation: AI on Turnover Intention through Appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low expression</td>
<td>.13 (.20)</td>
<td>-.14, .62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium expression</td>
<td>.24 (.12)</td>
<td>.05, .53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expression</td>
<td>.34 (.15)</td>
<td>.09, .69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Mediation: AI on Turnover Intention through Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low expression</td>
<td>.00 (.13)</td>
<td>-.28, .25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium expression</td>
<td>-.07 (.08)</td>
<td>-.25, .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expression</td>
<td>-.14 (.13)</td>
<td>-.43, .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Mediation: AI on Turnover Intention through Anger Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low expression</td>
<td>.04 (.11)</td>
<td>-.15, .28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium expression</td>
<td>.09 (.07)</td>
<td>-.02, .24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expression</td>
<td>.14 (.10)</td>
<td>-.03, .36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indexes of Moderated Mediation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Appropriateness</td>
<td>.12 (.15)</td>
<td>-.23, .38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Effectiveness</td>
<td>-.08 (.12)</td>
<td>-.32, .16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Anger Frequency</td>
<td>.06 (.09)</td>
<td>-.11, .25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 122 *p < .05 **p < .01 N = 122 *p < .05 **p < .01 B (Unstandardized coefficient) for outcome variables and θ (Effect) for indirect effects. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Anger Intensity: mean-centered.

Figure 5.6 shows that the strength of this indirect relationship was affected by the extent targets reported using the ER strategy of expression (i.e., low, medium or high) in response to intense sender anger targeted towards them. Figure 5.6 shows that targets more likely to use expression as a strategy reported the highest turnover
intention levels when intense sender anger is seen as inappropriate. Those who reported using lower levels of expression also described slightly lower turnover intentions compared with those targets that reported the highest likelihood of using expression in response to intense sender anger viewed as inappropriate. Figure 5.6 also shows that when targets attributed intense sender anger as more appropriate, the effects of different levels were not significant.

Figure 5.6 The effect of the target’s expression on the relationship between sender anger intensity appropriateness and the target’s turnover intention.

Hypothesis 3c was unsupported and Hypothesis 4a was partially unsupported. Table 5.4 shows that attributions of sender anger effectiveness did not mediate the negative effect of target perceptions of sender anger intensity on turnover intentions at all three levels of the targets’ ER strategy of expression. Furthermore, the negative effect of target perceptions of anger intensity on turnover intentions was not mediated by attributions of sender anger frequency at all three levels of the target’s ER strategy of expression. Finally, Hypothesis 5a was unsupported. Support for the full moderated mediation model of the effects of the ER strategy of expression on attributions of sender
anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and anger frequency was not found, as per Figure 5.1. However, separate paths within the model were as per the preceding analyses.

ii. **Attributions of Anger Appropriateness, Effectiveness and Frequency as the Mediating Mechanisms Between Anger Intensity and Outcomes of Positive Health, Negative Health, and Turnover Intentions Moderated by Suppression**

**Positive Health Outcomes.** Table 5.5 examines the mediating effect of the three attributions of sender anger intensity: appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, on the relationship between sender anger intensity on the outcome of targets’ positive health, and the moderating impact of the target’s ER strategy of suppression. First, the results show that higher perceptions of sender anger intensity were associated with lower positive health levels ($B = -0.16, p < 0.05$), consistent with Hypothesis 1a. In support of preliminary correlation results, the attribution of sender anger intensity appropriateness predicted greater positive health in targets ($B = 0.31, p < 0.05$). However, contrary to preliminary results, higher attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness ($B = -0.28, p < 0.05$) were associated with lower target positive health levels. The attribution of frequent sender anger intensity did not predict target positive health ($B = -0.03, p = n.s.$). The use of suppression as an ER strategy in response to intense sender anger was not associated with positive health ($B = 0.07, p = n.s.$).

In support of Hypothesis 3a and 4b, Table 5.5 shows that attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness mediated the negative effect of targets’ perception of higher anger intensity on positive health. This was statistically significant at all three levels of the targets’ ER strategy of suppression (at $-1SD$, IE $= -0.21$; at mean, IE $=-0.17$; at $+1SD$, IE $=-0.13$).
Table 5.5: Anger intensity, attributions, and positive health outcomes moderated by suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>( B/\theta ) (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variable model: Positive Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.93 (.23)</td>
<td>2.47, 3.40</td>
<td>12.44 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>-.16 (.06)</td>
<td>-.29, -.03</td>
<td>-2.40 (112)</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>.31 (.05)</td>
<td>.21, .41</td>
<td>6.24 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>-.28 (.06)</td>
<td>-.40, -.16</td>
<td>-4.64 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Frequency</td>
<td>-.03 (.07)</td>
<td>-.18, .11</td>
<td>-.44 (112)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Effect of X on Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AI on Positive health</th>
<th>( B/\theta ) (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.16 (.06)</td>
<td>-.29, -.03</td>
<td>-2.41 (112)</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect Effects**

i) Mediation: AI on Positive Health through Appropriateness

| Low suppression       | -.21 (.05)          | -.31, -.11   |
| Medium suppression    | -.17 (.04)          | -.25, -.09   |
| High suppression      | -.13 (.05)          | -.24, -.04   |

ii) Mediation: AI on Positive Health through Effectiveness

| Low suppression       | .11 (.04)           | .02, .17     |
| Medium suppression    | .10 (.03)           | .04, .17     |
| High suppression      | .10 (.04)           | .04, .19     |

iii) Mediation: AI on Positive Health through Anger Frequency

| Low suppression       | -.04 (.05)          | -.15, .06    |
| Medium suppression    | -.01 (.03)          | -.07, .04    |
| High suppression      | .02 (.04)           | -.06, .09    |

**Indexes of Moderated Mediation**

i) Appropriateness

| Suppression           | .04 (.03)           | -.03, .11    |

ii) Effectiveness

| Suppression           | .00 (.02)           | -.04, .06    |

iii) Anger Frequency

| Suppression           | .03 (.04)           | -.04, .12    |

\( N = 122 *p < .05 \) \(*p < .01 N = 122 \) \(*p < .05 \) \(*p < .01 B \) (Unstandardized coefficient) for outcome variables and \( \theta \) (Effect) for indirect effects. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Anger Intensity: mean-centered.

More specifically, Figure 5.7 shows that the strength of this indirect relationship was affected by the extent targets reported using the ER strategy of suppression (i.e., low, medium or high) in response to sender anger intensity targeted towards them. In
terms of low appropriateness attributions, Figure 5.7 shows targets less likely to use suppression as a strategy reported the lowest levels of positive health outcomes. Those who reported using medium levels of suppression also reported slightly lower levels of positive health compared with those targets that reported the highest likelihood of using suppression in response to sender anger intensity viewed as inappropriate. Figure 5.7 also shows that when targets attributed sender anger intensity to be more appropriate, the effects of different suppression levels were not present.

Figure 5.7 The effect of the target’s suppression on the relationship between sender anger intensity appropriateness and the target’s positive health.

Furthermore, in support of Hypothesis 3b and 4b, Table 5.5 shows that attributions of sender effectiveness mediated the negative effect of target perception of anger intensity on positive health. This was statistically significant at all three levels of the target’s ER strategy of suppression (at -1SD, IE = .11; at mean, IE = .10; at +1SD, IE = .10). In terms of low effectiveness attributions, Figure 5.8 shows targets more likely to use suppression as a strategy reported the highest positive health outcomes. Those who reported using medium suppression levels also reported slightly higher
positive health levels than those who reported the lowest likelihood of using suppression in response to sender anger intensity viewed as ineffective. Figure 5.8 also shows that when targets attributed sender anger intensity to be more effective, the effects of different suppression levels were very similar to the levels for lower effectiveness.

Figure 5.8 The effect of the target’s suppression on the relationship between sender anger intensity effectiveness and the target’s positive health.

However, Hypothesis 3c and 4b were unsupported. The results indicate that sender anger frequency attributions did not mediate the negative effect of target perception of anger intensity on positive health. Finally, Hypothesis 5b was unsupported. Support for the full moderated mediation model of the effects of the ER strategy of suppression on attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency was not found, as per Figure 5.1. However, separate paths within the model were as per the preceding analyses.
Negative Health Outcomes. Table 5.6 examines the mediating effect of the three attributions of sender anger intensity: appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, on the relationship between sender anger intensity on negative health outcomes and the moderating impact of the ER suppression strategy. First, the results show that higher perceptions of sender anger intensity were not associated with targets’ negative health ($B = .00$, $p = n.s$), meaning Hypothesis 1b was not supported. As outlined in Table 5.6, higher attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness predicted lower negative health in targets ($B = -.20$, $p < .05$). However, the targets’ attributions of effectiveness ($B = .15$, $p = n.s$), anger frequency ($B = .06$, $p = n.s$) and their ER suppression strategy ($B = -.10$, $p = n.s$) did not directly predict targets’ negative health.

In support of Hypothesis 3a and 4b, Table 5.6 shows that sender appropriateness attributions mediate the negative effect of target perceptions of anger intensity on negative health. This was statistically significant for targets that reported using medium levels of suppression only (at -1SD, IE = .11; at mean, IE = .11; at +1SD, IE = .11). In terms of target attributions of low sender anger intensity appropriateness, Figure 5.9 shows targets less likely to use suppression as a strategy reported the highest levels of negative health outcomes. Those who reported using medium levels of suppression also reported slightly higher levels of negative health compared with those targets that reported the highest likelihood of using suppression in response to sender anger intensity viewed as appropriate.
Figure 5.9 The effect of the target’s suppression on the relationship between sender anger intensity appropriateness and the target’s negative health.

Furthermore, the results did not support hypotheses 3b and 3c and only provided support for hypothesis 4b. Table 5.6 shows regression results did not show a negative effect of target perceptions of anger intensity on targets’ negative health mediated by attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness or frequency at any level of target suppression.

Finally, Hypothesis 5b was unsupported. Support for the full moderated mediation model of the effects of target ER strategy of suppression on attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency were not found, as per Figure 5.1. However, separate paths within the model were as per the preceding analyses.
Table 5.6: Anger intensity, attributions, and negative health outcomes moderated by suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>$B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variable model: negative health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.86 (.32)</td>
<td>2.22, 3.49</td>
<td>8.95 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>.00 (.09)</td>
<td>-.17, .18</td>
<td>.03 (112)</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>-.20 (.07)</td>
<td>-.34, -.07</td>
<td>-3.06 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>.15 (.08)</td>
<td>-.01, .31</td>
<td>1.82 (112)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Frequency</td>
<td>.06 (.10)</td>
<td>-.14, .26</td>
<td>.58 (112)</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Effect of X on Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AI on Negative health</th>
<th>$B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.00 (.09)</td>
<td>-.17, .18</td>
<td>.03 (112)</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect Effects**

i) Mediation: AI on Negative Health through Appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suppression</th>
<th>$B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low suppression</td>
<td>.11 (.06)</td>
<td>-.01, .22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium suppression</td>
<td>.11 (.05)</td>
<td>.03, .21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High suppression</td>
<td>.11 (.07)</td>
<td>-.01, .27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Mediation: AI on Negative Health through Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suppression</th>
<th>$B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low suppression</td>
<td>-.07 (.04)</td>
<td>-.15, .03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium suppression</td>
<td>-.05 (.03)</td>
<td>-.13, .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High suppression</td>
<td>-.04 (.05)</td>
<td>-.16, .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Mediation: AI on Negative Health through Anger Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suppression</th>
<th>$B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low suppression</td>
<td>.02 (.05)</td>
<td>-.08, .14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium suppression</td>
<td>.01 (.03)</td>
<td>-.05, .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High suppression</td>
<td>.00 (.06)</td>
<td>-.12, .10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indexes of Moderated Mediation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suppression</th>
<th>$B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Appropriateness</td>
<td>.00 (.05)</td>
<td>-.09, .13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Effectiveness</td>
<td>.02 (.04)</td>
<td>-.08, .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Anger Frequency</td>
<td>-.01 (.05)</td>
<td>-.13, .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 122 *p < .05  **p < .01 N = 122 *p < .05  **p < .01 B (Unstandardized coefficient) for outcome variables and $\theta$ (Effect) for indirect effects. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Anger Intensity: mean-centered.

**Turnover Intention Outcomes.** Table 5.7 examines the mediating effect of the three attributions of sender anger intensity: appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, on the relationship between sender anger intensity on turnover intention.
outcomes, and the moderating impact of the ER strategy of suppression. First, the results show that sender anger intensity did not predict turnover intention ($B = -.25, p = n.s.$), meaning that Hypothesis 1b was not supported.

Table 5.7: Anger Intensity, attributions, and turnover intention outcomes moderated by suppression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>$B/\theta$ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.34 (.65)</td>
<td>2.12, 4.72</td>
<td>5.22 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>-.25 (.18)</td>
<td>-.61, .11</td>
<td>-1.39 (112)</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>-.52 (.14)</td>
<td>-.79, -.25</td>
<td>-3.81 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>.31 (.17)</td>
<td>-.02, .64</td>
<td>1.84 (112)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Frequency</td>
<td>.42 (.21)</td>
<td>.01, .84</td>
<td>2.03 (112)</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent variable model: Turnover Intention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression model: AI on Turnover Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI on Turnover Intention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect Effects**

| Low suppression | .24 (.15) | .07, .57  |
| Medium suppression | .29 (.12) | .13, .55  |
| High suppression | .34 (.15) | .04, .64  |

| Low suppression | -.03 (.11) | -.31, .14  |
| Medium suppression | -.11 (.08) | -.29, .03  |
| High suppression | -.19 (.11) | -.41, .02  |

**Indexes of Moderated Mediation**

| Suppression | .06 (.10) | -.19, .21 |
| Suppression | -.09 (.08) | -.22, .12 |
| Suppression | .05 (.09) | -.22, .16 |

$N = 122 *p < .05$ **$p < .01$ $N = 122 *p < .05$ **$p < .01$ $B$ (Unstandardized coefficient) for outcome variables and $\theta$ (Effect) for indirect effects. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Anger Intensity: mean-centered.
In support of preliminary correlation results, higher attribution of sender anger intensity appropriateness predicted lower turnover intention in targets ($B = -.52$, $p < .05$). However, higher attributions of sender anger frequency ($B = .42$, $p < .05$) predicted higher turnover intentions in targets. The attribution of effectiveness ($B = .31$ to $.14$, $p = \text{n.s.}$) and the ER suppression strategy ($B = -.09$, $p = \text{n.s.}$) did not predict turnover intentions in targets.

In support of Hypothesis 3a and support of Hypothesis 4b, Table 5.7 shows that attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness mediated the negative effect of targets’ perceptions of higher sender anger intensity on turnover intention. This was statistically significant at all three levels of the targets’ ER strategy of suppression (at -1SD, IE = .24; at mean, IE = .29; at +1SD, IE = .34). More specifically, Figure 5.10 shows that the strength of this indirect relationship was affected by the extent targets reported using the ER strategy of suppression (i.e., low, medium or high) in response to sender anger intensity targeted towards them. In terms of high appropriateness attributions, Figure 5.10 shows targets most likely to use suppression as a strategy reported the lowest levels of turnover intention. In turn, those who reported using medium levels of suppression reported higher turnover intentions compared with those targets that reported the highest likelihood of using suppression in response to sender anger intensity viewed as appropriate. However, Figure 5.10 shows when targets attributed sender anger intensity as inappropriate, the effects of different levels of suppression on turnover intentions were not significant. Furthermore, Hypotheses 3b and 3c were not supported here. Table 5.7 shows that the negative effect of target perceptions of anger intensity on turnover intentions was not mediated by attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness or frequency at any target suppression level.
Finally, Hypothesis 5b was unsupported. Support for the full moderated mediation model of the effects of the ER strategy of suppression on attributions of appropriateness, effectiveness, and anger frequency was not found, as per Figure 5.1. However, separate paths within the model were as per the preceding analyses.

iii. **Attributions of Anger Appropriateness, Effectiveness, and Frequency as the Mediating Mechanisms Between Anger Intensity and Outcomes of Positive Health, Negative Health, and Turnover Intentions Moderated by Reappraisal**

**Positive Health Outcomes.** Table 5.8 examines the mediating effect of the three attributions of sender anger intensity: appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, on the relationship between sender anger intensity on positive health outcomes and the moderating impact of the ER strategy of reappraisal. First, the results show that higher perceptions of sender anger intensity were associated with lower target positive health ($B = -.15, p < .05$) in support of preliminary correlation results and Hypothesis 1a. In support of preliminary correlation results, higher attribution of sender anger intensity
appropriateness predicted greater positive health in targets \( (B = .28, p < .05) \). However, contrary to preliminary results, higher attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness \( (B = -.23, p < .05) \) were associated with lower target positive health. The attribution of anger frequency \( (B = -.04, p > .05) \) and the ER strategy of reappraisal \( (B = .10, p > .05) \) did not predict positive health.

