

**The Regulation of Anger and Its Role in Collective Action Intentions: The Moderating
Influence of Self-Expression**

Sterre Hoogterp

s4343697

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen

PSB3N-BT15: Bachelor Thesis

Group: 2425_1b_2

Supervisor: prof. dr. E. Gordijn

Second evaluator: dr. H.J.E. Greijdanus

In collaboration with: S. Feher, A. den Hartog, F. Weening, V. van Beusekom, M. ten
Klooster

April 22, 2025

A thesis is an aptitude test for students. The approval of the thesis is proof that the student has sufficient research and reporting skills to graduate, but does not guarantee the quality of the research and the results of the research as such, and the thesis is therefore not necessarily suitable to be used as an academic source to refer to. If you would like to know more about the research discussed in this thesis and any publications based on it, to which you could refer, please contact the supervisor mentioned

Abstract

Anger plays a key role in motivating collective action. How individuals regulate their anger may influence their willingness to engage in protest. This study investigated the effects of anger regulation on felt anger and collective action intentions, with self-perceived self-expression as a potential moderating factor. Based on previous research, we hypothesized that suppressing anger would lead to increased felt anger and greater collective action intentions, particularly for individuals high in self-expression. Using an experimental survey design, participants ($N = 367$) were randomly assigned to either an anger suppression or expression condition. Contrary to expectations, suppression did not result in higher felt anger or greater collective action intentions. Instead, our findings suggest that expressing anger may sustain or amplify emotional arousal rather than providing relief. Next to that, self-expression did not moderate these effects, possibly because highly expressive individuals already possess adaptive regulation strategies that buffer against the discomfort of suppression. These findings challenge conventional assumptions about the role of anger regulation in collective action. Future research could examine individual differences in emotion regulation and different measures of self-expression, to better understand the link between anger regulation and collective action intentions.

Introduction

Anger is widely recognized as a key driver of collective action and protest behavior, serving as an emotional response to perceived injustice (Tausch et al., 2011). Emotional arousal, particularly anger, mobilizes individuals by motivating them to address perceived injustices and uphold their moral values (Tausch et al., 2011). This suggests that when individuals experience anger in response to a situation, the emotion can serve as a motivating force, prompting them to take action. However, there is an ongoing debate about how the way anger is managed—whether it is expressed or suppressed—might lead to different behavioral outcomes. Suppression can maintain emotional arousal (Gross, 2002), while expression might alleviate immediate emotional tension, reducing urgency for action. As said before, negative emotions, such as anger, are motivational factors for collective action (van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2023). Would the effect of suppressing anger vary for expressive versus non-expressive people? It is likely to assume that people who perceive themselves as self-expressive, would have a stronger reaction to suppression. Since expressive individuals have the tendency and strong will to express themselves when they deem it fit (Riggio & Riggio, 2002).

Although anger is strongly linked to collective action, as previously noted, how its regulation, whether through suppression or expression, impacts future collective action intentions remains unclear. Borders and Wiley (2019) demonstrate that rumination about discrimination mediates the relationship between anger and collective action, suggesting that the internal processing of anger has a distinct influence on mobilization. The purpose of this research is to figure out what the effect is of suppressing or expressing anger on felt anger, and collective action intentions, and whether this effect is moderated by self-expression.

Suppression versus Expression of Anger

Studies like those by Gross (2002) suggest that emotion regulation leads to distinct psychological and social outcomes, particularly in how individuals process and act on their feelings. However, the specific implications of these emotion regulation strategies for collective action intentions remain underexplored. Suppressing anger involves inhibiting its outward expression. Gross (2002) found that suppressing negative emotions does not reduce the intensity of the felt emotion. Instead, individuals continue to perceive the situation as emotion-provoking, which can lead to heightened emotional arousal over time. This aligns with Wegner's (1994) "Ironic Process Theory", which suggests that attempts to suppress thoughts can paradoxically make them more persistent; as the act of suppressing thoughts can inadvertently bring those thoughts to the forefront. When applied to emotional regulation, this suggests that suppressing anger may lead individuals to think about their emotions even more, thereby intensifying their experience of anger. When you keep thinking of something negative, you are ruminating about it. According to Borders and Wiley (2019), rumination is linked to stronger intentions to take action against perceived injustice.

