



Anger in Learning -- The Relationships between Teachers' Aggressive Anger Expressions and Students' Achievement Goals

Jana Chi San Ho

The University Of Saint Joseph (Macao), Macau Sar

Abstract

This review paper examined the relationship between perceived aggressive anger expressions in teachers and students' achievement goals by integrating findings from neurocognitive evidence on motivational directions and theoretical models of achievement goals in motivation. Previous research on anger and its motivational direction has not examined the specific characteristics of anger expressions and their impacts on motivational tendencies. Although anger is typically perceived as a negative emotion, different expressions (such as the presence or absence of threats) may lead to distinct outcomes, producing either positive or negative consequences. The evidence linking anger and avoidance raised concerns about the effect of fear triggered by threatening cues in anger expressions. Since threats appeared to mediate the relationship between teachers' anger and students' learning motivation, the nature of anger expression was considered a potential reason for inconsistencies in existing research on the motivational tendencies associated with anger. This review paper differentiated various types of teacher anger expression, focusing particularly on the presence or absence of threats. Aggressive anger expressions by teachers may create a sense of threat for students, potentially leading them to adopt avoidance-oriented goals. Findings suggest that the motivational direction of anger has often been overshadowed by its affective valence in much of the research in this area.

Keywords: teacher emotion, pedagogical practice, academic emotion, motivation, learning motivation

1. Introduction

It is evident that one's emotional expressions have an impact on others. Emotion expressions function as social cues, allowing observers to infer the thoughts, desires, or intentions of the communicator (Graham, 1984). For instance, parents' emotional expressions are important signals for infants' actions when the infants are in situations of uncertainty (Hirshberg & Svejda, 1990). The conveyed emotional information from familiarized people influences infants' responses. Moreover, emotional displays might have a motivational influence on individuals. Emde et al. (1978) discovered that cries often motivate people to alleviate distress whereas smiles typically encourage maintaining positive social interactions. While

teachers' anger has been widely studied, particularly for its positive and negative effects on student experiences (e.g., Rodrigo-Ruiz, 2016), little research has explored how specific characteristics of anger expression influence these outcomes. This review paper examined the relationship between perceived teachers' aggressive anger expressions and students' achievement goals by integrating findings from neurocognitive evidence on motivational directions and theoretical models of achievement goals in motivation.

2. Theoretical background

2.1 Anger in the learning context: Teachers' anger

Frenzel et al. (2009) describe the relationship between teachers' emotions and student behavioral responses and propose a reciprocal model that teachers' emotions, impacted by student behaviors, in turn, influence teaching instructions; therefore continuing the cyclical effect in the impact of teachers' emotions on students' learning outcomes. Chronic anger experiences might also deplete teachers' mental resources and reduce teaching effectiveness, resulting in lower student engagement (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). In studies exploring the frequency of discrete emotions experienced by teachers in real-life assessment, anger is reported as the most prominent emotion among other negative emotions such as anxiety, boredom, and shame (Chang, 2009; Sutton, 2007; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Although anger is one of the most prominently felt negative emotions of teachers, most teachers consider anger as an emotional response that might lead to inappropriate and disruptive student behavior (Lovšin & Polak, 2022; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Teachers' anger provides lower-quality education and interferes with teaching effectiveness (Frenzel et al., 2011). Cheng et al. (2025) also found that teachers' anger can be contagious and led to students' anger, lowered motivation and learning performance. Thus, anger has been viewed as a frustrating stimulus by teachers and they attempt to down-regulate or suppress it (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). As a consequence, when it comes to students' failures, teachers might constraint their anger and display pity to students instead. Nevertheless, some findings have revealed that anger might be a two-sided sword and demonstrated the constructive impact of teachers' anger on students' learning motivation and discovered that pity caused more harm to students' expectancy of success and persistency after previous failures (Graham, 1984). Genuine anger expression was also found to have short-term benefits for teacher-perceived student engagement (Wang et al., 2023).

2.2 Types of teachers' anger expressions

Drawing from research in the field of interpersonal communication (e.g., Canary & Spitzberg, 1990), anger can be expressed in four different ways based on two dimensions: the level of threat in the anger expression and the directness of the anger expression (Guerrero, 1994). The four types are distributive aggression, passive aggression, integrative assertion, and nonassertive denial. The type of anger expression can influence our interpersonal relationships (Sereno et al., 1987). In the context of classroom learning, teacher-student relationships as well as students' learning outcomes can be impaired if students perceive the teacher's anger expression as inappropriate or threatening. Therefore, it is important to find out which types of anger are constructive and can motivate students to approach learning goals instead of avoiding them. Much previous research only examined the impact of teachers' anger on students' learning outcomes. Barely any research paid attention to the effects of different types of teachers' anger expressions (except McPherson et al., 2003). Hence, the impact of the types of teachers' anger expression on students' learning motivation is not clear.

