

**TARGETS' REACTION TO COWORKER INCIVILITY: A SOCIAL NETWORK
PERSPECTIVE**

A THESIS

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
FELLOW PROGRAMME OF MANAGEMENT**

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT

INDORE



Manoj Kumar Yadav (2017FPM009)

Date: June, 2024

Thesis Advisory Committee (TAC) Members

Prof. Ranjeet Nambudiri [Chairperson]

Prof. Srinath Jagannathan [Member]

Prof. Nobin Thomas [Member]

ABSTRACT

Workplace incivility – “low-intensity deviant behavior with an ambiguous intent to harm” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p. 457), is on the rise, and so is the tangible cost involved (Porath & Pearson, 2013; Yao et al., 2021). Therefore, the quest to understand the antecedents and subsequent effects to diagnose the severity of workplace incivility continues. However, given the number of people involved in an incivility engagement (instigator, target, witnesses, and reciprocators – those who seek retribution), the scarce use of social networks to further understand workplace incivility appears questionable. More so when literary evidence exists to substantiate that social networks helped further understand various other workplace aggression constructs (Huitsing et al., 2014; Yang & Treadway, 2018; Pauksztat & Salin, 2020). To respond to this research gap, we examine the role of social network ties on how the targets respond to uncivil events.

Essay 1: Supervisors, coworkers, and customers are significant sources of workplace incivility (Schilpzand et al., 2016). Among these sources, incivility from supervisors and customers has an inherent hierarchy, power differential, and status-related issues (Sliter et al., 2010; Potipiroon & Ford, 2019). However, we hypothesized that social networks can play a detrimental role in how they affect the response to coworker incivility. Thus, *Essay 1* intends to answer the question, does the workplace social relationship of the target with the instigator have *any role in reciprocating or not-reciprocating incivility*? The social network's relational context implies that either close, problematic, ambivalent, or indifferent ties attach each coworker among themselves (Bloor et al., 2004). Therefore, consistent with social exchange theory, we examined how one chooses to react to incivility instigated by a known coworker. More so, when this known coworker shares a specific relationship with the instigator. We conducted a social network survey (*Study 1 – 129 university faculty members from 13 faculties*) and a social network survey-based daily diary study conducted in two waves across seven days (*Study 2 – 106 university faculty members from 11 faculties*) to test the role of the four types of social network ties in the relationship between incivility and two types of behavioral reactions to workplace incivility – reciprocation and non-reciprocation. The results in both *Study 1* and *Study 2* suggest that within-person differences exist in how the targets of uncivil behavior react to the uncivil instigators. Similarly, the two studies also find evidence of the moderating role of problematic and indifferent ties in the relationship between incivility and non-reciprocation, suggesting that social network ties are one plausible explanation for within-person differences in reacting to uncivil events. While *Essay 1* measures the moderating effect of social network ties on the behavioral response to workplace incivility, *Essay 2* incorporates the moderating effect of social network ties on both affective and behavioral reactions to workplace incivility.

Essay 2: Consistent with cognitive-motivational-relational (CMR) and affective-events theory (AET), we address the research question, ‘*Does the relationship (network tie types) that targets and instigators of workplace incivility share generate specific affective and behavioral*

reactions?' A recent study suggests that overt forms of workplace aggression generate approach-based and covert forms, such as workplace incivility, generate avoidance-based affective and behavioral reactions (Ferris, Yan, Lim, Chen, & Fatimah, 2016). However, specific research within the incivility context suggests anger as an approach-based negative affect and reciprocation or confrontation as an approach-based behavioral reaction to workplace incivility (Porath & Pearson, 2012; Bunk & Magley, 2013). *Essay 2* addresses this literary contrast by proposing social network ties as the plausible mechanism. *Study 1* employs the scenario-based daily diary survey conducted in two waves across five days and included data from 320 postgraduate and PhD students. *Study 2* uses an experience sampling technique conducted in two waves across seven days and includes data from 79 university faculty members from 11 faculties. Both these studies again confirmed within-person differences in how targets of uncivil behavior respond to uncivil instigators. In addition, the scenario-based study suggests a moderating role of close ties in the indirect effect of incivility on avoidance as a behavioral reaction (through anxiety). Similarly, we also found evidence of the moderating role of ambivalent and problematic ties in the indirect effect of incivility on confrontation (through anger). Lastly, the study also substantiates the moderating role of problematic and indifferent ties on the direct effect of incivility on reciprocation. Like the first study, the second study also supports the mediating role of anxiety and anger between incivility and avoidance and between incivility and reciprocation and confrontation, respectively. However, the results of this study reject the moderating hypotheses of social network ties.