Combining Wegner's (1994) Ironic Process Theory with the effects of rumination helps explain why suppressing anger in a given situation can lead to increased felt anger afterward. Felt anger can serve as a powerful motivator for collective action (van Zomeren et al., 2004), highlighting how suppression may intensify internal emotional arousal and may therefore strengthen the motivation to engage in collective action.

Anger and Collective Action

Emotions such as anger are recognized as powerful motivators for collective action (Tausch et al., 2011; van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2023; van Zomeren et al., 2004). Borders and Wiley (2019) found that after a period of rumination, anger tends to intensify, resulting in a delayed yet stronger drive for collective action. As van Stekelenburg and Klandermans (2023) highlight, "Emotions permeate protest at all stages: recruitment,

sustained participation, and dropping out” (p. 76), suggesting that emotions are central to understanding collective action. Van Zomeren et al. (2004) argue that anger, as part of the emotion-focused approach to collective action, is particularly significant because it is an action-oriented emotion. The regulation of anger, whether through suppression or expression, plays a key role in shaping an individual’s willingness to engage in collective action. When anger is expressed, it can serve as a mobilizing force, strengthening group identity and encouraging collective action (Solak et al., 2021). Conversely, suppressed anger can intensify feelings of anger, which in turn may increase intentions to participate in collective action.

If individuals feel unable to express their dissatisfaction, their suppressed anger may intensify their motivation to act. Could this dissonance between the desire to express emotions and the inability to do so explain why some people engage in collective action while others do not? In this context, self-expression emerges as a key factor in linking felt anger to collective action intentions.

The Role of Self-Expression as a Moderating Factor

Self-expression is known as the tendency to openly communicate emotions and beliefs. Since there is no research yet on the effects of self-expression on collective action, this research will build on existing research on extraversion. Extraversion is a personality trait closely linked to self-expression. Research by Riggio and Riggio (2002) highlight a significant link between extraversion and emotional expressiveness, showing that extraverts—who are typically more outgoing, talkative, and impulsive—are more likely to express their emotions openly. In contrast, introverts, who tend to be more introspective and reserved, are less inclined to externalize emotions, whether verbally or nonverbally. This distinction has important implications for collective action.

Because extraverts are naturally more emotionally expressive, they are more likely to externalize anger, especially when suppression conflicts with their inherent emotional

tendencies. This creates cognitive dissonance, as their actions (suppressing anger) are inconsistent with their feeling (a desire to express it). According to Festinger's Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, as outlined by Miller et al., (2015), when individuals encounter inconsistencies between their beliefs and actions, they experience psychological discomfort. Discomfort drives individuals to take action in order to restore a sense of consistency (Miller et al., 2015).

Extraverts are generally more excitable and active, making them more effective nonverbal communicators of emotion (Riggio & Riggio, 2002). Consequently, individuals who view themselves as extroverted often perceive themselves as more expressive than those with introverted tendencies. Building on the literature surrounding extraversion, the following conclusions can be made on self-expression. To resolve the cognitive dissonance expressive individuals experience when they suppress their emotions, these individuals may engage in compensatory conviction—a process described by McGregor et al. (2001) in which individuals, confronted with internal conflict, reinforce their beliefs or adopt more extreme attitudes to restore consistency. The tension between suppressed anger and the desire to express it could motivate them to engage in protest actions to resolve this discomfort. Their heightened sensitivity to suppression, combined with the cognitive dissonance it creates, further drives their motivation to act, making self-expression a key factor in understanding involvement in collective action.

