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ABSTRACT

The Effects of Leader Negative Emotions on Evaluations of Leadership:

The Role of Anger and Sadness

by

Juan M. Madera

While existing literature on leadership articulates the importance of leader emotion, there has been little attention to the potential roles of more specific emotions. The current paper examined the effect of leader emotion on evaluations of leadership in the context of a product recall. In particular, this research examined how the expression of anger and sadness influences how effective a leader is perceived to be in times of crises. This was done by manipulating the emotion of the leader, as well as the response of the leader. The results revealed that a leader expressing either sadness or anger/sadness was evaluated more favorably than a leader expressing anger. Furthermore, a leader accepting responsibility for the crisis was evaluated more favorably than a leader not accepting responsibility.
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The Effects of Leader Negative Emotions on Evaluations of Leadership:

The Role of Anger and Sadness

An organizational crisis is an event that threatens an organization’s viability. Typically, such an event is characterized by ambiguity and the belief that decisions must be made swiftly (Pearson & Clair, 1998); thus, employees often experience a crisis as an episode of threat and uncertainty requiring urgent action (Pescosolido, 2002). It is a natural inclination in times of distress to rely upon leaders to make sense out of the uncertainty a crisis engenders (Bucy, 2002; Yukl & Howell, 1999). As such, an organizational crisis is an important context in which to examine leadership (Boin & Hart, 2003; Halverson, Murphy, & Riggio, in press).

What leaders say and how they say it – largely determines how they are evaluated as leaders during a crisis (Kash & Darling, 1998; Pearson & Clair, 1998). Leaders and their firms’ reputation may depend on how well they react to the crisis at hand (Kash & Darling, 1998). As such, a crisis represents a formidable task, as well as a window of opportunity (Boin & Hart, 2003). When leaders respond effectively, they may be herald as heroes (e.g., Ruldoph Giuliani responding to the Spetember 11th attacks). Leaders may also be evaluated negatively if they respond ineffectively.

Emotions are also related to how one responds to a crisis. Emotions are intense feelings that are directed at someone or something (George, 1996). There are multiple universal expressions of emotion that people distinguish as separate and distinct (Ekman, 1999). These include both negative emotions, such as anger and sadness, and positive emotions, such as happiness and surprise. Negative emotions are natural reactions to crises (Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000). Because subordinates often rely upon
their leaders to interpret events (Pescosolido, 2002), leaders should be cognizant of how their negative emotional reactions to a crisis may influence how they are evaluated by their followers.

Implicit leadership theory states that individuals’ evaluations of leaders are determined not objectively but through the confirmation of expectations individuals hold of leaders (Phillips and Lord, 1981). That is, individuals develop prototypes of leaders and then evaluate leaders according to their conception of leaders. Accordingly, individuals may hold conceptions of how leaders should respond to crises and the appropriate emotions leaders should express. Individuals develop global impressions of leadership by evaluating how well leaders match their prototypes, and therefore, individuals will evaluate a leader favorably if the leader expresses the emotions individuals believe to be appropriate. It is also important to note that the nature of the crisis will influence how leaders’ emotions will their followers’ evaluations. That is, emotions perceived to be appropriate in one situation might not be perceived to be appropriate in another.

In this study, I assessed how leaders’ emotional expression influences the way they are perceived as leaders. In particular, I used experimental methods to manipulate the emotional expressions of leaders and examine how individuals evaluate them as leaders. In this paper, I first discuss in more detail why subordinates look to leaders in times of crisis. Second, I will discuss how people form impressions of leaders on the basis of emotional expression and how these impressions may influence how a leader is evaluated. In particular, I will discuss two emotions in detail – anger and sadness. Finally, I will discuss the limitations of this past research and propose research that
extends past findings and clarifies the influence of leaders’ emotions during times of crises.

*Leaders in Times of Crisis*

The literature on crisis and leadership provides a theoretical framework to support the idea that emotional reactions to crises influence followers’ evaluations of their leaders. In periods of upheaval and stress, subordinates feel helpless, anxious, and frustrated often resulting in perceptions of an uncertain future (Yukl & Howell, 1999). Clore, Schwartz, and Conway (1994) found that such uncertainty encourages individuals to examine their leaders, because individuals expect their leaders to respond effectively to crises. Thus, crises create the need for leaders that will fix the problem. Similarly, Marcus and Mackuen (1993) found that crises lead people to examine and question the current hierarchy in their organizations, including their leaders. In sum, crises provide many circumstances in which leaders are evaluated, and consequently, opens a window of opportunity for those who demonstrate effective leadership (Bass, 1998). This crisis-reform theory suggests that although crises represent a challenge to “bring things back to normal,” crises are also an opportunity for leaders to demonstrate effective leadership (Boin & Hart, 2003, p. 545).

The crisis that the Johnson and Johnson Company faced in 1982 provides an example of how a crisis could generate a window of opportunity. In the fall 1982, seven people near Chicago died of cyanide poisoning linked to Tylenol capsules. The company’s public relations department had no plans to deal with such a crisis, yet the CEO, James Burke, quickly capitalized on the crisis by taking advantage of the opportunity to demonstrate the concern and responsibility of Johnson and Johnson. He
rejected glossing over the disaster, and instead regained the firm’s market share by deciding to introduce a tamper-proof Tylenol bottle. At a time of great public concern, Burke received accolades for his leadership (e.g., "American Corporate Conscience Award" by Council on Economic Priorities; Bass, 1998).

Theories of charismatic leadership also allude to the importance of crises for leaders. For example, Yukl and Howell (1999) argue that the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership might also be inspired by a crisis. Under crisis conditions people long for a figure who appears powerful and has a clear sense of direction, providing hope for reprieve from the distress. Pillai (1996) also proposes that crises encourage the emergence of charismatic leadership. In particular, a crisis fosters the emergence of charismatic leaders who are then evaluated as more effective than leaders who emerge in non-crisis situations.

Furthermore, historical accounts of crisis leadership provide some evidence that crises provide opportunities for leaders to demonstrate effectiveness. In particular, House, Spangler, and Woycke (1991) investigated the antecedents and consequences of U.S. presidents’ charisma. The results showed that the number of crises faced by the president in both domestic and international arenas was significantly and strongly related to the president’s behavioral charisma. Pillai and Meindl (1998) argue that Adolf Hitler’s rise to power provides an example of negative events as antecedents for successful and effective (although destructive) leadership. The political and economic crisis in Germany during the 1930’s created the conditions to attribute effectiveness to a leader (i.e., Hitler) whose emotion-laden messages were perceived as appropriate to the solution of the crises. In addition, Hertzler (1940) argues that history provides examples of how crisis
creates a situation in which a group finds itself in need of a great leader. Civil wars, invasions, and disorganized national finances led to the rise of Latin American dictators. Hence, crises preceded the urgency for strong leaders, and because crises lead people to reevaluate their leader, crises also create an opportunity for leaders to communicate effectively and therefore they may lead to positive evaluations.

