

From Anger Suppression to Collective Action: The Roles of Injustice Appraisals and Anger

Szonja V. Feher

S4257464

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen

PSB3-BT_2425: Bachelor Thesis

Group: 2425_1b_2

Supervisor: prof. Dr. E. Gordijn

Second evaluator:

In collaboration with: Famke Weening, Maik Klooster, Alyssa Hartog, Sterre Hoogterp, Vita Beusekom

April 22, 2025

Abstract

Previous research has shown that emotions, particularly anger, and appraisals of injustice play a key role in motivating collective action. However, less is known about how emotion regulation influences this process. This study examined whether suppressing versus expressing anger affects injustice appraisal, felt anger, and collective action intentions. Using a 2 (emotion regulation: suppression vs. expression) \times 2 (cost: high vs. low) between-subjects design, 376 participants were randomly assigned to conditions and presented with a morally controversial scenario (Black Pete). They completed self-report measures of anger, injustice appraisal, and collective action intentions. Results showed that emotion regulation significantly affected anger, with expression leading to more anger than suppression, but had no significant impact on injustice appraisal or collective action intentions. Mediation analysis revealed that anger, but not injustice, mediated the link between emotion regulation and collective action. Exploratory analysis suggested that when anger was modelled as preceding injustice appraisal, both significantly and sequentially mediated this relationship. These findings challenge traditional models that prioritize injustice appraisal and highlight the importance of anger expression in driving collective action behaviour. Understanding how emotion regulation shapes collective action offers valuable insight for mobilizing movements focused on moral and societal injustice.

Keywords: Emotion Regulation, Anger Expression, Injustice Appraisal, Collective Action, Anger Suppression, Moral Conflict

From Anger Suppression to Collective Action: The Roles of Injustice Appraisals and Anger

Imagine the following scenario: you are sitting in a café, and you overhear someone make racist remarks. What do you do? Do you find it unjust? Do you experience anger? If so, do you express or suppress your anger? Do you take action?

The question of how and why people respond to moral transgressions, like the one in this scenario, has been the subject of extensive research aimed at discovering the psychological mechanisms that drive people to participate in collective action. This topic is particularly relevant in today's socio-political climate, where many people feel angry and frustrated about the state of the world. Recent years have seen a notable increase in participation in collective action, reflecting the rising relevance of understanding the psychological processes that motivate such behaviour (Carvacho et al, 2023). By deepening our understanding of collective action behaviours, this knowledge can be applied to practical contexts, for instance, by informing approaches to foster social and political mobilization.

While existing research has provided significant insight into what motivates people to engage in collective action, such as perceived injustice, group identity and efficacy (Klandermans, 2002; van Zomeren et al, 2008; van Zomeren & Iyer, 2009; van Zomeren, 2019; Agostini & van Zomeren, 2021), less is known about how emotional responses are regulated in these moments, and how this regulation influences the decision to act (for an exception, see Solak et al, 2021). We are particularly interested in the role of anger regulation, which remains relatively unexplored, despite strong evidence that anger plays a key role in driving collective action.

To address this gap in the existing literature, we aim to explore the role of anger regulation, specifically anger suppression and expression, and how it affects felt anger and collective action intentions. To delve deeper into how these mechanisms work together, we

investigate whether injustice appraisal, one's cognitive evaluation of unfairness, helps explain how anger regulation influences both the intensity of anger and the intention to engage in collective action.

Collective Action

Collective action, as defined by Tajfel and Turner (1979), is any action that aims to improve the status, power, or influence of an entire group. Research from Klandermans (2002) identified three core motivators of collective actions: injustice appraisal; one's cognitive evaluation of unfairness, efficacy; the belief in their ability to effectively make a difference, and identity; their identification with the disadvantaged group or the group of activists. These findings were later supported by van Zomeren et al (2008) and van Zomeren & Iyer, (2009), who demonstrated that these motivators appear globally relevant for predicting collective action. The work of these researchers culminated in the development of the Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA), which integrates these determinants to provide an extensive explanation of collective action.

Injustice and Anger

Amongst the three key motivators outlined in SIMCA, the role of perceived injustice warrants further attention, particularly as it can evoke anger (Mikula et al, 1998).

Importantly, the type of anger that is relevant in this context is not merely personal aggravation but rather moral anger, an aroused emotional state which stems from a primary appraisal of a moral standard violation that impacts others more than oneself and prompts corrective behaviour intended to improve the social condition, even in the face of significant personal risk (Lindebaum & Geddes, 2016). This is supported by Landmann and Hess (2016), who found that anger is highly contingent on moral violations. Moreover, Landmann and Rohmann (2020) later found that anger mediated the effect of injustice on collective action, emphasizing its key role in mobilization.

Anger has been consistently identified as the most dominant emotional response to injustice and plays an important role in mobilizing collective action (Clayton, 1992; Mikula et al, 1998). According to appraisal theories of emotion, anger arises when individuals perceive a situation as undesirable, caused by others, relevant to their goals, and believing that they have some ability to respond (Lazarus & Smith, 1993; Roseman, 1984; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). Across these appraisal theories, anger is consistently associated with perceptions of external blame and personal control, making it highly suited to motivate approach-oriented behaviours like protest. Furthermore, Frijda et al (1989) argue that anger not only reflects an emotional evaluation but can also be regarded as a state of action readiness, further highlighting its central role in protest behaviour in the face of injustice.

Expanding beyond individual experiences, intergroup emotions theory (Mackie et al, 2000) suggests that when individuals identify with a certain group, it gets integrated into their sense of self, gaining social and emotional relevance. When one strongly identifies with a group, events that affect the group are perceived as relevant, giving rise to emotional responses such as anger. These are not merely personal emotions but are intertwined with the individual's identity. Given anger's significant role in motivating collective action, it is important to consider how people regulate their emotional responses. Emotion regulation strategies used to manage anger may shape whether the anger is translated into collective action and therefore it warrants further investigation.

Anger Regulation

Despite its potential significance, current research on how emotion regulation influences anger and collective action is scarce. Gross (1998) defines emotion regulation as a process involving individuals influencing the emotions they have, when they have them, how they experience and express these emotions. Research by Tamir (2016) demonstrates that emotion regulation can occur out of instrumental concern. For example, people may choose

to suppress or express their anger when they perceive it to be useful, not merely to improve well-being.

A relevant theoretical framework is Wegner's (1994) Ironic Process Theory, which describes the phenomenon whereby thought suppression leads individuals to experience greater levels of occurrence and accessibility of the thought. Research by Yap & Tong (2009) found that the rebound effect also occurs in suppressed appraisals, as its suppression paradoxically activates it. This suggests that in the context of injustice appraisal, suppressing the evaluation of a situation as unfair may make it more salient.