Table 5.8: Anger intensity, attributions and positive health outcomes moderated by reappraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>(<em>B</em>/\theta (SE))</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>(t(df))</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.94 (.23)</td>
<td>2.48, 3.40</td>
<td>12.67 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>-.15 (.06)</td>
<td>-.28, -.03</td>
<td>-2.41 (112)</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>.28 (.05)</td>
<td>.18, .38</td>
<td>5.62 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>-.23 (.06)</td>
<td>-.35, -.10</td>
<td>-3.63 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Frequency</td>
<td>-.04 (.07)</td>
<td>-.19, .11</td>
<td>-.52 (112)</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent variable model: positive health**

**Indirect Effects**

i) Mediation: AI on positive health through anger appropriateness

| Low reappraisal | .12 (.04) | .05, .21 |
| Medium reappraisal | .08 (.03) | .03, .15 |
| High reappraisal  | .04 (.04) | .04, .19 |

ii) Mediation: AI on positive health through anger effectiveness

| Low reappraisal | -.03 (.05) | -.13, .04 |
| Medium reappraisal | -.01 (.02) | -.07, .03 |
| High reappraisal  | .01 (.03)  | -.06, .05 |

iii) Mediation: AI on Positive Health through Anger Frequency

| Low reappraisal | -.03 (.05) | -.13, .04 |
| Medium reappraisal | -.01 (.02) | -.07, .03 |
| High reappraisal  | .01 (.03)  | -.06, .05 |

**Indexes of Moderated Mediation**

i) Appropriateness  
Reappraisal | .04 (.03) | -.00, .12 |

ii) Effectiveness  
Reappraisal | -.04 (.03) | -.11, -.00 |

iii) Anger Frequency  
Reappraisal | .04 (.03) | -.00, .12 |

\( N = 122 \) *\( p < .05 \) **\( p < .01 \) \( \) (Unstandardized coefficient) for outcome variables and \( \theta \) (Effect) for indirect effects. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Anger Intensity: mean-centered.
In support of Hypothesis 3a and in support of Hypothesis 4c, Table 5.8 shows that attributions of sender appropriateness mediated the indirect effect of targets’ perception of anger intensity on positive health, and this was statistically significant at all three levels of the targets’ ER strategy of reappraisal (at -1SD, IE = -0.19; at mean, IE = -0.16; at +1SD, IE = -0.12). More specifically, Figure 5.11 shows that the strength of this indirect relationship was affected by the extent targets reported using the ER strategy of reappraisal (i.e., low, medium or high) in response to intense sender anger targeted towards them. In terms of low appropriateness attributions, Figure 5.11 shows targets less likely to use reappraisal as a strategy reported the lowest levels of positive health outcomes. Those who reported using medium levels of reappraisal also reported lower levels of positive health compared with those targets that reported the highest likelihood of using reappraisal in response to intense sender anger viewed as inappropriate. Figure 5.11 also shows that when targets attributed sender anger intensity as appropriate, the effects of different reappraisal levels were not present.

Figure 5.11 The effect of the target’s reappraisal on the relationship between sender anger intensity appropriateness and the target’s positive health.
Furthermore, in support of Hypothesis 3b and 4b, Table 5.8 shows that attributions of sender anger effectiveness mediated the negative effect of target perceptions of anger intensity on positive health for targets who reported using low and medium levels of reappraisal only (at $-1SD$, IE $= .12$; at mean, IE $= .08$; at $+1SD$, IE $= .04$). In terms of low effectiveness attributions, Figure 5.12 shows targets less likely to use reappraisal as a strategy reported the lowest levels of positive health outcomes. Those who reported using higher reappraisal levels reported higher levels of positive health than those who reported using medium levels of reappraisal in response to intense sender anger viewed as effective. Figure 5.12 also shows that when targets attributed sender anger intensity as high in effectiveness, the effects of different reappraisal levels did not differ. On the other hand, Hypothesis 3c was unsupported. The results indicate that attributions of sender frequency did not mediate the negative effect of target perception of anger intensity on positive health at all reappraisal levels.

Finally, Hypothesis 5c was partially supported. The overall index of moderated mediation in Table 5.8 shows the significant effect of sender anger intensity on positive health through the targets’ attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness was moderated by the targets’ ER reappraisal strategy. This moderation mediation result is demonstrated by the significant bootstrapped CIs $[-.11, -.00]$. However, support for the full moderated mediation model of the effects of the ER strategy of reappraisal on attributions of appropriateness and anger frequency was not found, as per Figure 5.1, although separate paths within the model were as per the preceding analyses.
Figure 5.12 The effect of the target’s reappraisal on the relationship between sender anger intensity effectiveness and the target’s positive health.

**Negative Health Outcomes.** Table 5.9 examines the mediating effect of the three attributions of sender anger intensity: appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, on the relationship between sender anger intensity on negative health outcomes, and the moderating impact of the ER strategy of reappraisal. First, the results show that higher perceptions of sender anger intensity did not predict negative health ($B = .03, p = n.s$), meaning Hypothesis 1b was not supported. Results found that targets’ higher attribution of sender anger intensity appropriateness ($B = -.18, p < .05$) and their greater use of the ER reappraisal strategy ($B = -.20, p < .05$) predicted lower negative health in targets providing support for hypothesis 3a and 4b. No support was found for Hypotheses 3b and 3c. Target attributions of effectiveness ($B = .13, p = n.s$) and anger frequency ($B = .05, p = n.s$) did not predict targets’ negative health.
Table 5.9: Anger intensity, attributions and negative health outcomes moderated by reappraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>B/θ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variable model: negative health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.76 (.31)</td>
<td>2.15, 3.37</td>
<td>8.96 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>.03 (.08)</td>
<td>-.14, .20</td>
<td>.35 (112)</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>-.18 (.07)</td>
<td>-.31, -.05</td>
<td>-2.72 (112)</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>.13 (.08)</td>
<td>-.03, .29</td>
<td>1.56 (112)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Frequency</td>
<td>.05 (.10)</td>
<td>-.15, .25</td>
<td>.50 (112)</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Effect of X on Y

| AI on Negative health | .03 (.08)  | -.14, .20     | .35 (112)  | .73  |

**Indirect Effects**

i) Mediation: AI on Negative Health through Appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reappraisal</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low reappraisal</td>
<td>.11 (.05)</td>
<td>.03, .22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium reappraisal</td>
<td>.10 (.05)</td>
<td>.02, .21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High reappraisal</td>
<td>.09 (.08)</td>
<td>-.04, .25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Mediation: AI on Negative Health through Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reappraisal</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low reappraisal</td>
<td>-.07 (.04)</td>
<td>-.16, -.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium reappraisal</td>
<td>-.05 (.03)</td>
<td>-.13, .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High reappraisal</td>
<td>-.02 (.05)</td>
<td>-.13, .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Mediation: AI on Negative Health through Anger Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reappraisal</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low reappraisal</td>
<td>.03 (.04)</td>
<td>-.05, .11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium reappraisal</td>
<td>.01 (.03)</td>
<td>-.05, .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High reappraisal</td>
<td>.00 (.04)</td>
<td>-.08, .10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indexes of Moderated Mediation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reappraisal</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Appropriateness</td>
<td>-.01 (.05)</td>
<td>-.11, .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Effectiveness</td>
<td>.03 (.03)</td>
<td>-.04, .11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Anger Frequency</td>
<td>-.01 (.03)</td>
<td>-.07, .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 122  *p < .05  **p < .01 N = 122  *p < .05  **p < .01 B (Unstandardized coefficient) for outcome variables and θ (Effect) for indirect effects. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Anger Intensity: mean-centered.

In support of Hypotheses 3a and 4c, Table 5.9 shows that the negative effect of target perception of anger intensity on negative health was mediated by attributions of sender appropriateness for targets who reported using low and medium levels of reappraisal only (at -1SD, IE = .11; at mean, IE = .10; at +1SD, IE = .09). Figure 5.13 shows that the strength of this indirect relationship was affected by the extent targets report using the ER strategy of reappraisal (i.e., low, medium or high) in response to intense sender anger targeted towards them. In terms of attributions of low appropriateness, Figure 5.13 shows targets least likely to use reappraisal as a strategy.
reported the highest levels of negative health outcomes. Those who reported using medium levels of reappraisal reported higher levels of negative health compared with those targets that reported the highest likelihood of using reappraisal in response to intense sender anger viewed as inappropriate. Figure 5.13 also shows that when targets attributed sender anger intensity as more appropriate, the effects of different levels of reappraisal were only slightly less pronounced.

Figure 5.13 The effect of the target’s reappraisal on the relationship between sender anger intensity appropriateness and the target’s negative health.

In support of Hypotheses 3b and 4c, Table 5.9 shows that the negative effect of target perception of anger intensity on positive health was mediated by attributions of sender effectiveness. This was statistically significant at the high level of targets’ ER strategy of reappraisal (at -1SD, IE =-.07; at mean, IE=-.05; at +1SD, IE=-.02). More specifically, Figure 5.14 shows that the strength of this indirect relationship was affected by the extent targets reported using the ER strategy of reappraisal (i.e., low, medium or high) in response to intense sender anger targeted towards them. In terms of attributions of high effectiveness, Figure 5.14 shows targets less likely to use
reappraisal as a strategy reported the highest levels of negative health outcomes. Those who reported using high levels of reappraisal reported lower levels of negative health compared with those targets who reported higher likelihood of using reappraisal in response to sender anger intensity viewed as effective. Figure 5.14 also shows when targets attributed sender anger intensity as less effective, the effects of different levels of reappraisal were less pronounced.
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**Figure 5.14** The effect of the target’s reappraisal on the relationship between sender anger intensity effectiveness and the target’s negative health.

Hypothesis 3c was unsupported. Table 5.9 shows that the negative effect of target perceptions of anger intensity on positive health was not mediated by attributions of sender anger intensity frequency for targets using any of the three levels of the ER reappraisal strategy. Finally, Hypothesis 5c was unsupported. Support for the full moderated mediation model of the effects of the ER strategy of reappraisal on attributions of appropriateness, effectiveness, and anger frequency were not found, as per Figure 5.1, although separate paths within the model clearly were as per the preceding analyses.
Turnover Intention Outcomes. Table 5.10 examines the mediating effect of the three attributions of sender anger intensity; appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency, on the relationship between sender anger intensity on turnover intention outcomes, and the moderating impact of the ER strategy of reappraisal. First, the results show that higher perceptions of sender anger intensity were not associated with targets’ turnover intention (B = -.24, p = n.s.), not supporting Hypothesis 1c. Table 5.10 results indicate that higher attribution of sender anger intensity appropriateness (B = -.56, p < .05) and effectiveness (B = .34, p < .05) predicted greater target turnover intention. However, while the attributions of intense sender anger frequency (B = .45, p < .05) was significant, the ER strategy of reappraisal (B = -.17, p = n.s.), did not directly predict turnover intentions.

Table 5.10: Anger intensity, attributions and turnover intention outcomes moderated by reappraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>*β/θ (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>t(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.37 (.64)</td>
<td>2.10, 4.63</td>
<td>5.25 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Intensity (AI)</td>
<td>-.24 (.18)</td>
<td>-.59, .11</td>
<td>-1.33 (112)</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>-.56 (.14)</td>
<td>-.83, -.28</td>
<td>-3.98 (112)</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>.34 (.17)</td>
<td>-.01, .68</td>
<td>1.94 (112)</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Frequency</td>
<td>.45 (.21)</td>
<td>.04, .87</td>
<td>2.15 (112)</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Effect of X on Y
| AI on Turnover Intention | -.24 (.18) | -.59, .11 | -1.33 (112) | .18 |

Indirect Effects

i) Mediation: AI on Turnover Intention through Appropriateness
| Low reappraisal | .24 (.17) | -.04, .65 |
| Medium reappraisal | .31 (.11) | .13, .55 |
| High reappraisal  | .38 (.13) | .13, .65 |

ii) Mediation: AI on Turnover Intention through Effectiveness
| Low reappraisal | -.03 (.12) | -.29, .22 |
| Medium reappraisal | -.12 (.08) | -.30, .02 |
| High reappraisal  | -.22 (.14) | -.52, .01 |

iii) Mediation: AI on Turnover Intention through Anger Frequency
| Low reappraisal | .18 (.12) | -.04, .44 |
| Medium reappraisal | .12 (.08) | -.01, .30 |
| High reappraisal  | .07 (.09) | -.06, .30 |

Indexes of Moderated Mediation

i) Appropriateness
| Reappraisal | .08 (.12) | -.21, .30 |

ii) Effectiveness
| Reappraisal | -.11 (.12) | -.35, .13 |

iii) Anger Frequency
| Reappraisal | -.06 (.08) | -.21, .11 |

N = 122 *p < .05  **p < .01  N = 122 *p < .05  **p < .01 B (Unstandardized coefficient) for outcome variables and θ (Effect) for indirect effects. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Anger Intensity: mean-centered.
Regression results partially support Hypothesis 3a and 4c; Table 5.10 shows that the negative effect of target perceptions of anger intensity on positive health was mediated by attributions of sender effectiveness for targets who reported using medium and high levels of reappraisal only (at -1SD, IE = .24; at mean, IE = .31; at +1SD, IE = .38). In terms of attributions of high appropriateness, Figure 5.15 shows targets more likely to use reappraisal as a strategy reported the lowest levels of turnover intention outcomes. Those who reported using medium levels of reappraisal reported higher levels of turnover intention compared with those targets that reported the highest likelihood of using reappraisal in response to sender anger intensity viewed as appropriate. Figure 5.15 also shows when targets attributed sender anger intensity as less appropriate, the effects of different levels of reappraisal were not significant.
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Figure 5.15 The effect of the target’s reappraisal on the relationship between sender anger intensity appropriateness and the target’s turnover intention.

Furthermore, Hypotheses 3b and 3c were unsupported. Table 5.10 results show that the negative effect of target perceptions of anger intensity on turnover intention
mediated by attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness and frequency was not significant at any of the levels of target reappraisal.

Finally, Hypotheses 5c was unsupported. Support for the full moderated mediation model of the effects of the ER strategy of reappraisal on attributions of appropriateness, effectiveness, and anger frequency was not found, as per Figure 5.1. However separate paths within the model were significant as outlined in the preceding analyses.

The three tables below summarize the hierarchical regression results. Summaries for direct effect (Table 5.11; Hypotheses 1a to 2c), indirect effect (Table 5.12; Hypotheses 3a to 4c), and moderated mediation effect (Table 5.13; Hypotheses 5a to 5c) results are below.

Table 5.11: Study 2: Summary of Direct Effects Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Hypothesis Description</th>
<th>Direct relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Perceptions of higher sender anger intensity are associated with lowered target positive health.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Perceptions of higher sender anger intensity are associated with higher target negative health.</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Perceptions of higher sender anger intensity are associated with higher target turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>There will be a negative relationship between perceptions of higher sender anger intensity and the receivers’ attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>There will be a negative relationship between perceptions of higher sender anger intensity and the receivers’ attribution of sender anger intensity effectiveness.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>There will be a positive relationship between perceptions of higher sender anger intensity and the receivers’ attributions of higher sender anger intensity frequency.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 5.12: Study 2: Summary of Indirect Effects Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Hypothesis Description</th>
<th>Indirect Relationship</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>The attribution of sender anger intensity appropriateness mediates the relationships between sender anger intensity and the target’s positive health, negative health and, turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>1. Supported for attributions of appropriateness for all outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>The attribution of sender anger intensity effectiveness mediates the relationships between sender anger intensity and the target’s positive health, negative health and, turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>2. Supported only for attributions of effectiveness and negative health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>The attribution of sender anger intensity frequency mediates the relationships between sender anger intensity and the target’s positive health, negative health and, turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td>3. Not supported for attributions of anger frequency for all outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>The target’s ER strategy of expression moderates the effects of the their attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency on their positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
<td>1. Supported for attributions of appropriateness for all outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>The target’s ER strategy of suppression moderates the effects of the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency on their positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
<td>2. Supported only for attributions of effectiveness and positive health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>The receivers’ ER strategy of reappraisal moderates the effects of the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency on their positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
<td>3. Not supported for attributions of anger frequency for all outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.13: Study 2: Summary of Moderated Mediation Effects Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Moderated Mediation Effects</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>The indirect effect of anger intensity on positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions will be mediated by the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency and moderated by ER strategies of expression.</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>The indirect effect of anger intensity on positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions will be mediated by the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency and moderated by ER strategies of suppression.</td>
<td>Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>The indirect effect of anger intensity on positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions will be mediated by the attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness, effectiveness, and frequency and moderated by ER strategies of reappraisal.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
<td>Partially supported for attributions of effectiveness and positive health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.5 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In this study, I examined the internal processes of workplace anger targets, mainly in terms of the relationship between the targets’ attributions and the ER strategies used in the face of workplace sender anger intensity. The RAM was foundational in developing the empirical model for this study and guiding this analysis. In this section, I first discuss the findings for the targets’ positive health outcomes followed by an examination of the targets’ negative health outcomes. Finally, I consider the results in terms of the targets’ turnover intentions.