The study discusses one of the crucial contextual variables of workplace incivility, i.e., social network tie type, in the context of its limitations, followed by managerial implications.

Keywords: Coworker incivility, Social network, Approach-avoidance framework, and Social network tie type

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

When I reflect on my thesis journey, I see a blurred line between personal and professional life. In addition, the journey was nothing short of a roller-coaster ride. The presence and frequency of bumpy rides were enormous and exhaustive, whether the rise of the pandemic, which took the world at bay, or the road accident I survived. My thesis, in the true sense, is, therefore, a tribute to everyone whose presence, guidance, and care made this thesis a reality.

First and foremost, my sincere thanks go to the participants of my thesis. I have definitely not given them an easy task. Their participation was not merely restricted to a one-time filling of a survey form. They were subjected to reading, writing, and understanding the study contexts often described in detail. They did all this over and above their daily job not just once but on multiple days over a month and, in many cases, even multiple times a day.

I cannot but will remain highly indebted to my thesis advisory committee members. Prof. Ranjeet Nambudri gave absolute freedom and yet a definite direction. He never forced a topic, method, or discussion; instead, he referred me to the right literary sources to discover them myself. Until I discovered them, he stood firmly behind me sometimes during the most challenging phases of my dissertation. Prof. Srinath Jagganathan is my method master. He strengthened my research design and taught me the right analytical tools. He is instrumental in teaching me mixed-effect linear and logistic regression analysis using R. Prof. Nobin Thomas introduced me to the social network perspective and method incorporated in the thesis. He was instrumental in teaching me social network-related data analysis using UCINET. Their timely intervention, inputs, and suggestions were invaluable.

I would also like to use this opportunity to thank the members of the thesis examination committee. Their questions and inputs helped me reconcile my thoughts with greater clarity. I am grateful to Prof. Selvaraj Putturaja, Prof. T. N. Krishnan, and Prof. Mit Vachharajani for providing a constructive and critical review of the thesis. Their input is more significant in enhancing and presenting the thesis in its current avatar. Needless to say, my journey could not have been completed without the silent yet definite support I have received from the members of the DPM Office (especially Armstrong Sir), the library, the DPM hostel, and computer centers.