This aligns with Schachter and Singer's (1962) emotion theory, which suggests that emotional states may arise from a state of physiological arousal and from a cognitive interpretation of the arousal. When individuals suppress their anger, the physiological arousal is maintained (Gross, 2002), which can potentially magnify the focus on the cause of the arousal, such as injustice, thereby intensifying the emotional response.

Current Research

Building on these theoretical insights, the current study aims to examine the role of emotion regulation, specifically of anger suppression and expression, on injustice appraisal, felt anger, and collective action intentions. Based on existing literature and theoretical frameworks, it posits the following hypotheses: H1: Compared to anger expression, suppression leads a) to higher levels of injustice appraisal b) to more felt anger, and c) to more collective intentions and H2: the relation between expression versus suppression and collective action intentions is sequentially mediated by injustice appraisal and anger.

Methods

Participants and Design

A total of 400 participants took part in this study. The participants were recruited through the first year SONA-pool from the University of Groningen and received credits for participation. Additionally, participants were recruited from the personal network of the researchers. As preregistered¹, we excluded participants who failed two or more attention checks ($N = 22$) or showed a response bias (i.e., extreme responding and/or flat-lining, such as always responding with "Strongly agree"; ($N = 1$), or who failed to complete at least 50% of the items that measure the dependent variables ($N = 9$). Furthermore, we also excluded participants who wrote less than 4 words in the question that required a written response about how participants handle their anger ($N = 1$). Finally, participants that completed the questionnaire in less than 4 minutes were also excluded, to ensure participants are fully engaged ($N=0$). This leaves a total number of participants of 367. Their ages ranged from 16 in number through 25 and older, with most participants falling in the 19-21 category (63.5%). From all participants, 287 identified as female, 77 as male, 2 as other and 1 preferred not to say. Out of all the participants, 24.8% identified themselves as part of an ethnic minority in the Netherlands, 73.8% identified as not being part of an ethnic minority and 1.4% of the participants preferred not to say. Furthermore participants were asked about their political orientation, their mean score was 3.04 ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.28$). Which corresponds to a slightly left-winged political orientation. According to a Monte Carlo analysis (Schoemann et al., 2017) a minimum of 360 participants were necessary to achieve a power of .8 with expected correlations of .3 to our hypotheses.

To manipulate the independent variables, an experiment was performed through means of a 2x2 between subjects design. The subjects were assigned to one of four

¹ See [AsPredicted](#)

conditions. Within these conditions, we tried to manipulate (a) expression and suppression of anger, as well as (b) high cost and low cost scenarios².

The complete survey can be found in the Appendix. The Ethical Committee of Psychology (ECP) from the University of Groningen approved this study.

Procedure and independent variables

The questionnaire was designed and distributed with the online survey software Qualtrics (see Appendix). The participants were first directed to an information page about the research and the procedure. Additionally they were asked for their informed consent, which included that participating is voluntary and that participants can stop at any time. Furthermore, contact details were included so participants can ask questions or express concerns about the research. Following the informed consent participants were asked about their age range (16-18, 19-21, 22-24, 25 or older), gender identity (Female/Male/Other/Prefer not to say), ethnicity (“Do you perceive yourself as an ethnic minority in the Netherlands?”; Yes/No), political orientation (1= *extremely left wing*; 7= *extremely right wing*).

Next we measured self-esteem by means of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965), consisting of ten items. This scale assesses a person’s global evaluations of themselves (e.g., “I take a positive attitude towards myself” and “I feel that I have a number of good qualities”) ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 0.98$, $\alpha = .90$).

Following this we measured perceived self-expression with eight items by asking the participants to what extent they agree with certain statements about themselves. For example: “I like to speak on what's on my mind”. This measure was based on items inspired by the College Self Expression Scale (Galassi et al., 1974). Four items were reverse coded and

² This method describes a study that consists of several subprojects, including the subproject described in this bachelor thesis. This means that not all manipulations and measurements are relevant for every subproject. In the analyses, only the findings that relate to the research question of this bachelor thesis are included.

phrased to show a low level of self-expression (e.g., “I keep my opinions to myself”). The other four items were phrased to show a high level of self-expression (e.g., “I am not afraid to speak up in public”) ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.81$, $\alpha = 0.80$).

After this, we provide information about Zwarte Piet through a perspective of how racist and unjust its black faced portrayal is. Subsequently, participants were asked a control question about whether they believed that the portrayal of Zwarte Piet in black face is racist (“Please indicate on the scale to what extent you believe that the portrayal of Zwarte Piet in black face is racist.”; 1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 1.69$).

Next we manipulated cost by randomly assigning participants to a high cost or low cost condition (see Appendix). Participants were asked to read a scenario and they had to imagine being a part of it. Anger was evoked in both situations by someone (i.e., Mark) making dismissive comments about Zwarte Piet, racism and tradition. In the *high cost* condition Mark is a group member, on whom the participants depend on for their grade of the project. He is making dismissive comments in a direct conversation. Confronting him would put the successful ending of the project at risk, resulting in a high costs situation. In the *low cost* condition, Mark is a stranger in a cafe, where his comments are easily overheard by others. Because Mark is a stranger it suggests that confronting him does not likely have negative consequences, therefore making it a low cost scenario. In the *low cost* condition we let them know that confronting Mark wouldn’t have negative consequences, in the *high cost* condition we let them know that confronting Mark might have negative consequences. In the *expression* condition participants were asked to imagine that they feel angry about the dismissive comments and that they would want to express their anger. After the cost manipulation, felt anger was measured, as well as the perception of transgression and protest intentions. This manipulation of the costs was checked at the end of the questionnaire (“Do you remember who Mark is?”).

After this we manipulated expression versus suppression of anger. Participants were instructed to imagine that they feel outraged by the situation and that they want to confront Mark, while taking into account that confronting can result in consequences, which differs for the high cost and low cost conditions. In the *suppression* condition, participants were instructed to imagine feeling angry about the comments and suppressing their anger (“Try to imagine you feel very angry, but that you do not want to express your feelings in this situation”). In both conditions participants were asked to write a short paragraph about how they would handle this situation (e.g., “How would you suppress your anger? What would you say and/or do in this situation?”). To make sure the participants were fully engaged, a timer was set for 30 seconds before participants could continue to the next question. This manipulation of the expression and suppression conditions was checked at the end of the questionnaire using a six item scale (e.g. “I could openly express my anger”, “I had to suppress my feelings of anger”) ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.85$, $\alpha = .94$). Three out of the six items were reversed and therefore re-coded. After the regulation manipulation, anger was measured again.

