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Abstract

This study examined the effect of individual differences, charismatic leadership and psychological empowerment on workplace aggression in Hong Kong. Participants were 145 full-time Hong Kong Chinese employees from range of organizations and professions. Hierarchical regression analysis results revealed that individual differences predicted 84% and charismatic leadership predicted 1.2% of workplace aggression. Results indicated trait anger and attitude toward revenge were positively related to workplace aggression, and charismatic leadership was positively related psychological empowerment. Preacher & Hayes’ (2008) bootstrap resampling approach in SPSS confirmed mediating effect of psychological empowerment in explaining the relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression.
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1. Introduction

Wherever people interact, there was the potential for anger and conflict. Workplace aggression had been one of the organizational problems in many countries (Chappell & Di Martino, 2006). Previous research showed that not all workers had been sharing the same risk of aggression at work (Budd, 2001). In England, a crime survey was conducted in 2002 and 2003 showed that about 376,000 employees had experienced at least one instance of violence at work. Moreover, the results also revealed that law enforcers were at high risk of workplace aggression (Upson, 2004). In the United States, a survey of workplace violence was conducted by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) in 2005 showed that violence had been occurred in half of reported organizations. In particular, 39.7% of the reported organization in the manufacturing industries had been experienced more violence (NIOSH, 2006).

Workplace aggression had been gaining worldwide concern including Hong Kong society. During July 2006 and August 2006, a cross-sectional survey of workplace violence was conducted by City University of Hong Kong for The Occupational Safety and Health Council (OSHC). The study revealed that workplace aggression was taken place mainly in verbal form, and in minor physical or behavioral aggression. In the government sector, 41.7% of the organizations reported that their staffs had been sworn or shouted at by other staffs, and 27.1% indicated that language or
behavioral threatening from other staffs had been experienced by their staffs. 25.7% reported that their staffs had experienced verbal or written threats. In the private/non-government sector, staffs being sworn or shouted was most commonly occurred, counted more than 29% of the organizations. Besides, 13% indicated that shoving or pushing were occurred. More than 12% reported that verbal or written threats were occurred among their staffs (OSHC, 2010). It was demonstrated that workplace aggression had ruined staff relationships, increased administrative cost (Laab, 1999), reduced productivity, and lowered staff morale and job satisfaction (Atkinson, 2000; Laab, 1999). Workplace aggression had been continued to be a significant and prevalent organizational problem. It aroused a growing number of researches to explore the effects of potential causes on workplace aggression in order to seek promotion of organizational training and development, and to shape a harmonious, aggression-free working environment.

1.1 Literature Review

1.1.1 Workplace aggression

bullying/mobbing, sexual and racial harassment, and psychological stress”. According to Bandura (1972), aggression was “injurious and destructive behavior that was socially defined as aggressive”. Cardy (1992) specified “workplace aggression as behaviors that an employee encountered in the course of his or her work that had adverse physical or psychological effects on the employee”. O’Leary-Kelly et al. (1996) defined workplace aggression as “attempted injurious or destructive behavior initiated by either an organizational insider or outsider that was instigated by some factor in the organizational context”. Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh and Kessler (2006) defined counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB) broadly as “intentional behavior that harmed or intended to harm organizations and its members”. Some researches combined different types of CWB into one type of measure (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Hepworth & Towler, 2004; Martinko, Gundlach & Douglas, 2002). On the other hand, some researches distinguished CWB into two levels: organizational and interpersonal (Robinson and Benett, 1995; Yang and Diefendorff, 2009). According to Robinson and Benett (1995), organizational counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB-O) referred to CWB that were targeted to organization while interpersonal counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB-I) referred to CWB that were targeted at coworkers, supervisors and subordinates in the organization. In addition, some researches focused on a single, narrowly defined CWB such as absence, theft, sabotage, etc. respectively (Greenberg, 2002; John, 1997; Laab, 1999). In the
current study, workplace aggression was defined as one of the CWB dimensions introduced by Spector et al. (2006), i.e., abuse behaviors, which referred to repulsive and harmful behaviors to other people.

Considerations had been taken regarding the measurement of workplace aggression in the current study. “CWB might been taken different manifestations depending on the constraints of the situation” (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Spector et al., 2006; Yang & Diefendorff, 2009). In determining the time period of measuring workplace aggression, according to Einarsen and Skigstad (1996) behaviors that had been taken place within the last six months were defined as “bullying”. On the other hand, for the purpose of study Bennett & Robinson (2000) developed a two-factor measurement included a 19-item scale of organizational and interpersonal deviance. Spector et al. (2006) also developed Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C) of 45 items in their study, and identified five subscales, “abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal”. Yang & Diefendorff (2009) developed a set of 23-items scale derived from existing scales that were applicable in Hong Kong. When the CWB items were developed in the current study, references from the survey of workplace violence in Hong Kong conducted in 2006 (OSHC, 2010) were taken, in which the most happened types of workplace aggressive behavior included physical, verbal or written threats, verbal insult and physical assault, etc. All these aspects were covered by the abuse subscale of CWB-C. According to Spector et al. (2006), abuse
consisted of harmful or repulsive behaviors, physically or verbally types of threats, or sabotage the person’s ability to work effectively, e.g. item 20, “insulted someone about their job performance”; item 35, “threatened someone at work with violence”; item 36, “threatened someone at work, but not physically”, etc. Participants were asked to report on a 5-point frequency scale, i.e., never, once in a while, sometimes, fairly often and every day. This provided systematic studies in assessing the aggressive behavior in its social context. Therefore, abuse subscale of CWB-C was recruited in the current study to measure workplace aggression in Hong Kong.