The Present Research

While previous research has shown that suppressing and expressing anger have different emotional consequences, the direct effect of emotion regulation on collective action intentions remains unexplored. In the current study, participants will be presented with a story involving the controversial figure of Zwarte Piet to evoke an emotional reaction. The celebration of Sinterklaas featuring Zwarte Piet has sparked widespread debate due to its

origins in slavery and its use of blackface (Van der Wijngaert, 2022). As Van der Pijl (2014) points out, Zwarte Piet taps into moral questions like racism, making it a fit tool for eliciting strong emotional reactions. Following the scenario description, the participants will either express or suppress their emotions. Their collective action intentions will then be measured to investigate the effects of emotional regulation strategies on their willingness to engage in protest actions. This approach allows us to explore the intricate relationship between suppressing or expressing anger, the intensity of felt anger, and the subsequent motivation to act.

Therefore this research aims to answer the following question: "How does the suppression versus expression of anger influence the felt anger and collective action intentions, and to what extent is this effect moderated by individuals' self-perception as self-expressive?" From the knowledge gathered by earlier research, the following hypotheses are formed. (i) Felt anger will be higher after anger is suppressed as opposed to after it is expressed. (ii) Collective action intentions will be higher when anger is suppressed as opposed to when anger is expressed. (iii) This effect is especially pronounced for people who perceive themselves as self-expressive.

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

¹ See [AsPredicted](#)

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 0.8 with expected correlations of 0.3 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 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 Appendix A. 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 A). The participants were first directed to an information page about

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.

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 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 A). Participants were asked to read a scenario and they had to

imagine being 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 A). 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") ($M = 5.59$, $SD = 1.27$, $\alpha = .90$). 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. (2011). 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

Manipulation Checks

We analyzed the manipulation check by means of a 2x2 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The analyses yielded a main effect of the regulation manipulation on participants' anger regulation perception, $F(1, 361) = 238.85, p < .001, \eta^2 = .40$. Participants who were told to express their anger ($M = 4.80, SD = 1.66$) felt significantly more that they could express their anger, as opposed to participants who were in the suppression condition ($M = 2.48, SD = 1.18$). It can be concluded that participants perceived the manipulation as intended. The analyses also yielded a main effect of the cost manipulation on participants' anger regulation perception $F(1, 361) = 5.38, p = .021, \eta^2 = .015$.³

Hypothesis Testing

The first hypothesis states that felt anger will be higher after anger is suppressed, as opposed to when anger is expressed. An ANCOVA was conducted to examine hypothesis (i). Results showed that the regulation manipulation had a significant effect on felt anger, after controlling for cost, $F(1, 364) = 4.64, p = .032, \eta^2 = .013$. The covariate cost was not significant, $F(1, 364) = 0.58, p = .447, \eta^2 = .002$. Participants in the suppression group (adjusted $M = 3.58, SE = 0.13$) reported significantly lower levels of felt anger than those in the expression group (adjusted $M = 3.97, SE = 0.18$), suggesting that suppressing anger leads to lower felt anger, compared to expressing anger. Therefore, hypothesis (i) stating that suppression of anger leads to higher felt anger is not supported. Rather, the opposite is found, with expression of anger leading to higher felt anger.

³ The cost manipulation is part of the broader research project, and will not be analyzed in this paper. In this research cost will be controlled for.

Hypothesis (ii) states that collective action intentions will be higher when anger is suppressed as opposed to when anger is expressed. An ANCOVA was conducted to test hypothesis (ii), while controlling for costs. Results showed that the regulation condition had no significant effect on collective action intention after controlling for cost, $F(1, 363) = 0.05$, $p = .830$, $\eta^2 = .00$. The covariate cost was not significant, $F(1, 363) = 0.05$, $p = .820$, $\eta^2 = .00$. Participants in the suppression group (adjusted $M = 2.82$, $SE = 0.08$) reported no significant differences in their collective action intentions to those in the expression group (adjusted $M = 2.85$, $SE = 0.08$), suggesting that the regulation of anger leads to no difference in collective action intentions. Thus, hypothesis (ii) stating that suppression of anger leads to higher future collective intention is not supported.