After the scenarios participants were asked about their injustice appraisal, emotions, and future collective action intentions. Moreover, participants were asked to indicate which cost condition they were in by asking what role Mark played in the prompt (see Appendix). In addition, we included three attention checks in the survey to detect inattentive responses. Lastly, participants were thanked and debriefed.

Dependent Measures

We asked participants to what extent they agree with statements on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*, unless stated differently.

Emotions

Emotions were measured twice: First after the cost manipulation, and again after the expression/suppression manipulation. Twenty items describing emotions were used, of which two were used to indicate anger (I would feel angry, I would feel outraged; $M_{\text{first measure}} = 4.30$, $SD = 1.70$; $M_{\text{second measure}} = 3.78$, $SD = 1.76$). Moreover, two items were used to measure guilt (i.e., guilty and ashamed; $M_{\text{first measure}} = 2.36$, $SD = 1.57$; $M_{\text{second measure}} = 2.82$, $SD = 1.74$). In the first measure of emotions participants were asked “To what extent would you experience the following emotions in light of what Mark said?”. In the second measure of emotions, participants were asked “At this stage, how would you feel now?” Participants could indicate their agreement on 7 point Likert scales (1=not at all; 7=very strongly). The remaining emotions were intended as filler items.

Perceived moral transgression

Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they found Mark’s remarks morally transgressive using 4 items (e.g. “What Mark said is strongly problematic”)($M = 5.6$, $SD = 1.3$, $\alpha = .90$). This measure took place after the cost manipulation. The items were constructed by the researchers.

Protest intentions

Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they felt like protesting towards Mark, using eight items (e.g. “I would confront Mark” and “I would ignore what he said”; ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 0.96$, $\alpha = .72$). Five out of the eight items were reversed and therefore re-coded. This measure took place after the cost manipulation. The items were constructed by the researchers.

Injustice Appraisal

Participants’ injustice appraisal was measured using 6 items, inspired by the Social Justice Scale (SJS) by Torres-Harding et al. (2012). The scale assesses participants’

subjective perception of injustice or unfairness (e.g. “Mark’s statements make it evident that people of color are being treated unfairly”) ($M = 5.45$, $SD = 1.06$, $\alpha = .87$). A new scale was created, considering the two reverse coded items. This measure took place after the manipulation of emotion regulation.

Collective Action Intentions

The collective action scale measures participants' willingness to take collective action in the future in response to our study context. The entire questionnaire contains 11 items that are categorized as either non-normative (e.g. “I would deface or destroy public images or advertisements that support, promote or feature zwarte piet”) ($M = 1.73$, $SD = 0.97$, $\alpha = .80$) or normative (e.g. “I would sign a petition against zwarte piet”) ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.54$, $\alpha = .82$). Analysis showed that the 8 items, excluding filler items, used to measure collective action had a reliability of .85 ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 1.11$). Statements were adapted from the Belief-aligned Collective Action (BCA) scale (Cervone et al., 2023) and several studies on normative and non-normative action (Imhoff et al., 2021; Tausch et al., 2011; Zúñiga et al. 2023). This measure took place after the manipulation of emotion regulation.

Results

Assumptions, Manipulation Check and Correlations

After data collection, the assumptions of linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity were tested to ensure they were not violated. Mild heteroscedasticity was found, but due to the large sample size and the use of bootstrapping in the mediation analysis, it was concluded that it does not significantly influence the results of the analysis. The remaining assumptions were not violated. To test if emotion regulation (anger expression vs suppression) and cost (high vs low) was successfully manipulated, a univariate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used. The results revealed a significant effect

for emotion regulation $F(1,361) = 238.85$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 p = .40$. Participants in the anger expression condition reported that they could express their anger more ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 1.66$) than participants in the suppression condition ($M = 2.48$, $SD = 1.18$). These findings suggest that manipulating emotion regulation had a significant effect on reported anger. Furthermore, the analysis revealed a significant effect for cost³ $F(1, 361) = 5.38$, $p = .021$, $\eta^2 = .015$. Participants in the high-cost condition reported that they expressed their anger less ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.67$) than participants in the low-cost condition ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 2.00$).

All correlations between the measures of interest were in the predicted direction (positive), and all were significant (see Table 1). First, the correlation between injustice appraisal and collective action intentions was strong and significant ($r = .61$). Similarly, the correlation between injustice appraisals and anger was also strong and significant ($r = .58$). Lastly, the correlation between anger and collective action intentions was also strong and significant ($r = .57$).

Table 1

Correlations

| | | Anger | Collective Action | Injustice Appraisal |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Anger | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .57** | .58** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | <.001 | <.001 |
| | N | 367 | 366 | 367 |
| Collective Action | Pearson Correlation | .57** | 1 | .61** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | <.001 | | <.001 |
| | N | 366 | 366 | 366 |

³ Cost was investigated as part of a larger project. Since it had a significant main effect, it will be used as a covariate in the rest of this analysis.

| | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-----|
| Injustice Appraisal | Pearson Correlation | .58** | .61** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | <.001 | <.001 | |
| | N | 367 | 366 | 367 |

Hypothesis Testing

To test if suppression, compared to expression, leads to higher injustice appraisal, anger, and collective action intentions (while controlling for cost), an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted on each of the variables. The results of the analysis revealed that emotion regulation did not significantly influence injustice appraisal, $F(1,364) = 0.39$, $p = .531$, $\eta^2 p = .001$, ($M_{sup} = 5.43$, $SD_{sup} = 1.10$, $M_{exp} = 5.50$, $SD_{exp} = 1.10$). This suggests that there was no significant difference in injustice appraisal between participants in the anger expression and suppression conditions.

Furthermore, the results indicate that emotion regulation significantly influences anger. $F(1,364) = 4.64$, $p = .032$, $\eta^2 p = .013$, ($M_{sup} = 3.58$, $SD_{sup} = 1.73$, $M_{exp} = 3.97$, $SD_{exp} = 1.76$). However, they suggest that participants in the expression condition reported more anger than in the suppression condition, thus not supporting the hypothesis.

Lastly, the results indicate that emotion regulation did not significantly influence collective action intentions, $F(1,363) = 0.00$, $p = .979$, $\eta^2 p < .001$ ($M_{sup} = 3.78$, $SD_{sup} = 0.87$, $M_{exp} = 3.78$, $SD_{exp} = 3.78$). This suggests that participants in the anger expression condition did not report significantly different scores on collective action in comparison to participants in the suppression condition, thus also not supporting the hypothesis.