Preliminary Pearson correlation and regression results indicated direct associations between attributions made of sender anger intensity and individual and organizational outcomes. Specifically, RQ3 asked, “How do ER strategies and particular attributions interact?” In Study 2, I tested this research by examining how ER strategies (moderator) and attributions (mediator) interact to predict the targets’ positive
health. Concerning RQ4, “How do different attributions and ER strategies combine to effect receivers’ individual and organizational outcomes?” results were established in this study between attributions, ER strategies, and individual outcomes. As per current research, I expect that the targets’ outcomes such as health and wellbeing (positive health and negative health) (Miers et al., 2007), and turnover intentions (Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2005) will impact organizational outcomes (e.g., lowered organizational commitment) (see Baillien et al., 2009). Results are discussed below.

5.5.1 The Impact of Workplace Anger Expressions, Attributions, and ER Strategies on the Target’s Positive Health

In support of previous workplace research on the targets of anger (see Allred et al., 1997; Baillien et al., 2009) and Hypothesis 1a, Study 2 showed that higher perceptions of sender anger intensity were associated with targets’ lowered positive health (e.g., lowered work functionality). Research indicates that individuals feel unwell at work and detached from their organization (Harlos & Axelrod, 2005). Perceptions of higher sender anger appropriateness and effectiveness were associated with targets’ health and wellbeing. With higher attributions of appropriateness, targets experienced better positive health. Conversely, with higher effectiveness, the target experienced poorer positive health. Potential reasons for these results are discussed below.

i. Sender Anger Intensity Appropriateness

First, in line with Hypothesis 3a, the results revealed that appropriateness attributions made of higher sender anger intensity were associated with better positive health for targets. In Study 1 (Chapter 4), the results indicated that perceptions of sender anger appropriateness appeared to be directly related to events. I argue that this focus on events (external attribution) instead of the sender being the cause of anger (internal attribution) could potentially engender better health outcomes for the target. The data from Study 2 seems to support this proposition. When targets attributed sender anger intensity as more appropriate, the effects of different ER expression levels on positive
health did not appear significant. The effects of different levels of suppression and reappraisal on positive health were also not present.

Perceived inappropriate expressions of sender anger intensity in the workplace are linked to the violation of norms or accepted behavior patterns for that organization (Callister et al., 2007; Mauss et al., 2007). Also, organizational cultures might contain unspoken rules and expectations about what emotional expressions are acceptable or not in the work environment (i.e., organizational display rules) (Ekman, 1992; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). As outlined by the DTM (Geddes & Callister, 2007), when the inappropriety threshold is crossed, there is a possibility of more negative outcomes. In terms of attributions of inappropriateness (i.e., low appropriateness), Study 2 results indicated much lower positive health levels at all target expression levels, in support of Hypotheses 3a and 4a. Besides (for attributions of low appropriateness), targets using the highest levels of the ER expression strategy reported the lowest positive health levels.

In contrast, targets using the lowest levels of the ER suppression strategy (for attributions of inappropriateness) reported similar outcomes (lowered positive health), partially supporting Hypotheses 3b and 4b (see Table 5.12 above). It might be that targets who use lower levels of the ER suppression strategy potentially use higher levels of expression. To reiterate, Study 2 showed targets that viewed sender anger intensity as inappropriate experienced lower levels of positive health outcomes, primarily if they used higher levels of the ER strategy of expression or low levels of suppression in response to this anger. However, further research is needed to examine this area.

On the other hand, in support of Hypothesis 4c, targets more likely to use higher levels of the ER reappraisal strategy (for attributions of inappropriateness) experienced better positive health than their counterparts who used lower levels. These results confirm current research that established cognitive reappraisal as an effective strategy...
(Gross & John, 2003; Shermohammed et al., 2017) for maintaining positive health outcomes. Gross and John (2003) explain that using reappraisal is not as taxing to the individual as using suppression, potentially clarifying why targets in this study experienced better positive health when they reappraised, even given low appropriateness attributions of sender anger intensity. Concerning the targets’ reappraisal, there was a stronger relationship at low reappraisal levels between inappropriateness and lowered positive health. Similar to the suppression effect mentioned above, potentially targets that used lower reappraisal also used higher expression. Thus, I propose that a target’s lower positive health outcomes are related to the sender’s anger intensity attribution (i.e., appropriate or inappropriate sender anger intensity) and the subsequent ER strategy used in response to a particular attribution. I argue that the targets’ attributions of low appropriateness of the senders’ anger intensity can be negatively related to the target’s overall wellbeing. In other words, targets may be more focused on protecting themselves from inappropriate sender anger intensity, such as provocative verbal and aggressive attacks (Friedman et al., 2004).

ii. **Sender Anger Intensity Effectiveness**

According to Gross (1998), controlled emotions are vital for individual and organizational effectiveness. As described by Study 1, frequent sender anger was often not considered controlled (and therefore less effective). In Study 2, targets of intense anger were asked to report their attributions around the effectiveness of sender anger intensity. Responses indicated that higher attributions of intense anger effectiveness were associated with lower levels of positive health. Furthermore, the results also showed that ER strategies moderated attributions of ineffectiveness (i.e., low effectiveness) in predicting positive health. When sender anger intensity was seen as ineffective, receivers who used the lowest level of expression experienced higher positive health levels (in support of Hypothesis 4a). Targets who used the most
suppression in the face of low sender anger intensity effectiveness experienced a similar outcome (better positive health). It might be that targets who use more suppression in the face of the sender’s anger intensity (for low effectiveness) essentially use less expression. Although current research results indicate that suppression is detrimental to an individual’s health and wellbeing (Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 2002), this does not seem to be the case when anger is attributed to ineffectiveness and targets use lower ER expression and higher suppression strategies. The interplay between ER strategies of suppression and expression should be further examined.

Under the same conditions of low sender anger intensity effectiveness, targets less likely to use reappraisal experienced lower positive health (see Gross & John, 2003). Gross and John (2003) explained that individuals who suppress emotions might use reappraisal at a later stage in the emotion generative process to the detriment of their health; however, the sequence of ER strategies targets used was not examined in Study 2.

Finally, the results indicate only one moderated mediation index. In support of Hypothesis 5c, the effect of sender anger intensity and the positive health outcome was mediated by targets’ attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness and moderated by targets’ ER strategy of reappraisal. In other words, the results for the total moderated mediation effect for all pathways, the index of moderated mediation (Hayes, 2017) as displayed in Figure 5.1, shows that the effect was significant (95% CI: [−.11, −.00]), indicating that the indirect effect of sender anger intensity on positive health through effectiveness was moderated by reappraisal (see Table 5.8).

iii. **Sender Anger Intensity Frequency**

Research has established several instances where anger targets have attempted to attribute meaning to sender anger (Martinko et al., 2013; Weiner, 2001). More recently, Lindebaum and his colleagues (2016) conducted a study in the United Kingdom military
on the positive and negative reactions to sender expressions of anger at work. They found that the UK military participants saw frequent expressions of anger as emerging from an internal deficiency of the sender that was internal, stable, and controllable. In Study 1, individuals expressing frequent anger were seen as out of control regardless of the situation. Although research established that sender anger intensity and frequency negatively impact targets (Geddes & Callister, 2007; Miron-Spekter & Rafaeli, 2009), Study 2 results did not identify associations between the targets’ attributions of sender anger intensity frequency and their negative health outcomes.

5.5.2 The Impact of Workplace Perceived Anger Intensity of Sender on the Target’s Negative Health

Study 2 results specified that higher sender anger intensity did not directly predict target negative health, disconfirming Hypothesis 1b. This non-association between anger intensity and the targets’ negative health seems to be in opposition to current research on the target, which suggests that individuals experiencing anger within abusive supervision felt stressed, emotionally exhausted, and experienced burnout (Carlson et al., 2012; Tepper, 2007), anxiety (Tepper, 2007), and lowered self-esteem (Rafferty & Restubog, 2011). However, Study 2 results revealed that target attributions of higher sender anger intensity appropriateness predicted lower negative health levels for the target. Further results are discussed in more detail below.

i. Sender Anger Intensity Appropriateness

As mentioned, hierarchical regression results did not establish direct associations between the targets’ attributions of sender anger intensity and negative health (e.g., lowered self-esteem); however, a closer examination of the targets’ internal processes revealed associations between appropriateness attributions of intense sender anger and the targets’ negative health. Higher appropriateness of sender anger intensity was associated with lowering negative health (e.g., better self esteem) for targets. In support of Hypothesis 4a, in the face of greater sender anger intensity appropriateness, targets
more likely to use expression as a strategy reported the lowest levels of negative health outcomes (e.g., better self esteem), supporting current research on the value of the expression of emotions to the targets’ health and wellbeing (see Siegman, 1993).

Furthermore, targets who used lower ER strategies of suppression for less appropriate attributions of anger reported higher negative health (e.g., lower self esteem) and lower positive health (e.g., lower work functionality) in support of Hypothesis 4b. These results concur with current literature on the suppression of emotions as detrimental to an individual’s health and wellbeing, leading to serious health issues (Alexander & French, 1946; Friedman, 2010; Glomb & Tews, 2004).

Similarly, targets that viewed anger as less appropriate and who used lower levels of the ER reappraisal strategy experienced higher negative health (e.g., lower self esteem). Although results indicated more negative outcomes for attributions of low sender anger intensity appropriateness, a closer examination of the interplay between emotions might shed further light on these results.

ii. **Sender Anger Intensity Effectiveness**

For target attributions of higher sender anger intensity effectiveness, targets who used higher expression levels reported lower negative health (e.g., better self-esteem) in support of Hypothesis 4a. These results also correspond to established psychoanalytic theory that inspired a belief that expressing one’s emotions such as anger was beneficial to health and wellbeing (Siegman, 1993) and to the organization (e.g., it can prompt investigation into improving organizational procedures and efficiency) (Lindebaum & Jordan, 2014). In addition, for high effectiveness attributions, targets that used less reappraisal experienced greater negative health (e.g., lowered self-esteem) than those who reported using more reappraisal. In other words, when anger was viewed as effective, targets who used less reappraisal experienced the highest level of negative health (e.g., increased lowered self-esteem). It could be that these individuals use
reappraisal later in the emotion generative process to the detriment of their health and wellbeing (Gross, 1998; Gross & John, 2003).

iii. **Sender Anger Intensity Frequency**

The results indicated that frequency attributions of sender anger intensity were not associated with negative health.

5.5.3 **The Impact of Workplace Perceived Anger Intensity of Sender on the Target’s Turnover Intentions**

Study 2 results revealed that higher sender anger intensity attributions did not predict turnover intentions, contradicting Hypothesis 1c. This result seems to contrast previous research showing that those who encountered perceived anger intensity of senders expressed the desire to leave the workplace (Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2005). Study 2’s examination of the moderating and mediating mechanism might provide some explanation for these seemingly contradictory results.

i. **Sender Anger Intensity Appropriateness**

Attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness led to more positive results for targets. For example, higher appropriateness attributions were associated with lowering turnover intentions. Also, targets that used higher levels of suppression and reappraisal in the face of higher anger appropriateness reported less turnover intentions. As mentioned earlier, current research has associated suppression to negative outcomes such as lowered health and wellbeing (Alexander & French, 1946; Friedman, 2010; Glomb & Tews, 2004), potentially impacting on turnover intentions (Harlos, 2010; Harlos & Axelrod, 2005; 2008). However, in contrast, Study 2 determined that the targets’ appropriateness attributions of the senders’ anger intensity play a role in determining lower turnover intentions.

In support of the proposition mentioned above (i.e., appropriateness attributions play a role in determining turnover intentions), for inappropriate sender anger intensity,
the targets who used higher levels of the ER expression strategy experienced higher turnover intentions. Although expression generated positive results for targets in terms of health and wellbeing (Siegman, 1993), when the targets in this study expressed their emotions, results indicated higher target turnover intentions in the face of intense, inappropriate sender anger.

ii. **Sender Anger Intensity Effectiveness**

The attribution of sender anger intensity effectiveness was not associated with the target's turnover intentions. In other words, attributions of sender anger intensity effectiveness seem to have little bearing on the individual’s desire to leave the workplace.

iii. **Sender Anger Intensity Frequency**

The hierarchical regression analysis results identified that attributions of frequent sender anger intensity predicted targets’ turnover intentions. In other words, when sender anger intensity was attributed as frequent, targets experienced higher turnover intentions. Results also show that high intensity anger is associated with more frequent anger. Geddes and Callister (2007) note that in terms of anger frequency, the lack of organizational action in the face of possibly frequent deviant workplace anger directed at targets can result in withdrawal behaviors. In this regard, when attributions of abusive supervision (a potential anger situation) are linked to organizational issues, receivers are more prone to use organization-focused nonconformity (i.e., complain about the organization or leave) (Allred, 1995).

Potentially, frequent sender anger intensity could corrode the targets’ trust in the angry person and, even more detrimental to the organization, their organizational trust. Research results indicate that anger expressed during negotiations impacted the receivers’ trust of the negotiator (sender), drawing attention away from the goal of attaining an agreement (Allred et al., 1997). I argue that frequent sender anger intensity
directed at the target might diminish trust, and eventually, the ability to interact and work with the sender and the organization itself. However, this was untested in the current research.

5.6 CONCLUSION

Finally, my research contributes to the existing body of knowledge by providing a better understanding of receivers’ internal processes when dealing with perceived sender anger intensity in the workplace, specifically focusing on receivers’ attributions for the senders’ intense anger; and subsequent ER strategies used in response to this anger. This study also contributes to a better understanding of how internal processes impact the target of anger. It is hoped that these results will help organizations to find ways to tackle problems and issues that develop from workplace anger expressions.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

6.1 CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Throughout this thesis, I have argued the importance of investigating receivers’ attributions and their ER strategies used when faced with perceived workplace anger intensity of senders. A better knowledge of receivers’ experiences and responses to workplace perceived anger intensity of the sender is vital, given that their attributions and ER strategies have not been examined closely within one model. This chapter provides a synopsis of the thesis, focusing on the main results originating from Studies 1 (Chapter 4) and 2 (Chapter 5). To develop the main themes that emerged from this thesis, I also compare and contrast findings with the current literature on workplace anger, specifically on intense anger expressions directed at the receiver (target and observer). Theoretical and practical propositions of the program of research are then considered. Finally, I examine both studies’ limitations and conclude by outlining future research possibilities and my final words.

6.2 OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH AND KEY FINDINGS

This research aimed to understand how receivers experience and respond to senders’ perceived anger intensity directed at them within the workplace. This thesis was based on a range of previous work in this field, and the research was built using mixed methods, a combination of both qualitative (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and quantitative approaches (Gelo et al., 2008, Hancock, 2004) to draw a set of conclusions within the thesis. Qualitative and quantitative approaches differ in ontology, the study of “what is” (Crotty, 1998: 10; Gelo et al., 2008) and epistemology, “what it means to know” (Cohen, Kincaid, & Childs, 2007, p. 7; Creswell & Tashakkori, 2007) (see Chapter 1). Qualitative research seeks to provide a deeper understanding of phenomena (Crotty, 1998). By permitting the participants in Study 1 to tell their stories of feeling
anger in the workplace, they provided greater detail of their understanding of and response to the sender anger received. On the other hand, quantitative research lends itself to theory testing and generalizations (Gelo et al., 2008). The quantitative research in Study 2 provided insight into receivers’ reactions to anger at work and the antecedents and consequences to these reactions. This research program used qualitative and quantitative methods (mixed methods) to enable a broader view of research issues (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Creswell & Tashakkori, 2007).