To test the last hypothesis, the moderating effect of self-expression on the hypotheses, we used model 1 PROCESS by Hayes (2017). In the analysis, cost was included as a covariate to control for its potential influence on felt anger and collective action intention. The main effect of regulation on felt anger was not significant ($B = 0.009$, $SE = 1.00$, $p = 0.992$). The main effect of self-expression on felt anger was also not significant ($B = -0.284$, $SE = 0.37$, $p = 0.442$). Lastly, the interaction between emotion regulation and self-expression on felt anger was not significant ($B = 0.085$, $SE = 0.23$, $p = 0.705$). This suggests that self-expression does not moderate the effect of emotion regulation on felt anger.

Next, the moderating effect of self-expression on collective action intention was investigated using the same method. The main effect of regulation on collective action intention was not significant ($B = 0.999$, $SE = 0.64$, $p = 0.119$). The main effect of self-expression on collective action intention was not significant ($B = 0.382$, $SE = 0.24$, $p = 0.106$). The interaction between emotion regulation and self-expression on collective action intention was also not significant ($B = -0.22$, $SE = 0.14$, $p = 0.123$). This suggests that self-expression

does not moderate the effect of regulation on collective action intention. This means that the hypothesis (iii) is not supported.

Discussion

In this study, the effect of anger regulation on felt anger and collective action intention was investigated, with self-perceived self-expression as a moderating factor. The hypotheses were that suppression of anger would lead to higher felt anger afterwards, and higher future protest intentions. These hypotheses were in line with existing literature on the influence of emotion regulation on felt emotions (e.g. Gross, 2002) and the literature on collective action (e.g. Tausch et al., 2011; van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2023; van Zomeren et al., 2004). The hypothesis that self-perceived self-expression functions as a moderator is grounded in the literature on extraversion by Riggio and Riggio (2002). They argue that expressive individuals have an intrinsic need to communicate their emotions. This can consequently lead to cognitive dissonance when expressive individuals are instructed to suppress these emotions.

The findings are not in line with our predictions. Contrasting the literature, in this study suppressing anger did not result in higher felt anger afterwards, nor in higher collective action intentions. This study provides supporting evidence for the opposing literature that *expressing* anger motivates collective action (e.g., Solak et al., 2021). Self-expression did not have an effect on felt-anger, nor on collective action intentions.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

While this research did not find support for the hypothesis that suppressing anger leads to more felt anger and collective action intentions, it still provides meaningful insights to contribute to the broader discussion on emotion regulation and collective action. Notably, the finding that expressing anger may amplify felt anger challenges conventional assumptions on emotion regulation. Prior research has suggested that suppression leads to maintained negative emotions (Gross, 2002; Wegner, 1994), whereas expression can give emotional

relief. However, our findings suggest that that expression may not always function as a release mechanism, but instead can reinforce emotional arousal.

One theoretical implication of these findings is that the influence of anger regulation on collective action intention may not be as straightforward as previously assumed. While the literature review of this study has suggested a relationship between suppressed anger and an increase in collective action intention, the present study indicates that it is in fact *expression* that plays a role in increased felt anger. Although this study did not find a direct effect between emotion regulation and collective action intentions, it did add to the discussion of the effects of anger regulation on collective action.

The Role of Self-Expression

Additionally, the absence of the moderating effect of self-perceived self-expression suggests that personality traits related to expressiveness, as discussed in the literature on extraversion (Riggio & Riggio, 2002), may not be as influential in this context as previously theorized. A possible explanation is that the construct of self-expression is broad, and our operationalization may not have captured the specific type of expressiveness relevant to anger regulation in collective action contexts. For example, some individuals may be more expressive in interpersonal settings but not necessarily when dealing with political or collective issues. If the measure of self-expression did not correspond to the specific context in which anger regulation affected collective action intentions, its moderating effect may not have been apparent. Future studies could refine the measurement by for example distinguishing between general expressiveness, political expressiveness, and emotional expressiveness in activism-related situations.