To test if injustice appraisal and felt anger mediate the relationship between emotion regulation (anger expression vs suppression) and collective action intention, I conducted a serial mediation analysis using PROCESS Model 6 (Hayes, 2021). The model was highly significant, $R^2 = .45$, $F = 97.30$, $p < .001$. The analysis results revealed that emotion regulation does not significantly predict collective action intentions ($\beta = -0.09$, $SE = 0.07$, $p = .195$). In addition, the model revealed that both injustice appraisal and anger are strong predictors of collective action ($\beta = 0.35$, $SE = 0.04$, $p < .001$ and $\beta = 0.17$, $SE = 0.02$, $p < .001$ respectively).

However, the findings of the indirect effects indicate that injustice does not significantly mediate the relationship between emotion regulation and collective action, ($\beta = 0.02$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% $CI = [-0.05, 0.10]$), however, anger does. ($\beta = 0.06$, $SE = 0.03$, 95% $CI = [0.01, 0.11]$). Hence, even though there is no direct effect of emotion regulation on collective action, there is an indirect effect through anger. This means that expression, rather than suppression, leads to higher feelings of anger and thus more collective action intentions. Lastly, injustice and anger do not sequentially mediate the relationship between anger regulation and collective action indirectly ($\beta = 0.01$, $SE = 0.02$, 95% $CI = [-0.02, 0.05]$).

Exploratory Analysis

As part of an exploratory analysis, an additional sequential mediation analysis was conducted to examine whether anger and injustice appraisal sequentially mediate the relationship between anger regulation and collective action intentions. While the primary analysis tested a pathway in which injustice appraisal precedes anger, this alternative model explores whether anger may instead drive injustice appraisals, which in turn influence intentions to participate in collective action. The indirect effects of this sequential mediation

model revealed that anger significantly mediated the relationship between anger regulation and collective action intentions ($\beta = 0.07$, $SE = 0.33$, 95% $CI = [0.01, 0.14]$). However, injustice does not significantly mediate the relationship between emotion regulation and collective action intentions ($\beta = -0.0238$, $SE = 0.03$, 95% $CI = [-0.09, 0.04]$). Lastly, the findings indicate that anger and injustice do significantly sequentially mediate the relationship between anger regulation and collective action intention ($\beta = 0.05$, $SE = 0.02$, 95% $CI = [0.00, 0.09]$). Hence, this secondary exploratory analysis indicates significant inverse effects when anger drives injustice appraisals, which in turn influence collective action intentions.

Discussion

The main findings revealed that anger suppression did not increase injustice appraisals compared to anger expression, thus rejecting hypothesis 1a. Furthermore, results demonstrated that people who expressed their anger reported feeling more anger than those who suppressed it, thus rejecting hypothesis 1b. Moreover, anger suppression did not lead to higher collective action intentions, thus rejecting hypothesis 1c.

Moreover, anger, but not injustice appraisal, mediated the relationship between anger regulation and collective action intentions. Overall, this suggests that how people regulate their anger influences their anger levels, which in turn can influence their willingness to act, but injustice appraisal does not appear to play a role in this process. These findings reject the second hypothesis.

However, the exploratory analysis revealed that expressing or suppressing anger influenced anger levels, shaping appraisals of injustice, ultimately affecting collective action intentions, thus supporting an alternative sequential mediation pathway. This phenomenon can be explained by Schwarz's (2012) feelings-as-information theory, which assumes that

individuals use feelings as a source of information, with different emotions offering distinct types of insight. In the context of this study, this could mean that individuals may view their anger as a source of information that notifies them of the occurrence of injustice and appraise the situation as unjust due to the feelings of anger they are experiencing.

Practical and Theoretical Implications

The findings suggest that expressing anger amplifies felt anger, which in turn can drive intentions to engage in protest behaviour such as collective action.

This has important practical implications for mobilizing movements aimed at societal change. Particularly in moral societal issues, where perceived injustice is a central concern, the alternative sequential process may be especially relevant. Organizations advocating for change could leverage this dynamic by encouraging open expressions of anger in response to injustice, as this can drive a greater willingness to act. Understanding this mechanism can help shape more effective strategies for rallying public support and sustaining collective efforts toward social justice.

Furthermore, the findings also contribute to theoretical understandings of the underlying mechanisms that drive collective action by challenging the role of anger suppression. The ironic process theory does not seem to apply to anger in this context. This raises questions about whether it operates differently in the context of emotions or if other emotions might still show significant effects.

In addition, the findings suggest that anger influences appraisals of injustice, providing meaningful insight into the role of emotional responses in shaping how people interpret social issues. Traditional models place injustice appraisal as a key motivator of collective action but fail to explore its predictive value with other motivators, such as anger. This alternative sequence warrants additional theoretical attention, and we should investigate

other cognitive and emotional processes underlying this effect to further enrich our understanding of how emotions contribute to social and political engagement.

Limitations and Further Directions

While this study provides valuable insights into the role of anger expression in collective action, several limitations should be considered. First, using a convenience sample may limit the generalizability of the findings. Participants were predominantly university students from the Netherlands, sharing similar socioeconomic status and cultural backgrounds (living in the Netherlands). As a result, the extent to which these findings apply to broader, more diverse populations remains undetermined. Future research should aim to replicate these findings with more varied samples to assess whether similar patterns emerge across different demographics.

However, it is important to note that a homogenous sample, in terms of age group, was advantageous in this context, as the research explored how people view topics that pertain to political orientation, a factor that can differ amongst different age groups and education levels. Therefore, using a sample that reflects a similar age group can provide valuable information and aid in reducing potential confounding variables that occur due to age differences, thus improving the study's internal validity.

Second, the use of self-report measures introduces the possibility of response biases. Social desirability effects may have influenced participants' responses, particularly regarding their willingness to engage in collective action, potentially leading to overestimating protest intentions. Additionally, self-reported accounts of anger may not fully capture participants' actual emotional experiences. Future studies could incorporate physiological or behavioural measures of anger to provide a more comprehensive assessment of anger responses.

Another limitation concerns the study's ecological validity. Although the experimental design aimed to simulate a real-life moral conflict, it is unclear how effectively participants immersed themselves in the hypothetical scenario. The extent to which an imagined confrontation with an unjust statement translates to real-world emotions and behaviours remains a critical question. Future research could benefit from observational or field studies that assess anger expression and collective action intentions in naturalistic settings.

Finally, the contextual validity of the manipulation should be considered. The study used the Zwarte Piet controversy as a context for evoking anger, a culturally specific issue that may not resonate equally across all participants or generalize well to other societal injustices. While the scenario effectively evoked anger, it remains unclear whether similar mechanisms would apply to different forms of injustice. Future research should examine whether the observed effects also emerge in a wider range of social and political contexts to establish the broader applicability of the findings.