The first type, distributive-aggression consists of direct and threatening anger expressions. This type of anger expression shows little respect for the receiver of the anger and is hostile. Examples of distributive aggression include throwing objects, yelling, and using offensive language. The second type is passive aggression, where anger is expressed in an indirect but threatening manner. With this type of expression, the exact message that the sender wants to deliver may be unclear. Examples of passive aggression include silent treatment, cold looks, and leaving the scene. The third type, integrative assertion relies on direct but non-threatening expressions of anger. This type of anger is characterized by honestly articulating thoughts and feelings without blaming the other(s). Concern for the other's rights and needs are taken into account. For instance, integrative assertion involves listening to the other's side of the story, discussing the problem, trying to solve the problems, and being fair to the other(s). The last type, nonassertive-denial, represents indirect and nonthreatening communication strategies. This type of anger expression is marked by an unwillingness or inability to confront thoughts or feelings. People using nonassertive denial attempt to deny that they are experiencing anger. An example would be to ignore the angry situation and to pretend that nothing has happened (McPherson et al., 2003). As a result, it might be difficult for students to perceive nonassertive-denial anger expressions as their teachers deny the experience of anger.

2.3 The impact of teachers' anger on causal attributions

In the educational context, certain emotions are linked to responses to particular causal thoughts (Graham, 1984; Weiner, 1982). For instance, the anger-effort linkage has been demonstrated both in research in which causal thoughts were manipulated and felt emotions were reported (Weiner, Graham, & Chandler, 1982) and in research in which emotions were manipulated and antecedent thoughts were inferred (Weiner, Graham, Stern, & Lawson, 1982). Evidence supports the beneficial role of anger in the attributional theory of learning motivation. More specifically, findings from Graham's research (1984) revealed the linkage between teachers' communicated anger and students' lack of effort attributions. Participants (consisting of elementary students) received either anger feedback or sympathetic feedback from a teacher experimenter after failing a puzzle task and were asked to report their expectancies of success at the beginning of each trial. There were five trials in total: the task in the first four trials could be solved and the failures were induced by the time limitation to reach a solution; the fifth trial was an unsolvable task (not visually clear to the participants) to test their persistency. In the practice puzzle, participants were induced to believe that the experimenter had some prior knowledge about their skill at the task that would lead them to expect a certain level of performance. Participants in the anger condition attributed their failures to their lack of effort. They reported a less significant decline in the expectancy of success in the first four trials, persisted longer, and engaged more in the fifth trial in the anger condition. Teachers' anger alleviated the decline in students' expectancies of success and persistence on a task after failure. In other words, students were less likely to withdraw from the tasks after failure when teachers displayed anger. Hence, it is believed that teachers' anger could motivate students to invest more effort in the future. Nevertheless, one weakness of Graham's research (1984) is that the findings have not been replicated in other studies. Limitations of this study include subject bias as only black and white ethnic groups were recruited in the study (in order to investigate whether ethnicity moderated the relationship between teachers' affective cues and students' judgments of personal competence, expectancies for success, causal attributions for failure, and persistence on the task). It is also criticized that the linkage from emotions to persistence occurred too far along in the hypothesized causal sequence to sustain the effects of affective cues, without the control of other variables.

2.4 Consequences of anger in the context of learning motivation

Pekrun et al. (2002) identified that anger might have an impact on motivation, cognitive functioning, learning self-regulation, and learning strategies in a learning process. Anger might be a two-sided sword to students' learning motivation. On the bright side, it has been revealed that teachers' anger promotes communication and responses (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). It is also linked to an approach tendency to overcome learning difficulties and to pursue higher goals (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). The activating role of anger might trigger a strong approach to motivation to cope with the challenges encountered in the learning process (Bandura & Cevone, 1983). On the downside, anger is related to lower self-efficacy, performance-avoidance goals as well as a decline in internal motivation (Pekrun et al., 2002). Results from a longitudinal study by Putwain et al. (2013) have revealed that anger correlates with students' performance-avoidance goals. In the study, participants were asked to fill in questionnaires about their academic emotions and learning goals three times throughout the academic year (at the beginning of each semester). Participants who experienced anger tended to avoid displaying academic incompetence. More specifically, participants who experienced anger at the beginning of the second semester were inclined to change their learning goals in the third semester in order to gain learning results that would not be worse in comparison to the others in the class (avoidance goals).