6.2.1 Overview of the Research Background and Studies

As noted in the literature review (Chapter 2), researchers have focused mostly on the angry persons’ expressions, their triggers, reactions (Booth & Mann, 2005; Fitness, 2000; Moreo et al., 2020), and the consequences of these episodes in the workplace (Booth & Mann, 2005; Chen & Spector, 1992; Fitness, 2000). More recent research has begun to address the influence of sender anger on the receiver (target and observer) (Geddes et al., 2018; Harlos, 2010; Holm, Torkelson, & Bäckström, 2016). In particular, receiver research to date has examined the anger emotion within the contexts of conflict (Geddes & Stickney, 2012), conflict and negotiation (Callister et al., 2017), bullying (Samnani, 2013), and abusive supervision (Carlson et al., 2012) revealing numerous individual and organizational outcomes (Callister et al., 2003; Stickney & Geddes, 2016). In Chapter 2, the primary outcomes discussed were around the impact of workplace anger on job satisfaction (Glomb, 2002), health and wellbeing (Miers et al., 2007), and the receivers’ turnover intentions (Harlos & Axelrod, 2005).

The literature review also indicated that on the one hand, anger can inspire individuals to deal with injustice and inequity (Bies et al., 1997), contribute to dispute resolution, and improve relationships between employees (Grandey et al., 2005). On the other hand, it can generate increased organizational incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999) and potential aggression and violence (Fox & Spector, 1999). Overall, the current
research findings show that individuals who are confronted with an angry opponent tend to develop a negative impression of them (Van Kleef & Côté, 2007), become angry (Van Kleef et al., 2004), and can be unwilling to interact with the opponent again (Kopelman et al., 2006). Previous research has revealed that receivers felt that anger during negotiations was characterized by a diminished desire to work together in the future (Allred et al., 1997). It also led to the refusal of business proposals (Pillutla & Murningham, 1996) and amplified the propensity to use aggressive tactics by the recipient (Forgas, 1998), a significant negative impact on both individuals and organizations.

Although research identified the impact of sender anger intensity on receivers’ individual and organizational outcomes, the case was made in this thesis that receivers’ attributions made about the motivations and causes of sender anger, and the subsequent emotion regulation strategies that receivers use in the face of perceived intense sender anger have not been thoroughly examined within one model. In developing this research, the relational anger model (RAM), drawn from attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998), specifically sought to fill this gap. This research program builds on the current body of existing research to better understand how the recipient attributes meaning to the workplace anger event and how they regulate emotions in the face of this. I also sought to identify whether links exist between attributions and emotion regulation strategies and whether these determine outcomes. Specifically, I addressed the following research questions:

**RQ1:** What attributions do receivers (direct targets or observers) of anger make of perceived sender anger intensity?

**RQ2:** What ER strategies do receivers of anger use in response to sender anger: a) directed at themselves or b) directed at others?

**RQ3:** How do ER strategies and particular attributions interact?
RQ4: How do different attributions and ER strategies combine to effect receivers’ individual and organizational outcomes?

Using a sequential mixed-methods approach (where Study 2 was built partially on the findings of Study 1), two studies were undertaken to examine the four research questions. Study 1 was qualitative (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and Study 2 was quantitative (Norkett, 2013). Purposive (nonprobability) sampling was used in both studies, with participants selected from organizations, both public and private.

i. Study 1

To recap, RQs 1 and 2 were the focus of this study. I used a social constructivist approach (Merriam, 2009), using qualitative methods (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) determining attributions made and ER strategies used by receivers (comprising direct targets and observers) of workplace anger. I also examined the relationship between these. Attributions were discussed concerning the locus of causality (internal or external), stability (stable or unstable), and controllability (controllable or uncontrollable) (see Weiner, 1979) of an event or behavior. The results indicated that workplace anger receivers consistently made two main attributions: a) ‘anger frequency’ and b) ‘anger appropriateness’. In Study 1, participants described the senders’ anger frequency as i) ‘frequent’ or ii) ‘once only’. Frequent displays of anger were viewed as stable behavior and encapsulated an internal locus of causality, while once only was ascribed to unstable attributions tending to coincide with an external locus of causality. In Study 1, frequent displays of anger were more likely to be attributed to the angry person’s internal deficiencies. While once only anger attributions centered mainly around situational causes (i.e., a manager dealing with an employee that had not delivered their work on time).

On the other hand, the sender’s ‘anger appropriateness’ was described in Study 1 as i) ‘inappropriate’ or ii) ‘appropriate’. Appropriate expressions seemed to be related to
normative behavior expected across a range of events instead of specific formal organizational display rules. The data also suggested that inappropriate expressions challenged organizational norms confirming the DTM (Geddes & Callister, 2007). Inappropriate expressions of anger seemed to link to the ‘breaking of’ norms or ‘crossing of’ established and acceptable organizational behavior patterns.

Concerning ER strategies, receivers in Study 1 used a mix of ER strategies to respond to the anger episodes. Overall, the main ER strategies used by both targets and observers were: a) situation selection, b) cognitive reappraisal, c) expression and d) the suppression of emotions. These findings correspond with the literature on the use of emotion regulation strategies (Gross 1998, 2003).

The analysis revealed that differences emerged between managers and employees’ emotion regulation strategies and between targets and observers. All managers in Study 1 directly impacted by the anger dealt with it proactively and expressed their concern about the senders’ anger, speaking firmly to the angry person, regardless of the fear for their safety (see Chapter 4). Research explains this phenomenon. Managers are responsible for increasing the cognizance of workplace issues before they get out of hand or generate an adverse organizational climate (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002). In Study 1, it seems that managers tried to manage the senders’ anger by responding verbally, expressing their emotions. Research has established that physical and mental threats can activate a ‘fight or flight’ response (Wilhelmsen, 2005). The data suggest that for managers, as direct targets of anger, a fight response enabled them to deal with any imminent threats and this may be linked to relational power. However, managers as observers of anger tended to intervene in the anger relationship, seeking to provide a peaceful resolution to the parties. Again, this reflects the responsibility managers take on to deal with the situation at hand and manage the individuals involved in that event (see Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002).
On the other hand, employees, particularly direct targets of anger, were more hesitant to express their emotions. Their central tendency was to suppress their emotions and distance themselves from the sender as much as possible. Research on the power of negotiators confirms these results. Low power individuals tend to waver when they speak (Holtgraves & Lasky, 1999; Hosman, 1989) and limit their expression of thoughts (Hall et al., 2006) and emotions (Keltner & Kring, 1998). Employees may keep silent for fear of punishment, fear, or to avoid confrontation (Morrison & Milliken, 2003).

Research explains that morality contains a component that reflects concern for others (Lindebaum et al., 2017). For employees in Study 1, observers of anger, there was a more considerable concern for the targets. Research on anger to date established that high power respondents were more inclined to think that anger incidents were successfully resolved (Fitness, 2000). However, in Study 1, employees, observers of sender anger, felt the issue was successfully resolved when they ascertained that targets or those around them were okay. Overall, participants confirmed that they engaged in using various attributions (see Heider, 1958) and ER strategies (see Gross, 1998) in the face of workplace sender anger.

ii. **Study 2**

This study used quantitative methods (Norkett, 2013) to build on the findings from Study 1. The main focus was to examine the relationship between the targets’ attributions made of workplace anger directed toward them and the emotion regulation strategies they used to address this. Besides, I examined whether the targets’ ER strategies and attributions played a part in determining individual and organizational outcomes. The study outcome variables were the targets’ health and wellbeing (positive and negative health) and turnover intentions. The main results are summarized below.

Overall, Study 2 results revealed that higher intensity of sender anger was directly and negatively associated with targets’ lower positive health (e.g., lower work
functionality). However, no direct effects of sender anger intensity on negative health and turnover intentions were found. Instead, Study 2 revealed the importance of targets’ attributions and ER strategies in explaining the ways sender anger intensity indirectly affects important target health outcomes (positive and negative health) and turnover intentions.

**Attributions and ER Expression Strategy.** The research findings suggest that leaders’ anger tends to decrease subordinate perceptions of leader efficacy (Lewis, 2000). The results from Study 2 indicated that the target’s higher use of expression in the face of the sender’s intense, inappropriate anger was associated with lower levels of targets’ positive health and higher turnover intentions. Also, higher target expressions in the face of high anger appropriateness were associated with lower negative health.

On a positive note, concerning attributions of low effectiveness, targets’ positive health was highest when targets used less expression in response to anger. Regarding negative health outcomes and sender attributions of high effectiveness, targets more likely to use expression as a strategy reported the lowest levels of negative health outcomes (e.g., better self-esteem).

**Attributions and the ER Suppression Strategy.** Research has established that individuals differentiate between deliberate and involuntary harmful actions (Allred et al., 1997; MacGeorge, 2001). In Study 2, the negative effect of target perception of higher anger intensity on positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions was explained by attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness and the use of suppression.

Overall, the results showed that when targets attributed sender anger intensity as inappropriate, targets who used the least suppression experienced lower positive health (e.g., lowered work functionality) and higher negative health (e.g., lowered self esteem). It is worth mentioning that previous research has established that the suppression of
emotions potentially because of job loss (Cortina & Magley, 2003) and potential punishment (Harlos, 2010) can be detrimental to individuals, leading to serious health issues (Alexander & French, 1946; Friedman, 2010; Glomb & Tews, 2004). However, in Study 2, targets of intense anger expressions experienced the same outcome of lowered health and wellbeing (both positive and negative health) even when using less suppression. In contrast, when targets attributed sender anger intensity as higher in appropriateness, upon higher suppression, targets experienced less desire to leave the workplace (i.e., lower turnover intentions).

For lower effectiveness attributions, targets who used higher levels of suppression experienced higher positive health. On the other hand, sender anger intensity frequency attributions did not mediate sender anger intensity on positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions at any level of suppression.

**Attributions and the ER Reappraisal Strategy.** Study 2 also showed that when participants viewed sender anger intensity as lower in appropriateness, targets that used the least reappraisal experienced lower positive health (e.g., lower work functionality) and higher negative health (e.g., lowered self-esteem). On the other hand, for attributions of higher appropriateness, targets that used the highest levels of reappraisal experienced the lowest turnover intentions.

Concerning attributions of lower sender anger intensity effectiveness, targets who used less reappraisal experienced lower positive health (e.g., lower work functionality). On the other hand, for attributions of higher sender anger intensity effectiveness, targets who used the lowest reappraisal levels experienced higher negative health (e.g., lowered self esteem).

The main findings indicate that attributions of the sender’s intense anger frequency was directly associated with targets’ turnover intentions. Spielberger et al. (1995) found that anger frequency was often associated with personality traits such as
the belief that the angry person is ‘anger prone’. In other words, it seems that anger prone individuals seem to express more intense anger.

Finally, in relation to appropriateness attributions of intense sender anger, low anger appropriateness seems to be the most salient attribution related to sender anger intensity that has the most negative impact on receiver health. Worth noting is that targets who experienced lowered positive health and higher negative health in the face of lower suppression when sender anger intensity was seen as lower in appropriateness also experienced lowered positive health when engaging in higher expression. Research established that expression is associated with better outcomes for the individual expressing it (Siegman, 1993). However, in the face of intense, inappropriate anger, target expressions have led to higher turnover intentions and lowered positive health. These results given the interplay between emotions remain to be investigated.

Based on the results identified in Study 1 and Study 2, three broad main themes emerged from this research program, as discussed below.

6.3 MAIN THEMES TO EMERGE FROM THE RESEARCH PROGRAM

In this research program, I identified some patterns that correspond to three broad themes that emerged from the research program, more specifically from the findings across Study 1 (Chapter 4) and Study 2 (Chapter 5). The major themes that emerged from the program of study were that sender anger generates both fight and flight responses from targets (Section 6.3.1); the importance of flexibility in determining anger appropriateness for target outcomes (Section 6.3.2); and anger as a motivational force for receivers: seeking equilibrium (Section 6.3.3). In the following sections, I consider these themes in light of RAM, current literature, and results from Studies 1 and 2.
6.3.1 Sender Anger Generates Both Fight and Flight Responses From Targets

Research to date has expressed great concern regarding the impact of sender anger on individuals within the organization. Because of this, organizations have provided mediators and human resource professionals as a measure of support for employees (Lipsky & Seeber, 2003). However, up to 75% of those impacted choose not to get assistance despite wanting to (Bingham, 2004). Reasons for this avoidance of the much needed help for receivers of workplace anger centers around the fear that voicing their concern will impact on their individual and working life (see Cortina & Magley, 2003; Harlos, 2010; Klaas & DeNisi, 1989). As discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of this research, the participants in Studies 1 and 2 described their challenges upon encounters with workplace anger. In Study 1 respondents commented on the impact of the frequency and intensity of anger (e.g., explosion) and explained their fear for their physical and psychological safety. Wilhelmsen (2000) explained that physical and mental threats can activate a ‘fight or flight’ response. Some receivers in Study 1 sensed danger directed at them from the angry person, describing the senders’ intentions as: “[he] wanted to kill me … he wanted to punch me … choke me” (Twenty Nine, Target, Manager), “[he] just took his anger out on me” (Twenty Six, Target, Employee), “[I] thought he was going to hit me … [I was] concerned that he would hurt me” (Participant Nineteen, Target, Manager). When receivers experience anger, they activate shielding psychological responses and behavior to deal with the seeming threat (Frijda, 1986).

Research has established that when faced with intense anger, receivers of workplace anger often engage in ‘fight’ (approach) or ‘flight’ (avoid) responses (in terms of their cognitive and affective processes and their behaviors) (Berkowitz & Harmon Jones, 2004; Wilhelmsen, 2000). However, the way individual fight or flight responses to workplace anger manifested differed depending on the attributions receivers made of the event. Research has established that sender anger informs the
receiver to some extent of the angry person’s motives, beliefs, and intentions (Keltner & Haidt, 1999). In Study 1, direct targets of sender anger (employees) responded to their interpretation of the event by operationalizing the flight mode in a few ways by removing themselves from the situation or moving away and ignoring the angry person. For those new to the job (direct targets, employees), flight took the form of receiving the anger without responding audibly to the angry person and portraying an internal acceptance of it. Participant Nine (Target, Employee) described it well: “I was new, I’d only been there for about a month or so … I knew it was my fault, I just really thought, ‘I’ve got to sit here and cop it’”.

For observers in Study 1, flight took on a slightly different format. Observers were more concerned with their team members and with the direct target of anger. For observers who had some responsibility for a team (e.g., supervisor) or clients (e.g., reception), flight also took the form of removing the team or client from the anger altercation where possible, including physically moving them to another room, or in the case of clients, trying to appease the situation. Some employees considered engaging in fight but instead took the flight option (see Berkowitz & Harmon Jones, 2004; Wilhelmsen, 2000). For example, Participant Twenty-Three (Observer, Employee) said: “Should I say something, like, ‘Mate, you really can’t talk to people like that’. In the mood he was in at the time I thought ‘He’s going to get angry at me’ … but I sort of thought that it’s outside of my [responsibility], cause I’m not a manager, you know”.

Some managers described a measured fight response. This controlled response seemed to be generated out of fear of retaliation. For example, Participant Twenty-Two (Target, Manager) explained: “I sort of pulled him [sender] aside and said, ‘You need to pull these reins in a little bit’”. Fear was evidenced when managers did their job by entering into fight mode. Participant Twenty-Two’s (Target, Manager) words were: “I just told him ‘Don’t touch me, if you touch me it can be a different scenario’”. Research
has found that superiors are more likely to confront the angry person than subordinates (Fitness, 2000). Throughout this study, receivers reported ER strategies of suppression and expression when dealing with sender anger. In some instances, receivers used reappraisal experiencing better outcomes, as explained by Participant Ten (Observer, Employee): “you're sort of, your anger subsides quite quickly when you then go, ‘Well hell, this could get a little bit worse’, you flick the switch and go along”.