1.1.2 Individual Differences

Although workplace aggression might be seemed to happen at random, there were often patterns that indicated when aggressive reactions were imminent. Previous studies suggested that both “dispositional and situational factors” were important in predicting workplace aggression (Hershcovis et al., 2004; Yang and Diefendorff, 2009). Whenever people were interacting with each other, their judgments tended to attribute it to dispositional or situational causes. Aggression was a “byproduct of both dispositional and situational variables” (Spector et al., 2006).

Dispositional attribution referred to internal dispositions like his personality, beliefs, attitude, etc. Situational attribution referred to external influence from the environment or culture (Kelley, 1967). A person’s behavior was affected by internal dispositions and situational influences. Previous researches consistently reported
dispositional factors were important in predicting workplace aggression (Aquino & Douglas, 2003; Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Hepworth & Towler, 2004). Douglas and Martinko (2001) reported individual differences counted for 60% of the variance in workplace aggression, including trait anger (Spielberger, 1996), negative affectivity (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), attitude toward revenge (Stuckless & Goranson, 1992), self-control, attributional style (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Hepworth & Towler, 2004), etc. Three factors, trait anger, negative affectivity and attitude toward revenge were included in the current study.

Speilberger (1996) identified two types of anger, state anger and trait anger. Trait anger was considered as a stable personality trait. It was described as where a person experienced frequent anger with varied intensity and was often accompanied by negative emotions such as irritation, hate, and disgust (Buss, 1961). Douglas and Martinko (2001), Hepworth and Towler (2004) and Hershcovis et al. (2004) reported “trait anger was significant predictor of workplace aggression”.

Negative affectivity was one of the individual differences variable that involved the experience of negative emotions and poor self-concept. A variety of negative emotions were subsumed in negative affectivity, including distressed, upset, hostile, irritable, guilt, fear, nervousness, etc (Aquino & Douglas, 2003; Watson et al., 1988). Participants who expressed higher negative affectivity were tended to be more pessimistic and perceived the world in a more negative term. Hepworth and Towler
(2004) reported negative affectivity was significant predictor of psychological empowerment. Martinko and Zellars (1998) suggested that negative affectivity was positively related to workplace aggression.

Revenge had been explicitly linked with aggression (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Greenberg, 2002; Stuckless & Goranson, 1992). According to Stuckless and Goranson (1992), “vengeance could be a strong motivation for aggressive and violent behavior”. Greenberg (2002) found that participants whom perceived themselves being abused by the company, they were more likely to engage in CWB such as shoplifting. Participants who perceived that the company was injustice and treated them unfairly, they were more likely to engage in aggressive behavior (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999).

Douglas and Martinko (2001) reported attitude toward revenge was also a significant predictor of workplace aggression.

1.1.3 Psychological Empowerment and Charismatic Leadership

Situational factor referred to “aspects of the social context that were perceived by people and were largely influenced by the other member of the organization” (Martinko, Gundlach, & Douglas, 2002). Negative emotions were brought up by some organizational circumstances, e.g. job performance, unfairness, injustice, etc (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Negative emotion were tended to increase the likelihood of CWB (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). This emotion-centered concept was highly related to the concept of psychological empowerment, which was defined as a “motivational
concept composed of four dimensions: meaning, choice, competence and impact” (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer, Kizilos & Nason, 1997). According to Spreitzer (2008), it was “a cognitive state characterized by a sense of perceived control, perceptions of competence, and internalization of the goals and objectives of the organization” (Spreitzer et al., 1997). When situational demands were met, the person experienced the sense of empowerment, in which the feeling of competence, power and control, as well as enhanced feelings of self-efficacy were perceived (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). In the organizational context, attitudes and beliefs of the employees were expected to be in agreement with the organization's mission and objectives. Leader was therefore considered to be an essential character in keeping both parties on track. Organizational transformation was typically thought to be provided by leadership such as “visionary, charismatic and inspirational leadership” (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999). Psychological empowerment had been linked to charismatic leadership (Howell & Frost, 1989; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Staffs were energized by charismatic leadership to participate in the process of organizational transformation (Lichtenstein, Uhl-Bien, Marion, Seers, Orton & Schreiber, 2006). Leadership shaped organizational norms and culture, which supported or inhibited abuse behaviors (Fox et al., 2001; O’Leary-Kelly et al., 1996). Hepworth and Towler (2004) reported that charismatic leadership was negatively related to workplace aggression and “counted for 3% of the variance in workplace aggression after controlling individual
differences”. Hepworth and Towler (2004) reported that there was a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and psychological empowerment. They also indicated that there was partial mediating effect of psychological empowerment between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression (Hepworth and Towler, 2004).

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of current study was to replicate Hepworth and Towler’s (2004) study to explore the effects of individual differences, charismatic leadership and psychological empowerment on workplace aggression in Hong Kong. While footsteps of Douglas and Martinko (2001) and Hepworth and Towler (2004) were followed in studying the relationship these factors, the scope of workplace aggression was focused on abuse behaviors which was one of the CWB dimensions introduced by Spector et al. (2006). This study was seek to better understand workplace aggressive behaviors by conducting the similar measurement administered in Hepworth and Towler (2004) and tested within Hong Kong Chinese context. It was believed that trait anger, negative affectivity and attitude towards anger were stable predispositions in predicting aggressive behaviors. Using the hierarchical regression analysis, this study was interested in investigating the association that each factor accounted for the variance in workplace aggression. It was also interested in exploring the effect of leadership style on workplace aggression. In particular, one situational factor was
focused, i.e. charismatic leadership, and was examined its relationship with workplace aggression. By establishing the mediating effect of psychological empowerment in relation to charismatic leadership and workplace aggression, it was believed that the charismatic leader improved staff’s motivation at work as well as perception to the organization, and eventually reduced the likelihood of staff’s engagement in aggressive behavior within the organization.