In addition, Frenzel et al. (2009) studied the role of teachers' determined discrete emotions in students' motivation to learn. Findings revealed that anger is less supportive in providing enthusiastic lessons than enjoyment and therefore leads to lower motivation. However, Sutton and Wheatley (2003) and Graham (1984) argued a different conclusion, affirming that students who perceive teachers' anger will consider that as a lack of effort instead of a lack of ability, which is associated with teachers' display of sympathy or pity after failure. In this manner, it appears more motivating for students to perceive teachers' anger and attribute the failure to the lack of effort, rather than incompetence.

2.5 Students' motivation: Achievement goal theory

Achievement Goal Theory is a social-cognitive theory of achievement motivation where an achievement goal is defined as "a future-focused cognitive representation that guides behavior to a competence-related end state that the individual is committed to either approach or avoid." (Hulleman et al., 2010). Ames and Archer (1988) suggested two types of achievement goals – mastery goals (where learning goals are to learn, work hard, and make an effort) and performance goals (where learning goals are to perform better than others). As some people are motivated to approach success while some are motivated to avoid failure, achievement goals can also be further divided into two categories in terms of goal valence – approach and avoidance (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). In fact, Harackiewicz et al. (2002) have emphasized the need to distinguish between approach and avoidance forms of the goals, especially for performance goals as many of the negative effects originally attributed to performance goals are related to performance-avoidance goals only (for a review, see Elliot & Moller, 2003).

In terms of goal valence, students with mastery approach goals want to learn as much as possible while students with performance approach goals want to get better grades than most of the other students (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). In contrast, students with mastery avoidance goals worry they might not learn as much as they possibly could in class whereas students with performance avoidance goals fear that they perform poorly in class (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Tab.1 extracted from achievement goal items (Elliot & McGregor, 2001) shows more details about the features of these goals.

Table 1: Features of achievement goals in terms of definition and valence

Goal definition			
Goal valence	Approach		Avoidance
	Mastery	It is important for me to understand the content of this course as thoroughly as possible.	Sometimes I'm afraid that I might not understand the content of this course as thoroughly as I'd like.
	Performance	My goal is to get a better grade than most of the other students.	My goal in this class is to avoid performing poorly.

2.6 Anger and the motivational direction: Approach vs avoidance

Although anger has been generally appraised as a negatively-valenced emotion, it has a special status among the emotions that can elicit both approach and avoidance motivation. Depending on the environment and situation, individuals react differently towards anger – with either approach or avoidance behavior. For instance, an avoidance motivational system organizes behavior such as avoiding punishments or threats (Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009).

In neurocognitive research, the motivational dimension of anger came from the idea that the two tendencies (approach and avoidance) are associated with different parts of the nervous system (e.g., Schneirla, 1959). Much research has shown evidence that approach motivation and avoidance motivation have partially distinct neural substrates (e.g., Depue & Collins, 1999; Pizzagalli et al., 2005). As for the association between anger and its direction in the motivational system, diverse findings show support for both the link between anger and approach motivation as well as the link between anger and avoidance motivation.

2.6.1 Anger and approach motivation

Some researchers have defined anger as a negatively-valenced affect that emerges when the blockage of movement toward a desired goal presents (Depue & Zald, 1993; Lewis, et al., 1990). Anger is characterized as the reaction to an unpleasant violation of what an individual expects as well as the occurrence of an event where exists a violation of what “ought to” be (Frijda, 1986; Ortony et al., 1988). A violation of such implies failure to maintain an existing desired outcome, and therefore, motivates one to achieve the maintenance. Studies have shown that individuals are faster to initiate approach movements toward angry facial expressions compared to avoidance movements, especially when physical approach seems effective in overcoming social challenges (Wilkowski & Meier, 2010). Furthermore, infants' anger responses to goal blockage positively correlated with toddlers' persistence at play at five months, suggesting that anger may contribute to approach-oriented behaviors and persistence even in early development (Lewis et al., 2015). These findings collectively support the notion that anger implies an underlying higher goal pursuit in approach motivation.

