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ABSTRACT

In this report, we present the results of an empirical investigation of the role of gender self-categorisation and emotion on prejudicial attitudes and experiences of aggressive behaviour. Our study was conducted in a male dominated workforce, and was based on analysis of 20 interviews. We argue that employees’ experiences of aggressive behaviour are a result of prejudicial attitudes in male-dominated workplaces, where strong gender self-categorisations exist. We predicted that these effects would be exacerbated by prejudicial attitudes deriving from gender self-categorisation and emotion. In particular, our results suggest that male and female emotional gender roles are becoming blurred. We conclude with a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of our findings for management of prejudicial attitudes and aggressive behaviour.
Previous research (e.g., see Esses & Dovidio, 2002; Parker Tapias, Glaser, Keltner, Vazquez & Wickens, 2007) has shown that men’s and women’s positive and negative prejudicial attitudes towards members of the opposite sex is a frequent occurrence in the workplace, and that these prejudicial attitudes are likely to be the result of individual emotional experiences. More recently, Kawakami, Dunn, Karmali, and Dovidio (2009) demonstrated that prejudicial attitudes result in counterproductive behavioural problems and higher levels of aggression. More particularly, Dovidio Esses, Beach, and Gaertner (2002) found that prejudicial attitudes and aggressive behaviour are linked with emotions. Still, and despite these reports, we were unable to locate any previous work that has provided a theoretical foundation, or empirical work to explore the role of positive and negative prejudicial attitudes on individual men’s and women’s experiences of aggressive behaviour in the workplace.

For the purpose of this study, we define aggressive behaviour as any behaviour intended to result in psychological harm (Neuman & Baron, 1998). While Neuman and Baron suggest that the aggression experienced by victims might result in behavioural problems at work, individual experiences of aggression are subjective. This is because, as Vaughan (2002) has shown, each individual perceives aggressive behaviour uniquely according to her or his own past experiences and personalities. Moreover, Scheikowski (2007) argues that behavioural problems that result in the experience of aggressive behaviour often result in high financial costs to organisations (see also James & Wooten, 2006).

The second focus of our research is the role of prejudicial attitudes. Based on Allport (1954), we define positive prejudicial attitudes as tolerant attitudes directed towards individuals who are seen to be similar to the actor, based exclusively on their membership of a personal category perceived to have unobjectionable qualities. Similarly, we define negative prejudicial attitudes as hostile attitudes directed towards dissimilar individuals based solely on their membership of a particular personal category perceived to have objectionable qualities.

In this paper therefore, we first provide a development of propositions to understand the nature of positive and negative prejudicial attitudes in individual men and women, and the relation of these attitudes to the individuals’ experiences of aggression at work. Second, we report the results of a qualitative study conducted in a male-dominated workplace to examine if these phenomena can be
found in practice. We believe that our research makes three contributions to the literature. First, our study will contribute to the development of gender diversity theory, addressing both the behavioural and the affective domains. Second, we contribute to the emerging understanding of emotion in organisations (Elfenbein, 2007) by providing implications for research into emotional experiences and their effects on prejudicial attitudes. Third, from a practical standpoint, our research provides evidence that emotional gender roles are becoming blurred in a workplace dominated by males.

**Individual gender self-categorisations as an antecedent of emotional experiences**

According to Hogg, Terry, and White (1995), individual self-categorisations are based on the notion that emotions flow from our self-conceptions. Additionally, Chattopadhyay, George, and Lawrence (2004) point out that one basis for identifying with a particular workplace group is gender. Chattopadhyay and his colleagues also indicate that, if individuals perceive themselves as belonging to a gender group, then those individuals’ emotional states will reflect that conception. Empirical research into gender and emotional experiences supports this idea. For example, Fischer, Rodriguez Mosquera, van Vianen, and Manstead (2004) found that, at least in developed industrial societies, males and females report experiences of negative and positive emotions differently, and these experiences are based upon their gender self-categorisation.