In Study 2, the data revealed the potential for the fight or flight response (see Berkowitz & Harmon Jones, 2004; Wilhelmsen, 2000) to be used by receivers of anger. In Study 2, when targets used fight, outcomes originating from a higher use of expression in the face of high or low sender anger intensity appropriateness and high sender anger intensity effectiveness were more negative (see Table 6.1). Research has found that subordinates are more likely to limit their use of the ER expression strategy in the face of sender anger (Hall et al., 2006). It seems that in the face of higher sender anger frequency, participants in Study 1 and Study 2 tended more towards a flight type behavior (e.g., turnover intention). Study 2 indicated a direct association between targets’ attributions of higher anger frequency and turnover intentions.

Furthermore, in Study 2, targets’ ER strategies seem to be linked to health outcomes mostly. As a form of fight (see Berkowitz & Harmon Jones, 2004; Wilhelmsen, 2000), expression arose as an essential strategy in predicting health outcomes. When sender anger intensity was seen as less appropriate, higher use of the ER expression strategy emerged as a significant moderator for lower positive health (e.g., lowered work functionality). However, a lower use of expression for lower effectiveness of sender anger intensity generated better positive health. Concerning flight, Study 2 found that higher suppression and reappraisal when anger was appropriate generated positive outcomes, such as lower turnover intentions (see Table 6.1), in accordance to the DTM framework (Geddes & Callister, 2007). Indeed, based
on the data in Study 1, a range of different flight reactions (avoidance, withdrawal) may have emerged if they were included as variables in Study 2.

Table 6.1: The moderating effect of target ER strategies on the relationship between target attributions of sender anger intensity and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets’ level of ER strategy used</th>
<th>Appropriateness and Effectiveness Attributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Appropriateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expression</strong></td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suppression</strong></td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reappraisal</strong></td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
Positive outcomes (in italics and bold)
Negative outcomes (normal font)

PH - Positive health
NH - Negative health
TI = Turnover intentions

Notes:
1. Moderating effects of the target’s ER strategies on the relationship between the attribution of frequent sender anger intensity and target outcomes were not identified and, therefore are not reflected in this table.
2. For full details on the Hierarchical Regression Moderated Mediation Results see Chapter 5 (5.4.2)

6.3.2 The Importance of Flexibility in Determining Anger Appropriateness for Target Outcomes

It is argued here that the targets’ attributions made of sender anger intensity identified in Study 1 and examined in Study 2 increased or decreased the “impropriety thresholds” (pp. 722-723) encapsulated by the DTM (Geddes & Callister, 2007). Geddes and Callister (2007) explained that the DTM contains two thresholds. The “expression threshold” that relates to an individual being able to communicate their felt
anger to persons within the organization, who can address the anger event; while the “impropriety threshold” indicates situations when the senders’ anger goes too far and workplace personnel find it inappropriate (Geddes & Callister, 2007 pp. 722-723). These thresholds also distinguish between suppressed anger (does not cross the expression threshold), expressed anger (crosses the expression threshold), and deviant anger (crosses the impropriety threshold and “deviates from organizational norms of tolerable emotion displays”) (Geddes & Callister, 2007, p. 202). My research suggests that the receivers’ attributions of the sender’s anger intensity determine the level of flexibility attributed to the impropriety threshold. A flexible application of this threshold allows individuals to express adverse emotions (i.e., anger) without feeling afraid to do so. The opposite occurs with increased rigidity in the impropriety threshold that may restrict employees from expressing authentic emotions, which can adversely impact their outcomes. According to Geddes and Callister (2007), outcomes that fall within the expression threshold, and the impropriety threshold will be more positive than outcomes that occur when the impropriety threshold is crossed.

Receivers’ attributions of sender anger were examined in both Studies 1 and 2. In Study 1, I identified that receivers made attributions around the senders’ anger appropriateness, effectiveness, and anger frequency. Study 2 examined the relationships between attributions and ER strategies in greater depth and subsequently assessed the role they play in determining individual and organizational outcomes. I propose that the flexibility applied to the impropriety threshold itself will determine the level of ER strategies used (be it lower or higher expression, suppression, or reappraisal), which establishes whether outcomes will be more positive or negative. In other words, attributions potentially act as precursors to the choice to use a lower or higher level of ER strategies (e.g., higher target expression).
Study 2 indicated that a higher perception of sender anger intensity was associated with target attributions of lower anger intensity appropriateness and effectiveness. In contrast, higher sender anger intensity perceptions were associated with target attributions of higher frequency of sender anger intensity. The moderating role of target ER strategies (expression, suppression and reappraisal) on the relationship between the targets’ attributions (of sender anger intensity) and outcomes is discussed below, exemplifying this thesis’s contribution to the DTM’s concept of flexibility in determining the impropriety threshold (Geddes & Callister, 2007).

i. Sender Anger Intensity Appropriateness and Effectiveness

As mentioned in the paragraph above, the results of Study 2 indicated that a higher perception of intense sender anger (potentially crossing the impropriety threshold) was associated with attributions of lower sender anger intensity appropriateness and effectiveness. In terms of low appropriateness attributions, the results of Study 2 revealed that targets more likely to use the ER expression strategy reported the lowest levels of positive health outcomes (lower work functionality) and the highest levels of turnover intentions confirming the DTM’s (Geddes & Callister, 2007) proposition that more negative outcomes could occur for deviant anger. It appears that low appropriateness attributions seem to contract the impropriety threshold, making it less flexible and tending towards a potentially more deviant anger. Because of this contraction of the impropriety threshold’s flexibility, anger targets (as seen in Study 2) seem to react to this more restricted threshold with a ‘fight or flight’ response (Berkowitz & Harmon Jones, 2004) with consequent negative outcomes. This less flexible threshold seems to equate to the direct results established in Study 2 between higher intensity of anger and lowered positive health (lowered work functionality). Harlos and Axelrod (2005) described the results of the impact of the sender’s anger on
the receivers’ health (targets and observers) as feeling unwell at work, detached from the organization, and dissatisfied in one’s job.

On the other hand, in Study 2, when targets attributed sender anger intensity as highly appropriate, the effects of different expression levels were less pronounced for positive health and turnover intention outcomes. In the case of higher appropriateness attributions, the flexibility within the impropriety threshold seemed to expand, and with this expansion, better outcomes were achieved for the target (see high appropriateness in Table 6.1). High appropriateness attributions in Study 1 were often seen as also crossing the impropriety threshold. In Study 2, participants who used more of the ER expression strategy in the face of higher appropriateness attributions experienced lower negative health. Besides, for higher appropriateness attributions, targets that used more suppression and reappraisal experienced lower turnover intentions. These positive results are in accordance with the DTS framework (Geddes & Callister, 2007).

Interestingly, targets who assessed low sender anger intensity effectiveness experienced mostly positive outcomes (see Table 6.1). Targets least likely to use expression, yet more likely to use suppression as an emotion regulation strategy reported higher positive health outcomes. Individuals who attribute sender anger intensity as low in effectiveness might generate higher flexibility within the impropriety threshold (Geddes & Callister, 2007). The reasons for this larger flexibility could be linked to the way in which the receiver views the angry person’s behavior. For example, in Study 1, Participant Five (Observer, Employee) thought the angry person’s behavior was ineffective: “you’re meant to be quite sophisticated, knowledgeable, intelligent and then this is how you’re behaving when your computer isn’t working properly!” This participant’s focus was to take action by dealing with the issue. It seems that the targets’ focus on the issue (i.e., the ineffectiveness of the senders’ intense anger) provided a distraction from the impact of the senders’ intense anger on them. Similarly, Participant
Twenty-Four (Target, Manager) approached a new manager to request that the sender take on some work the previous manager had undertaken and thought their approach to be ineffective: “I was taken aback. I was shocked. I thought it was very unprofessional. I was a little bit disgusted really, because there are so many expressions you can use to somebody, if you don’t think that’s your role, than to say what she said”. The participant’s response to sender anger was to suppress their response: “[I’m] not going to start conflict or have an opinion just yet”. This shift in focus to the ineffectiveness of the sender as opposed to the focus on the protection of ‘self’ (i.e., fight or flight) (Berkowitz & Harmon Jones, 2004) could potentially be the reason for the larger threshold awarded by the receivers’ low effectiveness attribution, and subsequently, an explanation of the potential positive outcomes. Another likely reason for the difference in flexibility within the impropriety threshold for effectiveness attributions is that in some instances, in Study 1, the approach of the receiver triggered sender anger intensity (e.g., request by the receiver for the sender to do work that was typically undertaken by a previous manager – Participant Twenty-Four). This could then influence the attribution of sender anger intensity effectiveness by the receiver.

Concerning high sender anger intensity effectiveness, outcomes were both positive and negative, indicating a potential contraction or expansion of thresholds in the face of higher anger effectiveness. For those participants who potentially expanded the flexibility within the impropriety threshold, outcomes seemed more positive. For example, participants who used more expression in the face of attributions of high sender anger intensity effectiveness experienced lower negative health outcomes (e.g., better self-esteem). On the other hand, participants that used the highest reappraisal in the face of attributions of lower sender anger intensity effectiveness experienced increased negative health (e.g., lowered self-esteem).
ii. **Sender Anger Intensity Frequency**

The results of Study 2 indicate that more frequent anger has more restricted access to the impropriety threshold. On the other hand, less frequent anger has more flexibility in the impropriety threshold. I propose that target attributions of higher anger frequency require further examination about the impact on the impropriety thresholds’ flexibility. As shown in Study 2, frequency attributions and type of ER strategies did not influence the relationship between sender anger intensity and target outcomes of health and wellbeing and turnover intentions. Study 2 also did not indicate a moderating effect of ER strategies on the relationship between attributions and outcomes. However, there was a direct association of frequent sender anger intensity with turnover intentions. In other words, a more rigid interpretation of the impropriety thresholds (as a result of more frequent anger) seems to lead to a stronger flight response (turnover) for direct targets of anger. Further examination of this phenomenon might be valuable for organizations in assisting with turnover issues faced by organizations.

6.3.3 Anger as a Motivational Force for Receivers: Seeking Equilibrium

Historically, up until 1955, the psychoanalytic (Freud & Strachey, 1896) and drive (see Kruglanski, Chernikova, Rosenzweig, & Kopetz, 2014) theories dominated the field of motivation research. Both theories are based on the premise that individuals strive to reduce tension. The central tenet is that a lack of equilibrium creates a motivational force to enable the return to an internally balanced state (e.g., homeostasis: sustaining a stable internal environment) (Weiner, 1986). I suggest that the senders’ anger generates a lack of equilibrium for the receiver. Given this challenge to the receivers’ internal ‘status quo’, I propose that a motivational force is set in motion to restore the receivers’ internal balance (e.g., the lowering of the threat in the face of anger). According to Weiner (1986), “a theory of motivation must include the self, it must be concerned with consciousness and the subjective world” (p. 8). I propose that
attributions fulfill this motivational force role (see RAM ‘the savior/mediator’, Chapter 3, 3.2). I argue (based on my findings in Study 1 and Study 2) that, in the face of anger interactions, the lack of equilibrium caused by the sender’s anger directed at the receiver will generate a motivational force (i.e., attributions) that attempts to manage ‘self’ (the receiver) and the ‘environment’ (the angry person and those also in imminent danger such as colleagues or clients) (Kelley, 1971, p. 22). Kelley (1971) explained that “The attributor is not simply an attributor, a seeker after knowledge, his latent goal in attaining knowledge is that of an effective management of himself and his environment” (p. 22).

This research suggests that receivers’ attributions of sender anger intensity inform (i.e., become a motivating force) the strategies they develop around managing emotions. I argue that this management of ‘self’ (the receiver) and the ‘environment’ (the angry person and others impacted by anger) is achieved through the receivers’ use of ER strategies (Gross, 1998). The primary purpose of this motivation to manage emotions is to restore the receivers’ internal equilibrium (e.g., homeostasis). Based on the data from Studies 1 and 2, I propose that achieving this purpose (e.g., return to the receivers’ ‘status quo’) does not necessarily mean that outcomes will be positive for the receiver. This phenomenon is discussed below in light of results found in Studies 1 and 2. First, I discuss the motivational force of attributions; second restoring the ‘status quo’, the ER management of the imminent threat of workplace anger; and finally, attributions and ER strategies: interacting to contribute to personal outcomes. Examples are limited to the appropriateness attribution, as it was the most prominent attribution made of the angry person in both Studies 1 and 2.

i. **The Motivational Force of Attributions**

It seems that attributions act as a ‘mediator’ (see Section 6.3.1) (see Kelley, 1971) between the challenge receivers face (instigated by sender anger intensity) and their
management of emotions (ER). Also, it appears that attributions have the function of being a motivational force in determining how the target should respond to intense sender anger (e.g., whether they should use more or less of certain ER strategies in the face of the attribution made of sender anger intensity) (see Kelley, 1971). The mediating role of attributions seems to indicate a twofold purpose. First, it suggests an interaction with ER strategies to deal with the disturbance to the ‘status quo’ for ‘self’ (Weiner, 1986), created by the anger episode. Second, for observers, it seems that attributions interact with ER strategies in an attempt to restore the status quo (Weiner, 1986), not only for self (observer) but also for ‘others’ (e.g., the direct target of anger or team members were impacted by sender anger). Receivers (targets and observers) in Study 1 (see Chapter 4) reported that they made choices to regulate their emotions in the face of the attributions they made of sender anger. This result seems to indicate an interaction between the attributions made and the ER strategies used. In Study 1, both targets and receivers reported this occurrence.

An example of the interactions between attributions and the ER strategy chosen was evidenced in Study 1 through Participant Nineteen (Target, Manager) who in the face of the inappropriateness of the sender’s anger intensity responded using ER strategies. Participant Nineteen (Target, Manager) expressed their emotion: “Well, I just said to him, I said, ‘Look, you don’t need to be speaking to me like that, go and do what you’ve been asked to do and we’ll talk about it later’”, followed by suppression “as it was happening I just stared at him and stood firmly in front of him, with the face that I wasn’t scared, as a poker face, but after that I was shaking, scared and I just went to the office, sat down”. Upon this challenge, this participant dealt with the sender’s anger by attributing it to be inappropriate and used the ER strategy of expression followed by suppression.
In Study 2, the targets’ attributions of sender anger intensity appropriateness were further examined. The results indicate that target attributions have a mediating role between sender anger intensity and target outcomes (positive health, negative health, and turnover intentions). This mediating role is further investigated below, given the moderating effect of emotion regulation strategies.

Restoring the ‘Status Quo’: The ER Management of the Imminent Threat of Workplace Anger

Receivers made attributions in the face of sender anger and used various ER strategies to address the impact to their status quo. In Study 1, most workplace anger receivers (that were employees, including new workers) maintained current emotions (preserving their affective experience and expression regarding the event). On the other hand, the response of managers was to intensify their expression (taking charge). At other times, employees suppressed their emotions, downplaying their ER expression strategy response. Participant Three (Target, Employee) depicted the downplay of emotions used in the face of inappropriate sender anger: “my immediate feeling was to make everything okay, smooth the situation over, tell them what they want to hear, don’t say anything, don’t challenge what they’re saying so I responded something like, ‘That’s fine’”. Downplaying the event’s significance was used as a way to deal with the impact of sender anger.

On the other hand, most managers, as direct targets of anger, asserted themselves by taking charge and using expression in the face of low anger appropriateness, as portrayed by Participant Nineteen (Target, Manager): “I tried to be calm and I just told him, ‘Don’t touch me, if you touch me it’ll be a different scenario’”. When receivers were observers and attributed anger as highly inappropriate, they used the ER expression strategy to protect the direct target of anger and team members observing the incident. This occurrence was explained well by Participant Two (Observer, Employee), who attributed the incident as valid, yet the sender anger as inappropriate:
I said, ‘I understand what’s happened and … you are absolutely well within your rights to be absolutely outraged at how this has gone down … but I’m not happy with the way in which it played out, and I’m not happy with the way in which it played out in front of other team members’.

Study 2 investigated the role of ER strategies as moderators, establishing results in terms of attributions. Targets more likely to use the ER expression strategy in the face of low anger appropriateness reported the lowest levels of positive health outcomes. This result could be related to a likely clash when the angry person is confronted with the target’s response (see Allred et al., 1997; Liu & Wang, 2010). Also, a recurring imbalance to the target’s status quo could trigger turnover intention outcomes. In Study 2, when intense sender anger was seen as inappropriate, targets’ higher use of expression was associated with lowering positive health. On the other hand, when targets attributed sender anger intensity as more appropriate, the effects of different expression levels appeared not significant, indicating that appropriate anger does not seem to be as much of a challenge to targets as inappropriate anger.