Similar implications can be seen in findings in educational research, Graham (1984) has demonstrated that teachers' anger is related to students' lack of effort attribution. Graham found that students were more persistent in a puzzle task when the teacher experimenter provided angry feedback after their previous failure trials. The teacher's anger implied a violation of his/her higher expectation from the student and thus motivated participants to spend more time on the puzzle task even after having failed four times. In contrast,

sympathetic feedback communicated teachers' beliefs of students' low ability, thus aggravating the decline of students' future expectancy of success and shortening the time spent in the final trial of the puzzle task. Students engaged more when teachers' anger was demonstrated, which seems to be the characteristic of the adoption of the approach goal according to the achievement goal theory. Although the majority of research findings indicate that anger impairs teaching enthusiasm and is detrimental to students' learning outcomes (Frenzel et al., 2009), the findings of this research are compelling evidence supporting the constructive motivational effects of teachers' anger. Empirical evidence also suggested that teacher anger can enhance students' learning performance, particularly for those with a promotion focus (van Doorn et al., 2014). Participants who faced an angry instructor were able to recognize word pairs more accurately than those who faced a happy instructor. The results challenge the widely promoted positivity paradigm in the field of academic emotions.

In addition, Harmon-Jones et al. (2004) integrated the hypotheses of social psychology and the methods of affective neuroscience and provided neurocognitive evidence that strongly supported the positive motivational effect of anger. Neurocognitive evidence supports that anterior cortical lateralization can indicate motivational direction (approach vs. avoidance) (Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009; Coan & Allen, 2003). Research has shown that cortical brain areas involved in anger overlap with the areas that are receptive to approach tendencies (e.g., Honk & Schutter, 2006). More specifically, Coan and Allen (2003) demonstrated the link between left frontal cortical activity and approach motivation as well as the link between right frontal cortical activity and avoidance motivation. As a consequence, research on hemispheric laterality and anger has been conducted to find out in which frontal cortical area anger triggers brain activities. Evidence supports that anger reflects an approach motivational system whereas anxiety is related to an avoidance motivational approach (Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009). Harmon-Jones et al. (2004) found that anger-provoking events and insults increased left frontal activity and decreased right frontal activity while sympathy eliminated this effect. In other words, anger-provoking experiences and insults from others led to an approach motivation while sympathy from others hindered the approach motivation system. In a later study, Harmon-Jones and Carver (2009) thoroughly reviewed a range of evidence that anger as a negatively-valenced affect relates to, or derives from, an approach motivational system.

Neurocognitive evidence (e.g., Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009) and educational findings (e.g., Graham, 1984) mentioned above strengthen the support for the argument that perceived anger from others leads to approach motivation in learning motivation. Contrary to what is generally expected, teachers' anger might be more beneficial to students' learning motivation than sympathy and pity. Nevertheless, one question can be raised about the conclusions drawn from the neurocognitive findings (Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009; Harmon-Jones et al., 2004): Is the approach tendency a response to anger, or does the experience of anger require the engagement of an approach motivational tendency as a precondition? Perhaps anger does not have any impact on the motivational directions, but when anger is triggered, approach motivational system is activated and engaged. One study by Harmon-Jones and Peterson (2008) found that participants who had received an approach prime prior to the experiment had greater behavioral aggression in response to an anger-inducing event. In other words, approach motivational tendencies influence the angry responses towards aversive events, which challenges the causality of the link between anger and motivational tendencies in neurocognitive research findings.

2.6.2 Anger and avoidance

On the other hand, anger-provoking events might trigger fear and lead to avoidance of motivational goals. As some of the situations used to convey the nature of anger entail substantive resemblance to situations used to specify the nature of fear, a link between anger and fear is suggested (Harmon-Jones et al., 2009). Similar to some characteristics of anger, fear arises from the threat of harm (Frijda, 1986) and reflects displeasure at the prospect of an undesirable event (Ortony et al., 1988). In the classroom, teachers' anger might evoke students' fear besides anger depending on the situation, especially anger-provoking situations with threats or undesirable outcomes such as detention after class or bad grades. The consequences of teachers' anger could lead to students' negative feelings such as anger, fear, or a mixture of both. An association between anger and fear has been seen in some factor analyses in the structure of self-reported mood and emotions (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988). In the factor analyses of these data, items pertaining to irritability or anger typically load together with items pertaining to threat avoidance or anxiety. Such results could lead to the conclusion that anger and fear come from a common source and these two emotions are somehow correlated.