Furthermore, Fischer et al. (2004) indicate two categories of negative emotions in terms of gender roles: powerfulness or powerlessness. In this respect, anger and contempt serve to display power and assertiveness towards others, whereas sadness, fear, shame, and guilt reflect powerlessness through internal blame, vulnerability, and inability to cope with negative events. Although Fischer et al., in their quantitative studies did not find gender differences when powerful emotions (e.g. anger & contempt) were experienced, other studies have demonstrated gender differences in the experience of powerless emotions (e.g. sadness, fear, shame & guilt) and in such positive emotions as love and joy (e.g., see Stoppard and Gunn Gruchy, 1993). For example, Stoppard and Gunn Gruchy (1993) showed that women, as a result of their gender role, tend to experience more joy (positive emotion) than men. This is because women seek to maintain relationships, care for others, and express solidarity and support.

Combining our foregoing arguments with evidence that the male role is considered to be assertive and aggressive, especially in developed industrial countries (Friedman & Ayala, 1991;
Dexter, 1985), it seems reasonable to conclude that individuals who self-categorize as males in the workplace will report higher experiences of negative powerful emotions than females. On the other hand, Dexter suggests that the gender female role is considered to be nurturing and forgiving (at least in developed industrial countries). Consequently, by the same logic, we posit that individuals who self-categorize as females in the workplace are likely to report higher negative powerlessness and positive emotions than males. Hence, although research to date has failed to find gender differences in the experience of powerful emotion in the workplace, we still expect individual gender differences in the report of all three categories of emotion: powerful negative, powerlessness negative and positive emotions:

**Proposition 1a:** *Individuals who self-categorise as males will experience powerful emotions (e.g. anger and contempt) more often than individuals who self-categorise as females.*

**Proposition 1b:** *Individuals who self-categorise as females will experience powerless emotions (e.g. sadness, fear, shame and guilt) more often than individuals who self-categorise as males.*

**Proposition 1c:** *Individuals who self-categorise as females will experience positive emotions (e.g. joy and love/compassion) more often than individuals who self-categorise as males.*

**Consecutive Emotional Experiences as an Antecedent of Prejudicial Attitudes**

In addition to our propositions suggesting individual gender differences in experiences of emotion, we also argue that men and women are likely to experience consecutively positive, powerful, and/or powerless emotions when they interact in the workplace. In this regard, Larsen Hemenover, Norris, and Cacioppo (2003) argue that consecutive experiences of positive and/or negative emotions allow individuals to make sense of stressors, to transcend traumatic experiences, and to gain mastery over future stressors such as in situations where men and women interact frequently or on a daily basis (see also Parker Tapias et al. 2007). Following the above argument, Weiss and Beal (2005) propose that events (e.g. gender interactions in the workplace) constitute “emotional episodes.” Consistent with this idea, we argue that emotional episodes – consecutive emotional events – accumulate to drive changes in individuals’ emotional experiences. Consequently, we envisage that individuals who are experiencing positive emotions (e.g. joy and love) should develop positive prejudicial attitudes towards same-gender members. Conversely, individuals who are experiencing powerful/powerless
emotions (e.g. anger, contempt, fear, shame, guilt) would be expected to harbor negative prejudicial attitudes towards people of the opposite gender. Hence, we anticipate that, in the workplace:

**Proposition 2a:** Males’ and females’ experience of positive emotions will lead to the increased likelihood they will form positive prejudicial attitudes toward members of their own gender group.

**Proposition 2b:** Males’ and females’ experience of powerful and powerless emotions will lead to the increased likelihood they will form negative prejudicial attitudes toward members of the opposite gender group.

**Prejudicial Attitudes and the Experience of Aggression**

Dovidio et al. (2002) argue that prejudicial attitudes are intentional. In particular, they suggest that prejudicial attitudes are behavioural responses to protect the self-concept from challenge. For instance, Perez, Vohs and Joiner (2005) posit that threats to self-concept are considered as provocative and aggressive behaviour (i.e., intending psychological harm) responses are viewed as a behavioural process to protect the individual’s self-concept. In addition, Malamuth (1988) and Harris (1974) have shown that there is a tendency for both males and females to direct more aggression toward the same-gender target. Nevertheless, research on the experience of aggression by males and females at work has demonstrated that both females and males experience more aggression from males than from females (Ramirez-Melgoza, 2006).