Respondents in Study 1 reported using several ER strategies (e.g., situation selection, suppression, expression, and reappraisal) in response to attributions made of sender anger to manage the threat. An example of this is when participants used reappraisal to change their interpretation of events in the face of inappropriate sender anger. Receivers explained that they thought things over and reviewed their emotional response to the workplace anger. In other words, participants who initially thought of engaging in the fight or flight (Berkowitz & Harmon Jones, 2004) response used reappraisal instead. Participant Nine (Target, Employee) illustrated how this happened: “Well I thought, “I’ve got better things to do than be angry with this bloke”. Participant Twenty-Three (Observer, Employee) observed an altercation between a manager and an
employee and cognitively reappraised and suppressed their emotions given inappropriate anger: “Should I say something, like, ‘Mate, you really can’t talk to people like that’. In the mood he was in at the time I thought he’s going to get angry at me … but I sort of thought that it’s outside of my [responsibility], cause I’m not a manager, you know”. Outcomes of this interaction between attributions and ER strategies are discussed below.

iii. **Attributes and ER Strategies: Interacting to Contribute to Personal Outcomes**

As discussed so far, I propose that the receivers’ internal equilibrium was challenged in the face of this internal imbalance; a motivational force (attributions) is set in motion to manage this threat through ER strategies. The ultimate management (ER strategies) goal is to restore the receivers’ internal status quo (e.g., homeostasis: sustaining a constant internal environment) (Weiner, 1986). However, when this is not achieved, I assume that it could lead to more negative outcomes for the individual and the organization. I examine this occurrence below, discussing results from Studies 1 and 2.

iv. **The ER Expression Strategy**

In Study 1, employees and managers used ER expression strategies in two ways. First, they used ‘expressive suppression’, potentially disrupting communication, and augment stress levels (Butler et al., 2003). For example, employees (targets of workplace anger) maintained current emotions (agreeing and downplaying the event). Second, managers (targets of workplace anger) tended to intensify their expression (i.e., take charge). On the one hand, employees who attributed anger as inappropriate agreed and downplayed the significance of the event, as depicted by Participant Three (Target, Employee), “my immediate feeling was to make everything okay, smooth the situation over, tell them what they want to hear, don’t say anything, don’t challenge what they’re saying, so I responded something like, ‘That’s fine’”. This ER regulation strategy in
response to inappropriate intense sender anger enabled the employee’s management of self. However, the internal conflict created by the internal dissonance could potentially generate negative outcomes.

On the other hand, some managers (direct targets of anger) asserted themselves by taking charge when faced with inappropriate sender anger, as portrayed by Participant Twenty-Two (Target, Manager): “Well, I just said to him, I said, look, ‘You don’t need to be speaking to me like that, go and do what you’ve been asked to do, and we’ll talk about it later’” and “I just told him ‘don’t touch me, if you touch me it can be a different scenario’”. In this case, the manager expressed his thoughts to manage self (e.g., achieving internal equilibrium). Managers as targets of anger in Study 1 reported that they achieved balance through expression (in the form of taking charge). This ER response does not seem to eventuate for employees when they are targets of anger. In Study 2, higher expression in the face of inappropriate anger was associated with lowered positive health and higher turnover intentions for the target. This result seems to differ from other current research that established that expressing one’s anger is beneficial to health and wellbeing (Siegman, 1993).

v. The ER Suppression Strategy

Receivers in Study 1 used the ER suppression strategy in response to the potentially motivational force of attributions. Employees as targets of anger used suppression, especially when sender anger was seen as inappropriate. Suppression was achieved through the withholding of emotion, as depicted in this quote from Participant One (Target, Manager) who wanted to react when faced with the senders’ anger, but instead suppressed her expression of emotions: ‘I didn’t at any time ever raise my voice, or show that I was incredibly irritated and annoyed by the behavior”. Study 1 did not indicate a direct association between sender anger intensity and the target’s health and wellbeing and turnover intentions. However, results in Study 2 show that in terms of
low appropriateness attributions, targets less likely to use suppression as a strategy reported the lowest level of positive health outcomes (e.g. lower work functionality) yet higher negative health outcomes (e.g. lower self-esteem). A more in-depth examination of the concomitant use of ER strategies could potentially clarify whether an individual that used less of the ER suppression strategy in the face of inappropriate anger is using more of the ER expression strategy instead. Interestingly, in Study 2, for targets that used higher suppression in the face of appropriate intense anger, there was little desire to leave the workplace. Even in the face of attributions of inappropriate sender anger intensity, the effects of different suppression levels on turnover intentions were insignificant.

vi. **The ER Reappraisal Strategy**

When receivers encountered workplace sender anger manifestations attributed as inappropriate, this threat to self and the environment was managed through the ER reappraisal strategy. In the case of inappropriate anger, I suggest that the use of reappraisal potentially enables the individual to address emotions more effectively, as Participant Nine (Target, Employee) explained: “Well, I thought, ‘I’ve got better things to do than be angry with this bloke’”. Study 2 results indicated that targets more likely to use reappraisal in response to sender anger intensity viewed as more appropriate reported the lowest turnover intention levels. On the other hand, a lower use of reappraisal in view of inappropriate anger was associated with lower positive health and higher negative health. Further research is required to determine whether the positive outcome is more related to the appropriateness of anger or to the use of the ER reappraisal strategy.

In conclusion, I propose that further examination is needed to examine the links between the potentially motivating factor of target attributions (generated in the face of intense workplace anger expressions) and the consequent management of this challenge.
through ER strategies. A greater understanding of this motivational process, will further clarify the impact attributions have on determining ER strategies and consequently in establishing positive or negative individual and organizational outcomes. Furthermore, an examination is required to establish other potential influences on outcomes considering the interplay between the ER strategies themselves (i.e., target ER strategies of expression, suppression, and reappraisal).

6.4 CONTRIBUTIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This research has some valid theoretical and practical contributions, however, it also has its limitations. These areas are discussed below.

6.4.1 Theoretical and Practical Contributions

In this section, I present the overall theoretical contributions and practical implications of this program of research. The literature review indicated that extant theories and models were insufficient to address both the interpersonal and intrapersonal processes of receivers of workplace anger within one model. A literature review provided the foundational theories for the relational anger model. This model underpins this research, and it is also a contribution to future research, especially concerning anger research. Theoretically, the RAM contributes to a better understanding of the mechanisms through which recipients make sense of and deal with sender anger and the positive or negative effects these mechanisms might have on organizations. Developing this framework provides a more in-depth insight into and extends the extant research around anger experiences at work. This model is unique by concentrating on the receivers’ internal processes instead of focusing only on sender anger outcomes. I anticipate that this model may be used to inform empirical studies that examine an individual’s reaction to anger at work (Geddes & Callister, 2007; Lindebaum et al., 2016; Stickney & Geddes, 2014). Furthermore, this research contributes by showing
how attributions and ER strategies are interconnected, specifically in an anger context. This research poses a contribution to AT and ER theories.

Given the methodology used in this research, the multi-method approach provided greater insight into receivers’ experiences of workplace anger. In Study 1, the qualitative approach elicited more in-depth, quality rich responses, enabling a more detailed view of receivers’ attributions made of sender anger and their emotion regulation strategies used to address this anger directed at them. In Study 2, the information gained in Study 1 was further examined.

In terms of practical contributions, these research findings may help to develop more effective programs and processes to support those who encounter anger in the workplace. Raising self-awareness is an essential part of this solution; providing mindfulness of attributions and ER strategies and their impact on individuals and organizations is an essential first step. Training on intense anger interaction scenarios geared explicitly towards lowering the tendency towards the ‘fight’ and ‘flight’ response can help manage the consequences of anger in a team (see Moreo et al., 2000). Lee et al. (2017) undertook a study on the “relationship of mindful awareness to neural processing of angry faces and the impact of mindfulness training: a pilot investigation”. Their results suggested a pre and post mindfulness change diminishing the left thalamus activation to angry face viewing. This is good news for interventions for receivers of anger, as awareness can potentially equip individuals to deal more effectively with diverse situations. For instance, role-plays addressing anger and perspective-taking may enable receivers of anger to build a resource to deal with anger episodes, equipping them to address workplace issues more effectively. Furthermore, a greater understanding of the impact of anger on receivers might engender greater financial investment by organizations enabling programs to address the impact of anger on receivers. This understanding can improve employees’ health and wellbeing outcomes,
improve staff retention, and contribute to sustained organizational growth and development.

In summary, theoretically, the RAM provides a framework for a unique examination of the motivating force that attributions play on the management of emotions (using ER strategies). This knowledge can enable new pathways to address workplace anger relations from the receivers’ perspective, enhancing the individual’s health and wellbeing and overall effectiveness of organizational retention and growth.

6.4.2 Limitations

This program of research has several limitations. The significant limitations are: first, a restricted small sample size across both studies; second, the timeframe of the recalled incident; third, the potential for researcher bias in Study 1 and methodological shortcomings in Study 2; and four, the inability to examine all factors surrounding the receiver of workplace anger. I address each of these issues in turn and indicate the steps taken to overcome these limitations.

The first limitation I acknowledge is the low sample sizes across both studies. The sample size affects the efficacy with which the results are interpreted. Thirty participants were interviewed in Study 1. However, the study’s sensitive nature (workplace anger experiences) and the saturation of themes that emerged suggest an adequate sample size (see Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). In Study 2, there were 122 completed responses (with matching Times 1 and 2). Although it would have been desirable to have more responses, it is understandable that (even though confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed), employees were wary of completing a survey related to workplace anger experiences. In terms of the businesses contacted, having their employees complete a survey of this nature might also reveal potential anger issues within the organization. An incentive was offered to overcome this barrier, and a 35% return on survey responses was achieved.
Second, another limitation that impacted both Studies 1 and 2 is related to the timeframe (last two years) of the recalled incident, ‘a time’ when participants were the target or observer of an anger incident. The question was intended to draw people to recall particularly ‘memorable’ (meaning ‘over the top’) types of displays. However, this might have encouraged interviewees to remember instances of ‘deviant’ anger, where they felt the sender ‘crossed the line’ versus less intense anger scenarios at work. In this case, flexibility was offered when participants focused on an incident older than two years.

Third, I acknowledge that researcher bias may have impacted both studies. Specifically, in Study 1, a qualitative study, research quality is mostly reliant on the researchers’ interviewing skills, and personal biases can pose limitations on the data collected. Likewise, semi-structured interviews can be predisposed to interviewee biases. To ensure biases and subjectivity were minimized, I used inter-rater reliability (Gwet, 2014). Any concerns over the data’s interpretation were dealt with using multiple coders to ascertain the conclusions’ reliability (Olson et al., 2016). Semi-structured interviews contain a few limitations. Initially, there is a considerable reliance on the memory of past events, leading to oversimplification, rationalization, social desirability, and hindsight bias (Dasborough et al., 2008). To address these limitations, I used the day reconstruction method (Kahneman et al., 2004) to ensure a better recall of events and experiences by reminding the interviewees of their activities on that day. This method also enables a daily assessment of thoughts and emotions (Diener & Tay, 2014).

In relation to Study 2, I acknowledge that methodological biases may have influenced the findings. The design of Study 2 may be susceptible to common method bias (Campbell & Fiske, 1959), a bias that can transpire when participants are asked to consistently respond using the same anchor points in scales throughout the survey.
To overcome this bias, I collected data at Times 1 and 2 using a split survey design, completed two weeks apart. Similarities in wording or survey items can also result in comparable responses (Cocco & Tuzzi, 2013), and the construct validity of surveys can be an issue. Furthermore, social desirability tendencies could be present (i.e., participants might respond in a certain way to become more acceptable in their responses) (Fischer & Fick, 1993). In view of this, the survey was pilot tested to establish the clarity and effectiveness of questioning and ensure the items’ construct validity (Stacks & Hocking, 1992). Finally, the survey methodology poses confidentiality questions (Singer & Couper, 2017); therefore, participants were reassured of confidentiality and de-identified responses.

Fourth, many factors that influence the receiver, such as individual differences (Calkins & Hill, 2007), context (Thompson & Lagattuta, 2006), display rules (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987), and adulthood changes (Charles & Carstensen, 2007), could not be assessed in this study. Similarly, the relationship between the sender’s gender and the impact of this variable on the receiver has not been examined. Although these could be seen as a threat to current results, future research poses an opportunity.

### 6.4.3 Future Directions

I acknowledge that this study is not a comprehensive examination of a receivers’ experience of anger at work, and on this basis, I encourage researchers to engage further with this topic. As discussed above in Section 6.3.2, further research targeted at analyzing the integration of attribution theory (Heider, 1958) and the process model of emotion regulation theory (Gross, 1998) considering the dual threshold model (Geddes & Callister, 2007) might provide more in-depth insights into the effect workplace anger has on receivers. In other words, a targeted examination of the flexibility that attributions of various kinds provide within DTM and how these potentially determine
the different levels of target ER strategies used is needed. A closer examination could also confirm whether health and wellbeing outcomes are predicted mostly by choice of ER strategy used in the face of a smaller or greater flexibility within the impropriety threshold, or by receiver attributions made of sender anger intensity (e.g., more appropriate or inappropriate perceptions of sender anger intensity). Besides, further research can also confirm or examine whether the targets’ association of higher anger intensity to frequent sender anger intensity significantly diminishes the flexibility within the ‘impropriety’ threshold so that targets see no option but to leave the workplace. In Study 2, this seemed to be the case. In other words, attributions of frequent sender anger intensity did not act as a mediator between sender anger intensity and outcomes, nor was it moderated by ER strategies. It did, however, have a direct association with turnover intentions. A closer examination of the impact and interaction of the sender’s gender and age on receivers might shed light on dynamics not yet examined in the area of these variables to anger research.

In this thesis, I proposed a foundational model for this research, the relational anger model, to better understand how recipients experience, manage and make sense of sender anger at work. This thesis presents the foundational theoretical basis (RAM) on which other researchers can examine attributions and emotional regulation strategies of receivers, not only of sender anger but also potentially of other intense emotions such as jealousy and hate. Further research is required to conduct longitudinal research (see Côté & Morgan, 2002) to establish the direction of causal effects proposed in the RAM with confidence. In other words, further research is required to ascertain the true nature of the relationships between the target attributions of sender anger intensity and the target’s ER strategies used in the face of workplace anger.

As noted above in the themes, a greater intensity of sender anger in the workplace generates challenges to the receivers’ ‘status quo’ often generating a ‘fight or flight’
response. It seems that the receivers’ fight or flight response borders on ‘coping’, addressed by the stress and coping literature (see Gross, 2015; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Gross (1998) acknowledged that coping is a significant founder of modern ER research. Coping is defined as “cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person” (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 141). It may be valuable to examine further whether the impact of intense sender anger on receivers generates coping strategies instead of interactive, relational ones. For example, emotion modification strategies such as situation modification (Gross, 1998, 2015) are known as problem-focused coping in the stress and coping literature (see Gross, 2015; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). A greater understanding of research results on other forms of coping (in addition to emotional regulation strategies) could further research on the receivers’ experiences and responses to workplace anger, as mentioned above.

6.4.4 Concluding Statements

This thesis presents the foundational theoretical basis (RAM), on which other researchers could examine attributions (Heider, 1958) and emotional regulation strategies (Gross, 1998) of receivers. A more in-depth investigation of the receivers’ internal processes (i.e., their attributions and emotion regulation strategies) in the face of intense anger expressions revealed how these significantly build on current research (Callister et al., 2017; Geddes & Callister, 2007; Schwarzmüller et al., 2018) and challenge existing results. Thus, advancing research on workplace anger receivers is essential, considering the significant findings presented in this research. I anticipate this research will be one of many studies to further examine the receivers’ processes in the face of workplace anger in detail.
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30-45 MINUTE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:
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1. Think of an event in which you experienced an anger expression recently by a work colleague.
2. Tell me about the events leading up to the incident. (Was the anger expression directed at you?)
3. Why do you think the person was angry?
4. What was going through your head to make sense of their anger? (Was it justified or not?)
5. Do you think you had a role to play in that person’s anger?
6. How did you feel when the anger expression happened? (Were there any other emotions that you felt?)
7. How did you deal with the feelings you just mentioned?
8. What was your response to the person? (What did you think, what was going through your head, was there anyone around when this was happening?)
9. Thinking about it now, would you have done anything differently?
10. What was the final outcome?
11. How did the anger expression affect you?
12. Describe what happened after the event? What happened? How did you make sense of their behaviour/anger?
APPENDIX 6 - ORGANISATIONAL INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURE

Organisational Consent Form

Project Title: "Experiencing and responding to anger at work"

Lead researchers:
Dr Ashlea Troth
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources
Griffith University
Ph: 07 3735 5241
E-mail: a.troth@griffith.edu.au

Professor Peter J Jordan
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources Griffith University
Ph: 07 3735 3717
E-Mail: peter.jordan@griffith.edu.au

Researcher:
Mrs Kathryn Moura
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources
Griffith University
Ph: 0406129480
E-Mail: kathryn.moura@griffithuni.edu.au

This project seeks to examine the experiences and responses of individuals to anger at work.