Besides, angry expressions toward others can signify dominance (Hess et al., 2009) or the fact that social rules or expectations have been violated (Blair, 2003). It was found that angry facial expressions were related to response reversal – a process that communicates to the recipients that they should terminate their current behaviors (Blair & Cipolotti, 2000; Marsh et al., 2005). This suggests that teachers' anger expressions might act as inhibitory cues that cease students' undesirable behaviors. Research indicates that nonconscious perception of angry faces tends to increase the likelihood of avoidance (Parkinson et al., 2017). In the first experiment, participants' free choice decisions were manipulated to act or withhold an action by subliminally presenting emotional faces in a speeded button-press test on a computer. Neutral, happy, angry, and fearful faces were masked backward to render them nonconscious and were presented for 20 ms before each target appeared on screen in the speeded button-press test. Results show that participants were more likely to voluntarily withhold the action due to the priming of subliminal angry faces while fearful and happy faces had no such effects, which suggests a mechanism whereby subliminally presented “threat” stimuli influence conscious inhibitory processes and lead to an avoidance approach in motivation. Nonetheless, the effects of angry faces upon intentional inhibition were gone when the faces were supraliminally (related to conscious processing) presented in the second experiment (i.e., the prime faces were presented for 100 ms with more discriminable emotional faces). This begs the question of why fearful faces, also considered threat stimuli, have no measured behavioral effects in this study. Unfortunately, explanations can only be provided with further research.

2.7 The impact of perceived threat on learning

As teachers' anger might appear to be a threat to students (Parkinson et al., 2017), it is relevant to figure out the relationship between perceived threats and students' learning motivation. Educational research has revealed the relationship between threatening stimuli and students' achievement goals in the context of school learning. Putwain and Symes (2011) revealed a positive correlation between perceived threats and performance-avoidance goals. This study concerns teachers' use of fear appeals when they prepare students for the final important qualification exam for Mathematics in secondary education in England and Wales, namely, the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE). Results revealed that when students appraised messages from teachers' fear appeals as threatening, they were more likely to adopt subsequent performance-avoidance goals and had an increase in test anxiety (i.e.,

worry and tension). More specifically, participants' perceived threat of fear appeals in the previous academic year (Year 10) led to increases in both their performance-avoidance goals ($\beta = .36, p = .004$) and mastery-approach goals ($\beta = .26, p = .008$) goals in the following year (Year 11). The researchers also found a positive correlation between perceived threats and mastery approach goals but advised that further research might be needed for that. They explained that mastery-approach goals are correlated to the need for achievement rather than the fear of failure (Elliot & Murayama, 2008). As GCSE grades in Mathematics are critical indicators of self-ability, it is believed that perceived threats might trigger students' motivation to overcome their fear of not achieving their personal potential or aspirations. Teachers' fear appeals might have threatened students' personal abilities and future aspirations rather than normative concerns, hence, resulting in the override of the fear of failure and the adoption of mastery-approach goals instead of striving for performance-approach goals to overcome the fear of failure as proposed by by Elliot and Pekrun (2007). Perceived threats seem to be an antecedent of both a fear of failure and a motivation to improve one's competence and/or learning in Mathematics. Another reason for this finding could be due to the difference in participants' trait anxiety. Different trait anxiety tendencies (high or low) may cause different reactions towards threats. However, this was not examined in this study.

Research on student attributions of teacher emotions and behaviors reveals the impact of aggression on anger attributions. While acknowledging their own misbehavior as the trigger, students attributed teachers' expressions of anger to internal causes to a greater extent when teachers used distributive aggression (yelling and screaming) and passive-aggression (giving angry looks) than assertive expression (calmly discussing the issue with the students) (McPherson & Young, 2004). Other research examining the impact of threats also revealed the detrimental effects on students' emotional engagement, behavioral disaffection and classroom engagement (Nicholson & Putwain, 2020). These studies highlight the importance of creating supportive, low-threat learning environments to promote student engagement and academic success.

3 Discussion

Previous research on anger and its motivational direction did not investigate the characteristics of anger expressions and their impacts on motivational directions. The present review paper revealed that the motivational direction of anger might have been overshadowed by the affective valence of anger in most of the research in this area. Although anger is perceived to be a negative emotion, different expressions (for example, the presence or absence of threats) might lead to different outcomes such as positive or negative consequences. The evidence of the link between anger and avoidance seems to raise concern about the effect of fear caused by threatening cues in anger. As threats appear to be a mediator of the relationship between teachers' anger and students' learning motivation, the expression of anger is believed to be one of the reasons accounting for the inconsistencies in existing research findings of the motivational tendency of anger. Future research on examining the motivational effects of teachers' anger can further differentiate the effects of different types of teachers' anger expressions on students' learning motivation depending on whether threats were present. One suggestion would be using experimental design to control different teachers' anger expressions and record students' achievement goals instantly after the anger episode takes place. Nevertheless, researchers must also control the variance of the extent to which teachers' anger expressions are interpreted as threatening by students as there might exist a gap between teachers' anger expressions and students' perception of them. As teachers' aggressive anger expressions might give students a sense of threat, it is hypothesized to be associated with students' adoption of avoidance goals.