Conclusion

To conclude, this study explored how emotion regulation strategies, specifically anger expression versus suppression, influence felt anger, injustice appraisal, and collective action intentions. The findings revealed that while emotion regulation did not directly affect collective action intentions, anger played a significant role in driving these intentions. Additionally, the study found that expressing rather than suppressing anger led to greater anger levels, influencing intentions to engage in collective action. In contrast, injustice appraisal did not play a significant role in this process. Importantly, the alternative sequential mediation pathway (where anger precedes injustice appraisal as a mediator between anger

regulation and collective action intentions) provides significant practical insight into the antecedents of collective action behaviours.

These insights carry real-world significance, shedding light on anger's powerful role in mustering social and political change. Understanding that anger expression can fuel the drive for justice allows for movements to channel this emotion into collective action. Activists can inspire urgency and commitment by cultivating an environment where anger is not suppressed but acknowledged and harnessed, transforming frustration into a force for change.

As we look to the future, expanding this research to include more diverse populations and a broader array of societal issues will deepen our understanding of the emotions that encourage individuals to take collective action. This will offer a more nuanced perspective on how to ignite and sustain movements, helping us to shape a world that is not only more just but also more willing to stand up for what is right.

References

- Agostini, M., & van Zomeren, M. (2021). Toward a comprehensive and potentially cross-cultural model of why people engage in collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of four motivations and structural constraints. *Psychological Bulletin*, 147(7), 667–700. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000256>
- Carvacho, H., González, R., Cheyre, M., Rocha, C., Cornejo, M., Jiménez-Moya, G., Manzi, J., Álvarez-Dezerega, C., Álvarez, B., Castro, D., Varela, M., Valdenegro, D., Drury, J., & Livingstone, A. (2023). When social movements fail or succeed: social psychological consequences of a collective action's outcome. *Frontiers in psychology*, 14, 1155950. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1155950>
- Cervone, C., Suitner, C., Carraro, L., & Maass, A. (2023). An Impartial Measure of CollectiveAction: Development and Validation of the Belief-aligned Collective Action Scale. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*. Online first. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000762>
- Clayton, S. D. (1992). The experience of injustice: Some characteristics and correlates. *Social Justice Research*, 5(1), 71–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01048378>
- Frijda, N. H., Kuipers, P., & ter Schure, E. (1989). Relations among emotion, appraisal, and emotional action readiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(2), 212–228. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.212>
- Galassi, J. P., Delo, J. S., Galassi, M. D., & Bastien, S. (1974). The college self-expression scale: A measure of assertiveness. *Behavior Therapy*, 5(2), 165–171. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7894\(74\)80131-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7894(74)80131-0)
- Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(3), 271–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.271>

- Gross, J. J. (2002). Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, 39(3), 281-291. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048577201393198>
- Hayes, A. F. (2021). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (3rd Ed). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Imhoff, R., Dieterle, L., & Lamberty, P. (2021). Resolving the puzzle of conspiracy worldview and political activism: Belief in secret plots decreases normative but increases nonnormative political engagement. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 12(1), 71–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550619896491>
- Klandermans, P. G. (2002). How group identification helps to overcome the dilemma of collective action. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45, 887–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764202045005009>
- Landmann, H., & Rohmann, A. (2020). Being moved by protest: Collective efficacy beliefs and injustice appraisals enhance collective action intentions for forest protection via positive and negative emotions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 71, 101491. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101491>
- Landmann, H., & Hess, U. (2016). What elicits third-party anger? The effects of moral violation and others' outcome on anger and compassion. *Cognition and Emotion*, 31(6), 1097–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2016.1194258>
- Lindebaum, D., & Geddes, D. (2016). The place and role of (moral) anger in organizational behavior studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(5), 738-757. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2065>
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(4), 602–616. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.602>

- Mikula, G., Scherer, K. R., & Athenstaedt, U. (1998). The Role of Injustice in the Elicitation of Differential Emotional Reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(7), 769-783. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167298247009>
- Roseman, I. J. (1984). Cognitive determinants of emotion: A structural theory. *Review of Personality & Social Psychology*, 5, 11–36.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schachter, S., & Singer, J. (1962). Cognitive, social, and physiological determinants of emotional state. *Psychological Review*, 69(5), 379–399. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046234>
- Schoemann, A., Boulton, A., & Short, S. (2017). Determining Power and Sample Size for Simple and Complex Mediation Models. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8, 194855061771506. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617715068>
- Schwarz, N. (2012). Feelings-as-information theory. In P. A. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, E. T. Higgins (Eds.) *Feelings-as-information theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 289-308). SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249215.n15>
- Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(4), 813–838. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.48.4.813>
- Smith, C. A., & Lazarus, R. S. (1993). Appraisal components, core relational themes, and the emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 7(3-4), 233–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699939308409189>
- Solak, N., Tamir, M., Sümer, N., Jost, J. T., & Halperin, E. (2021). Expressive suppression as an obstacle to social change: Linking system justification, emotion regulation, and collective action. *Motivation and Emotion*, 45(5), 661–682. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-021-09883-5>

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-37). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tamir, M. (2016). Why do people regulate their emotions? A taxonomy of motives in emotion regulation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 20(3), 199–222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868315586325>
- Tausch, N., Becker, J. C., Spears, R., Christ, O., Saab, R., Singh, P., & Siddiqui, R. N. (2011). Explaining radical group behavior: Developing emotion and efficacy routes to normative and nonnormative collective action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(1), 129–148. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a002272>
- Torres-Harding, S., Siers, B., & Olson, B. D. (2012). Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the Social Justice Scale (SJS). *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 50(1-2), 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-011-9478-2>
- van Zomeren, M. (2019). Toward a cultural psychology of collective action: Just how “core” are the core motivations for collective action? *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 13, Article e15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/prp.2019.7>
- van Zomeren, M., & Iyer, A. (2009). Introduction to the social and psychological dynamics of collective action. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65(4), 645–660. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01618.x>
- van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: a quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(4), 504–535. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.504>
- Wegner D. M. (1994). Ironic processes of mental control. *Psychological review*, 101(1), 34–52. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.101.1.34>.