1.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses

Based on literature review, the study aimed at examining three research questions:

(a) What were the effects of individual differences on workplace aggression? (b) What were the effects of charismatic leadership on workplace aggression? (c) Was there mediating effect of psychological empowerment in explaining the relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression?

Series of hypotheses were proposed:

**RQ1: What were the effects of individual differences on workplace aggression?**

**H1:** Trait anger, negative affectivity and attitude toward revenge would be positively related to workplace aggression.

**RQ2: What were the effects of charismatic leadership on workplace aggression?**

**H2:** After controlling for individual differences, charismatic leadership would be negatively related to workplace aggression.

**RQ3: Was there mediating effect of psychological empowerment in explaining**
relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression?

H3: After controlling for individual differences and charismatic leadership, psychological empowerment would be negatively related to workplace aggression.

H4: After controlling for individual differences, charismatic leadership would be positively related to psychological empowerment.

H5: Psychological empowerment would mediate the relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression.

Figure 1. Illustration of the Research Model.
2. Methodology

2.1 Participants

186 acquaintances, colleagues and classmates of the researcher, from range of organizations and professions were invited to participate in the research. They were invited through email or Facebook (invitation application and private message) to complete a questionnaire over three months period from December 2013 to February 2014. 152 questionnaires were completed and returned. Those incomplete questionnaires with missing data were excluded, resulting in a final sample size of 145, of which 69 (47.6%) were male and 76 (52.4%) were female. The mean age was 38.89 (SD=8.10, ranging from 23 to 63 year). All participants were Hong Kong resident, and of which most of them (91%) were bachelor degree or higher. 25 (17.2%) were non-management, 55 (37.9%) were junior management, 44 (30.3%) were middle management and 21 (14.5%) were senior management. 23 (15.9%) of the participants worked less than one year in the company, 40 (27.6%) worked 1 to 3 years, 51 (35.2%) worked 4 to 6 years, 21 (14.5%) worked 7 to 9 years and 10 (6.9%) worked more than 10 years in the company. They all worked full time under Hong Kong employment contract, passed probation and were permanent employees whom enjoyed full company welfare. The participants were informed the objectives, rights and consent about this research.

2.2 Measures
Workplace aggression. The 17-item abuse subscale of Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C), (Spector et al., 2006) were used to indicate how often abuse aggressive behavior at work had done by participants (1 = never to 5 = every day). The coefficient alpha was .962.

Charismatic leadership perception. Based on Hepworth and Towler (2004), 12-item The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X/Short Form), (Bass & Avolio, 1995) with three 4-item subscales, Attributed Charisma (AC), Idealized Influence (II) and Inspirational Motivation (IM) were used as measures of charisma leadership perception (1 = never to 5 = almost every time). The coefficient alpha was .909.

Trait anger. The State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI-2) was introduced a measure of the frequency of anger feelings over time and the control of suppressed anger (Speilberger, 1996). The 10-item trait anger subscale of STAXI-2 were included to measure trait anger, with higher scores indicated higher trait anger (1 = almost never to 4 = almost always). The coefficient alpha was .954.

Negative affectivity. 4 items of negative affectivity subscale from the short form of Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS-SF) (Watson et al., 1988) were selected, i.e., distressed, upset, hostile irritable, to indicate the level of the negative effect of participants. With higher scores indicated higher levels of negative affect (1
= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). These items were more relevant to measure the workplace aggressive behavior in Hong Kong. The coefficient alpha was .912.

**Attitude towards revenge.** 8 items from Vengeance Scale (Stuckless and Goranson, 1992) were included to measure participants’ attitude toward revenge, with higher scores indicated more positive attitude toward revenge (1 = strong disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Item 4, 5 and 7 were reversed code items. The coefficient alpha was .925.

**Psychological empowerment.** The 12-item Psychological Empowerment Scale (PES), (Spreitzer, 1995) were used to assess psychological empowerment (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The coefficient alpha was .929.

2.3 Translation of the questionnaire to Traditional Chinese version

Total of 63 items, including 10 items of trait anger subscale of the STAXI-2, 4 items of negative affectivity subscale of the PANAS-SF, 8 items from Vengence Scale, 12 items of Attribution Charisma (AC), Idealized Influence (II) and Inspirational Motivation (IM) subscale of the MLQ-5X/Short Form, 17 items of abuse subscale of the CWB-C, and 12 items of the PES, were translated into Traditional Chinese version. Three of the researcher’s acquaintances, being Hong Kong Chinese who were fluent in English and native Chinese speakers, were each responsible for each of the three steps of translating the scales to Chinese, back-translating them to English, and reviewing the outcome. Another researcher’s acquaintance, being a Hong Kong Chinese and
English teacher who was fluent in English and native Chinese speaker, was invited to perform the back-translation independently. Advice of Geisinger (2003) was taken and a conference was conducted with all the four acquaintances to improve on the outcome. A pilot test was conducted to obtain feedback before the Traditional Chinese version was finalized. The essence of meaning, conciseness, comprehensibility, and the proper Chinese sentence structure and the way of expression were taken for arriving at the final version. The list of questionnaire items were displayed in Appendix 2, and the finalized full questionnaire in Traditional Chinese version was shown in Appendix 1.