Also, future research on this topic shall include other psychological variables as possible moderators. For instance, the adoption of mastery approach goals might be due to students' need for achievement, which is not caused by teachers' anger expressions (Elliot & Murayama, 2008). Moreover, Huang (2016) examined the relations between achievement goals and self-efficacy. The correlation between mastery approach goals and self-efficacy was moderate to strong while the correlations between avoidance goals and self-efficacy were low. Academic self-efficacy is correlated to one's achievement goals and should be controlled when explaining the effects of teachers' threatening anger expressions and students' achievement goals. Future research should take these variables into account for a better understanding of the effects of teachers' aggressive anger expressions.

3.1 Practical implications for educational settings

This review has shown that perceived threats is detrimental to students' learning motivation. Hence, teacher education should cover guidelines for expressing anger in ways that are not threatening to students. Previous studies indicate that students can often discern the authenticity of teachers' emotions through verbal and nonverbal cues, adjusting their responses accordingly. Inauthentic emotional expressions tend to be less effective in engaging students and may even hinder learning, compared to genuine emotional displays (Keller et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2023). The research (Wang et al., 2023) shows that genuine, well-timed anger can be more effective than faking or hiding it. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers should not suppress their anger but express them in non-threatening ways. For example, teachers should avoid throwing tantrums and threatening students in class, yelling or screaming at them, criticizing them, etc. Instead, teachers should express their anger in direct and assertive, with little or no intensity (McPherson et al., 2003). In other words, teachers should express their anger by calmly communicating their feelings, discussing the problems with their students, listening to their side of the story, and making every effort to be fair. Assertive discipline techniques have been advocated by teacher training experts (Hoy & Murphy, 2001). Teachers are advised to demonstrate and communicate their expectations to students with caring and concern. Apart from expressing anger, drawing from Self Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2012), fostering student motivation is best achieved by supporting their core psychological needs. An autonomy-supportive environment that satisfies these needs can promote greater intrinsic motivation, deeper conceptual learning, and more persistent engagement than external factors like teacher's anger.

Like us, teachers are human beings with emotions. They can't pick and choose their feelings. Suppressing their anger is not good for themselves, and for students as well. Anger is a two-sided sword that entails both constructive and destructive influences on students' academic motivation and performance. A better approach to resolve the problem of teacher anger in the classroom is not banning teachers from showing emotions but rather communicating their anger to students in appropriate ways that can possibly lead to increased student motivation.

References

- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(3), 260. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.3.260>
- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1983). Self-evaluative and self-efficacy mechanisms governing the motivational effects of goal systems. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 45(5), 1017. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.5.1017>
- Becker, E. S., Goetz, T., Morger, V., & Ranellucci, J. (2014). The importance of teachers' emotions and instructional behavior for their students' emotions—An experience sampling

- analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 43, 15-26.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.05.002>
- Blair, R. J. R. (2003). Facial expressions, their communicatory functions, and neuro-cognitive substrates. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London: Series B, Biological Sciences*, 358(February), 561–572. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2002.1220>
- Blair, R. J., & Cipolotti, L. (2000). Impaired social response reversal: A case of acquired sociopathy'. *Brain*, 123(6), 1122-1141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/123.6.1122>
- Burić, I., & Frenzel, A. C. (2023). Teacher emotions are linked with teaching quality: Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence from two field studies. *Learning and instruction*, 88, 101822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2023.101822>
- Canary, D. J., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1990). Attribution biases and associations between conflict strategies and competence outcomes. *Communications Monographs*, 57(2), 139-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759009376191>
- Carver, C. S., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2009). Anger is an approach-related affect: evidence and implications. *Psychological bulletin*, 135(2), 183. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013965>
- Chang, M. L. (2009). Teacher emotional management in the classroom: Appraisals, regulation, and coping with emotions. In *the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA*.
- Cheng, Z., Peng, X., Zhang, Y., Luo, Y., Hu, J., & Chen, X. (2025). The impact of teachers' angry feedback on junior high students' emotional experience, cognitive inference, and learning performance. *Educational Psychology*, 45(6), 661–680.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2025.2495044>
- Coan, J. A., & Allen, J. J. (2003). Frontal EEG asymmetry and the behavioral activation and inhibition systems. *Psychophysiology*, 40(1), 106-114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8986.00011>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Self-determination theory. *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, 1(20), 416-436. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249215.n21>
- Depue, R. A., & Collins, P. F. (1999). Neurobiology of the structure of personality: Dopamine, facilitation of incentive motivation, and extraversion. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22, 491–517. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X99002046>
- Depue, R. A., & Zald, D. H. (1993). Biological and environmental processes in nonpsychotic psychopathology: A neurobehavioral perspective.
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2× 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 80(3), 501. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.3.501>
- Elliot, A. J., & Moller, A. C. (2003). Performance-approach goals: Good or bad forms of regulation? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 39(4), 339-356. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2004.06.003>
- Elliot, A. J., & Murayama, K. (2008). On the measurement of achievement goals: critique, illustration, and application. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(3), 613. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.3.613>
- Elliot, A. J., & Pekrun, R. (2007). Emotion in the hierarchical model of approach-avoidance achievement motivation. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012372545-5/50005-8>