Yap, A. J., & Tong, E. M. W. (2009). The Appraisal Rebound Effect: Cognitive Appraisals on the Rebound. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(9), 1208-1219.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167209338073>

Zúñiga, C., Asún, R., & Louis, W. (2023). Normative and non-normative collective action facing repression in a democratic context: A mixed study in a Chilean Social Movement. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 11(1), 362-

382. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.7973>

Appendix

Qualtrics Questionnaire

Information about the research:

“Bachelor thesis Feelings about racism and the Dutch Sinterklaas tradition and our relations to other people”

Why do I receive this information?

- You are being invited to participate in this research, because we are interested in how you think and feel about social issues, such as racism, in The Netherlands. Therefore, we are reaching out to you.
- This research involves bachelor students, Szonja Feher, Famke Weening, Maik ten Klooster, Alyssa den Hartog, Sterre Hoogterp, Vita van Beusekom and it is supervised by PhD student Hannah Lee and Dr Ernestine Gordijn from the University of Groningen
- The start date of the research will be January 22, 2024 and the end date of the research will be April 18, 2025.

Why this research?

- In this research, we want to study what views students have on several highly debated societal issues such as racism, and how they respond to others expressing their thoughts about these issues.
- For this research, we are looking for participants who are older than 16.

What do we ask of you during the research?

- First, we will ask you for your consent to participate. When you agree to participate, you will be guided to the online questionnaire. In the questionnaire, you first answer some demographic questions (i.e., your age range, gender, ethnicity and political orientation). Further, we will ask several questions about how you perceive yourself. Next, you will be asked to express your attitudes about societal issues concerning racism, specifically in relation to the Dutch tradition of Sinterklaas. After this, you will read a passage about other people talking about this topic and complete some items. Then you will be asked your opinion and feelings about this. After completing the questionnaire, you will receive more information on this research. Only after completing the full survey, will you receive more information on this research. If you decide to withdraw from the study but would like to receive more information, you can always ask for more information about this study by sending an email to m.a.ten.klooster@student.rug.nl.
- The questionnaire will take about 15 minutes to complete.

Do I have to participate in this research?

- Participation in the research is voluntary. However, your consent is needed. Therefore, please read this information carefully. Ask all the questions you might have, for example, because you do not understand something. Only afterwards, you decide if you want to participate. If you decide not to participate, you do not need to explain why, and there will be no negative consequences for you. You have this right at all times, including after you have consented to participate in the research.

What are the consequences of participation?

- With our research, we hope to gain more understanding about people's attitude towards societal issues concerning racism, and how they think about what other people think about these issues. Thus, with your participation, you will contribute to this research. Your participation will also help a PhD student with her project as well as a group of Bachelor students with their thesis.
- We believe there are little to no risks associated with participating in this study. However, you may find some questions difficult to answer or would prefer not to answer them. Please remember that you may always withdraw from the study and/or skip questions you may not wish to answer, which does not have any negative consequences for you.
- You will receive 0.4 SONA credits for participation.

How will we treat your data?

- Your data will be used to write a doctoral thesis project, a bachelor thesis project and possibly to write an empirical article in a scientific peer-reviewed journal.
- Your data is confidential. Some information may act as identifiers when combined (i.e., gender, age range, whether you perceive yourself as an ethnic minority in the Netherlands or not, and political orientation). Also, we will collect individual SONA ID's. We use them only to compensate for your participation. Once we compensated you, we will delete them. Only the supervisors of this study will have access to it. The data consists of your responses to the questions which will be collected using an online questionnaire. We collect this data for scientific purposes.
- If the data is published, we will remove information that could be used to identify individual participants.

- When the study is finished, the data will be stored at a safe University of Groningen server and will be stored for 10 years.

What else do you need to know?

- You may always ask questions about the research: now, during the research, and after the end of the research. You can do so by sending an email to m.a.ten.klooster@student.rug.nl.
- Do you have questions/concerns about your rights as a research participant or the conduct of the research? You may also contact the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences of the University of Groningen: ec-bss@rug.nl.
- Do you have questions or concerns regarding the handling of your personal data? You may also contact the University of Groningen Data Protection Officer: privacy@rug.nl.
- Data processing takes place in Europe.
- As a research participant, you have the right to a copy of this research information (e.g., by making a screenshot).

By consenting to participate in this study you understand the following:

- I have the right to receive a copy of this informed consent form by taking a screenshot of this page or asking the researcher for a copy. (send an email to m.a.ten.klooster@rug.nl)
- My participation is voluntary, and I can withdraw from this study at any moment without having to give a reason and without any negative consequences.
- I am allowed to refuse to answer any questions that I do not wish to answer. I do not have to provide any reason for this, and this does not have any negative consequences.

- My responses are confidential and will only be shared with anyone after being anonymized.
- All my responses will be securely stored and are only accessible to the researchers.
- After completing the questionnaire, I will receive more information on the purpose of this research.
- I approve that the supervisors of this research can handle my personal data.
- I declare to be at least 16 years old.

Do you agree to participate in this study?

- ☐ Yes, I consent to participate.
- ☐ No, I do not consent to participate.

Consent to processing my personal data

- ☐ Yes, I consent to the processing of my personal data as mentioned in the research information.
- ☐ No, I do not consent to the processing of my personal data

Which of these best describes your gender identity? Please select one answer.

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Prefer not to say

How old are you?

- ☐ 16-18
- ☐ 19-21
- ☐ 22-24
- ☐ 25+

Do you perceive yourself as an ethnic minority in the Netherlands?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Prefer not to say

Please indicate where on the scale you see yourself regarding your own political orientation

| | Extremely left wing | Left wing | Slightly left wing | Neither left nor right | Slightly right wing | Right wing | Extremely right wing |
|--|------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| My political orientation is | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Now we would like to ask some questions about how you perceive yourself. Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following items (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree)

| | Strongl y disagre e (1) | Disagre e (2) | Somewha t disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagre e (4) | Somewha t agree (5) | Agre e (6) | Strongl y agree (7) |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | | | |

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following items (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree)

| | Strongl y disagree (1) | Disagre e (2) | Somewha t disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagre e (4) | Somewha t agree (5) | Agre e (6) | Strongl y Agree (7) |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I feel I do not have much to be proud of | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I feel useless at times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I feel that I have a number of good qualities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I am able to do things as well as most | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**other
people**

**At times
I think I
am no
good at
all**

0 0 0 0 0 0 0

**I take a
positive
attitude
toward
myself**

0 0 0 0 0 0 0

**On the
whole, I
am
satisfied
with
myself**

0 0 0 0 0 0 0

**I wish I
could
have
more
respect
for
myself**

0 0 0 0 0 0 0

**All in
all, I am
inclined
to feel
that I
am a
failure**

0 0 0 0 0 0 0

In this study we are interested in how people think and feel about the Sinterklaas tradition in the Netherlands, and especially in the debate concerning Zwarte Pete (Black Pete). We first give you more information about this tradition. What is Sinterklaas?