_Crises and leader emotion._ The literature on leader emotion expression is germane to a discussion of the antecedents of favorable leader evaluations. Emotions are natural reactions to crises, and leaders’ reactions to these events play a role in how they are evaluated (Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000). There is growing interest in how leaders rely on the expression of emotions to help convey their message or influence others during crises (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; George, 2000; Glomb & Hulin, 1997; Hossack, 1993; Lewis, 2000; Tiedens, 2001). For instance, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) argue that leaders’ emotional expression has an impact on their subordinates’ perception of the leaders’ self-confidence.

Research on positive emotions demonstrates how leader emotion may influence their subordinates. Positive emotions expressed by leaders may inspire and motivate subordinates (Bass, 1990; Conger & Kanugo, 1994). “Leaders that show excitement, enthusiasm, and activity, are more likely to energize their subordinates and convey a sense of efficacy, competence, optimism, and enjoyment” (George, 1996, p. 162). For example, John F. Kennedy used positive emotional expressions to elicit support for his visionary goals (Chemers, 1997). Furthermore, charismatic leaders use emotions to arouse similar feelings in their audience (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). By using positive emotions in articulating their vision, leaders paint a positive picture of the future and
promote followers’ positive feelings. Transformational leaders use positive emotions to motivate their subordinates and communicate a vision (Bass, 1990). However, positive emotions may not always be what a leader expresses. It may depend on the context, and in times of crises, negative emotions may be warranted.

Leaders’ negative emotion can, too, influence subordinates in a number of ways. First, negative emotions may arouse subordinates. For example, George (2000) argues that because negative emotions foster systematic and careful information processing, it may be fruitful for leaders dealing with a crisis to express negative emotions to redirect attention to amend the problems produced by the crisis. Therefore, negative emotions expressed by leaders may also influence subordinates during a crisis (Masters & Sullivan, 1989).

Second, leaders can use negative emotions to encourage support from subordinates, because threat displays often function to strengthen the bond between subordinate and dominant figures (Masters & Sullivan, 1989). In particular, anger displays against a common enemy may motivate followers (Bucy, 2000). In response to the Oklahoma City federal building bombing, Bill Clinton expressed sympathy towards the victims, but anger towards the perpetrators. This emotional stance was posited to earn him a 12-point boost at the polls (Bucy & Newhagen, 1999).

Finally, negative emotions may frame a speech or vision by setting the mood. For example, Bucy and Newhagen (1999) emphasize that presidents use emotions to frame and set a mood for their messages. For instance, Michael Dukakis expressed unimpressed, emotionally flat responses to questions about hypothetical negative events (e.g., a perpetrator raping his wife) during the 1988 presidential debates, which
gave viewers the impression that he lacked compassion and the ability to express outrage. Dukakis’s goal was to display a calm demeanor to demonstrate his control. However, his emotional expressions (or lack of) were deemed inappropriate. Similarly, Edmund Muskie’s sad emotional reaction (e.g., showing tears) at a press conference raised doubts about his fitness for office and scuttled his presidential aspiration as the 1972 presidential hopeful.

Several mechanisms have been proposed to explain such findings. First, emotional expressions may transfer to other individuals through emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994). According to emotional contagion theory, the corresponding feeling of the emotion is created when individuals spontaneously and unconsciously mimic the facial expressions of the individual expressing the emotion. Emotional contagion effects have been demonstrated in group settings (Barsade, Ward, Turner, & Sonnenfeld; 2000) and are more likely to occur when the sender of emotions occupies an important or central position in a group (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994). Thus, leaders that show negative emotions towards an outside threat might arouse subordinates by transferring the same emotions (George, 1996; Lewis, 2000).

Second, emotions serve as communication about an individual’s intentions and behavior (Ekman, 1997) and signal what values one attaches to different issues (Putnam, 1994). By such mechanisms, an expresser of emotions can influence others’ behaviors and emotions. For example, anger induces fear and compliance in others because anger is usually followed by aggression (Barry & Oliver, 1996). The expression of anger suggests that issues under consideration are important to the expresser and, that the expresser is not going to yield (Friedman et al., 2004).
Third, specific emotions can influence decisions by producing a change in the perceived likelihoods attached to events mentioned in messages and by affecting the way information is processed (DeSteno, Petty, Rucker, Wegner, & Braverman, 2004). Emotions can also influence attempts at persuasion, because an individual can be more successful when messages are framed with emotional overtones matching the emotions of the recipients. Accordingly, a leader may be more persuasive when expressing emotions that match the emotions of subordinates.

The aforementioned research is important considering the findings that effective leaders almost always rely on the expression of feelings and emotions to help convey their messages (George, 1996). Such expressions are often a critical element in subordinates’ acceptance or rejection of a leader’s message. So, when effective leaders want to implement significant changes, they rely on how emotions frame and mobilize their messages.

One of the main objectives for organizational leaders, then, may be to decide upon the most appropriate emotions to express during a crisis. Theories of leadership, however, do not articulate which emotion is appropriate for leaders to express in times of crises. The current research attempts to better understand how leaders’ emotional expression specifically influences the way they are perceived as leaders. In particular, because positive emotions (i.e., happiness and surprise) are not common reactions to crises, the current research focuses on two negative emotions commonly linked to crises – anger and sadness (Humphry, 2002; Lewis, 2000; Tiedens, 2001).

The nature of the crisis. I propose that one role of an organizational leader is to express appropriate emotion(s) during a crisis. But what is perceived as appropriate may
depend on the context or the nature of the crisis. It is important to note that the nature of the crisis will drive which emotion(s) will be perceived as appropriate or effective. Although there is an array of crises an organization can face (e.g., product recall, extortion, hostile takeover, terrorist attack, product boycott, or a natural disaster), organizational crises share a number of common elements with each other. More specifically, crises are believed to (1) have a low probability of occurring, but still pose a major threat to the survival of an organization (Pearson & Mitroff, 1993); (2) offer little time to respond (Quarantelli, 1998); and (3) present a dilemma in need of a decision that will result in change (Dutton, 1986; Pearson & Clair, 1998).

Crises do vary, however, along an important dimension, which is the source of the crisis. In some situations, the source of the crisis is external such as a terrorist attack or a natural disaster. The source of the crisis may also be internal, in which management, employees, or products are the source (e.g., product tampering, plant explosion, or product recall). Because it is an internal and controllable threat, product recall is a type of crisis in which all fingers are pointed at the leader (Pearson & Clair, 1998). From the fiasco of Firestone’s tire recall in 2000 to more recently Mitsubishi’s recall of automobiles, product recall is a crisis that has made headlines and has gained public scrutiny. In such a context, a leader must show concern for consumer safety as well as the initiative to make the necessary changes (Pearson & Clair, 1998). Product recall is representative of crises in which the source is internal and like all other crises poses a major threat to employees and consumers, offer little time to respond, and presents a need for a quick decision. Therefore, the current research will focus on one example of crisis – product recall.
Evaluations of Leaders Based on Emotional Expressions

The foregoing discussion suggests three points that are central to the current research: (1) crises create a situation in which subordinates evaluate their leaders, (2) negative emotions are natural reactions to crises, and (3) leaders may use emotions to motivate and influence their subordinates. Given these three points, I attempt to describe why and how anger and sadness might result in favorable evaluations of a leader facing a product recall.