In respect to the experience of aggression at work, we argue that individuals who hold positive prejudicial attitudes towards same-gender members are more likely to experience lesser aggression from same-gender members. This is because they may want to protect same-gender members, and also to preserve their own self-esteem as members of that gender group. In contrast, individuals’ who hold negative prejudicial attitudes towards opposite-gender members are likely to experience higher aggression from the opposite-gender members. This is because such individuals may want to confirm their negative prejudicial attitudes about opposite-gender members. Hence:

**Proposition 3a:** Individuals with positive prejudicial attitudes towards same-gender members are more likely to experience lesser aggressive behaviour from same-gender members.

**Proposition 3b:** Individuals with negative prejudicial attitudes towards opposite-gender members are more likely to experience higher aggressive behaviour from opposite-gender members.
METHOD

To collect our data for this qualitative study, we relied on in-depth interviews. Eder and Harris (1999) indicate that in-depth interviews allow for a conversational approach that provides greater opportunity to consider details, to collect sensitive information, and to gather a large amount of information in one sitting.

Organisational Setting and Sample

Our study was undertaken in a male-dominated workplace, and we employed purposive sampling of male and female employees. Our aim was to explore if our propositions could be found in practice in such an organisation. A male-dominated workforce was selected because previous research shows that women and men employed in male-dominated workplaces are frequently exposed to hostile behaviours (Fielden, Davidson, Gale & Davey, 2000). Specifically, we collected our data in an engineering organisation where males accounted for ninety percent of 1,500 employees.

Following Vaughn & Stamp (2003), twenty employees were short listed (10 females and 10 males) to participate in the in-depth interviews. Interviewees ranged from senior executives to operational staff. Additionally, interviewees’ tenure varied from 3 months to 30 years. Interviews questions were open-ended, focusing on individual gender self-categorisations, emotions, prejudicial attitudes and experience of aggressive behaviour. The interviews lasted between 45 minutes and 3 hours, averaging 1.5 hours (resulting in approximately 650 pages of transcription).

ANALYSIS

Content analysis

We used content analysis to categorise systematically the participants’ responses and descriptions. Content analysis is a technique used to extract desired information from a body of material (usually verbal) by systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics of the material (Holsti, 1969). Specifically, content analysis allows a large body of information to be reduced to a smaller and more manageable form of representation (Smith, 2000). Jehn (1997) notes that analysts, by using content analysis, systematically identify topics and themes, with a view to categorising the material content of transcribed interviews. The coding schemes we adopted for males and females were based on our propositions, as indicated in Table 1.
We employed two independent raters to conduct the data coding and categorising based on the scheme set out in Table 1. The raters coded the transcripts independently and were unaware of the theoretical underpinnings or the purpose of the study. Cohen’s kappa statistic showed 80 percent agreement in the coding between the first author and the two raters across all the coding categories.

Thematic analysis

According to Boyatzis (1998), thematic analysis enables construction of meaning. As such, social facts or observations emerge that identify social phenomena. Subsequently, after finishing the transcript coding, we reviewed the coded textual segments to identify the frequency of the primary/manifest-level themes (reoccurring patterns directly observable in the transcripts, see Klenke, 2008 for a review). Table 2 shows the results of coding for male and female interviewees.

RESULTS

Propositions 1a and 1b

From Table 2, it is clear that males and females in this male-dominated organisation did not differ in their experiences of powerful emotion. While this finding does not lend support to Proposition 1a, which was based on the logic that males tend to be more aggressive than females (Friedman & Ayala, 1991; Dexter, 1985), it is consistent with other recent empirical findings (e.g., Fischer et al., 2004). Moreover, our results also make it clear that the females in our study self-categorised as both females and males. Specifically, all female interviewees self-categorised as females, both at work and outside, while 80% also self-categorised as males. Women who indicated that they self-categorise as males associated their male gender self-categorisation with assertiveness, on the basis that assertiveness assists them to survive in a male-dominated organisation. For example, female participant 9 indicated that “my assertiveness helps me to carry out my daily duties, and, being tough, thus I can stand up for myself”.