Sinterklaas is a centuries-old Dutch tradition celebrated annually on December 5th (called "Pakjesavond," or Gift Evening). The holiday revolves around Sinterklaas. Sinterklaas, a white man, is assisted by his helpers, traditionally called Zwarte Piet(en) (Black Petes)(see image). These helpers distribute gifts, candy, and are supposed to add “playful” elements to the festivities. One of the festivities surrounding Sinterklaas involves a parade that marks his arrival in the Netherlands with music, floats, and excitement. Traditionally, Zwarte Piet is portrayed with blackface makeup, curly hair, exaggerated red lips, gold earrings, and brightly colored clothing. This portrayal has been widely criticized for being reminiscent of racist caricatures and stereotypes associated with colonial-era depictions of Black people. Zwarte Piet is a subordinate to Sinterklaas. He is depicted as less intelligent and more clownish than Sinterklaas, reinforcing racial stereotypes. Blackface is widely recognized as offensive and racist in many parts of the world due to its historical use to mock Black people. For many, the continued use of Zwarte Piet in blackface signals a lack of awareness or concern for the feelings and dignity of black people. For many Black people and other ethnic minorities in the Netherlands, the portrayal of Zwarte Piet is a reminder of colonial history and systemic racism. Seeing such imagery in public celebrations can make these communities feel disrespected, unwelcome or excluded from Dutch cultural life. The celebration of Zwarte Piet can evoke feelings of pain, humiliation, and anger among those who associate it with racial oppression and mockery. Black people may experience bullying or feel stigmatized due to the mocking tones and comparisons made during the Sinterklaas festivities

Please indicate on the scale to what extent you believe that the portrayal of Zwarte Piet in black face is racist?

| Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Please imagine the following scenario (read carefully, questions will be asked about it afterwards):

Imagine that you're at a group assignment meeting, sitting around the table with all your group members. Completing this project is crucial for earning your bachelor's degree.

However, several parts of the assignment must be created collaboratively, making teamwork absolutely essential for success. At some point during the meeting, the conversation shifts to the topic of Zwarte Piet's discussion and "woke culture" in general. Suddenly, your group member Mark, who is someone you have always had a close emotional bond with, starts making dismissive remarks about "Zwarte Piet," racism, and tradition. He laughs and says: "So nowadays you can't say anything anymore, right? What's next, canceling the whole Sinterklaas? This is all absolute nonsense. Traditions are traditions. And when you're a Zwarte Piet, you are supposed to be black. How hard is that to understand? These people are just delusional. They shove their little 'woke' culture and anti-racism propaganda online and into schools to brainwash kids with this garbage. And when I say something against it, I'm

the bad guy and I'll be cancelled. This whole 'woke bullshit' is just people who think they are better than the rest of us, telling me what I'm allowed to say and do." Mark continues, "And don't even get me started on this "Zwarte Piet is racist". They want us to believe the world is ending and make us give up our traditions just so they can feel righteous about 'being equal and kind to all'. Meanwhile, all those annoying 'woke protesters' don't understand traditions - trying to destroy our way of life." Then Mark adds, "And you know who's really benefiting from all this? Black people. The left is letting them flood into the country, taking jobs from us, and draining our welfare system. We're supposed to bend over backward for them, while we are struggling. It's all part of the same woke agenda—open borders, special treatment for everyone but us, and forcing us to give up our way of life. We have to stand up against this madness. This is why I'll be painting myself black again coming to Sinterklaas, tradition is tradition."

Please imagine the following scenario (read carefully, questions will be asked about it afterwards):

Imagine that you're studying/ working in a cafe and having a coffee. You overhear two people you do not know, talking to each other at the table next to you. One of them is called Mark. At some point their conversation shifts to the topic of Zwarte Piet's discussion and "woke culture" in general. Suddenly, the guy called Mark starts making dismissive remarks about "Zwarte Piet," racism, and tradition. He laughs and says: "So nowadays you can't say anything anymore, right? What's next, canceling the whole Sinterklaas? This is all absolute nonsense. Traditions are traditions. And when you're a Zwarte Piet, you are supposed to be black. How hard is that to understand? These people are just delusional. They shove their little 'woke' culture and anti-racism propaganda online and into schools to brainwash kids with this garbage. And when I say something against it, I'm the bad guy and I'll be canceled."

This whole ‘woke bullshit’ is just people who think they are better than the rest of us, telling me what I’m allowed to say and do." Mark continues, "And don’t even get me started on this “Zwarte Piet is racist”. They want us to believe the world is ending and make us give up our traditions just so they can feel righteous about 'being equal and kind to all”. Meanwhile, all those annoying ‘‘woke protesters’’ don't understand traditions - trying to destroy our way of life”. Then Mark adds, "And you know who’s really benefiting from all this? Black people. The left is letting them flood into the country, taking jobs from us, and draining our welfare system. We’re supposed to bend over backward for them, while we are struggling. It’s all part of the same woke agenda—open borders, special treatment for everyone but us, and forcing us to give up our way of life. We have to stand up against this madness. This is why I’ll be painting myself black again coming to Sinterklaas, tradition is tradition."

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements:

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| What Mark said is strongly problematic. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I think it is unacceptable to say what Mark said. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I think what Mark said is defendable. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I agree with what is said. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

To what extent would you experience the following emotions in light of what Mark said?

| | 1 (Not at all) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 (Very strongly) |
|---------------------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| I would feel angry. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel outraged. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel happy. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel disgusted. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel guilty. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel pleased. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel contempt. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel shocked. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel unconcerned. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel upset. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

To what extent would you experience the following emotions in light of what Mark said?

| | 1 (Not at all) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 (Very strongly) |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------|
| I would feel indifferent. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel irritated. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Select 3 (attention check) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel annoyed. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel disturbed. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel unmoved. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel surprised. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel comfortable. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel ashamed. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel satisfied. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel appalled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

You may agree or disagree with what Mark says. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

| | Strongl y disagre e (1) | Disagre e (2) | Somewha t disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagre e (4) | Somewha t agree (5) | Agre e (6) | Strongl y agree (7) |
|--|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| I would confront Mark. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would feel the urge to speak up against what he said. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would not want to confront him. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would ignore what he said. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would express agreement with what he said. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would back up what he said. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I would express my emotions to Mark. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would suppress how I feel about what Mark said. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Now we want you to imagine the following (read carefully, questions will be asked about it afterwards):

Immediately, you can notice how anger starts boiling in you because you believe it's strongly problematic to say something like this. You feel outraged. Mark's comments deeply offend you, your values, and what you believe in. You find it morally outrageous for someone to say something like this. Now you face a dilemma. You know that speaking up could create a big drama in the group, possibly leading to heated arguments and potentially even long-lasting tension between certain group members. You know that if you start a confrontation, your group member will be mad at you for ruining the meeting with political discussions that cause heated, and potentially even lasting, conflict. At the same time, the idea of staying silent feels really wrong to you, you cannot possibly let statements like these go unchallenged.