The literature on emotion perception provides evidence that people form impressions of others on the basis of emotion expressions (Monterpare & Dobish, 2003). For example, Ekman (1997) argues that facial expressions of emotion have meaning, providing information about the expresser. In particular, emotions provide others with information about the antecedents, the expresser’s thoughts, the expresser’s internal physical state, what the expresser is likely to do next, and what the expresser wants the perceiver to do.

Several mechanisms have been identified to account for such phenomena. The ecological theory of social perception suggests that displays of emotion may be regarded as expressions of approach, attack, or avoidance because they suggest how dominant or friendly a person may behave rather than simply how angry or sad a person may feel (Monterpare & Zebowitz-McArthur, 1988). For example, anger may viewed as an attack, conveying a person’s intention to act in a domineering and hostile manner. Expressions of sadness may be seen as expressions of avoidance, suggesting a person’s reticence toward interaction, submissiveness, and timidity. Thus, when facing a product recall, leaders expressing anger may lead to the perception that they are willing to attack
the problem, whereas expressing sadness during a crisis may communicate sympathy for any harm that the product caused.

More evidence of associations between emotion expressions and trait impressions is provided in a study in which participants were asked to make trait ratings of six trained actors displaying sadness, happiness, anger, disgust, and fear (Knutson, 1996). As expected, actors displaying anger were perceived as being high in dominance, but low in affiliation, whereas those displaying sadness were perceived as being low in dominance and avoidance, but high in affiliation. Montepare and Dobish (2003) replicated the results using untrained targets, and further showed that the relationships between emotional expressions and trait impressions were generally independent of the impact of facial attractiveness. Accordingly, an organizational leader expressing anger may be perceived to be dominant, whereas a leader displaying sadness may be perceived to be warm.

Limitations of Past Research

Both the anecdotal and empirical research outlined above maintain that leadership is intrinsically an emotional process, where leaders' expression of emotion affect their standing as a leader. And, while there has been research examining the influence of leader emotion, there are important limitations. One limitation is that past research has examined leader emotion as single discrete emotions rather than examining combinations of emotions. There is a reason to question research examining single emotions. In fact, people frequently display affect blends, wherein individuals express two emotions (Ekman, 1997). One may ask if individuals can express both anger and sadness, and therefore examining anger and sadness separately may be unrealistic.
The social constructionist approach to emotion expression argues that although all emotions are reducible to a few basic, universal emotions such as anger and sadness, a given stimulus may elicit multiple emotions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). Thus, this theoretical approach to emotions suggests that one should examine multiple emotions simultaneously rather than one at a time. The current research will address this limitation by including a condition in which a leader expresses both anger and sadness.

There are reasons to hypothesize that expressing both anger and sadness may lead to the most favorable result for leaders dealing with a product recall. Although sadness is associated with weakness, it is also associated with warmth and affiliation (Gallois, 1993). A leader expressing sadness communicates empathy, which is important to express when considering the potential or actual injuries caused by defective products. At critical moments, however, expressing sadness alone may also invite uncertainty and therefore, prompt negative evaluations of the leader. So, expressing sadness alone may not be an effective strategy for leaders. Would Rudolph Giuliani have been successful if he had only expressed sadness? The most likely answer is no. As research has demonstrated, in times of crises strong, dominant leaders reassure individuals. Because sadness is a passive emotion, it may be the case that leaders should also express an active emotion such as anger (Lewis, 2000).

Research demonstrates that emotions are accompanied by different levels of activation (Rucker & Petty, 2004). Anger is accompanied by a state of heightened activation, while sadness is accompanied by a state of deactivation. Furthermore, the nature of the activation may signal what activities are desirable, such that, for example, anger is accompanied by a state of readiness to act and arousal.
Bass (1990) argues that in the role of a CEO, anger is often associated with strong leadership. “Anger expressions create the impression that the expresser is strong and persuades other to comply with the expresser” (Tiedens, p. 87, 2001). Anger expression is intimidating and may lead to compliance by others (Adler, Rose, & Silverstein, 1998; Sutton, 1991). Furthermore, anger expression may lead to the perception that the expresser is an effective leader (Bucy & Newhagen, 1999; Masters & Sullivan, 1989; Tiedens, 2001).

Expressions of anger are viewed as an attack, conveying a person’s intention to act in a domineering manner (Monterpare & Zebrowitz-McArthur, 1988) and, in response to crises, a leader who appears in control reassures people (Bucy, 2000; Kash & Darling, 1998). In the context of a product recall, anger toward the mistake(s) that led to the recall communicates that the leader will not tolerate such carelessness. It is sometimes the case that the leader is at fault, so showing anger towards one’s mistake also conveys that the leader is willing to acknowledge the mistake and will do something to amend it. But only expressing anger may also not be an effective strategy. Consequently, because expressing sadness may be fruitful to convey empathy and expressing anger may be effective to convey competence, a leader expressing both sadness and anger may be an effective strategy.

The literature on emotion expression discussed earlier provides important implications for leaders faced with product recall. Depending on the context, sadness creates the perception that the expresser is warm and agreeable, but also weak, submissive, and in need of help (Gallois, 1993). Sadness expressed by leaders may be a sign of weakness for subordinates (Lewis, 2000). Sadness, however, does conjecture
positive impressions about leaders, such as empathy, warmth, and affiliation. So, expressing sadness towards a crisis in which there are deaths or harm toward individuals (e.g., the product recall of Tylenol) may be an effective strategy for leaders. Anger is associated with dominance, strength, and intelligence (Gallois, 1993; Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000). The belief that a leader is angry after a negative event results in the perception that the leader is competent and effective (Tiedens, 2001), because anger is linked to power and sadness is linked to submission (Montepare & Dobish, 2003). However, expressing only anger towards a product recall may be a sign that the leader is cold, or is upset because of the loss of money.

A series of four studies by Tiedens (2001) provides evidence that anger expressions can lead to favorable attributions because expressions of anger create the perception that the expresser is competent. The first study used excerpts of Bill Clinton’s grand jury testimony about the Lewinsky scandal. One clip showed him with angry facial expressions, and the second clip showed him with sadness expressions. The participants that viewed the angry-expression clip were more likely to believe that Clinton should remain as president than the group that saw the sad and remorseful clip. In a second study, participants viewed a video of an actor portraying a politician giving a speech about terrorism in either an angry way or in a sad way. Participants in the angry condition perceived the expresser to be more effective than those in the sad condition, and participants rated the angry politician as more competent leader than the sad politician.

In Tieden’s (2001) third study, employees at a software company rated how often their peers expressed anger. The group’s manager rated how likely he would promote
each of the employees. Anger expression positively predicted the likelihood for promotion. That is, the more anger employees expressed, the greater was the likelihood that the manager would promote them. In the fourth study, participants watched a video clip of a job interview in which the applicant described a negative event. At the end of each expression applicant’s said the negative event made them angry or sad. The participants were asked to rate the degree to which they would hire the applicants and to award them a salary. Although both groups were equally willing to hire both applicants, they awarded the higher-level job and a higher salary to the applicant who showed anger than the applicant who showed sadness. Anger led to the perception that expressers were competent and capable. Those expressing sadness were viewed as likeable and warm, but also not capable for leadership. Anger not only created compliance through intimidation but it also created the perception that the expresser was a capable leader.