In relation to Proposition 1b, our data revealed that, although males and females did not differ in their experiences of fear, they did differ on sadness. Specifically, women (90%) employees
indicated that they experienced fear frequently at work. For example, “my crying is triggered by fear” (F5). But men (84%) also indicated that they frequently experienced fear. For example, “I feel lots of fear” (M2). On the other hand, female and males differed in the way they experienced sadness. For the males, 80% reported sadness compared to 60% of females. For example, a male (M8) indicated that “you become depressed from your sadness”. This is the opposite to Proposition 1b, where we predicted that females would experience more powerless emotions than males.

**Proposition 1c**

We found little male-female differences in the experience of joy, “I feel happy here” (F1) “being happy during the day” (M5). In addition, joy is a result of working with qualified people, a female (F4) expressed that “I enjoy the fact that I work with some very qualified professional people who are good at their jobs”. On the other hand, there were differences in experiences of love/compassion, but only for the females. For example, a female (F5) indicated that “my compassion, my strength, my passion, my empathy, my optimism, helps me survive as a successful female within the organisation. I’m a very caring person”. Thus, our findings support Proposition 1c in respect of love/compassion, but not for joy.

**Propositions 2a and 2b**

Concerning proposition 2a, our analysis indicated that males and females both linked positive emotions with the formation of positive prejudicial attitudes. There were some important gender differences, however. For the males, 80% indicated that powerful and powerless emotions were also associated with positive prejudicial attitudes towards members of their own gender group. For instance, one male (M1) said that “two of the chaps were disappointed, because they were pretty definite that the girls would not be able to fit in the same amount of work and they said, no we should have men here because girls can’t carry their weight”. Conversely, 20% of males indicated that positive emotions were associated with positive prejudicial attitudes towards members of their own gender group; for example, M7 commented “I think is happiness and joy, we are a very happy crowd down there (the mine), it relaxes everyone you know everyone is happy we laugh and we carry on everyone relaxes you can talk about things”.

Similarly, 80% of females indicated that, when they self-categorise as males, powerful and powerless emotions were associated with positive prejudicial attitudes towards members of the same
gender group they identify with (i.e. males). In this respect, one female (F1) remarked, “me personally as a female surviving in the workplace for me to cry will be a sign of weakness mmmm and because a male colleague wouldn’t cry I certainly not going too so that’s me”. On the other hand, all females indicated that, when they self-categorise as females, their positive emotional experiences are associated with positive prejudicial attitudes towards members of the same gender group. The illustration below is an example of females expressing a positive prejudicial attitudes to other females “I, like the lady that I’m working with, who’s training me up, I’ve got a lot of admiration for her, I trust her” (F6). Accordingly, Proposition 2a received mixed support.

Proposition 2b, on the other hand, was fully supported. Females (50%) suggested that, when they self-categorise as males, they show negative prejudicial attitudes towards females as a result of experiencing powerful or powerless emotion. As an illustration, a female who self-categorised as a male (F1) expressed the view that “she was very emotional and I work with extreme calm in this environment and she didn’t want to be working she probably wanted to be at home with the baby”.

When females self-categorise as females, however, they expressed negative prejudicial attitudes towards opposite gender members (males) as a result of experiencing powerful or powerless emotions. For instance, F2 indicated that, when she self-categorises as a female, her powerful emotion is associated with negative prejudicial attitude towards males: “I thought oh, I’ve got to be one of the boys, but not at all I’m a woman and I think there’s a lot of women in this organisation that try to masculinise themselves, mmmm, I don’t even know the word, become more masculine in their behaviour. Um, and that’s not necessary”.

In the same vein, men (70%) expressed negative prejudicial attitudes towards members of the opposite group as a result of their powerful or powerless emotional experiences. For example, M8 remarked, “I don’t know if it’s actually a personal dislike or just a dislike from, like I said before, the fact that their (females) work’s not up to scratch”.