2.4 Pilot Test

Five of the researcher’s acquaintances were invited by email to undertake a pilot test which was given the same setting as the actual research questionnaires. After completion participants were contacted verbally by mobile phone to record the actual time taken to complete the questionnaire and feedbacks concerning any ambiguous terms and questions. Missing words and typo errors were reported and corrected at the final questionnaire.

2.5 Procedures

The finalized questionnaire was sent by the internet in order to collect as much data as possible. Participants were invited by emails or Facebook private messages to complete a questionnaire. When the file attached in the email was opened, a letter of
consent (Appendix 1) was presented on the first page before proceeded to the questionnaire. After the questionnaire was completed, it was returned to the researcher by email or Facebook private message. The data was input into excel files for further SPSS analysis.

2.6 Statistical Analysis

The data collected was coded or recoded all reverse scored items, and the bivariate correlation was examined to study the relationships between individual differences, charismatic leadership and workplace aggression. A series of hierarchical regression analyses were adopted to estimate the model. The five control variables were entered in the first stage, three individual differences variables in the second stage, charismatic leadership in the third stage and psychological empowerment in the fourth stage. Finally, mediation analyses were tested using Preacher and Hayes’ (2008) bootstrap resampling approach in SPSS to test the indirect effect of charismatic leadership on workplace aggression via psychological empowerment.

Control Variables. Some researches revealed no relationship between demographic factors and workplace aggression (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Hepworth & Towler, 2004). On the other hand, other researches indicated that gender (Stuckless & Goranson, 1992), age (Aquino & Douglas, 2003), education (Chappell & Di Martino, 2006), tenure (Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998) and hierarchical status
(Aquino, Tripp & Bies, 2001) were associated with workplace aggression. These five factors were controlled in our study.
3. Results

Regarding to the sample data, there were 152 participants originally. However, after checking each of them, seven participants’ data were ruled out due to missing data. As a result the total sample size was 145 with 69 male and 76 female aged from 23 to 63. Most of the participants were in the age of 31 to 40 (53.1%) and were holder of bachelor degree (84.1%), who worked as junior management level (37.9%) and mostly had been working 4 to 6 years in the company (37.2%). Demographic profile of the sample was shown in Table 1.

Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlation coefficients between variables were contained in Table 2. These results showed the bivariate correlations between workplace aggression and trait anger, negative affectivity, attitude towards revenge, charismatic leadership and psychological empowerment, which were in the expected direction and significantly correlated.
Table 1  
**Demographic Profile of the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or below</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague or Bachelor degree</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-management level</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior management</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N=145.
Table 2  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-Order Correlations Between Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Aggression</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait anger</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>-.61*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affectivity</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>-.65*</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward revenge</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>-.79*</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.68*</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>-.61*</td>
<td>-.79*</td>
<td>-.79*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical status</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05. ** p < .01, two-tailed tests.

Note. N=145.
Table 3

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for the Workplace Aggression on Individual Differences, Charismatic Leadership and Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical status</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait anger</td>
<td></td>
<td>.410***</td>
<td>.302***</td>
<td>.599***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affectivity</td>
<td>-.156**</td>
<td>-.095*</td>
<td>-.406***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward revenge</td>
<td>.731***</td>
<td>.923***</td>
<td>.761***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.196***</td>
<td>.372***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.387***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.920***</td>
<td>.932***</td>
<td>.942***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.841***</td>
<td>.012***</td>
<td>.009***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=145. Entries were standardized betas.
* p < .05.    ** p < .01.   *** p < .001.

Results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis were indicated in Table 3.

In Step 1, the controlled demographic variables were entered (i.e., gender, age, education level, tenure and hierarchical status). Step 2, the individual differences variables were entered (i.e., trait anger, negative affectivity and attitude toward revenge). Step 3, the charismatic leadership variable were entered and in Step 4, the psychological empowerment variable were entered. Regression analyses in this study revealed no significant relationship among demographic variables and workplace
aggressive behavior, i.e., gender, age, education level, tenure, hierarchical status, These results were consistent with previous studies in which no significant effects of demographic variables on workplace aggressive behavior was found (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Hepworth & Towler, 2004). These variables were being excluded from analyses in the study conducted by Hepworth and Towler (2004).

3.1 The Effects of Individual Differences, Charismatic Leadership and Psychological Empowerment on Workplace Aggression

The results shown in Table 3 indicated that the effects of trait anger and attitude toward revenge were in the hypothesized direction and significant (p < .001). In supporting H1, individual differences were significantly predicted workplace aggression, and counted for 84.1% (p < .001) of the variance in workplace aggression. In particular, trait anger (β = .41) and attitude toward revenge (β = .73) were significant predictors of workplace aggression. Although negative affectivity was also found significant (p < .01), it contributed less in predicting workplace aggression behavior (β = -.16). These results suggested that individual differences were related to workplace aggression. Participants who displayed higher level of trait anger and attitude toward revenge were higher tendency in engaging workplace aggressive behavior.