The expression of both anger and sadness may lead to favorable evaluations for leaders facing a product recall. Because product recalls may involve some degree of culpability, sadness may be an effective emotion to express since sadness is associated with remorse and empathy (Tiedens, 2002). Anger is associated with dominance, strength, and intelligence (Gallois, 1993; Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000), and therefore, may lead to favorable evaluations for the leader.

Hypothesis 1: Leaders expressing both sadness and anger in a product recall situation will be evaluated more favorably than leaders expressing either anger or sadness alone.

Another limitation to past research examining the influence of leader emotion is the lack of manipulating the leader’s response. That is, it is not clear whether expressing
anger and sadness is an effective strategy for leaders because it’s a reaction to a threat or if it is due to the response of the leader (i.e., what they do in a crisis). The current research will address this limitation by manipulating the leader’s response. In the context of a product recall, leaders can either accept responsibility and do something proactive (e.g., recall the defective products) or they cannot accept responsibility. Because the current research is focusing on product recalls, in which fingers are pointed to the leader, such manipulations will help determine whether the effect of leader emotion is due to the response or the emotion itself.

Experimental research in leadership crisis suggests that leaders are perceived to be better leaders responding to a crisis than leaders in non-crisis situations when they respond effectively. For example, Hunt, Boal, and Dodge (1999) found that crisis-responsive leaders were rated better than leaders who were not in a crisis situation, but that ratings of this leader deteriorated after the crisis had abated. Kets de Vries (1988) found that followers become more attached to their leaders in times of crisis because the leader offers them direction and security. Furthermore, Halverson, Holladay, Kazama, and Quinones (in press) demonstrated that the existence of an organizational crisis led to greater attributions of effective leadership, as well as followers’ intentions to reciprocate self-sacrificial behavior. These findings are not surprising considering that crises are stressful and raise uncertainty, requiring urgent decisions. Leaders are, therefore, looked upon to take control and provide guidance (Bucy, 2002). These experimental findings, however, may have different results if the leader responded ineffectively.

In the context of a product recall, Masatoshi Ono, CEO of Bridgestone-Firestone’s tire during the recall of 6.5 million tires because they were linked to 101
deaths in the U.S, provides anecdotal evidence that when not accepting responsibility, a leader may emerge from crisis as ineffective. Ono not accepting and disagreeing with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s findings that the tires were defective was seen as an inappropriate and ineffective strategy, which resulted in great financial loss and tarnished the company’s image.

In contrast, James Burke, CEO during the Tylenol recall fiasco of 1982, provides anecdotal evidence that when responding effectively, a leader may emerge from crisis as effective (Bass, 1989). Paul Pressler, CEO of Gap Inc., provides another example of a leader responding effectively to a recall of children’s outwear, after the company received 13 reports of the zipper pull detaching. Pressler accepted responsibility for the defective product and conducted a nationwide recall of about 666,000 children’s coats and fleece pullovers, resulting in saving the image of the company and maintaining their profits.

The current research will address the shortcomings of past research by assessing the effect of a leader’s response to a product recall (i.e., acceptance vs. not accepting). And, because past research indicates that leaders who respond effectively to crises are rated as effective, it is expected that regardless of the emotion expressed, leaders will be rated more effective when leaders accept responsibility for the events that led to the product recall than leaders who do not accept responsibility.

It is also expected that the leader’s response will influence the effect of the leader’s emotion expression. For example, the positive effect of leaders expressing anger may be due to the fact anger is an active emotion (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). And a leader expressing anger because of a product recall can be a sign that the leader will not
accept such mistakes when the leader accepts the fault. When a leader accepts a mistake, expressing sadness may be a sign of redemption (Tiedens, 2001), but it may be seen as self-pity if the leader does not accept responsibility. Anger and sadness may also indicate the lack of emotional control if a leader does not accept responsibility for the events that led to the crisis at hand (Lewis, 2000). Therefore, it is expected that the response of the leader will influence the effects of anger and sadness expressions.

Hypothesis 2: Leaders accepting responsibility for the mistakes that led to a product recall will be evaluated more favorably than leaders not accepting responsibility.

Hypothesis 3: A leader’s response to a product recall will moderate the effect of leader emotion on follower evaluation such that leaders expressing both anger and sadness will be evaluated more favorably when accepting responsibility than when leaders do not accept responsibility.

The Current Research

The current research examines the influence of leaders’ negative expressions (i.e., anger, sadness, a combination of anger and sadness) in times of a crisis. Such research is important because a crisis creates a situation in which subordinates are often prone to evaluate their leaders – leaders’ use of emotions in times of crises may be used to arouse, persuade, and otherwise motivate subordinates. Thus, the current research manipulates expression within a crisis paradigm. In addition to expressions being important behavioral choices that a leader can make, the leader can also choose whether or not to accept responsibility for the crisis. The current research, then, also examines reactions to leaders taking or rejecting responsibility for a crisis. The particular crisis that is used in
the current research involves a product recall scenario – a medication is linked to cancer and must be recalled. This scenario was chosen because it provided a reasonable backdrop against which both negative emotions and responsibility could be manipulated.

Method

Participants

One-hundred and sixty-one undergraduate students from Rice University recruited participants to take part in the current study. Each student was asked to recruit two participants in exchange for one-hour of experimental credit. Thus, a total of 322 full-time employees from various occupations and organizations volunteered to take part in the study. Of these employees, 161 were men, 157 were women, and four did not provide information on their gender. The average years of work experience for the participants in the study was 14 years and 10 months.

Design and Procedure

This study used a 3 X 2 between-subjects design, with the leader’s emotional expression (anger, sadness, or anger/sadness) as the first factor and the leader’s response (acceptance or not accepting) as the second factor. Undergraduate students enrolled in psychology courses received research credit in exchange for recruiting working adults to complete questionnaires. The undergraduate students were instructed to distribute two experimental packets to adults with a full-time job. The packets included an envelope, instructions, a vignette (which manipulated the leader’s emotion and the type of response), and a questionnaire (see Appendix A for an example of the questionnaire). A manipulation check was also employed at the end of the survey, in which participants were asked to choose an emotion from a list to indicate how the leader felt about the
product recall. The list included “anger and sad, anger, sad, and do not know.” The participants were also asked to choose how the leader responded from a list that included “accepted responsibility, did not accept responsibility, and do not know.” After completing these manipulation checks, the participants returned the questionnaires in a sealed envelope to the undergraduate students who then returned the sealed envelopes to the experimenter.

**Vignettes**

This study utilized vignettes of a leader addressing a failed product that led to a product recall (see Appendix B for the full scenario). The vignette was presented as a news clipping from the Associated Press, which included a synopsis of the product recall and an interview in which the leader expresses his emotion(s). The emotion(s) expressed by the leader was manipulated throughout the body of the text. For example, the headline of the article stated “corporate leader, Michael Worth, says he is ‘angry,’ ‘sad.’ or ‘angry and sad’.” The leader’s response was manipulated by either stating in the hypothetical news clip that the leader accepted responsibility of the failed product or did not accept responsibility for the failed product.