There is a reason why I see the lines drawn between personal and professional lives as blurred. It was never because the personal space cut through my professional space; instead, it was otherwise always. Hence, I cannot but mention my beloved family members who walked through the thins and thicks of my PhD journey – my father, Shri Lalbhadur Yadav, wife Lalita, sister Meera, younger brothers Manish, Mukesh, and Mahesh, sister-in-law Shraddha and the newest and the most cutest member of our house – Vedika. My gratitude will not be complete unless I mention my mother, Late Smt. Manorama Yadav, who may have been physically absent but was always spiritually available as the guiding light through the difficult phases of this journey. Last but definitely not least, I will forever remain indebted to the rocking colleagues from the FPM fraternity, IIM Indore.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	9
CHAPTER 2 DEFINITION OF KEY VARIABLES	19
2.1 Network tie types	19
2.2 Reciprocated and non-reciprocated incivility tie	21
2.3 Approach-avoidance framework	22
CHAPTER 3 LITERATURE REVIEW	24
3.1 Detailed review of the literature	24
3.1.1 Long-term and immediate effects of workplace incivility	27
3.1.2 Antecedents of workplace incivility	29
3.1.3 Moderators of workplace incivility and its effects	30
3.1.4 Research methodologies employed	31
3.1.5 Social Network Perspective and Workplace Incivility	32
3.1.6 Sources of Workplace Incivility	34
3.2 Research Gaps	35
3.3 Research questions	36
CHAPTER 4 ESSAY 1	38
4.1 Theoretical foundation and development of hypothesis	38
4.1.1 Social exchange theory as a paradigm	39
4.1.2 Social Relationships and Reciprocity to Workplace Incivility	40
4.2 Study 1	44
4.2.1 Research Design	45
4.2.2 Plan of Analysis	52
4.2.3 Results	53
4.2.4 Discussion	62
4.3 Study 2	63
4.3.1 Research Design	63
4.3.2 Plan of Analysis	66
4.3.3 Results	66
4.3.4 Discussion	76
4.4 Discussion	77
CHAPTER 5 ESSAY 2	81
5.1 Theoretical foundation and development of hypothesis	81
5.1.1 Anxiety and anger as elicited affect to incivility	84

5.1.2 Acting on negative affect.....	85
5.1.3 Mediation hypotheses	87
5.1.4 Moderated mediation hypotheses	88
5.2 Study 1.....	94
5.2.1 Research Design	94
5.2.2 Plan of analysis	103
5.2.3 Results	104
5.2.4 Discussion.....	115
5.3 Study 2.....	118
5.3.1 Research Design	118
5.3.2 Plan of Analysis.....	121
5.3.3 Results	121
5.3.4 Discussion.....	129
5.4 Discussion	136
CHAPTER 6 DISCUSSION.....	138
6.1 Summary of the findings	138
6.2 Theoretical implications.....	140
6.3 Methodological contribution to the workplace incivility literature	143
6.4 Practical implications	144
6.5 Limitations and Future Research Directions.....	147
6.6 Conclusion.....	149
CHAPTER 7 REFERENCES	151
CHAPTER 8 ANNEXURE	166
8.1 Annexure 1: List of Figures	166
8.2 Annexure 2: List of Tables.....	167
8.3 Annexure 3: PHASE 1 Survey form	169
8.4 Annexure 4: PHASE 2: Daily Survey (Day 1-6)	175
8.5 Annexure 5: Measures (Essay 1).....	178
8.6 Annexure 6: Experimental context, network tie type, and incivility manipulation	186
8.7 Annexure 7: Measures (Essay 2).....	210
8.8 Annexure 8: Pilot Study to Reduce WIS to one-item scale	217

List of Figures

Figure 1: Conceptual model incorporating the positive and negative aspects of social relationships (Adapted from Bloor, Uchino, Hicks, & Smith, 2004 and Bushman & Holt-Lunstand, 2009)	20
Figure 2: Incivility network ties.....	21
Figure 3: Proposed model predicting reciprocation	41
Figure 4: Proposed model predicting non-reciprocation	41
Figure 5: Summary of the Procedure followed to conduct the survey	48
Figure 6: Role of Problematic ties on Incivility – Non-Reciprocation relationships	61
Figure 7: Role of Indifferent ties on Incivility – Non-Reciprocation relationships.....	61
Figure 8: Role of Close ties on Incivility – Non-Reciprocation relationships.....	62
Figure 9: Role of Problematic ties on Incivility – Non-Reciprocation relationships	72
Figure 10: Role of Indifferent ties on Incivility – Non-Reciprocation relationships.....	72
Figure 11: Role of Close ties on Incivility – Non-Reciprocation relationships.....	73
Figure 12: Role of Problematic ties on Incivility – Reciprocation relationships.....	73
Figure 13: Role of Indifferent ties on Incivility – Reciprocation relationships	74
Figure 14: A heuristic model of the role of network characteristics between the target-instigator dyad in understanding immediate affective and behavioral reactions to workplace incivility	82
Figure 15: Proposed model for incivility – avoidance relationship through anxiety moderated by close ties.....	94
Figure 16: Proposed model for incivility – confrontation and incivility – reciprocation relationship through anger moderated by non-close ties	94
Figure 17: Role of close ties in incivility – anxiety relationship	113
Figure 18: Role of problematic ties in incivility – anger relationship	114
Figure 19: Role of ambivalent ties in anger – confrontation relationship	114
Figure 20: Role of problematic ties in incivility – reciprocation relationship	115
Figure 21: Role of indifferent ties in incivility – reciprocation relationship	115
Figure 22: Number of uncivil incidents reported per day (Study 2 of Essay 1 & 2)	135
Figure 23: Flowchart of the workplace incivility and the proposed contribution of Essay 2	166