H2, which hypothesized that charismatic leadership was negatively related to workplace aggression after controlling individual differences, was not supported by
the results shown in Table 3. In this study, charismatic leadership (β = .20) was positively related to workplace aggression and was counted for an additional 1.2% (p < .001) of the variance in workplace aggression after controlling trait anger, negative affectivity and attitude toward revenge. On the other hand, H3 which stated that psychological empowerment was negatively related to workplace aggression after controlling individual differences and charismatic leadership, was supported by the results shown in Table 3. Psychological empowerment (β = -.39) was negatively related to workplace aggression and counted for an additional .9% (p < .001) of the variance in workplace aggression after controlling individual differences and charismatic leadership. Lastly, the results shown in Table 4 supported H4, which stated that charismatic leadership was positively related to psychological empowerment after controlling individual differences. Charismatic leadership (β = .46) was found positively related to psychological empowerment in the current study, and counted for an additional 6.5% (p < .001) in psychological empowerment after controlling individual differences.
Table 4

Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for the Psychological Empowerment on Individual Differences and Charismatic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Psychological Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical status</td>
<td>.103**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait anger</td>
<td>.767**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affectivity</td>
<td>-.806**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward revenge</td>
<td>-.420***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
<td>.455***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.937***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.065***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=145. Entries were standardized betas.
* p < .05.  ** p < .01.  *** p < .001.

Figure 2. Illustration of a Hypothesized Mediation Model. Charismatic Leadership Affects Workplace Aggression Indirectly Through Psychological Empowerment.
3.2 Mediation model

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess three components of the hypothesized mediation model, i.e., charismatic leadership, psychological empowerment and workplace aggression (Figure 2). First, it was found that charismatic leadership was negatively associated with workplace aggression ($B = -0.70$, $t (145) = -10.07, p = .001$). Secondly, it was found that charismatic leadership was positively related to psychological empowerment ($B = 1.11$, $t (145) = 21.31, p = .001$). Lastly, results indicated that the mediator, psychological empowerment, was negatively associated with workplace aggression ($B = -0.42$, $t (145) = -4.00, p = .001$). A-path and b-path were significant. The bootstrapping method and bias-corrected confidence estimates were used to test the mediation effect (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004; Preacher & Hayes, 2004). “95% confidence interval of the indirect effects was obtained with 5000 bootstrap resamples” (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). The macros also provided all the output needed to assess mediation under the criteria suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986), that the “coefficients on the independent variables in each of these models must be significant in order for mediation to occur. Besides, the coefficient on the independent variable was smaller when paired with the mediator than when it was the sole independent variable”. The results confirmed the mediating effect of psychological empowerment in the relation between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression ($B = -0.47; CI = -0.69 to -0.22$). This suggested that
the indirect effect of charismatic leadership on workplace aggression via psychological empowerment was significantly different from zero. In addition, the results indicated that the direct effect of charismatic leadership on workplace aggression became non-significant (B = -.23, t (145) = -1.69, p = .09) when psychological empowerment was controlled, and thus suggested full mediation. As a result, H5 was supported. The results were displayed in Figure 3.

![Mediation Model](image)

*Figure 3. Mediation Model of Charismatic Leadership Affects Workplace Aggression Indirectly Through Psychological Empowerment.*

*Note. * p < .05.  *** p < .001.*
4. Discussion and Conclusions

4.1 Discussion

The purpose of current study was to explore the effects of individual differences and charismatic leadership on workplace aggression in Hong Kong. In addition, the study conducted by Hepworth and Towler (2004) was replicated through examining the mediating effect of psychological empowerment in explaining the relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression. In addressing these issues, three research questions were examined: (a) What were the effects of individual differences on workplace aggression? (b) What were the effects of charismatic leadership on workplace aggression? (c) Was there mediating effect of psychological empowerment in explaining the relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression?

The results provided full support for H1, H3, H4 and H5, but no support for H2. In general, the results indicated that the individual differences variables selected for this study, i.e. trait anger, negative affectivity, attitude toward revenge, counted for 84.1% of the variance in workplace aggression. This supported the previous studies which was suggested that individual differences were important in predicting workplace aggression (Aquino & Douglas, 2003; Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Hepworth & Towler, 2004; Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998). In particular, trait anger and attitude toward revenge were related to workplace aggression. The positive
relationship between trait anger and workplace aggression in this study also confirmed the previous studies, that participants who were “predisposed to experience anger” were more likely to engage aggressive behavior in workplace (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Hershcovis et al., 2007; Hepworth & Towler, 2004). It was also found that participants reported higher scores in attitude toward revenge were tended to report higher frequency of aggressive behavior at work. However, the positive relationship between negative affectivity and workplace aggression was not found, which was similar to the results of Hepworth and Towler (2004), and Douglas and Martinko (2001). Besides, the positive relationship between charismatic leadership and psychological empowerment after controlling individual differences, supported the results in Hepworth and Towler (2004).