Further, highly expressive individuals may already possess flexible emotion regulation strategies that operate independently of the assigned regulation condition. While they tend to express emotions naturally, they are also accustomed to situations that require suppression

(e.g., professional or formal environments), which may make suppression feel less unnatural or distressing than anticipated. These individuals might rely on strategies such as cognitive reappraisal or emotional redirection to manage anger internally, without needing outward expression. If they can mentally reframe the situation, suppression may not necessarily increase their anger. Conversely, individuals who are less expressive may not depend on outward expression to regulate emotions, making the difference between suppression and expression conditions less impactful. Future research should investigate whether habitual emotion regulation strategies mediate the relationship between self-expression and collective action intentions.

From a practical perspective, these findings have implications for activist movements and organizations aiming to harness emotions for collective action. While anger is a powerful mobilizing force (Tausch et al., 2011; van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2023; van Zomeren et al., 2004), the way it is regulated may influence the longevity of engagement. If expression sustains anger rather than resolving it, activist strategies may need to consider how to channel anger productively rather than assuming that suppression leads to higher felt anger. Moreover, given that suppression did not lead to heightened collective action intentions in this study, it may be useful to explore alternative emotion regulation strategies, such as cognitive reappraisal and expression, as potential means of sustaining motivation among protesters.

Limitations and Future Directions

Despite having a large sample of 367 participants, there are some limitations to the generalizability of this research. One important limitation of this study is the type of participants. While we had a big enough sample, the participants were mostly first year Psychology students (334 out of 367 participants). The setting could have created a situation in which these participants were eager to finish the survey, and did not fully engage with our manipulation. We attempted to prevent bias by including a timer and making people write

down words on how they would suppress/express their anger. Participants who did not meet our set standards for these manipulation checks were excluded. However, a risk remains that participants were not fully engaged, and therefore the results are not accurate. Next to that, the participants showed a homogenous group in age and gender. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions for the general population. For future research, it would be interesting to replicate this experiment with a more heterogeneous participant group. There may be differences in how anger regulation affects adolescents and adults, with adults potentially having more experience and developed strategies for regulating anger due to their age.

Another limitation is the effectiveness of the anger inducing scenario. Our story about Zwarte Piet and the discussion around racism, may not have evoked strong enough anger in participants. While we did include a check to see whether participants found Zwarte Piet racist and included a measure to check if the participant were angry before the regulation, it is possible that the situations with Mark were not making them angry *enough*. This implies that the manipulations could not accurately regulate the felt anger; for the felt anger was not there. There can be a difference between reporting that you are feeling angry because of the situation, and physically *feeling* angry. Future research could include more precise assessments of what triggers anger in participants, ensuring a more effective manipulation. Additionally, physiological measures could be used to assess the intensity of felt anger more accurately.

Further research into the effects of anger regulation on felt anger and future collective action intentions can be interesting to understand human behavior, particularly how emotional experiences shape decisions to engage in protest behavior and collective action. It offers insights into the psychological mechanisms driving protest participation, highlighting how individuals' emotional regulations influence their motivation to participate in collective action. It is possible that other psychological or contextual factors, such as group identity, or

social support, play a role in translating emotional experiences into protest behavior. Future research could explore how these factors interact with emotion regulation to shape collective action tendencies

Conclusion

This study investigated the effects of anger regulation on felt anger and protest intentions, with self-perceived self-expression as a moderating factor. Contrary to our hypotheses, suppressing anger did not lead to heightened felt anger or increased collective action intentions, challenging prior research that links suppression to emotional build-up and collective action motivation. Instead, our findings suggest that expressing anger may sustain or amplify emotional arousal rather than providing relief. Additionally, self-expression did not moderate the relationship between anger regulation and protest intentions. One possible explanation is that highly expressive individuals may already have adaptive emotion regulation strategies that mitigate the discomfort of suppression. Moreover, our measurement of self-expression may not have captured the specific type of expression relevant to protest behavior.