List of Tables

Table 1: Frequency of social network ties, uncivil interactions, and reaction to uncivil interactions	54
Table 2: Mean, SD, and correlation table (<i>Study 1, Essay 1</i>)	55
Table 3: Correlation Diagnostics for multicollinearity – Reciprocation model (<i>Study 1, Essay 1</i>)	57
Table 4: Correlation Diagnostics for multicollinearity – Non-reciprocation model (<i>Study 1, Essay 1</i>)	57
Table 5: Summary of regression analysis predicting reciprocation and non-reciprocation (<i>Study 1, Essay 1</i>)	60
Table 6: Mean, SD, and correlation table (<i>Study 2, Essay 1</i>)	68
Table 7: Multicollinearity diagnostics – Reciprocation model (<i>Study 2, Essay 1</i>)	69
Table 8: Multicollinearity diagnostics – Reciprocation model (<i>Study 2, Essay 1</i>)	69
Table 9: Summary of regression analysis predicting reciprocation (<i>Study 2, Essay 1</i>)	70
Table 10: Summary of regression analysis predicting non-reciprocation (<i>Study 2, Essay 1</i>)	71
Table 11: Counterintuitive findings of the study	75
Table 12: Mean, SD, and Correlation table (<i>Study 1, Essay 2</i>)	106
Table 13: Multicollinearity diagnostics (<i>Study 1, Essay 2</i>)	106
Table 14: Summary of regression analysis predicting avoidance (<i>Study 1, Essay 2</i>)	109
Table 15: Summary of regression analysis predicting confrontation (<i>Study 1, Essay 2</i>)	110
Table 16: Summary of regression analysis predicting reciprocation (<i>Study 1, Essay 2</i>)	111
Table 17: Mean, SD, and Correlation (<i>Study 2, Essay 1</i>)	122
Table 18: Multicollinearity diagnostics (<i>Study 2, Essay 1</i>)	122
Table 19: Summary of regression analysis predicting avoidance (<i>Study 2, Essay 1</i>)	123
Table 20: Summary of regression analysis predicting confrontation (<i>Study 2, Essay 2</i>)	124
Table 21: Summary of regression analysis predicting reciprocation (<i>Study 2, Essay 2</i>)	125
Table 22: Counterintuitive findings for WIC, gender differences between target and instigator, and group size	127
Table 23: Summary of the results of hypotheses (<i>Essay 1</i>)	167
Table 24: Summary of the results of hypotheses (<i>Essay 2</i>)	168

We examined three possible reactions to workplace incivility involving the target's response affecting the instigator somehow. Reciprocation as a reaction involves the instigator facing incivility from the target in response to their incivility. Confrontation involves the instigator facing a backlash from the target that their uncivil act was not well taken. Avoidance has the potential to keep the instigator guessing. Two of these reactions are action-oriented behavioral tendencies, and one was avoidance-oriented tendencies per the avoidance-approach framework. Thus, we attempted to cover ample types of reactions that can be included in one study without unnecessarily complicating the model. However, we encourage future researchers to incorporate other forms of workplace incivility, such as reporting, absenteeism, withdrawal, and rumination.