It was failed to confirm a negative relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression in this study, thus the results in Hepworth and Towler’s (2004) study was not supported. Possible explanation to this could be the problem of the measurement itself, which was not considered how perception might change across leaders. The perception of only one target leader from each participant was measured, but the process of shaping perception could be stimulated by another leader (Hall & Lord, 1995). Another explanation was the differentiate approach that participants adopted in evaluating charismatic leadership perception. Lord and Maher (1993, cited in Awamleh and Gardner, 1999) introduced the concept of “recognition”
and “inferential” approaches. Participants might rely more on the recognition approach in evaluating leaders due to its convenience and less effort in recalling short-term memory. Besides, Holladay and Coombs (1993) confirmed that ability of delivery was related to leader’s communication, and was a strong predictor of perceived leader charisma, effectiveness and organizational performance. Different evaluation approaches were not measured or controlled in the study. Further research might be focused on distinguishing target or stimulated leader, and explored charismatic leadership evaluation approaches. On the other hand, it was found that after individual differences was controlled, charismatic leadership were counted for only 1.2% of the variance in workplace aggression. This results was similar to the 3% variation for charismatic leadership in the study of Hepworth and Towler (2004), which was relatively small compared to 84.1% for individual differences in this study. Although it was argued that important variable could also be explained by small effect size (McCartney & Rosenthal, 2000), these results should be conservatively interpreted. The significance of charismatic leadership in predicting workplace aggression was remained in question due to low effect size. Further research could focus on exploring the effect size of charismatic leadership in workplace aggression.

The mediating effect of psychological empowerment was examined in explaining the relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression. In current study, the SPSS procedure introduced by Preacher and Hayes (2008) was adopted in
testing the mediation model, 95% confidence interval of the indirect effects was obtained with 5000 bootstrap resamples. The finding confirmed the mediating effect of psychological empowerment as well as the results in Hepworth and Towler’s (2004) study. Enhanced the feelings of self-efficacy or perceived competence promoted employees’ commitment, job involvement and positive organizational behavior. It mediated the relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression.

4.2 Limitations and Future Studies

Some limitations of the current study should be noted. Firstly, the questionnaire was translated into Traditional Chinese version, validity test including concurrent validity and convergent validity were recommended for in-depth investigation. Secondly, participants were asked to make subjective estimates of the frequency of abuse behavior in the workplace and personal attitude towards anger and hostility, some other objective measures should be supplemented to improve the validation of the data. Thirdly, the convenient sampling method by inviting acquaintances to join the survey through the invitation by online platform might introduce potential sampling biases that the generalization of the findings was restricted. For example, 85.5% of participants were aged from 31 to 50 years, and 84.1% were educated to bachelor degree. Another problem of the current sampling method, that participants from a wide range of occupational sector were invited in the current study, whereas Douglas and Martinko’s (2001) participants were specified into two organizations, i.e.,
transportation company and public school. Lichtenstein et al., (2006) argued that leadership perception was a “dynamic concept and product of interaction between people”, that “work atmosphere” within the organization resulted in varying employees’ perception of their leaders and organization procedures. Different occupational setting might vary the effects of individual differences as well as workplace aggression (Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, & Pereira, 2002). According to US NIOSH (2006), “workplace violence was not distributed randomly across all workplaces but was clustered in particular occupational settings”. It might be worthwhile to consider exploring the effects of specific types of occupational sector on workplace aggression in the future. The role of charismatic leadership in explaining workplace aggression should be further examined in particularly the size effect. In addition, the scope of workplace aggression in the current study was relatively limited. The full spectrum of CWB-C introduced by Spector et al. (2006) was not adopted in the measure. Moreover, interpersonal or organizational factor were not included, nor other potential situational factors that affected workplace aggression behaviors. For example, Hershcovis et al., (2007) studied the individual and situational predictors of interpersonal and organizational aggression, in particularly identified “interpersonal injustice and poor leadership as predictors of supervisor and coworker-targeted aggression”. Further research on the effects and interaction among these factors would perhaps help to better understand the causes of workplace aggression, as to help the
organizations to learn how to intervene before aggressive behavior escalated, and to promote an aggression-free working environment.

4.3 Conclusions

In this study, the effects of individual differences, charismatic leadership and psychological empowerment on workplace aggression in were examined. In comply with Hong Kong workplace context, the measurement of workplace aggression was focused on the concept of abuse behaviors introduced by Spector et al., (2006). The positive relationship between trait anger and attitude toward revenge on workplace aggression, and the positive relationship between charismatic leadership and psychological empowerment were demonstrated. In addition, Preacher and Hayes’ (2008) bootstrap resampling approach in SPSS was adopted to test the indirect effect of charismatic leadership on workplace aggression via psychological empowerment. The results confirmed the mediating effect of psychological empowerment in the relationship between charismatic leadership and workplace aggression. Limitations of this study and future researches had been discussed. Current study focused on one situational factor, i.e., charismatic leadership. The role of charismatic leadership in explaining workplace aggression should be further examined in particularly the size effect. The effects of different occupational setting, interaction among individual and situational factors on target-specific workplace aggression should be put in future research consideration as to explore the potential predictors of workplace aggression.
in a broader context.
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Appendix 1

香港一般工作狀況問卷

您好：

我是香港城市大學應用心理學專業的研究生，現在正進行一項有關香港人一般工作狀況的研究。如果您願意參加此項研究，請按照您的實際情況，表達您的看法。完成全卷大概需要 20 分鐘。

請仔細閱讀每一部分的指示及說明，然後回答每一題目。回答過程中，請不要與別人討論有關的問題和答案。問卷不會記名亦不會問及個人病歷，資料只供學術研究使用，絕對保密，所有資料將會在研究完成後銷毀。

如您有任何問題歡迎聯絡我。

多謝各位參與這項研究！

二零一三年十二月
I). 請圈出一個你認為最能顯示出你對每題各種感受程度的數值。

1-------------2--------------3-------------4
幾乎從不       很少       經常       幾乎每次

在過去六個月，你可有感到：

1. 當事情被耽誤時，我會生氣。 ........................................... 1 2 3 4

2. 在大眾面前受到批評我會大發雷霆。 ................................. 1 2 3 4

3. 得到不好的評價時，我會怒火中燒。 ................................. 1 2 3 4

4. 表現不被重視時，我會感到惱火。 ................................. 1 2 3 4

5. 我是性急的。 ............................................................... 1 2 3 4