- Emde, R. N., Kligman, D. H., Reich, J. H., & Wade, T. D. (1978). Emotional expression in infancy: I. Initial studies of social signaling and an emergent model. In *The development of affect* (pp. 125-148). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-2616-8_5
- Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., Stephens, E. J., & Jacob, B. (2009). Antecedents and effects of teachers' emotional experiences: An integrated perspective and empirical test. In *Advances in teacher emotion research* (pp. 129-151). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0564-2_7
- Frijda, N. H. (1986). The emotions: Studies in emotion and social interaction. Paris: *Maison de Sciences de l'Homme*.
- Graham, S. (1984). Communicating sympathy and anger to Black and White children: The cognitive (attributional) consequences of affective cues. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(1), 40. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.1.40>
- Guerrero, L. K. (1994). "I'm so mad I could scream:" The effects of anger expression on relational satisfaction and communication competence. *Southern Journal of Communication*, 59(2), 125-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10417949409372931>
- Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Pintrich, P. R., Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Revision of achievement goal theory: Necessary and illuminating. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.3.638>
- Harmon-Jones, E., & Peterson, C. K. (2008). Effect of trait and state approach motivation on aggressive inclinations. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(5), 1381-1385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.05.001>
- Harmon-Jones, E., Vaughn-Scott, K., Mohr, S., Sigelman, J., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2004). The effect of manipulated sympathy and anger on left and right frontal cortical activity. *Emotion*, 4(1), 95. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.4.1.95>
- Hess, U., Adams, R. B., & Kleck, R. E. (2009). The face is not an empty canvas: how facial expressions interact with facial appearance. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 364(1535), 3497-3504. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2009.0165>
- Hirshberg, L. M., & Svejda, M. (1990). When infants look to their parents: I. Infants' social referencing of mothers compared to fathers. *Child Development*, 61(4), 1175-1186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1990.tb02851.x>
- Honk, J. V., & Schutter, D. J. (2006). From affective valence to motivational direction: the frontal asymmetry of emotion revised. *Psychological Science*, 17(11), 963-965. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01813.x>
- Hoy, A. W., & Murphy, P. K. (2001). Teaching educational psychology to the implicit mind. *Understanding and teaching the intuitive mind: Student and teacher learning*, 145-185.
- Huang, C. (2016). Achievement goals and self-efficacy: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 19, 119-137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.07.002>
- Hulleman, C. S., Schrager, S. M., Bodmann, S. M., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2010). A meta-analytic review of achievement goal measures: Different labels for the same constructs or different constructs with similar labels?. *Psychological bulletin*, 136(3), 422. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018947>