Insert Figure 23 about here

6.6 Conclusion

The current thesis sets an interesting premise through the use of social networks with social exchange theory as its theoretical perspective. One of the tenets of social exchange theory used in this study establishes that the nature of interpersonal relationships can be that crucial context that sets the rule of how negative social transactions, such as workplace incivility, will be interpreted and reacted upon. The results of the multiple studies suggest that interpersonal relationships in the form of four different network types play a role in how co-workers may evaluate and selectively react to specific instigators. More specifically, when the target-

instigator dyad is problematically or indifferently related to each other. Our study contributes to workplace incivility scholarship by providing insights from social network perspectives to suggest when a covert form of workplace aggression, such as incivility, may lead to approach or avoidance-based affective and behavioral tendencies of targets. However, in contrast to the experimental setup, the participants' responses from the realistic settings seem muted. This muteness raises challenges with regard to the use of socio-centric measures of social network surveys in workplace incivility scholarship. Contrary to our belief, some of the counterintuitive findings of the study further suggest exploring the role of perceived incivility climate and gender differences between target and dyad as other sets of important contexts other than interpersonal relationships.

CHAPTER 7 REFERENCES

- Akiyama, H., Antonucci, T., Takahashi, K., & Langfahl, E. S. (2003). Negative interactions in close relationships across the life span. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 58(2), P70-P79. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/58.2.P70>
- Akella, D. & Eid, N. (2021). An institutional perspective on workplace incivility: Case studies from academia. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 16(1), 54-75. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-11-2019-1853>
- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 452–471. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/259136>
- Appleby, C. (2010). The cost of bad behavior: How incivility is damaging your business and what to do about it. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 23 (2), 197–202. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534811011031373>
- Aquino, K., & Thau, S. (2009). Workplace victimization: Aggression from the target's perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60(1), 717-741. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163703>
- Bahr, H. M., & Bahr, K. S. (1996). A paradigm of family transcendence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 541–555. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353715>
- Barclay, L. J., & Kiefer, T. (2014). Approach or avoid? Exploring overall justice and the differential effects of positive and negative emotions. *Journal of Management*, 40(7), 1857-1898. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312441833>
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1998). Workplace aggression--the iceberg beneath the tip of workplace violence: Evidence on its forms, frequency, and targets. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 21(4), 446-464. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/workplace-aggression-iceberg-beneath-tip-violence/docview/226977960/se-2>
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1-48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- Beattie, L. & Griffin, B. (2014a). Accounting for within-person differences in how people respond to daily incivility at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87, 625–644. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12067>
- Beattie, L. & Griffin, B. (2014b). Day-level fluctuations in stress and engagement in response to workplace incivility: A diary study. *Work and Stress*, 28(2), 124–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2014.898712>

- Bello, D., Leung, K., Radebaugh, L., Tung, R. L., & van Witteloostuijn, A. (2009). From the editors: Students samples in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40, 361-364. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2008.101>
- Blau, G., & Andersson, L. (2005). Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(4), 595-614. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905X26822>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Blau, G. (2007). Partially testing a process model for understanding victim responses to an anticipated worksite closure. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71, 401-428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.08.005>
- Bloor, L. E., Uchino, B. N., Hicks, A., & Smith, T. W. (2004). Social relationships and physiological function: The effects of recalling social relationships on cardiovascular reactivity. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 28(1), 29-38. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324796abm2801_5
- Brass, D. J., Butterfield, K. D., & Skaggs, B. C. (1998). Relationships and unethical behavior: A social network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(1), 14-31. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.192955>
- Bryk, A. S., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1992). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Bunk, J. A., & Magley, V. J. (2013). The role of appraisals and emotions in understanding experiences of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(1), 87-105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030987>
- Burt, R. S. (1987). Social contagion and innovation: Cohesion versus structural equivalence. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(6), 1287-1335. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228667>
- Burt R. (2001). Structural holes versus network closure as social capital. In Lin N., Cook K. S., Burt R. S. (Eds.), *Social capital: Theory and research*: pp. 31-56. New York: Aldine.
- Bushman, B. B., & Holt-Lunstad, J. (2009). Understanding social relationship maintenance among friends: Why we don't end those frustrating friendships. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28(6), 749-778. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2009.28.6.749>
- Buss, A. H. (1961). *The psychology of aggression*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Cahyadi, A., Hendryadi, H., & Mappadang, A. (2021). Workplace and classroom incivility and learning engagement: the moderating role of locus of control. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00071-z>
- Carlson, D., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., Ferguson, M., & Whitten, D. (2011). Work-family enrichment and job performance: A constructive replication of affective events theory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(3), 297-312. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022880>