**Dependent Measures**

To assess the participants’ evaluation of the leader, two previously developed scales of *Perceived Competence* and *Legitimacy* of the leader were used, both of which will be explained in more detail.

*Perceived Competence.* Perceived competence was measured by a scale taken from Tiedens (2001). This scale consists of four items (“he is a competent leader,” “he is a knowledgeable leader,” “he is not a likeable leader,” [R] and “he is a strong leader”).
These items were rated on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The internal consistency reliability for these items was .78.

*Legitimacy.* Legitimacy was measured by a scale developed by Halverson, Holladay, Kazama, and Quinones (in press). The scale for attributions of legitimacy consists of three items (alpha coefficient = .92; “I would want him to continue to be CEO of the company,” “he deserves the position of CEO,” and “I would not approve of him as a leader” [R]). These items were rated on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The internal consistency reliability for these items was .79.

*Final scale development.* In conducting a correlational analysis between the two scales, a very high positive correlation (r = .75) was found. Thus, I tested the dimensionality of both scales with a Principal Components Factor Analysis. The results revealed one meaningful factor with an Eigenvalue of 4.17 that accounted for 59.58% of the variance. Accordingly, all items from both scales were combined to make one scale that will be used as measure of a global evaluation of the leader. For the factor loadings of each item of the composite variable, see Table 1. The internal consistency reliability for all the items was .80.

**Results**

*Manipulation checks.* An Analysis of Variance, F(2, 319) = 29.29, p = .001, revealed that participants rated the leader as feeling both anger and sadness (M = 1.25, SD = .045) when reading about the leader feeling anger and sadness, rated the leader as feeling anger (M = 1.92, SD = .047) when reading about the leader feeling anger, and rated the leader as feeling sadness (M = 2.81, SD = .047) when reading about the leader feeling sad. As another measure to ensure the effectiveness of the manipulation,
Table 1

**Evaluation of the Leader (Item and Factor Loading)**

- I would want him to continue to be CEO of the company. (.88)
- He deserves the position of CEO. (.86)
- He is a competent leader. (.85)
- He is a knowledgeable leader. (.72)
- I would not approve of him as a leader. (-.70)
- He is not a likeable leader. (-.69)
- He is a strong leader. (.67)
frequency analyses demonstrated that participants chose the option of both anger and sadness 90% of the time when reading about the leader feeling anger and sadness, chose the option of anger 87% of the time when reading about the leader feeling anger, and chose the option of sad 88% of the time when reading about the leader feeling sad. An ANOVA, $F(1, 311) = 86.23, p = .001$, revealed that participants rated the leader as accepting responsibility ($M = 1.12, SD = .020$) when reading about the leader accepting responsibility and rated the leader as not accepting responsibility ($M = 1.97, SD = .021$) when reading about the leader not accepting responsibility. A frequency analyses demonstrated that participants chose the option of accepting responsibility 96% of the time when reading about the leader accepting responsibility and chose the option of not accepting responsibility 89% of the time when reading about the leader not accepting responsibility. 

Leader emotion. The results revealed that the leader’s emotion had a significant effect on the evaluation of the leader ($F(2, 316) = 3.78, p = .024, \eta^2 = .023$). To test Hypothesis 1, which stated that leaders expressing both sadness and anger in a product recall situation will be evaluated more favorably than leaders expressing either anger or sadness alone, I ran a priori contrasts. The results did not reveal a significant difference in the evaluation of the leaders between leaders expressing both sadness and anger ($M = 4.01, SE = .1$) and leaders expressing either anger ($M = 3.62, SE = .1$) or sadness alone ($M = 3.98, SE = .1$), $t (319) = .96$, $ns$, not supporting Hypothesis 1. A power analysis was conducted to determine the power to detect a significant effect (Cohen, 1992). The effect size of the test was .18; a small effect size according to Cohen’s (1992) standards. 

\[^{1}\] I ran the analyses using only the participants that passed the manipulation checks and found the same pattern of results if I use all the participants. Therefore, the reported analyses include all 322 participants.
calculated the harmonic mean, because there were unequal sample sizes producing 146.69. The result demonstrated that the power was only .32. As such, the power was too low with only a 32% chance of rejecting the null hypothesis when it is false. However, as shown in Figure 1, the results did reveal that leaders expressing sadness and anger/sadness emotion where evaluated more favorably than a leader expressing anger ($t(319) = -2.07, p = .04$), providing partial support for Hypothesis 1. In sum, a leader expressing both sadness and anger was perceived more favorably than a leader expressing only anger, but was not perceived more favorably than a leader expressing only sadness.

*Leader response.* The results revealed that the leader’s response had a significant effect on the evaluation of the leader ($F(1, 316) = 94.07, p = .001, \eta^2 = .23$). As expected, the leader accepting responsibility for the crisis was rated more favorably ($M = 4.46, SE = .082$) than the leader that did not accept responsibility for the crisis ($M = 3.31, SE = .09$). Thus, the results supported Hypothesis 2, which stated that leaders accepting responsibility for the mistakes that led to a product recall will be evaluated more favorably than leaders not accepting responsibility (see Figure 2).

The results did not reveal significant interactions between leader emotion and leader response on the evaluation of the leader ($F(2, 316) = 1.97, p = .14, \eta^2 = .01$). To test Hypothesis 3, which stated that a leader’s response to a product recall will moderate the effect of leader emotion on follower evaluation such that a leader expressing both anger and sadness will be evaluated more favorably when accepting responsibility than when a leader does not accept responsibility, I performed simple effect and contrasts analyses. The simple effect analyses revealed that there were differences in the evaluation of leaders for the three emotions when the leader did not accept responsibility
Figure 1
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(F(2, 151) = 4.82, p = .009), but not when the leader accepted the responsibility (F(2, 165) = .204, p = .009). As shown in figure 3, the results revealed that when the leaders’ response was not accepting responsibility, leaders expressing sadness/anger (M = 3.49, SE = .14) and sadness (M = 3.5, SE = .15) were evaluated more favorably than leaders expressing anger (M = 2.9, SE = .15; t (316) = 3.22, p = .001). Furthermore, when the leaders’ response was not accepting responsibility, leaders expressing sadness/anger (M = 3.49, SE = .14) were evaluated more favorably than leaders expressing anger (M = 2.9, SE = .15; t (316) = 2.83, p = .005), and leaders expressing sadness (M = 3.5, SE = .15) were evaluated more favorably than leaders expressing anger (M = 2.9, SE = .15; t (316) = 2.83, p = .005). No such differences were found when the response was acceptance. In sum, the results did not support Hypothesis 3.