- Keller, M. M., Becker, E. S., Frenzel, A. C., & Taxer, J. L. (2018). When teacher enthusiasm is authentic or inauthentic: Lesson profiles of teacher enthusiasm and relations to students' emotions. *AERA Open*, 4, 2332858418782967. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858418782967>
- Lewis, M., Alessandri, S. M., & Sullivan, M. W. (1990). Violation of expectancy, loss of control, and anger expressions in young infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(5), 745. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.26.5.745>
- Lewis, M., Sullivan, M. W., & Kim, H. M. S. (2015). Infant approach and withdrawal in response to a goal blockage: Its antecedent causes and its effect on toddler persistence. *Developmental psychology*, 51(11), 1553. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000043>
- Lindsay, J. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2000). From antecedent conditions to violent actions: A general affective aggression model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(5), 533-547. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200267002>
- Lovšin, I. K., & Polak, A. (2022). Teachers' Beliefs about Their Anger in Relation to Certain Aspects of Teaching. *Pedagoška obzorja*, 37(2), 80-97.
- Marsh, A. A., Ambady, N., & Kleck, R. E. (2005). The effects of fear and anger facial expressions on approach-and avoidance-related behaviors. *Emotion*, 5(1), 119. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.5.1.119>
- McPherson, M. B., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (2003). The dark side of instruction: Teacher anger as classroom norm violations. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 31(1), 76-90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909880305376>
- McPherson, M. B., & Young, S. L. (2004). What students think when teachers get upset: Fundamental attribution error and student-generated reasons for teacher anger. *Communication Quarterly*, 52(4), 357–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370409370206>
- Nicholson, L. J., & Putwain, D. W. (2020). A cross-lagged panel analysis of fear appeal appraisal and student engagement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(3), 830-847. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12334>
- Ortony, A., Clore, G. L., & Collins, A. (1988). The cognitive structure of emotions. 10.1017/CBO9780511571299. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511571299>
- Parkinson, J., Garfinkel, S., Critchley, H., Dienes, Z., & Seth, A. K. (2017). Don't make me angry, you wouldn't like me when I'm angry: Volitional choices to act or inhibit are modulated by subliminal perception of emotional faces. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 17(2), 252-268. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-016-0477-5>
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Titz, W., & Perry, R. P. (2002). Academic emotions in students' self-regulated learning and achievement: A program of qualitative and quantitative research. *Educational psychologist*, 37(2), 91-105. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3702_4
- Pizzagalli, D. A., Sherwood, R. J., Henriques, J. B., & Davidson, R. J. (2005). Frontal brain asymmetry and reward responsiveness—A source localization study. *Psychological Science*, 16(10), 805–813. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01618.x>
- Putwain D. W., Larkin D., Sander P. (2013). A reciprocal model of achievement goals and learning related emotions in the first year of undergraduate study. *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.* 38 361–374. 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2013.07.003. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709909X426130>

- Putwain, D. W., & Roberts, C. M. (2009). The development of an instrument to measure teachers' use of fear appeals in the GCSE classroom. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(4), 643-661. <https://doi.org/10.1348/2044-8279.002005>
- Putwain, D. W., & Symes, W. (2011). Teachers' use of fear appeals in the Mathematics classroom: Worrying or motivating students?. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(3), 456-474.
- Rodrigo-Ruiz, D. (2016). Rodrigo-Ruiz, D. Effect of Teachers' Emotions on Their Students: Some Evidence. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*, 3(4), 73-79.
- Schneirla, T. C. (1959). An evolutionary and developmental theory of biphasic processes underlying approach and withdrawal.
- Sereno, K. K., Welch, M., & Braaten, D. (1987). Interpersonal conflict: Effects of variations in the manner of expressing anger and justification for anger upon perceptions of appropriateness, competence, and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 15(1-2), 128-143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909888709365264>
- Sutton, R. E. (2007). Teachers' anger, frustration, and self-regulation. In P. A. Schutz & R. Pekrun (Eds.), *Emotion in education* (1st ed., p. 259-274). San Diego, CA: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012372545-5/50016-2>
- Sutton, R. E., & Wheatley, K. F. (2003). Teachers' emotions and teaching: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 15(4), 327-358. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026131715856>
- van Doorn, E. A., van Kleef, G. A., & van der Pligt, J. (2014). How instructors' emotional expressions shape students' learning performance: the roles of anger, happiness, and regulatory focus. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(3), 980. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035226>
- Wang, H., Chiu, M. M., & Hall, N. C. (2023). Teacher anger as a double-edged sword: Contrasting trait and emotional labor effects. *Motivation and Emotion*, 47(4), 650-668. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-023-10027-0>
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 54(6), 1063. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>
- Weiner, B. (1982). The emotional consequences of causal attributions. *Affect and cognition*, 17.
- Weiner, B., Graham, S., & Chandler, C. (1982). Pity, anger, and guilt: An attributional analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8(2), 226-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167282082007>
- Weiner, B., Graham, S., Stern, P., & Lawson, M. E. (1982). Using affective cues to infer causal thoughts. *Developmental Psychology*, 18(2), 278. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.18.2.278>
- Wilkowski, B. M., & Meier, B. P. (2010). Bring it on: angry facial expressions potentiate approach-motivated motor behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 98(2), 201. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017992>