- Casciaro, T., & Lobo, M. S. (2008). When competence is irrelevant: The role of interpersonal affect in task-related ties. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 655–684. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.53.4.655>
- Carpenter, M. A., Li, M., & Jiang, H. (2012). Social Network Research in Organizational Contexts: A Systematic Review of Methodological Issues and Choices. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 1328–1361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312440119>
- Carter, S. (1998). *Civility: Manners, morals, and the etiquette of democracy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Chan, C., Landry, S. P., & Troy, C. (2011). Examining external validity criticisms in the choice of students as subjects in accounting experiment studies. *The Journal of Theoretical Accounting Research*, 7(1), 53–78. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/examining-external-validity-criticisms-choice/docview/894123503/se-2>
- Chen, Y., Ferris, D. L., Kwan, H. K., Yan, M., Zhou, M., & Hong, Y. (2013). Self-love's lost labor: A self-enhancement model of workplace incivility. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4), 1199–1219. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0906>
- Chris, A. C., Provencher, Y., Fogg, C., Thompson, S. C., Cole, A. L., Okaka, O., Bosco, F., & Gonzalez-Morales, G. (2022). A meta-analysis of experienced incivility and its correlates: Exploring the dual path model of experienced workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 27(3), 317–338. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000326>
- Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 599–609. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.599>
- Connidis, I. A., & McMullin, J. A. (2002b). Sociological ambivalence and family ties: A critical perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 558–567. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00558.x>
- Cook, K. S., & Whitmeyer, J. M. (1992). Two approaches to social structure: Exchange theory and network analysis. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18(1), 109–127. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.18.080192.000545>
- Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 55–75. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2008.27745097>
- Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2009). Patterns and profiles of response to incivility in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(3), 272–288. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014934>
- Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management*, 39(6), 1579–1605. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311418835>

- Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Magley, V. J., & Nelson, K. (2017). Researching rudeness: The past, present, and future of the science of incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 299–313. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000089>
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(1), 64–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64>
- Demsky, C. A., Fritz, C., Hammer, L. B., & Black, A. E. (2019). Workplace incivility and employee sleep: The role of rumination and recovery experiences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24*(2), 228–240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000116>
- Dutton, J. E., & Heaphy, E. D. (2003). The power of high-quality connections. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, and R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of New Discipline* (pp. 263–278). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Elliot, A. J. (2006). The hierarchical model of approach-avoidance motivation. *Motivation and Emotion, 30*(2), 111–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9028-7>
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology, 2*, 335–362. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.02.080176.002003>
- Estes, B., & Wang, J. (2008). Integrative literature review: Workplace incivility: Impacts on individual and organizational performance. *Human Resource Development Review, 7*(2), 218–240. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484308315565>
- Ferguson, M. (2012). You cannot leave it at the office: Spillover and crossover of coworker incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(4), 571–588. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.774>
- Ferris, D. L., Yan, M., Lim, V. K., Chen, Y., & Fatimah, S. (2016). An approach-avoidance framework of workplace aggression. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(5), 1777–1800. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0221>
- Fingerman, K. L. (2009). Consequential strangers and peripheral ties: The importance of unimportant relationships. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 1*(2), 69–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2009.00010.x>
- Fingerman, K. L., Hay, E. L., & Birditt, K. S. (2004). The best of ties, the worst of ties: Close, problematic, and ambivalent social relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(3), 792–808. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00053.x>
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1990, March). *Assessing strategies for coping with harassment: A theoretical/empirical approach*. Paper presented at the midwinter conference of the Association for Women in Psychology, Tempe, Arizona.
- Fridja, N. H. (1993). Moods, emotion episodes, and emotions. In M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions*, 381–403, New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Fox, J. (2003). Effect displays in R for generalised linear models. *Journal of Statistical Software, 8*(15), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v008.i15>