Propositions 3a and 3b

Consistent with Proposition 3a, females (70%) who self-categorised as males experienced lesser aggressive behaviour from males. For example, F5 suggested that “I look a bit like a man, I would prefer to wear pants to work than walk around in a skirt, – I really think that that does influence behaviour”. Similarly, men (20%) who held positive prejudicial attitudes towards males
experienced lesser aggressive behaviour from males. For instance, M3 stated that “they can stir me over and over and I don’t care, no one has mess with my personal life”

With respect to Proposition 3b, our analysis indicated that the males (50%) who held negative prejudicial attitudes towards females did not experience higher levels of aggressive behaviour from them. On the other hand, the female interviewees (70%) who held negative prejudicial attitudes towards males experienced high levels of aggressive behaviour from men. F4 provided this example: “I have a male colleague that abused me over the phone and I was in the company of others”. On the basis of these results, we concluded that Proposition 3b was supported only in the case of females.

DISCUSSION

In summary, results from our data analyses were consistent with Propositions 2b and 3a, mixed in respect of Propositions 1c, 2a, and 3b, and not consistent with Propositions 1a or 1b. We discuss these results in more detail next.

Supported propositions: 2b and 3a

Proposition 2b. Our data were consistent with the idea that males’ and females’ experiences of powerful and powerless emotions lead them to form negative prejudicial attitudes toward members of the opposite gender group. This substantiates previous work by Diamond and Aspinwall (2003), who explored the role of women’s negative emotion and their prejudicial attitudes towards males. Our results also support the work of Cross and Bagilhole (2002), who explored the role men’s negative emotion and their prejudicial attitudes towards females.

Proposition 3a. We also found that interviewees with positive prejudicial attitudes towards same-gender members were more likely to experience lesser aggressive behaviour from same-gender members. This is in accord with Engen, Leeden, and Willemsen (2001), who reported that females who self categorise as males may consider that aggressive behaviour is a characteristic of a masculine organisation, and that they must accept this as part of admission into the organisation and for acceptance as co-workers. In the instance of males, their lessened experience of aggressive behaviour from males may be associated with propinquity (or closeness, see Hodson, Dovidio & Esses, 2003). For instance, propinquity among male co-workers may lead to a culture of honour in the organisation, despite the fact that day-to-day interactions are often aggressive (Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle & Schwartz,
As a result of this culture, aggressive behaviour may tend to become the norm for interactions with co-workers (O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin & Glew, 1996).

**Mixed support: Propositions 1c, 2a, 3b**

**Proposition 1c.** We anticipated that interviewees who self-categorised as females would experience positive emotions more often than those who self-categorised as males. This was not supported in the instance of joy, but was for love/compassion. This finding is in accord with Stoppard and Gunn Gruchy (1993), who concluded that this is because, with love and compassion, women seek to maintain relationships, to care for others, and to express solidarity and support.

**Proposition 2a.** We expected that experience of positive emotions would lead to consistent prejudicial attitudes toward males’ and females’ own gender groups. While we found this to be so, we also found similar affects for powerful and powerless negative emotions. This may be the outcome of aversive sexism (Melgoza & Wolfram Cox, in press). These authors suggest that, in ambiguous conditions, aversive sexists may display greater negative feelings towards similar gender members than towards opposite gender members in order to show pro in-group sentiments and to avoid wrong-doing and even deny in-group favouritism.

**Proposition 3b.** Here, we anticipated that interviewees with negative prejudicial attitudes towards opposite-gender members would experience higher aggressive behaviour from opposite-gender members. This was supported only in the instance of females. One explanation for the lack of this effect for males could be that women do not tend to be aggressive in the presence of male co-workers because such behaviour could have implications for their well being and career path in the organisation (see Engen et al., 2001).

**Not supported: Propositions 1a and 1b**

In these propositions, we anticipated that interviewees who self-categorised as males (females) would experience powerful (powerless) emotions more often than individuals who self-categorise as females (males). We found in our analysis that males and females only differed in their experience of sadness. They did not differ in their experience of powerful and powerless emotion. One explanation for this finding may be that high masculinity in female co-workers in male-dominated workplaces is associated with lower scores of anxiety (which is under the cluster of fear, see Lazarus, 1992) and strain as these leads to greater problem-solving skills (Long, 1989). Alternatively, consistent with our
findings that females’ self-categorize as both males and females, this may be indicative that male and female emotional sex roles are becoming increasingly blurred on today’s organisations.