These findings have both theoretical and practical implications. They highlight the complexity of emotion regulation in activism, suggesting that the relation between anger regulation and collective action is not as straightforward as expected. Nonetheless, limitations such as sample homogeneity and the anger inducing method suggest that future research could employ more diverse participant groups and more impactful stimuli. Understanding how anger regulation shapes engagement in collective action remains a valuable avenue for further research, with implications for both psychological theory and activist strategies.

References

- Borders, A., & Wiley, S. (2019). Rumination about discrimination mediates the unique association between anger and collective action intentions. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 22(3), 366–380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217749887>
- Cervone, C., Suitner, C., Carraro, L., & Maass, A. (2023). An Impartial Measure of Collective Action: 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>
- 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. (2002). Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, 39(3), 281–291. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048577201393198>
- 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.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1177/1948550619896491>
- McGregor, I., Zanna, M. P., Holmes, J. G., & Spencer, S. J. (2001). Compensatory conviction in the face of personal uncertainty: going to extremes and being oneself. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(3), 472–488.
- Miller, Monica & Clark, Jordan & Jehle, Alayna. (2015). Cognitive Dissonance Theory (Festinger). 10.1002/9781405165518.wbeosc058.pub2.
- Riggio, H. R., & Riggio, R. E. (2002). Emotional Expressiveness, Extraversion, and Neuroticism: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 26(4), 195–218. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1022117500440>

- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 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://10.1177/1948550617715068>
- 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>
- 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/a0022728>
- 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://10.1007/s10464-011-9478-2>
- Van der Pijl, Y., & Goulordava, K. (2014). Black Pete, “Smug Ignorance,” and the Value of the Black Body in Postcolonial Netherlands. *NWIG: New West Indian Guide / Nieuwe West-Indische Gids*, 88(3/4), 262–291. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24713754>
- Van De Wijngaert, L. (2022). Understanding polarization: A case study of Black Pete in the Netherlands. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 26(1), 399–414.
<https://doi.org/10.2478/plc-2022-19>
- van Stekelenburg, J., & Klandermans, B. (2023). *A Social Psychology of Protest: Individuals in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://www-cambridge->

org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/core/books/social-psychology-of-protest/8E4E37EC039062C0DD9EDDCE42F13BB3

van Zomeren, M., Spears, R., Fischer, A. H., & Leach, C. W. (2004). Put your money where your mouth is! Explaining collective action tendencies through group-based anger and group efficacy. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 87(5), 649–664.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.5.649>

Wegner, D. M. (1994). Ironic processes of mental control. *Psychological Review*, 101(1), 34–52. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.101.1>

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

Appendix A

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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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)	Somewh at disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagre e (4)	Somewh at agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongl y agree (7)

I am self expressive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am not afraid to speak up in public	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I like to speak on what's on my mind	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I express anger or annoyance when it is justified	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I keep quiet when I don't agree with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Select agree (this is a check)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I keep my opinions to myself	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am inclined to be over-apologetic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I go out of my way to avoid troubles with other people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

I take a positive attitude toward myself	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I wish I could have more respect for myself	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think it is unacceptable to say what Mark said.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think what Mark said is defensible.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I agree with what is said.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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)

[illegible]

I would feel irritated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Select 3 (attention check)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel annoyed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel disturbed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel unmoved.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel surprised.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel comfortable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel ashamed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel satisfied.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel appalled	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

You may agree or disagree with what Mark says. To what extent do 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 confront Mark.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel the urge to speak up against what he said.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would not want to confront him.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would ignore what he said.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would express agreement with what he said.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would back up what he said.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would express my emotions to Mark.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would suppress how I feel about what Mark said.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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)?

[illegible][illegible]

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Mark's statements reflect a disregard for ethical standards that should guide actions toward others.

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

1 (Not at all)

2

3

4

5

6

7 (Very strongly)

angry

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

outraged

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

happy

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

disgusted

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

guilty

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

unconcerned

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

contempt

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

[illegible]

I had to
suppress
my
feelings of
anger

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I felt
restricted
in
expressin
g my
anger

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I could
openly
display my
anger

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I could
express
my anger
freely

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I felt no
restriction
s in
expressin
g my
anger

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

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!