6. 當發怒時我會說臟話。 ................................................ 1 2 3 4

7. 我容易勃然大怒。 ................................................ 1 2 3 4

8. 我是個魯莽的人。 ................................................ 1 2 3 4

9. 我的脾氣暴躁。 ................................................ 1 2 3 4

10. 遇到挫折時我會想打人。 ............................................. 1 2 3 4
II). 請圈出一個你認為最能顯示出你對每題各種感受程度的數值。

非常不同意   不同意   既不同意也不反對   同意   非常同意

在過去六個月，你可有感到：

1. 苦惱………………………………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5

2. 不高興………………………………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5

3. 懷有敵意………………………………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5

4. 易怒……………………………………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5
III). 請圈出一個你認為最能顯示出你對每題各種感受程度的數值。

1----------------2----------------3----------------4---------------5-------------6---------7
非常不同意 少許不同意 不同意 既不同意也不反對 同意 少許同意 非常同意

在過去六個月，你可有感到：

1. 對傷害過我的人報復，是沒有錯的。.................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. 我不只會氣惱，我會報復直至扯平。..................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. 我相信“以眼還眼，以牙還牙”的座右銘。............. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. 復仇在道德上是錯的。..................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. 堅持去復仇的人很令人厭惡。............................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. 如果某人找我麻煩，我會找方式去報復令他們後悔。 .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. 我覺得很容易去原諒曾經傷害我的人。.................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. 復仇是甜美的。.................................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
IV. 請圈出一個你認為最符合 **你的直屬上司** 的管理行為描述的數值。

1------------2--------------3----------------4----------------5
幾乎從不uxe很少有時經常幾乎每次

**我的直屬上司...**

1. 會談他們覺得最重要的價值和信念。 .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
2. 會樂觀地談及將來。 .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
3. 會對我灌輸，我能和他/她關聯在一起的自豪。 .......... 1 2 3 4 5
4. 會熱情地談及需要達成的事。 ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
5. 會詳述有強烈目的感的重要性。 ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
6. 要為團體利益著想而超脫個人私利。 .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
7. 行為樹立了我對他/她的尊重。 ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
8. 作決定時會考慮到道德和倫理上的後果。 ............... 1 2 3 4 5
9. 展示出權力感和自信心。 ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
10. 清晰表達出令人信服的未來構想。 ............................. 1 2 3 4 5
11. 強調擁有集體使命感的重要性。 ............................. 1 2 3 4 5
12. 流露出自信，相信目標會實現。 ............................. 1 2 3 4 5
V). 請依照你的工作情況，選出你認為最符合描述的數值。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>幾乎從不</th>
<th>很少</th>
<th>有時</th>
<th>經常</th>
<th>每天</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

在過去六個月，你可曾：

1. 在工作上，帶起或繼續散播一個損害性的謠言。 ........ 1 2 3 4 5
2. 給客戶難看或不禮貌對待客人。 .............................. 1 2 3 4 5
3. 侮辱同事的工作表現。 ........................................ 1 2 3 4 5
4. 取笑同事的私人生活。 ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
5. 忽視同事。 ............................................. 1 2 3 4 5
6. 因自己工作上的過錯而責怪某人。 ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
7. 和同事挑起一場爭吵。 ..................................... 1 2 3 4 5
8. 用言語辱罵同事。 ......................................... 1 2 3 4 5
9. 對同事做出粗鄙的動作（舉中指）。 ....................... 1 2 3 4 5
10. 用暴力威脅同事。 ......................................... 1 2 3 4 5
11. 用非身體暴力去威脅同事。 ............................... 1 2 3 4 5
12. 對同事說粗鄙的事，令他/她感到壞透。 ............... 1 2 3 4 5
13. 對同事做某些事來給他/她難看。 ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
14. 玩一個刻薄的惡作劇，令同事感到尷尬。 ............... 1 2 3 4 5
15. 未得許可去偷看同事的私人郵件或物品。 ............... 1 2 3 4 5
16. 打或推撞同事。 ......................................... 1 2 3 4 5
17. 侮辱或取笑同事。 ......................................... 1 2 3 4 5
VI. 請依照你工作情況，圈出你認為最符合描述的數值。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我所做的工作對我來說非常重要。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我的工作活動對我來說是個人的意義。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我所做的工作對我來說很有意義。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我對自己的工作能力很有信心。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在表現我的工作活動方面我確信自己的能力。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我掌握我的工作所需要的各項技能。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我有很大的自主權去決定如何完成我的工作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我可以自己決定如何去做我的工作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我有相當大的機會在獨立和自由去做我的工作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我對我的部門發生的事情影響很大。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我對我的部門發生的事情有很大的控制權。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我對我的部門發生的事情有很重要的影響力。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
個人資料

請在以下各題，選一個適當答案，並在該答案前的空格加上 ✓ 號。

1) 性別： a. □ 男 b. □ 女

2) 年齡： _______ 歲

3) 婚姻狀況： a. □ 單身 b. □ 已婚 c. □ 其他 _______

4) 教育程度：
   a. □ 中學程度或以下 b. □ 大學或大專 c. □ 碩士研究生
   d. □ 博士研究生或以上

5) 所屬公司的工作年資：
   a. □ 1 年以下 b. □ 1-3 年 c. □ 4-6 年 d. □ 7-9 年 e. □ 10 年以上

6) 所屬公司的職位：
   a. □ 非管理級或以下 b. □ 初級主管 c. □ 中級經理
   d. □ 高級行政管理或以上

7) 個人每月收入(大約港幣)：
   a. □ 20,000 元或以下 b. □ 20,001-50,000 元 c. □ 50,001 元或以上

全卷完，謝謝您的參與！
Appendix 2: List of Questionnaire Items for Workplace Aggression in Hong Kong


Please CIRCLE the best described frequency by using the following rating scale.