- Fox, J. & Hong, J. (2009). Effect displays in R for multinomial and proportional-odds logit models: Extensions to the effects package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 32(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v032.i01>
- Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2018). Visualizing fit and lack of fit in complex regression models with predictor effect plots and partial residuals. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 87(9), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v087.i09>
- Fox, J. & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An R companion to applied regression*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gabriel, A. S., Butts, M. M., Yuan, Z., Rosen, R. L., & Sliter, M. T. (2018). Further understanding incivility in the workplace: The effects of gender, agency, and communion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(4), 362–382. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000289>
- Gordon, M. E., Slade, L. A., & Schmitt, N. (1986). The “science of the sophomore” revisited: From conjecture to empiricism. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 191–207. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4282666>
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), 161–178. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092623>
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481–510. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2780199>
- Granovetter, M. (1992). Economic institutions as social constructions: a framework for analysis. *Acta Sociologica*, 35(1), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000169939203500101>
- Griffin, B. (2010). Multilevel relationships between organizational-level incivility, justice and intention to stay. *Work & Stress*, 24(4), 309–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2010.531186>
- Guarana, C. L., & Hernandez, M. (2015). Building sense out of situational complexity: The role of ambivalence in creating functional leadership processes. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 5(1), 50–73. <https://doi.org/50-73>. [10.1177/2041386614543345](https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386614543345)
- Han, S., Harold, C. M., Oh, I. S., Kim, J. K., & Agolli, A. (2022). A meta-analysis integrating 20 years of workplace incivility research: Antecedents, consequences, and boundary conditions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(3), 497–523. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2568>
- Harrigan, N., & Yap, J. (2017). Avoidance in negative ties: Inhibiting closure, reciprocity, and homophily. *Social Networks*, 48, 126–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2016.07.003>
- Hays, R., Hayashi, T., & Stewart, A. (1989). A five-item measure of Socially Desirable Response Set. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 49, 629–636. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316448904900315>
- Hershcovis, M. S. (2011). “Incivility, social undermining, bullying... oh my!”: A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 499–519. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.689>

- Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2007). Towards a relational model of workplace aggression. In J. Langan-Fox, C. L. Cooper, & R. Klimoski (Eds.), *Research Companion to the Dysfunctional workplace: Management challenges and symptoms* (pp. 268–284). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Hershcovis, M. S., Cameron, A. F., Gervais, L., & Bozeman, J. (2018). The effects of confrontation and avoidance coping in response to workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(2), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000078>
- Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., ... & Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 228–238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.228>
- Huitsing, G., Snijders, T. A., Van Duijn, M. A., & Veenstra, R. (2014). Victims, bullies, and their defenders: A daily diary study of the coevolution of positive and negative networks. *Development and Psychopathology*, 26(3), 645–659. <https://doi.org/645-659.10.1017/S0954579414000297>
- Ingram, P., & Roberts, P. W. (2000). Friendships among competitors in the Sydney hotel industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(2), 387–423. <https://doi.org/10.1086/316965>
- James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2013). *An introduction to statistical learning* (Vol. 112). New York, NY: Springer.
- Johnson, R. E., Selenta, C., & Lord, R. G. (2006). When organizational justice and the self-concept meet: Consequences for the organization and its members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99(2), 175–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.07.005>
- Jongh, P. J., Jongh, E., Pienaar, M., Gordon-Grant, H., Oberholzer, M., & Santana, L. (2015). The impact of pre-selected variance inflation factor thresholds on the stability and predictive power of logistic regression models in credit scoring. *Orion*, 31(1), 17–37. <https://doi.org/10.5784/31-1-162>
- Kabat-Farr, D., Cortina, L. M., & Marchiondo, L. A. (2018). The emotional aftermath of incivility: Anger, guilt, and the role of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 25(2), 109–128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000045>
- Kabat-Farr, D., Walsh, B. M., & McGonagle, A. K. (2019). Uncivil supervisors and perceived work ability: The joint moderating roles of job involvement and grit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4), 971–985. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3604-5>
- Kahn, R. L., & Antonucci, T. C. (1980). Convoys over the life course: Attachment, roles, and social support. In P. B. Baltes & O. C. Brim (Eds.), *Life-span, Development, and Behavior*, (pp. 254–283). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Kelley, H. H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 15, pp. 192–241). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