Discussion

The results of this study demonstrate that a leader’s response and the emotions the leader express do influence the manner in which the leader is evaluated. The results also reveal that a leader expressing either sadness or anger/sadness was perceived more favorably than a leader expressing anger. Furthermore, a leader accepting responsibility for the crisis was evaluated more favorably than a leader not accepting responsibility. Such findings support and add to past research demonstrating that not accepting responsibility is a less effective strategy than accepting responsibility (Folkes & Whang, 2003). This study, however, demonstrates that one must also consider the emotion that a leader expresses. When the leader’s response is that of not accepting responsibility, the leader expressing sadness/anger or sadness was perceived more favorably than the leader expressing anger.
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It is possible that I did not find differences between a leader expressing sadness and a leader expressing both anger and sadness because of the nature of the crisis that was employed in the current study. That is, I adopted a crisis that involved a failed product, which led to a product recall because the product was linked to cancer. In such a context, a leader is probably most effective when showing concern (Pearson & Clair, 1998), therefore expressing sadness was probably interpreted to be an appropriate emotion. In contrast, although anger is associated with dominance, strength, and intelligence (Gallois, 1993; Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000), expressing only anger may be interpreted as a sign that the leader is cold. The current research found that a leader expressing anger was perceived less favorably than was a leader expressing sadness or both anger and sadness.

Tiedens (2001) found that anger expressions can lead to favorable attributions because expressions of anger create the perception that the expresser is competent. In the current research, however, I found effects that revealed the opposite findings. More specifically, anger was the least effective emotion for a leader to express in the context of a failed product. One difference between the current study and that of Tieden’s research is that the participants in this study evaluated a hypothetical leader; however, participants in Tieden’s study evaluated their own leader (i.e., the president of the United States and an ambassador). A second difference was that the leaders in Tieden’s research faced a crisis caused by an external threat (i.e., terrorists), whereas the crisis of the current study was an internal one. Anger was an effective emotion to express in Tieden’s research possibly because anger is associated with dominance, strength, and intelligence (Gallois, 1993; Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000) and is often interpreted as a sign of attack.
to an external threat. In contrast, the current research involved some culpability since a product recall was caused by a failed product that should never have been placed in the market. Therefore, sadness was effective since sadness is a sign of remorse, empathy, warmth, and affiliation (Tiedens, 2002).

Limitations and Future Research

As with most laboratory research, the current study is not without limitations. First, only two emotions were examined, anger and sadness. According to Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) there are multiple primary emotions, such as anger, sadness, and surprise, as well as secondary emotions such as disgust, envy, and shame. Although it may be fruitful to investigate other emotions, it did not make logical sense to have included these other emotion (i.e., fear, love, joy, and surprise) in the current research because these emotions would not be expressed by a leader in response to a product recall. Another limitation is that current experiment did not investigate other crises. But what is perceived as appropriate may depend on the contextual factors of the crisis. It is important to note that the nature of the crisis will influence the perception of which emotion(s) is perceived as appropriate or effective. Thus, the results are limited to the context of a product recall, and therefore the results may have been different in other situations as demonstrated by Tiedens (2002) who found opposite results. Future research may address this limitation by investigating the effects of leader emotion and response in multiple situations.

Furthermore, participants did not make judgments about their own leader, but rather made judgments about a hypothetical leader. Such a limitation may hinder the generalizability of the results in situations where the leader is evaluated by their own
subordinates because subordinates know more about their leader than an individual reading about another leader. As such, subordinates’ evaluations about their leader may be influenced by past encounters or experiences with their leader. Despite this limitation, the results may have implications for public perceptions of leaders facing a product recall, because the experimental stimuli were presented as a “real” news clipping and the participants were instructed that they were making judgments about “a recent case in the news.” That is, this research examined how a leader’s emotion and response to a product recall influences how he is evaluated by the general public. Such implications are important in light of current and public product recalls. A prime example is the recall that Raymond Gilmartin, Chairman, President, and CEO of Merck, faced when Merck recalled its drug Vioxx, a popular arthritis drug and the best selling drug (2.5 billion dollar per year), off the market as a major study linked the drug to heart attacks and strokes. The results of this study demonstrate that accepting responsibility for the failed product led to effective evaluations for the leader. Furthermore, when the leader's response is not accepting responsibility, a leader expressing sadness/anger or sadness led to favorable evaluations.

Another possible limitation is that the participants were told what the emotion the leader expressed rather than seeing a leader express an emotion. Although there is emotion research that uses a paper people methodology, there is also research that uses videos of leaders expressing an emotion. Using the paper method has more control because it ensures that a participant knows exactly what a leader is feeling. The video method is more naturalistic in that participants must assess what the leader is feeling and expressing, but there is less control because participants may perceive different emotions.
Furthermore, presenting an emotion on paper may elicit a response from a participant that is different from a response elicited by a video.

Future research may address such a methodological issue. For example, it could be the case that reading about what a person is feeling may elicit a cognitive response, whereas seeing a person’s emotion may elicit an emotional response. Emotion research demonstrates that when followers observe the emotional expression of a leader, they may be emotionally influenced through emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994). Emotional contagion occurs when individuals unintentionally imitate the emotional expressions of the individual expressing the emotion. Gump and Kulik (1997) have demonstrated that emotional contagion is more likely to occur when individuals are under stress. Similarly, Thompson and Bolger (1999) found that married couples were more likely to experience emotional contagion in periods of stress. Therefore, viewing a leader express an emotion may elicit an emotional response during a crisis through emotional contagion. Reading about a person’s emotion may not elicit the same phenomena of emotional contagion. Instead, a person’s reaction to such stimuli may be more of a cognitive response, because the individual reads about the emotion and then makes a judgment about the appropriateness of the emotion rather than also feeling the emotion.

Future research also might examine organizational factors that influence the emotional expressions of leaders. Such factors include the climate for emotion expression of the organization. The expressions of certain emotions may be regulated in many organizations and occupations by particular climates (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1991). Organizational climate is a function of what is supported and expected, and therefore,
sends strong signals to what is expected from the behaviors of employees (Reichers & Schneider, 1990). In some organizations, employees are expected to display positive emotions and inhibit the expression of negative emotions (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003). Positive emotional displays are often aimed at increasing liking between employees and customers. For instance, customer service agents are usually expected to express positive emotions to create positive feelings in customers, so that they well leave with a positive impression of the company (Grandey & Brauburger, 2002). In other organizations, the expression of negative emotions is appropriate and sometimes expected (e.g., bill collectors; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1991). Thus, certain climates may foster particular expressions of emotions (e.g., anger) whereas other climates might inhibit such displays and/or foster other emotions. As part of the climate, leaders may also be expected to display positive emotions in such industries. In sum, future research might consider the climate for emotion expression of the organization when examining the effectiveness of emotional displays of leaders.

Furthermore, other organizational factors that influence the emotional expressions of leaders are the industry and occupation. Stereotypes, for instance, suggest that airline flight attendants are expected to be cheerful, funeral counselors are expected to show sadness, and medical doctors are expected to be emotionally neutral. According to Grandey and Brauburger (2002), there are three types of emotional work requirements that map on to certain industries and occupations. The first type is customer service that requires front-line employees to be integrative and, therefore employees are expected to display positive emotions (e.g. happiness). The second industry includes occupations such as bill collectors and bouncers, in which employees are expected to display anger
and other negative emotions. The third industry and emotion type include occupations such as therapists, judges, and medical doctors, in which employees are expected to suppress emotional displays, because neutral emotional displays are used to convey dispassionate authority. Thus, future research may investigate how the effectiveness of leaders expressing certain emotions may vary as a function of the industry and occupation.