**Limitations and recommendations for future research**

The results of this study are limited to the male and female participants of a male-dominated manufacturing organisation, and so should be generalised only with care to other male-dominated organisations (police force) or to female-dominated organisations (e.g., primary schools). Clearly, additional research is recommended within these organisations to see if the frameworks developed in our study are transferable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Implications for theory and practice**

While some of our propositions were supported, others were not. Interestingly, we found that males’ and females’ experiences of powerful and powerless emotions were associated with positive prejudicial attitudes. Our results also provide evidence that experiences of aggressive behaviour result from prejudicial attitudes. Moreover, our results support the idea that emotional gender roles are becoming blurred in a workplace dominated by males. In effect, it would seem traditional stereotypes about male and female emotional gender roles in a male-dominated workplace are changing.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Our aim in this study was to explore empirically, in a male-dominated workforce, the role gender self-categorisations and emotion on the link between prejudicial attitudes and experiences of aggressive behaviour. To achieve this aim, we adopted a qualitative approach and collected interview data to see if we could find evidence to support a series of propositions based on the extant literature. Our results were mixed. We confirmed that experience of powerful and powerless emotions leads to negative prejudicial attitudes toward members of the opposite gender group, and that positive prejudicial attitudes towards same-gender members led to less aggressive behaviour from same-gender members. But we also found that powerful and powerless negative emotions can have contrary effects that we suggested may result from aversive sexism (Melgoza & Wolfram Cox, in press). Finally we found that, while males and females differed in their experience of sadness, they did not in general differ in their experience of other powerful or powerless negative emotions. This was an unexpected result that suggests that male and female emotional gender roles in a male-dominated workplace are becoming increasingly blurred. Future research to test this idea more rigorously is clearly warranted.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code 1 related to propositions 1a, 1b and 1c</td>
<td>Individual gender self-categorisations</td>
<td>Describes if individuals self-categorise as males or females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 1.1</td>
<td>Individual emotional experiences</td>
<td>Describes emotions experienced by males or females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 1.2</td>
<td>Individual gender self-categorisation and emotional experiences</td>
<td>Describes individual gender self-categorisations and differences with experience of emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 2 related to proposition 2a</td>
<td>Positive prejudicial attitudes</td>
<td>Describes positive prejudicial attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 2.1</td>
<td>Emotion and positive prejudicial attitudes</td>
<td>States associations between individuals’ emotional experiences and positive prejudicial attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 2.1.1 related to proposition 3a</td>
<td>Positive prejudicial attitudes and lesser experiences of aggressive behaviour</td>
<td>Describes associations between positive prejudicial attitudes and lesser experiences of aggressive behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 3 related to proposition 2b</td>
<td>Negative prejudicial attitudes</td>
<td>Describes positive prejudicial attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 3.1</td>
<td>Emotion and positive prejudicial attitudes</td>
<td>States associations between individuals’ emotional experiences and negative prejudicial attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 3.1.1 related to proposition 3b</td>
<td>Negative prejudicial attitudes and experience of aggressive behaviour</td>
<td>Describes associations between negative prejudicial attitudes and experiences of aggressive behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Coding themes between males and females and frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Female self-categorisation (0, 80%)</th>
<th>Male self-categorisation (100%, 80%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 1.1 &amp; 1.2*</td>
<td>Female self-categorisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80%, 100%)</td>
<td>(40%, 30%)</td>
<td>(40%, 80%)</td>
<td>(10%, 10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 1.1 &amp; 1.2*</td>
<td>Love/compassion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20%, 60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20%, 40%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30%, 20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20%, 30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 2.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work</td>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Direct Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50%, 70%)</td>
<td>(30%, 60%)</td>
<td>(30%, 50%)</td>
<td>(20%, 20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50%, 60%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20%, 20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20%, 20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 80%)</td>
<td>(0, 30%)</td>
<td>(10%, 20%)</td>
<td>(40%, 30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 3.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabotage colleagues’ work (0, 20%)</td>
<td>Hostile remarks (20%, 30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0, 20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0, 20%)</td>
<td>(20%, 30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Note: Figures in parentheses represent percentage of frequencies of male and female responses, respectively. *The numbers in parenthesis also indicate the gender differences with experience of emotion.