- As an organisation, you will be asked to provide a list of potential participants for each of the following cities, Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne, to be part of a 45-45 minute one on one interview with the researcher. The researcher will send out e-mail invitations to all potential participants asking employees to contact the researcher directly should they wish to participate in the study. The organisation will not be notified of who has been contacted by the researcher.

- All data collected as a result of this research will be treated confidentially, including your organisation’s name. Participant names will not be associated to the interview responses in any way.

- Participation in this research is voluntary and refusal to participate will involve no penalty. Participants may discontinue participation at any time without comment or penalty.

- By completing this consent form you are giving your consent as an organisation to participate in this research in the format outlined above.

- Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

- Feedback will be available on request outlining the aggregated results and outcomes of the research. To get this feedback email a.troth@griffith.edu.au or kathryn.moura@griffithuni.edu.au.

www.griffith.edu.au

Gold Coast Logan MacGregor Nathan South Bank
Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

ORGANISATIONAL CONSENT FORM DETAILS

Project Title: “Experiencing and responding to anger at work”

**Lead researchers:**
Dr Ashlea Troth
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources
Griffith University
Ph: 07 3735 5241
E-mail: a.troth@griffith.edu.au

Professor Peter J. Jordan
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources Griffith University
Ph: 07 3735 3717
E-Mail: peter.jordan@griffith.edu.au

**Researcher:**
Mrs Kathryn Moura
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources
Griffith University
Ph: 0406129480
E-Mail: kathryn.moura@griffithuni.edu.au

**PRIVACY STATEMENT**

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and / or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at [http://www.griffith.edu.au/privacy-plan](http://www.griffith.edu.au/privacy-plan) or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

Any reporting delivered to the organisation will only be provided once all data has been gathered. No names will be linked to the information collected and reporting will only be made once data has been gathered on various organisations ensuring that no information shared can be traced either directly, indirectly or by inference to any of your employees or to their team.

Organisation: _____________________________________________________________________

Representative’s Name:____________________________________________________________

Representative’s Position: __________________________________________________________

Signature: ________________________________________________ D ate: __________________
APPENDIX 7 - Study 2 Organizational Information Sheet

Organizational Information Sheet

Project Title: “Experiencing and responding to anger at work”

Lead Researcher
Mrs Kathryn Moura
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources
Griffith University
Ph: 0406129480
E-Mail: kathryn.moura@griffithuni.edu.au

Supervisors:
Dr Ashlea Troth
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources
Griffith University
Ph: 07 3735 5241
E-mail: a.troth@griffith.edu.au

Professor Peter J. Jordan
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources Griffith University Ph: 07 3735 3717 E-
Mail: peter.jordan@griffith.edu.au

This project seeks to examine the experiences and responses of individuals to anger at work.

• As an organisation, you will be asked to provide three participants from your organisation in Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne to be part of a 30-45 minute one on one interview with the researcher.

• All data collected as a result of this research will be treated confidentially, including your organisation’s name. Participant responses will be de-identified.

• Participation in this research is voluntary and refusal to participate will involve no penalty. Participants may discontinue participation at any time without comment or penalty.

• By completing this consent form you are giving your consent as an organisation to participate in this research in the format outlined above.

• Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

www.griffith.edu.au

Gold Coast  Logan  Mt Gravatt  Nathan  South Bank
Feedback will be available on request outlining the aggregated results and outcomes of the research. To get this feedback email a.troh@griiith.edu.au or kathryn.moura@grifffithuni.edu.au.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.
Participant Information Sheet

Why is the research being conducted? We are examining how a frustration, annoyance, anger event in the workplace impacts on an individuals’ attributions made of the event and how these attributions influence their choice of emotion regulation strategies.

What you will be asked to do.
This Survey contains two parts spaced out two weeks apart. In Part 1 you will be requested to answer basic demographic questions and measures assessing your personality, display rules and emotion regulation behaviours. Part 1 should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Part 2 contains questions on an anger event you have experienced, job satisfaction, health and wellbeing and turnover intent questions. Part 2 should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Your confidentiality. All data collected as a result of this research is treated confidentially. There is a code on your survey so that your data can be matched across Part 1 and Part 2 of this study. All survey responses are securely stored at Griffith University and computer data files will be password protected. No replies to the survey will be analysed in a manner that would identify an individual or small group of employees.

Consent to Participate. By doing this survey, you will be indicating your consent for us to use your data in our research. There will be no penalty if you choose not to submit your survey.

Expected benefits of this research. The research is expected to increase an understanding of human resource management, more specifically of how individuals attribute meaning to an event that involved dealing with a frustrated, annoyed or angry individual and the consequent regulation of their emotions in the workplace. This information will assist employees to better deal with these events in the workplace.

Risks to you. The risks of this research are not above those associated with everyday living.

Questions / further information. If you would like to obtain any further information about this project, please contact Mrs Kathryn Moura on 0406129480 or k.moura@griffith.edu.au, Professor Ashlea Troth on (07) 3735 5241 or a.troth@griffith.edu.au, Professor Peter Jordan on (07) 3735 3717 or peter.jordan@griffith.edu.au.

The ethical conduct of this research. Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Feedback to you. In about two weeks time, upon completion of the Survey you will be given a choice to participate in a draw to win a Personal Coaching Package valued at $1350.00.

Chief Investigators
Mrs Kathryn Moura
Griffith Business School
Griffith University
+61 0406129480
k.moura@griffith.edu.au

Prof. Peter Jordan
Griffith Business School
Griffith University
+61 7 3735 3717
Peter.Jordan@griffith.edu.au

Prof. Ashlea Troth
Griffith Business School
Griffith University
+61 7 3735 5241
a.troth@griffith.edu.au
“Experiencing and responding to anger at work: a recipient’s perspective.”
GU reference number: 2016/647

Survey: Part 1

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the survey in Part 1 of the survey. You can finalise it at home or at work and it should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your individual responses will remain Strictly Confidential and you will not be identified from any feedback in this survey. A second survey will follow in two weeks time. By completing the survey you can choose to go into a draw to win a coaching package with 6 sessions to the value of AU$1350.00

Completion of this survey will be taken as your consent to participate in the research.

1. Before you start the survey, it is important that you enter your 4 digit unique identifier in the space provided below. This is a unique number only known to you.
Please create the four digit unique identifier using the following information:
Last two digits of your mobile phone number.
Last letter of the street you live in.
First letter of the suburb you live in.

Demographics

2. What is your gender?
   ☐ Male
   ☐ Female

3. What was your age at your last birthday? _________________________

4. Is English your first language?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ If no, please specify language: ________________________________

5. What is your position in the organisation? Select from the options below:
   ☐ Owner
   ☐ CEO
   ☐ Manager
   ☐ Supervisor
   ☐ Employee
   ☐ Other (please specify): ________________________________

6. On what basis are you employed?
   ☐ Permanent Full Time
   ☐ Temporary Part Time
   ☐ Casual
   ☐ Permanent Part Time
   ☐ Temporary Part time
   ☐ Other (please specify): ________________________________
7. What industry are you in?

☐ Legal
☐ Mining
☐ Manufacturing
☐ Medical
☐ Banking
☐ Other (please specify):

8. How long have you worked in your current organisation?
Year/s: __________
Month/s: __________

9. How long have you worked in your current work role?
Year/s: __________
Month/s: __________

10. Please provide a clear description of what your job entails: __________

11. We would like to ask you some questions about how you generally manage your emotions at work. Please choose the option that best describes each item below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Part of my job is to make a customer/client feel good.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My workplace does not expect me to make customers/clients feel good.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>This organisation would say that part of the product/service to clients is a friendly, cheerful service.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My organisation expects me to try to act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with customers/clients.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I am expected to keep my bad moods or negative reactions hidden from customers/clients.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>This organisation expects me to try to pretend that I am not upset or distressed.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am expected to try to pretend I am not angry or feeling contempt while on the job.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. We would like to ask you some questions about your emotional life within the workplace. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I modify the elements of situations that have an undesired impact on me (for example, by removing myself from the situation).</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I work out plans to minimise the negative aspects of situations.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I try to minimise the negative aspects of an impacting situation.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I change the situation to alter its emotional impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I take actions to get rid of the problems I am having</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>When a situation is disturbing me, I focus my attention away from the troubling aspect of the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I refocus the conversation on aspects of the situation that I consider more appealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I divert my attention from the aspect of the problem causing the undesired emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>When a situation is unpleasant to me, I refocus by discussing positive issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>When I think a situation might cause an undesirable emotion in me, I draw back from focusing on the negative aspects of that situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>When I want to feel more positive emotions (such as joy or amusement), I put my problems into perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I try to influence my emotions by changing how I think about the situation I am in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>When I want to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), I try to change the significance I attach to a situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>When I want to feel more positive emotion (such as joy or amusement), I change the meaning I attach to the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>In my team, when I want to feel less negative emotions (such as sadness or anger), I put my problems into perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>When I experience undesirable emotions, I tell myself not to express them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I encourage myself to keep my emotions private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>When others with whom I interact are 'venting' about a problem, I encourage them to stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>When others are experiencing undesirable emotions, I suggest strategies for them to control those emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I encourage others not to express their emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement - go on your first reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>In between</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How satisfied are you with the quality of the resources available to</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you to do your job well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How satisfied are you with the quality of the working conditions</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available to you to do your job well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please select an option below to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the pair of traits described below, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other. I see myself as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extraverted, enthusiastic</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical, quarrelsome</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dependable, self-disciplined</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anxious, easily upset</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Open to new experiences, complex</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reserved, quiet</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sympathetic, warm</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Disorganised, careless</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Calm, emotionally stable</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conventional, uncreative</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of research results will be available on request. To receive a copy of this feedback please email a.troth@griffith.edu.au or k.moura@griffith.edu.au.

Many thanks for your assistance in completing this survey! We will contact you again in approximately 2 weeks.

Remember to print this page for your reference.
APPENDIX 10: STUDY 2 SURVEY - Part 2

Survey Part 2

Thank you for completing Part 1 of this two part survey two weeks ago. In this section (Part 2 of the survey) you will be asked to describe an anger event you have experienced in the workplace in the last two years. You can complete the survey at home or at work – the survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Completion of this survey will be taken as your consent to participate in the research.

1. Enter your unique 4 digit code identifier according to the instructions below:
   Last two digits of your mobile number. Last letter of the street you live in. First letter of the Suburb you live in.

2. What is your gender?
   ☐ Male
   ☐ Female

3. What was your age at your last birthday? _________________________

4. Describe in detail an incident at work during which you were the recipient of an expression of anger (for example: anger, frustration, annoyance) from a fellow worker/colleague in the last two years. Describe who, when and what happened.

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

5. Where did the incident happen?

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________
6. How often did you experience that person’s anger prior to the event you described in item 4?

- Rarely. It was a one off occasion.
- Sometimes. It happens every so often.
- Frequently. It happens every week.
- Very frequently. It occurs daily.

Other (please specify): __________________________________________________________________

7. What was the angry person’s position in the organisation when the event occurred?

- Above your level.
- Below your level.
- Same level.

8. In relation to the anger event described in Question 4, how appropriate was the angry person’s anger?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The angry person said several things that seemed irrelevant to the situation</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The angry person was a smooth conversationalist</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Everything the angry person said was appropriate</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The angry person’s conversation was very suitable to the situation</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Some of the things the angry person said were awkward</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The angry person’s communication was very proper</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The angry person said some things that should not have been said</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I was embarrassed at times by the angry person’s remarks</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Some of the angry person’s remarks were inappropriate</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I was comfortable with the angry person’s remarks throughout the conversation</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Some of the things the angry person said were embarrassing to me</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Some of the things the angry person said were in bad taste</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The angry person did not violate any of my expectations</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 The way the angry person expressed some of their remarks was unsuitable</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 The things the angry person spoke about were all valid as far as I’m concerned</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Some of the angry person’s remarks were simply improper</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 At least one of the angry person’s remarks was rude</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 The angry person’s conversation was very beneficial</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 The angry person achieved what they apparently wanted to achieve in the conversation</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 For the angry person, it was a useless conversation</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 The angry person was in control of the conflict</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The angry person was effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The angry person’s conversation was unsuccessful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The angry person got what they wanted out of the conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The conversation was unprofitable for the angry person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The angry person obtained his or her goal in the conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The angry person was an ineffective conversationalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The angry person didn’t know what was going on in the conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The angry person was rewarded in the conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The angry person found the conversation to be very useful and helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The angry person lost control of the direction of the conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The talk went pretty much the way the angry person wanted it to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The angry person found the conversation very unrewarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How would you describe the intensity of the angry person's anger in the incident described in Question 4?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Moderately Strong</th>
<th>A Little Strong</th>
<th>Not Strong</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furious</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How would you rate your main reaction to the angry person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Moderately Strong</th>
<th>A Little Strong</th>
<th>Not Strong</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressed</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – Please Specify</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. How was your emotional control during the anger interaction described in Q4. How did you respond in that situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>During the anger incident I thought about something else when I wanted to feel more positive emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I kept my emotions to myself when interacting with the angry person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What I was feeling when faced with the angry person was written all over my face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I tried to remain objective but firm when faced with the angry person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>During the anger incident, I changed what I was thinking about to lessen my negative emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I told the angry person what annoyed me without being aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>During the incident, when I felt positive emotions, I was careful not to express them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the anger episode, I made myself think about the situation in a way that helped me stay calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>During the incident, people could easily see exactly what I was feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I did not express my emotions during the incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>During the incident when I wanted to feel more positive emotion, I changed the way I was thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I spoke to the angry person openly about my emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>During the incident people could easily see exactly what I was feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>During the incident I controlled my emotions by changing the way I thought about the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>When I felt negative during the incident, I made sure not to express my emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>During the incident, when I wanted to feel less negative emotion, I changed the way I was thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I told the angry person what I disagreed with in a calm but clear way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I freely and naturally expressed my emotions to the angry person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How did you feel after the incident you described in Question 4 above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More so than usual</th>
<th>Same as usual</th>
<th>Less than usual</th>
<th>Much less than usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to concentrate on what you were doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Felt that you were playing a useful part in things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Felt capable of making decisions about things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Feeling reasonably happy all things considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Able to face up to your problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lost much sleep over worry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Felt constantly under strain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Felt you could not overcome the difficult situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Felt unhappy and depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lost confidence in yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thought of yourself as a worthless person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. After the anger event you experienced do you intend or are you contemplating leaving your current job or position? Please complete the options below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am planning to search for a new job during the next 12 months (1)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have my own way I will leave my organisation to work in another organisation one year from now (2)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently think of quitting my job (3)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I would like to go into the draw to win a personal development coaching package with 6 sessions worth AU$1320.00.

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes, please add your contact details below (only e-mail or phone accepted). Contact details will only be used to notify you if you are the winner.

E-mail: ____________________________ or Phone: ____________________________

A summary of research results will be available on request. To receive a copy of this feedback please email a.troth@griffith.edu.au or kathryn.moura@griffithuni.edu.au.

Thank you for your assistance in completing this survey!
Appendix 11 – Survey Key – Parts 1 and 2

Survey Part 1

Thank you for taking the time to participate in the survey in Part 1 of the survey. You can finalise it at home or at work and it should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your individual responses will remain Strictly Confidential and you will not be identified from any feedback in this survey. A second survey will follow in two weeks time. By completing the survey you can choose to go into a draw to win a coaching package with 6 sessions to the value of AU$1350.00

Completion of this survey will be taken as your consent to participate in the research.

1. Before you start the survey, it is important that you enter your 4 digit unique identifier in the space provided below. This is a unique number only known to you.

Please create the four digit unique identifier using the following information:

Last two digits of your mobile phone number.

Last letter of the street you live in.