Another limitation of the current research involves the fact that the hypothetical leader of the current study was male. There is a large volume of research examining gender differences in leadership roles and a number of significant differences emerge (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). For instance, in a meta-analysis, Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that women were more likely to adopt a democratic or participative style than men, while men were more likely to adopt an autocratic or directive style than women. Such findings have been linked to the fact that men and women are socialized differently (Eagly & Karau, 2002). That is, women are socialized to be communal or nurturing, friendly, and helpful, and men are socialized to be agentic or competitive, aggressive, and dominant. As Eagly et al. (2000) argued, men and women behave differently as leaders and individuals expect different behaviors from male and female leaders. Female leaders, however, are not necessarily evaluated a less effective leaders than male leaders. In a meta-analysis, Eagly, Karu, and Makhijani (1995) found that men were more effective than women in roles that were defined in more masculine terms, and women were more effective than men in roles that were defined in less masculine terms.

Such findings and theorizing have implications for the current study and for future research. First, since anger is associated with aggression and dominance, female leaders...
expressing anger may be evaluated less favorably than male leaders. Second, male leaders expressing sadness may be evaluated less favorably than female leaders because sadness is associated with weakness. But, one may also argue that a crisis is a strong situation in which a leader expressing a certain emotion (e.g., sadness in the current study), regardless of the gender, is perceived more favorably. The notion that a crisis can create a strong situation in which gender roles are less important is consistent with the argument that the formal roles provide powerful guides to behavior that may diminish gender difference (Eagly and Johnson, 1990). A crisis such as a failed product linked to cancer creates a situation in which leaders should express sadness, because sadness is a sign of remorse, empathy, warmth, and affiliation (Tiedens, 2002), which may be expected in such a situation and as demonstrated in this study, leads to favorable evaluations. Future research may investigate whether such expectations override any gender expectations in emotion expression during a crisis.

Implications

The results of the current research emphasize what a leader should do to be evaluated favorably in the face of a product recall. Leaders should take steps to correct or remediate the harm of a failed product, accept responsibility, and show concern for the customers and other individuals who can potentially be harmed. The results also stress the importance of specific emotions in influencing evaluations of effective leadership. Leaders’ emotions hold evolutionary significance for a social organization, and by conveying the proper emotion, leaders may transmit important cues that signal dominance, composure, and bonding (Masters & Sullivan, 1989). Emotional displays are instrumental for the leaders in regulating status and power relationships in human
societies. Furthermore, leader emotion expressions may be evaluated for traits that are inherent for effective leadership (e.g., credibility; Bucy, 2000).

The findings of current research have implications for impression management tactics a leader can utilize. "Impression management occurs because an actor has a goal of creating and maintaining a specific identity by strategically exhibiting behaviors, both verbal and nonverbal, that will cause a target to view the actor as desired" (Bozeman & Kacmar, 1997, p. 9). Controlling one's image is instrumental in regulating status and power in social hierarchies (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). There are various methods in which a leader attempts to control their images during social situations. One way in which a leader may control their image is through the expression of emotions that are deemed appropriate for certain social interactions by fabricating an emotion that they do not actually feel. Although this study did not investigate the expression of emotions as an impression management tool, the results demonstrate that a leader can use emotions as an impression management tactic. In the current study, when not accepting responsibility for a product recall, the leader was evaluated more favorably when expressing sadness or both anger and sadness than when expressing anger alone.

The results of this study also have implications for implicit leadership theory (Phillips & Lord, 1981). Much of the research on implicit leadership theory emphasizes the role of employees’ perceptions of their leaders. Individuals hold assumptions about the traits and abilities that characterize their prototypic leaders. They are stored in memory and are activated when interacting with leaders, and therefore their evaluations of a leader is dependent on how well the leader matches the prototype. The results of this study indicate that in a product recall crisis, leaders that express both anger and sadness
or sadness alone are evaluated more favorably than a leader expressing anger alone.

Thus, emotions may be part of individuals’ prototypes of leaders. Individuals may have assumptions of what emotion(s) a leader should express during a crisis.

Conclusion

The current research highlights the importance of examining a leader’s response to a crisis. In times of crises, individuals look to their leader for direction. By accepting responsibility and taking steps to ensure the safety of consumers, the leader was evaluated more favorably in the current study. The most effective response was one characterized by a leader who accepted responsibility and initiated proactive steps in dealing with a crisis. In addition, the current research demonstrated the interpersonal effect of a leader’s emotion on how the leader was evaluated. When a leader did not accept responsibility, the leader was evaluated more favorably when expressing sadness or both sadness and anger. Taken together, the results indicate that leaders should carefully consider the emotions and reactions that they display to their followers.
References


content: The influence of affective diversity in top management teams.

*Administrative Science Quarterly, 45,* 802-836.


of Applied Psychology, 88, 79-86.


_The Howard Journal of Communication, 13_, 113-128.


Plous, S., & Williams, T. (1995). Racial stereotypes from the days of American Slavery:


and Social Psychology, 39, 590-598.


Appendix A
Questionnaire Example

**Directions**: Using the following scale please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. **Remember, there are no right or wrong answers.**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
--- --- --- --- --- --- ---
Strongly Disagree    Neither Agree    Strongly Agree
Nor Disagree

1) ______ Michael Worth is a competent leader.

2) ______ Michael Worth is a knowledgeable leader.

3) ______ Michael Worth is a strong leader.

4) ______ Michael Worth is not a likeable leader.

5) ______ Michael Worth is a warm leader.

6) ______ If I worked for him, I would want him to continue to be CEO of the company.

7) ______ I would accept him as a CEO.

8) ______ I would not approve of him as a leader.

9) ______ He deserves the position of CEO.

10) ______ Michael Worth is a strong corporate leader.

11) ______ I would work for him.

12) ______ I respect Michael Worth.

13) ______ If I worked for him, he would motivate me to be loyal to the company.

14) ______ I think Michael Worth is a criminal.

15) ______ I think he should go to jail.

16) ______ I believe in him.

17) ______ I would be proud to be associated with Michael Worth.
18) ______ If I were a Multiplex Corporation employee, I would be committed to working for Michael Worth.

19) ______ Michael Worth’s response to the FDA’s decision was ethical.

20) ______ If I worked for Michael Worth, I would consider quitting.

21) ______ If I were an employee, I would be satisfied working for Michael Worth.

22) ______ I would be willing to work for Multiplex Corporation.
ASSOCIATED PRESS — Corporate leader, Michael Worth, says he accepts responsibility for the recall of his corporation’s best selling product.

THE COMMENTS, released Monday by NBC News, came in an interview with the CEO of Multiplex Corporation, Michael Worth, after Multiplex Corporation was forced by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to recall Fentex.

“I accept responsibility for this problem.” Worth said, according to the NBC excerpt. When asked how he felt, Worth replied, “Who wouldn’t be angry and sad?”

The FDA had no choice but to force Multiplex Corporation to recall the over the counter drug, Fentex, after independent sources linked Fentex to cancer. Studies conducted at Harvard and UCLA found that individuals develop cancer after taking Fentex for long periods of time. These findings prompted the FDA to instruct Mutliplex Corporation to conduct a nationwide recall of Fentex.