1----------------2-------------------3------------------4

Almost never Once in a while Sometimes Almost always

During the past six months, have you ever felt:

1. I get angry when slowed down…………………………………... 1 2 3 4
2. Furious when criticized in front…………………………………... 1 2 3 4
3. Infuriated when poor evaluation…………………………………... 1 2 3 4
4. Annoyed when no recognition…………………………………... 1 2 3 4
5. I am quick tempered……………………………………………... 1 2 3 4
6. When I get mad, I say nasty things…………………………………... 1 2 3 4
7. I fly off the handle………………………………………………….. 1 2 3 4
8. I am a hothead person…………………………………………….. 1 2 3 4
9. I have a fiery temper………………………………………………. 1 2 3 4
10. Frustrated, feel hitting someone……………………………………... 1 2 3 4
II). Negative Affectivity subscale of PANAS-SF (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988).

Please CIRCLE the best described option by using the following rating scale.

1------------------2------------------3-------------------4---------------5

Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

During the past six months, have you ever felt:

1. Distressed………………………………………………………... 1 2 3 4 5
2. Upset………………………………………………………………. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Hostile……………………………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5
4. Irritable……………………………………………………………... 1 2 3 4 5

Please CIRCLE the best described option by using the following rating scale.

1------------------2------------------3------------------4------------------5------------------6------------------7

Strongly disagree  Moderately disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Moderately agree  Strongly agree

During the past six months, have you ever felt:

1. There is nothing wrong with getting back at someone that has hurt you…………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I don’t just get mad, I get even…………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I believe in the motto “An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth”……………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Revenge is morally wrong. (R)………………………….. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. People who insist on getting revenge are disgusting. (R) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. If someone causes me trouble, I’ll find a way to make them regret it……………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I find it easy to forgive those who have hurt me. (R)…. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Revenge is sweet……………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Note. 4,5,7 are reversed coding.
IV). MLQ-5X/Short Form (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

Please judge how frequently each statement fits YOUR DIRECT SUPERVISOR, and CIRCLE the best described option by using the following rating scale.

1------------------2------------------3------------------4------------------5

Never   Once in a while   Sometimes   Fairly often   Almost every time

My direct supervisor I am rating...

1. Talks about their most important values and beliefs..............  1  2  3  4  5
2. Talks optimistically about the future..................................  1  2  3  4  5
3. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her............  1  2  3  4  5
4. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished…  1  2  3  4  5
5. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose..  1  2  3  4  5
6. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.............  1  2  3  4  5
7. Acts in ways that builds my respect...............................  1  2  3  4  5
8. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions….  1  2  3  4  5
9. Displays a sense of power and confidence..........................  1  2  3  4  5
10. Articulates a compelling vision of the future....................  1  2  3  4  5
11. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.....................................................  1  2  3  4  5
12. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved..............  1  2  3  4  5
V). Abuse subscale of CWB-C (Spector et al., 2006).

According to your work situation, please CIRCLE the best described frequency by using the following rating scale.

1----------------2----------------3----------------4-----------------5

Never Once in a while Sometimes Fairly often Every day

Within the past six months, have you ever:

1. Started or continued a damaging or harmful rumor at work..... 1 2 3 4 5
2. Been nasty or rude to a client or customer....................... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Insulted someone about their job performance.................... 1 2 3 4 5
4. Made fun of someone’s personal life................................ 1 2 3 4 5
5. Ignored someone at work.............................................. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Blamed someone at work for error you made...................... 1 2 3 4 5
7. Started an argument with someone at work....................... 1 2 3 4 5
8. Verbally abused someone at work................................. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Made an obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work...... 1 2 3 4 5
10. Threatened someone at work with violence...................... 1 2 3 4 5
11. Threatened someone at work, but not physically............... 1 2 3 4 5
12. Said something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad

13. Did something to make someone at work look bad

14. Played a mean prank to embarrass someone at work

15. Looked at someone at work’s private mail/property without permission

16. Hit or pushed someone at work

17. Insulted or made fun of someone at work
VI). PES (Spreitzer, 1995).

According to your work situation, please CIRCLE the best described option by using the following rating scale.

1----------------2----------------3-----------------4-----------------5

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree

1. The work I do is very important to me……………………… 1 2 3 4 5

2. My job activities are personally meaningful to me…………….. 1 2 3 4 5

3. The work I do is meaningful to me………………………….. 1 2 3 4 5

4. I am confident about my ability to do my job………………….. 1 2 3 4 5

5. I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities……………………………………………………….. 1 2 3 4 5

6. I have mastered the skills necessary for my job………………….. 1 2 3 4 5

7. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job… 1 2 3 4 5

8. I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work……… 1 2 3 4 5

9. I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job…………………………………………….. 1 2 3 4 5

10. My impact on what happens in my department is large……….. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department ......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5

12. I have significant influence over what happens in my department ................................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5