Try to imagine you feel very angry, and that you want to express your feelings in this situation. Please write a short paragraph about how you would handle this situation: How would you express your anger? What would you say and/or do (e.g., your facial expression)?

Now we want you to imagine the following (read carefully, questions will be asked about it afterwards):

Immediately, you can notice how anger starts boiling in you because you believe it's strongly problematic to say something like this. You feel outraged. Mark's comments deeply offend you, your values, and what you believe in. You find it morally outrageous for someone to say something like this. Now you face a dilemma. You know that speaking up could create a big drama in the group, possibly leading to heated arguments and potentially even long-lasting tension between certain group members. You know that if you start a confrontation, your group member will be mad at you for ruining the meeting with political discussions that cause heated, and potentially even lasting, conflict. At the same time, the idea of staying silent feels really wrong to you, you cannot possibly let statements like these go unchallenged. You feel torn and don't know what to do.

Try to imagine you feel very angry, but that you do not want to express your feelings in this situation. Please write a short paragraph about how you would handle this situation: How would you suppress your anger? What would you say and/or do in this situation (e.g., your facial expression)?

Now we want you to imagine the following (read carefully, questions will be asked about it afterwards):

Immediately, you can notice how anger starts boiling in you because you believe it's strongly problematic to say something like this. You feel outraged. What the guy called Mark said deeply offend you, your values, and what you believe in. You find it morally outrageous for someone to say something like this. You consider your options and how you want to deal with this situation. You quickly realize that there's little risk in speaking up. This person isn't someone you're close to, you have nothing to lose in terms of personal relationship. You pause for a moment and consider all this, then you decide to express your anger.

Try to imagine you feel very angry, and that you want to express your feelings in this situation. Please write a short paragraph about how you would handle this situation: How would you express your anger? What would you say and/or do (e.g., your facial expression)?

Now we want you to imagine the following (read carefully, questions will be asked about it afterwards):

Immediately, you can notice how anger starts boiling in you because you believe it's strongly problematic to say something like this. You feel outraged. What the guy called Mark said deeply offends you, your values, and what you believe in. You find it morally outrageous for someone to say something like this. However, you pause to consider whether it's worth speaking up. You consider your options and how you want to deal with this situation. You quickly realize that there's little risk in speaking up. This person isn't someone you're close to, you have nothing to lose in terms of personal relationship. However, even though you found it very upsetting what they said, would confronting this person you don't know make any difference? After considering for one moment, you decide to keep your anger to yourself and not express any of it towards the others.

Try to imagine you feel very angry, but that you do not want to express your feelings in this situation. Please write a short paragraph about how you would handle this situation: How would you suppress your anger? What would you say and/or do in this situation (e.g., your facial expression)?

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements:

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Mark's remarks about Zwarte Piet and woke culture are unjust. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mark's remarks about Zwarte Piet and woke culture are fair. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mark's statements make it evident that people of color are being treated unfairly. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements:

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Somewhat disagree (3) | Neither agree nor disagree (4) | Somewhat agree (5) | Agree (6) | Strongly agree (7) |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| I would deface or destroy public images or advertisements that support, promote or feature Zwarte Piet | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would verbally intimidate and harass people who are pro-Zwarte Piet on internet forums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would verbally intimidate and harass people who are anti-Zwarte Piet on internet forums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I would make disruptive noises (e.g. yelling, chanting) during a Sinterklaas parade if it | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

features
Zwarte Piet

I would
prevent
people from
protesting
against
Zwarte Piet

0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Please reflect on your reaction to Mark's statement. What were you told to imagine? I
had to imagine that.....

| | 1 (absolutely disagree) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 (Absolutely agree) |
|--|----------------------------|-----|---|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| I was not able to show my anger openly | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I had to suppress my feelings of anger | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I felt restricted in expressing my anger | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I could openly display my anger | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I could express my anger freely | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I felt no restrictions in expressing my anger | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Do you remember who Mark is?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes, someone in a cafe
- ☐ Yes, a member of a study group working on an assignment

This was the final question. Do you have any comments about the study?

Thank you for your participation in this study! Please read the following information about this study carefully. We have withheld some information about the study.

Actual purpose and nature of the study

At the beginning of the study, you were informed that this research focuses on what views people have on highly debated societal issues, especially concerning racism in the Dutch tradition of Sinterklaas, and how they respond to other people expressing their thoughts about these issues. To investigate this, we provided you with a scenario description of someone (Mark) making dismissive remarks about topics such as “Zwarte Piet” and woke culture.

However, there were actually different versions of who made this statement and in which context they did so and on how you reacted to this statement. Depending on the condition you were assigned to, you were asked to imagine either the situation that someone who is close to you and with whom you may want to avoid conflict made these remarks or a stranger with whom getting into conflict would come at lower costs. Further, depending on the condition you were assigned to, you were either asked to imagine you expressed your anger or chose not to express it. This is why we then asked you about your feelings, opinions, and protest intentions towards the dismissive remarks after you were told to either suppress or express your anger about them.

Please do not discuss this research with other people as we are still collecting data and knowing about our hypotheses may influence the findings.

Our goal is to examine whether the anger someone experiences and their protest intentions are affected by whether they express it or suppress their anger in light of a moral violation. We have withheld this information to make sure you were not influenced by it. We want to emphasize that this study was purely academic in nature, and your responses will be kept strictly confidential. Your participation was completely voluntary, and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. Thank you once again for your

valuable participation, we appreciate your help in furthering our understanding of these important issues.

Now that you have read all the information about the purposes of the study, do you still agree with the use and processing of your data?

- ☐ Yes, I consent to the use and processing of my data.
- ☐ No, I do not consent to the use and processing of my data, and my data should be permanently deleted.

Finally

We would like to thank you again for your participation. It is very meaningful for us and possibly helps to add new findings in the research field of intergroup relations. If you are interested in the results of this research, feel free to send an email to m.a.ten.klooster@student.rug.nl. If you click on the arrow below you, you have finished the questionnaire. Your answers will be automatically recorded (if you press the arrow below) and associated to your SONA ID. Thanks again for your participation!