“Although there is an endless array of problems an organization can face, it was my responsibility to anticipate such a problem.” Worth said, about his duty as a leader. Visibly angry and sad, Worth faced the rest of the media to answer questions.

Worth conducted an immediate product recall of all the bottles of Fentex from the entire country, which amounted to millions of products and a loss of millions of dollars. Additionally, Multiplex Corporation halted all advertisement for the product. Worth stated that the company’s responsibilities were to the consumers and medical professionals using its products, employees, the communities where its people work and live, and its stockholders.
Accepts and Angry

ASSOCIATED PRESS — Corporate leader, Michael Worth, says he accepts responsibility for the recall of his corporation’s best selling product.

THE COMMENTS, released Monday by NBC News, came in an interview with the CEO of Multiplex Corporation, Michael Worth, after Multiplex Corporation was forced by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to recall Fentex.

“I accept responsibility for this problem.” Worth said, according to the NBC excerpt. When asked how he felt, Worth replied, “Who wouldn’t be angry?”

The FDA had no choice but to force Multiplex Corporation to recall the over the counter drug, Fentex, after independent sources linked Fentex to cancer. Studies conducted at Harvard and UCLA found that individuals develop cancer after taking Fentex for long periods of time. These findings prompted the FDA to instruct Mutlilplex Corporation to conduct a nationwide recall of Fentex.

“Although there is an endless array of problems an organization can face, it was my responsibility to anticipate such a problem.” Worth said, about his duty as a leader. Visibly angry, Worth faced the rest of the media to answer questions.

Worth conducted an immediate product recall of all the bottles of Fentex from the entire country, which amounted to millions of products and a loss of millions of dollars. Additionally, Multiplex Corporation halted all advertisement for the product. Worth stated that the company’s responsibilities were to the consumers and medical professionals using its products, employees, the communities where its people work and live, and its stockholders.
Accepts and Sad

ASSOCIATED PRESS — Corporate leader, Michael Worth, says he accepts responsibility for the recall of his corporation’s best selling product.

THE COMMENTS, released Monday by NBC News, came in an interview with the CEO of Multiplex Corporation, Michael Worth, after Multiplex Corporation was forced by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to recall Fentex.

“I accept responsibility for this problem.” Worth said, according to the NBC excerpt. When asked how he felt, Worth replied, “Who wouldn’t be sad?”

The FDA had no choice but to force Multiplex Corporation to recall the over the counter drug, Fentex, after independent sources linked Fentex to cancer. Studies conducted at Harvard and UCLA found that individuals develop cancer after taking Fentex for long periods of time. These findings prompted the FDA to instruct Mutiplex Corporation to conduct a nationwide recall of Fentex.

“Although there is an endless array of problems an organization can face, it was my responsibility to anticipate such a problem.” Worth said, about his duty as a leader. Visibly sad, Worth faced the rest of the media to answer questions.

Worth conducted an immediate product recall of all the bottles of Fentex from the entire country, which amounted to millions of products and a loss of millions of dollars. Additionally, Multiplex Corporation halted all advertisement for the product. Worth stated that the company’s responsibilities were to the consumers and medical professionals using its products, employees, the communities where its people work and live, and its stockholders.
Does not Accept, Angry, and Sad

ASSOCIATED PRESS — Corporate leader, Michael Worth, says he does not accept responsibility for the recall of his corporation’s best selling product.

THE COMMENTS, released Monday by NBC News, came in an interview with the CEO of Multiplex Corporation, Michael Worth, after Multiplex Corporation was forced by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to recall Fentex.

“I do not accept responsibility for this problem.” Worth said, according to the NBC excerpt. When asked how he felt, Worth replied, “Who wouldn’t be angry and sad?”

The FDA had no choice but to force Multiplex Corporation to recall the over the counter drug, Fentex, after independent sources linked Fentex to cancer. Studies conducted at Harvard and UCLA found that individuals develop cancer after taking Fentex for long periods of time. These findings prompted the FDA to instruct Multiliplex Corporation to conduct a nationwide recall of Fentex.

“There is an endless array of problems an organization can face, it was not my responsibility to anticipate such a problem.” Worth said, about his duty as a leader. Visibly angry and sad, Worth faced the rest of the media to answer questions.

Worth conducted an immediate product recall of all the bottles of Fentex from the entire country, which amounted to millions of products and a loss of millions of dollars. Additionally, Multiplex Corporation halted all advertisement for the product. Worth stated that the company’s responsibilities were to the consumers and medical professionals using its products, employees, the communities where its people work and live, and its stockholders.
ASSOCIATED PRESS — Corporate leader, Michael Worth, says he does not accept responsibility for the recall of his corporation’s best selling product.

THE COMMENTS, released Monday by NBC News, came in an interview with the CEO of Multiplex Corporation, Michael Worth, after Multiplex Corporation was forced by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to recall Fentex.

“I do not accept responsibility for this problem.” Worth said, according to the NBC excerpt. When asked how he felt, Worth replied, “Who wouldn’t be angry?”

The FDA had no choice but to force Multiplex Corporation to recall the over the counter drug, Fentex, after independent sources linked Fentex to cancer. Studies conducted at Harvard and UCLA found that individuals develop cancer after taking Fentex for long periods of time. These findings prompted the FDA to instruct Mutliplex Corporation to conduct a nationwide recall of Fentex.

“There is an endless array of problems an organization can face, it was not my responsibility to anticipate such a problem.” Worth said, about his duty as a leader. Visibly angry, Worth faced the rest of the media to answer questions.

Worth conducted an immediate product recall of all the bottles of Fentex from the entire country, which amounted to millions of products and a loss of millions of dollars. Additionally, Multiplex Corporation halted all advertisement for the product. Worth stated that the company’s responsibilities were to the consumers and medical professionals using its products, employees, the communities where its people work and live, and its stockholders.
ASSOCIATED PRESS — Corporate leader, Michael Worth, says he does not accept responsibility for the recall of his corporation’s best selling product.

THE COMMENTS, released Monday by NBC News, came in an interview with the CEO of Multiplex Corporation, Michael Worth, after Multiplex Corporation was forced by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to recall Fentex.

“I do not accept responsibility for this problem.” Worth said, according to the NBC excerpt. When asked how he felt, Worth replied, “Who wouldn’t be sad?”

The FDA had no choice but to force Multiplex Corporation to recall the over the counter drug, Fentex, after independent sources linked Fentex to cancer. Studies conducted at Harvard and UCLA found that individuals develop cancer after taking Fentex for long periods of time. These findings prompted the FDA to instruct Multiplex Corporation to conduct a nationwide recall of Fentex.

“There is an endless array of problems an organization can face, it was not my responsibility to anticipate such a problem.” Worth said, about his duty as a leader. Visibly sad, Worth faced the rest of the media to answer questions.

Worth conducted an immediate product recall of all the bottles of Fentex from the entire country, which amounted to millions of products and a loss of millions of dollars. Additionally, Multiplex Corporation halted all advertisement for the product. Worth stated that the company’s responsibilities were to the consumers and medical professionals using its products, employees, the communities where its people work and live, and its stockholders.