First letter of the suburb you live in.

|   |   |   |

Demographics

2. What is your gender?

☒ Male

☒ Female

3. What was your age at your last birthday? _________________________

4. Is English your first language?

☒ Yes

☒ No

☒ If no, please specify language: ________________________________

5. What is your position in the organisation? Select from the options below:

☒ Owner

☒ CEO

☒ Manager

☒ Supervisor

☒ Employee

☒ Other (please specify): ________________________________

6. On what basis are you employed?

☒ Permanent Full Time

☒ Temporary Part Time

☒ Casual

☒ Permanent Part Time

☒ Temporary Part time

☒ Other (please specify): ________________________________
7. What industry are you in?

☐ Legal
☐ Mining
☐ Manufacturing
☐ Medical
☐ Banking
☐ Other (please specify): 

8. How long have you worked in your current organisation?

Year/s: ____________
Month/s: ____________

9. How long have you worked in your current work role?

Year/s: ____________
Month/s: ____________

10. Please provide a clear description of what your job entails: 

________________________________________________________________________________

Display Rules (C.V.)

ORGANISATIONAL DISPLAY RULES (Q11.1 – Q11.7)

11. We would like to ask you some questions about how you generally manage your emotions at work. Please choose the option that best describes each item below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Part of my job is to make a customer/client feel good.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My workplace does not expect me to make customers/clients feel good.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This organisation would say that part of the product/service to clients is a friendly, cheerful service.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My organisation expects me to try to act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with customers/clients.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am expected to keep my bad moods or negative reactions hidden from customers/clients.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This organisation expects me to try to pretend that I am not upset or distressed.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am expected to try to pretend I am not angry or feeling contempt while on the job.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Positive Display Rule Perceptions (Q11.1 – Q11.4)</th>
<th>Negative Display Rule Perceptions (Q11.5 – Q11.7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Part of my job is to make a customer/client feel good.</td>
<td>5. I am expected to keep my bad moods or negative reactions hidden from customers/clients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My workplace does not expect me to make customers/clients feel good.</td>
<td>6. This organisation expects me to try to pretend that I am not upset or distressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>This organisation would say that part of the product/service to clients is a friendly, cheerful service.</td>
<td>7. I am expected to try to pretend I am not angry or feeling contempt while on the job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My organisation expects me to try to act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with customers/clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotion Regulation (Mediating Variable)

**INTERPERSONAL EMOTION MANAGEMENT (Q12.1-12.20)**

12. We would like to ask you some questions about your emotional life within the workplace. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I modify the elements of situations that have an undesired impact on me (for example, by removing myself from the situation)</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I work out plans to minimise the negative aspects of situations</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I try to minimise the negative aspects of an impacting situation</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I change the situation to alter its emotional impact</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I take actions to get rid of the problems I am having</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 When a situation is disturbing me, I focus my attention away from the troubling aspect of the problem</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I refocus the conversation on aspects of the situation that I consider more appealing</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I divert my attention from the aspect of the problem causing the undesired emotions</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 When a situation is unpleasant to me, I refocus by discussing positive issues</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 When I think a situation might cause an undesirable emotion in me, I draw back from focussing on the negative aspects of that situation</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 When I want to feel more positive emotions (such as joy or amusement), I put my problems into perspective</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I try to influence my emotions by changing how I think about the situation I am in</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 When I want to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), I try to change the significance I attach to a situation</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14  When I want to feel more positive emotion (such as joy or amusement), I change the meaning I attach to the situation

15  In my team, when I want to feel less negative emotions (such as sadness or anger), I put my problems into perspective

16  When I experience undesirable emotions, I tell myself not to express them

17  I encourage myself to keep my emotions private

18  I When others with whom I interact are 'venting' about a problem, I encourage them to stop

19  When others are experiencing undesirable emotions, I suggest strategies for them to control those emotions

20  I encourage others not to express their emotions

Item Breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation Modification</th>
<th>Attentional Deployment</th>
<th>Cognitive Change</th>
<th>Modifying the Emotional Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 1</td>
<td>I modify the elements of situations that have an undesired impact on me (for example, by removing myself from the situation)</td>
<td>12 6</td>
<td>When a situation is disturbing me, I focus my attention away from the troubling aspect of the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2</td>
<td>I work out plans to minimise the negative aspects of situations</td>
<td>12 7</td>
<td>I refocus the conversation on aspects of the situation that I consider more appealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 3</td>
<td>I try to minimise the negative aspects of an impacting situation</td>
<td>12 8</td>
<td>I divert my attention from the aspect of the problem causing the undesired emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 4</td>
<td>I change the situation to alter its emotional impact</td>
<td>20 9</td>
<td>When a situation is unpleasant to me, I refocus by discussing positive issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 5</td>
<td>take actions to get rid of the problems I am having</td>
<td>12 10</td>
<td>When I think a situation might cause an undesirable emotion in me, I draw back from focusing on the negative aspects of that situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Satisfaction (D.V.)

**JOB SATISFACTION (Q13.1 – 13.3)**

13. Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement - go on your first reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>In between</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job?</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  How satisfied are you with the quality of the resources available to</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you to do your job well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  How satisfied are you with the quality of the working conditions</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available to you to do your job well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personality (C.V.)**

**TEN ITEM PERSONALITY INVENTORY (Q14.1 – Q14.10)**


14. Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please select an option below to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the pair of traits described below, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other. I see myself as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1        Extraverted, enthusiastic</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2        Critical, quarrelsome</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3        Dependable, self-disciplined</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4        Anxious, easily upset</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5        Open to new experiences, complex</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6        Reserved, quiet</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7        Sympathetic, warm</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8        Disorganized, careless</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9        Calm, emotionally stable</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10       Conventional, uncreative</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item Breakdown:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Emotional Stability</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 1</td>
<td>Extraverted, enthusiastic</td>
<td>14 2</td>
<td>Critical, quarrelsome (r)</td>
<td>14 3</td>
<td>Dependable, self-disciplined</td>
<td>14 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 66</td>
<td>Reserved, quiet (r)</td>
<td>14 7</td>
<td>Sympathetic, warm</td>
<td>14 8</td>
<td>Disorganized, careless (r)</td>
<td>14 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of research results will be available on request. To receive a copy of this feedback please email a.troth@griffith.edu.au or k.moura@griffith.edu.au.

Many thanks for your assistance in completing this survey! We will contact you again in approximately 2 weeks.

Remember to print this page for your reference.
Survey Part 2

Thank you for completing Part 1 of this two part survey two weeks ago. In this section (Part 2 of the survey) you will be asked to describe an anger event you have experienced in the workplace in the last two years. You can complete the survey at home or at work – the survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Completion of this survey will be taken as your consent to participate in the research.

1. Enter your unique 4 digit code identifier according to the instructions below:
   Last two digits of your mobile number. Last letter of the street you live in. First letter of the Suburb you live in.

Demographics

2. What is your gender?
   ☐ Male
   ☐ Female

3. What was your age at your last birthday? _________________________

The Anger Incident

4. Describe in detail an incident at work during which you were the recipient of an expression of anger (for example: anger, frustration, annoyance) from a fellow worker/colleague in the last two years. Describe who, when and what happened.

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

5. Where did the incident happen?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
Regularity of Anger (Attributions - IV)

6. How often did you experience that person’s anger prior to the event you described in item 4?

- Occasionally. It was a one off occasion.
- Sometimes. It happens every so often.
- Frequently. It happens every week.
- Very frequently. It occurs daily.

Other (please specify): __________________________________________________________________

Status/Position in the organisation (CV or MV)

7. What was the angry person’s position in the organisation when the event occurred?

- Above your level.
- Below your level.
- Same level.

Appropriateness of Anger (Attributions - IV)

APPROPRIATENESS AND EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES (Q8.1 – Q8.33)

8. In relation to the anger event described in Question 4, how appropriate was the angry person’s anger?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The angry person said several things that seemed irrelevant to the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The angry person was a smooth conversationalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Everything the angry person said was appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The angry person’s conversation was very proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Some of the things the angry person said were awkward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The angry person’s communication was very proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The angry person said some things that should not have been said</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I was embarrassed at times by the angry person’s remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Some of the angry person’s remarks were inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I was comfortable with the angry person’s remarks throughout the conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Some of the things the angry person said were embarrassing to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Some of the things the angry person said were in bad taste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The angry person did not violate any of my expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The way the angry person expressed some of their remarks was unsuitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The things the angry person spoke about were all valid as far as I’m concerned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Some of the angry person’s remarks were simply improper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17 At least one of the angry person’s remarks was rude
18 The angry person’s conversation was very beneficial
19 The angry person achieved what they apparently wanted to achieve in the conversation
20 For the angry person, it was a useless conversation
21 The angry person was in control of the conflict
22 The angry person was effective
23 The angry person’s conversation was unsuccessful
24 The angry person got what they wanted out of the conversation
25 The conversation was unprofitable for the angry person
26 The angry person obtained his or her goal in the conversation
27 The angry person was an ineffective conversationalist
28 The angry person didn’t know what was going on in the conversation
29 The angry person was rewarded in the conversation
30 The angry person found the conversation to be very useful and helpful
31 The angry person lost control of the direction of the conversation
32 The talk went pretty much the way the angry person wanted it to
33 The angry person found the conversation very unrewarding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item breakdown</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 1 The angry person said several things that seemed irrelevant to the situation</td>
<td>8 18 The angry person’s conversation was very beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 2 The angry person was a smooth conversationalist</td>
<td>8 19 The angry person achieved what they apparently wanted to achieve in the conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 3 Everything the angry person said was appropriate</td>
<td>8 20 For the angry person, it was a useless conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 4 The angry person’s conversation was very suitable to the situation</td>
<td>8 21 The angry person was in control of the conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 5 Some of the things the angry person said were awkward</td>
<td>8 22 The angry person was effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 6 The angry person’s communication was very proper</td>
<td>8 23 The angry person’s conversation was unsuccessful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 7 The angry person said some things that should not have been said</td>
<td>8 24 The angry person got what they wanted out of the conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 8 I was embarrassed at times by the angry person’s remarks</td>
<td>8 25 The conversation was unprofitable for the angry person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 9 Some of the angry person’s remarks were inappropriate</td>
<td>8 26 The angry person obtained his or her goal in the conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 10 I was comfortable with the angry person’s remarks throughout the conversation</td>
<td>8 27 The angry person was an ineffective conversationalist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 11 Some of the things the angry person said were embarrassing to me</td>
<td>8 28 The angry person didn’t know what was going on in the conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 12 Some of the things the angry person said were in bad taste</td>
<td>8 29 The angry person was rewarded in the conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 13 The angry person did not violate any of my expectations</td>
<td>8 30 The angry person found the conversation to be very useful and helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 14 The way the angry person expressed some of their remarks was unsuitable</td>
<td>8 31 The angry person lost control of the direction of the conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 15 The things the angry person spoke about were all valid</td>
<td>8 32 The talk went pretty much the way the angry person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as far as I'm concerned, I wanted it to

Some of the angry person’s remarks were simply improper.

The angry person found the conversation very unrewarding.

At least one of the angry person’s remarks was rude.

### Intensity of Sender Anger (IV)

9. How would you describe the intensity of the angry person’s anger in the incident described in Question 4?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Moderately Strong</th>
<th>A Little Strong</th>
<th>Not Strong</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furious</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target Emotion (M)

10. How would you rate your main reaction to the angry person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Moderately Strong</th>
<th>A Little Strong</th>
<th>Not Strong</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressed</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – Please Specify</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emotion Regulation (Med. V.)

**SITUATIONAL EMOTION REGULATION QUESTIONNAIRE (Q11.1-11.14)**

|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

11. How was your emotional control during the anger interaction described in Q4. How did you respond in that situation?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>During the anger incident I thought about something else when I wanted to feel more positive emotion</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I kept my emotions to myself when interacting with the angry person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What I was feeling when faced with the angry person was written all over my face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I tried to remain objective but firm when faced with the angry person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>During the anger incident, I changed what I was thinking about to lessen my negative emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I told the angry person what annoyed me without being aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>During the incident, when I felt positive emotions, I was careful not to express them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>During the anger incident, I made myself think about the situation in a way that helped me stay calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>During the incident, people could easily see exactly what I was feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I did not express my emotions during the incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>During the incident when I wanted to feel more positive emotion, I changed the way I was thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I spoke to the angry person openly about my emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>During the incident people could easily see exactly what I was feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>During the incident I controlled my emotions by changing the way I thought about the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>When I felt negative during the incident, I made sure not to express my emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>During the incident, when I wanted to feel less negative emotion, I changed the way I was thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I told the angry person what I disagreed with in a calm but clear way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I freely and naturally expressed my emotions to the angry person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Item Breakdown:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 1</td>
<td>During the anger incident I thought about something else when I wanted to feel more positive emotion</td>
<td>11 2</td>
<td>I kept my emotions to myself when interacting with the angry person</td>
<td>11 3</td>
<td>What I was feeling when faced with the angry person was written all over my face</td>
<td>11 4</td>
<td>I tried to remain objective but firm when faced with the angry person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 5</td>
<td>During the anger incident, I changed what I was thinking about to lessen my negative emotions</td>
<td>11 7</td>
<td>During the incident, when I felt positive emotions, I was careful not to express them</td>
<td>11 9</td>
<td>During the incident, people could easily see exactly what I was feeling</td>
<td>11 6</td>
<td>I told the other person what annoyed me, but without being aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 8</td>
<td>During the anger episode, I made myself think about the situation in a way that helped me stay calm</td>
<td>11 10</td>
<td>I did not express my emotions</td>
<td>11 13</td>
<td>During the incident people could easily see exactly what I was feeling</td>
<td>11 18</td>
<td>I freely and naturally expressed my emotions to the angry person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 11</td>
<td>During the incident when I wanted to feel more positive emotion, I changed the way I was thinking</td>
<td>11 15</td>
<td>When I felt negative during the incident, I made sure not to express my emotions</td>
<td>11 12</td>
<td>I spoke to the angry person openly about my emotions</td>
<td>11 17</td>
<td>I told the other person what I disagreed with in a calm but clear way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 14</td>
<td>During the incident I controlled my emotions by changing the way I thought about the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 16</td>
<td>During the incident, when I wanted to feel less negative emotion, I changed the way I was thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health & Wellbeing (DV)**

**GENERAL HEALTH QUESTIONNAIRE – GHQ12 (Q12.1-12.12)**


12. How did you feel after the incident you described in Question 4 above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>More than usual</th>
<th>Same as usual</th>
<th>Less than usual</th>
<th>Much less than usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Able to concentrate on what you were doing</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Felt that you were playing a useful part in things</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Felt capable of making decisions about things</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Feeling reasonably happy all things considered</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Able to face up to your problems</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lost much sleep over worry</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt constantly under strain</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Felt you could not overcome the difficult situation</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Felt unhappy and depressed</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lost confidence in yourself</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Thought of yourself as a worthless person</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item Breakdown:**
## Positive Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 1</td>
<td>Been able to concentrate on what you are doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2</td>
<td>Felt that you are playing a useful part in things?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 3</td>
<td>Felt capable of making decisions about things?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 4</td>
<td>Been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 5</td>
<td>Been feeling reasonably happy all things considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 6</td>
<td>Been able to face up to your problems?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Negative Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 7</td>
<td>Lost much sleep over worry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 8</td>
<td>Felt constantly under strain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 9</td>
<td>Felt you could not overcome your difficulties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 10</td>
<td>Been feeling unhappy and depressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 11</td>
<td>Been losing confidence in yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 12</td>
<td>Been thinking of yourself as a worthless person?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turnover Intent (Outcome D.V.)

**INTENTION TO QUIT & TURNOVER (Q19.1-19.3)**


13. After the anger event you experienced do you intend or are you contemplating leaving your current job or position? Please complete the options below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am planning to search for a new job during the next 12 months (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have my own way I will leave my organisation to work in another organisation one year from now (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently think of quitting my job (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I would like to go into the draw to win a personal development coaching package with 6 sessions worth AUS1320.00.

○ Yes
○ No

If yes, please add your contact details below (only e-mail or phone accepted). Contact details will only be used to notify you if you are the winner.

E-mail: ____________________________ or Phone: ____________________________

A summary of research results will be available on request. To receive a copy of this feedback please email a.troth@griffith.edu.au or kathryn.moura@griffithuni.edu.au.

Thank you for your assistance in completing this survey!
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