- Kelley, H. H., & Michela, J. L. (1980). Attribution theory and research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 31, 457–501. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.31.020180.002325>
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibault, J. E. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kelling, G. L. & Wilson, J. Q. (1982, March). Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly*, 249, 29–38. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465/>
- Kern, J. H., & Grandey, A. A. (2009). Customer incivility as a social stressor: the role of race and racial identity for service employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012684>
- Kilduff M., Brass D. J. (2010). Job design: A social network perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 309–318. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.609>
- Kilduff, M., & Krackhardt, D. (1994). Bringing the individual back in: A structural analysis of the internal market for reputation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 87–108. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256771>
- Kim, T. Y., & Shapiro, D. (2008). Revenge against supervisor mistreatment: Negative emotion, group membership, and cross-cultural difference. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 19, 339–358. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10444060810909293>
- Krackhardt D. (1992). The strength of strong ties: The importance of philos in organizations. In Nohria N., Eccles R. G. (Eds.), *Networks and Organizations: Structure, Form, and Action*, 216–239. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Krackhardt, D., & Porter, L. W. (1985). When friends leave: A structural analysis of relationship between turnover and stayers' attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30(2), 242–261. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393107>
- Krackhardt, D., & Porter, L. W. (1986). The snowball effect: Turnover embedded in communication networks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(1), 50–55. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.1.50>
- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest package: Tests in linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82(13), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>
- Labianca, G., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Exploring the social ledger: negative relationships and negative asymmetry in social networks in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(3), 596–614. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.21318920>
- Lang, M. & R Core Team (2021). _backports: Reimplementations of functions introduced since R-3.0.0_. R package version 1.4.1, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=backports>
- Lata, M., & Chaudhary, R. (2021). Workplace spirituality and experienced incivility at work: Modeling Dark Triad as a moderator. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 174, 645–667. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04617-y>
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Li, M. (2013). Social network and social capital in leadership and management research: A review of causal methods. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(5), 638–665. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.04.005>
- Libby R., Bloomfield, R., & Nelson, M. W. (2002). Experimental research in financial accounting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 27(8), 775–810. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682\(01\)00011-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682(01)00011-3)
- Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: the interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 483–496. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.483>
- Lim, S., Ilies, R., Koopman, J., Christoforou, P., & Arvey, R. D. (2018). Emotional mechanisms linking incivility at work to aggression and withdrawal at home: An experience-sampling study. *Journal of Management*, 44(7), 2888–2908. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316654544>
- Lim, S., & Lee, A. (2011). Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: Does family support help? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(1), 95–111. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021726>
- Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95>
- Lim, V. K., & Teo, T. S. (2009). Mind your E-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. *Information & Management*, 46(8), 419–425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2009.06.006>
- Loomis, J. M., Blascovich, J. J., & Beall, A. C. (1999). Immersive virtual environment technology as a basic research tool in Psychology. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 31(4), 557–564. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03200735>
- Long, J. A. (2019). _interactions: Comprehensive, user-friendly toolkit for probing interactions_. R package version 1.1.0, <https://cran.r-project.org/package=interactions>
- Luscher, K., & Pillemer, K. (1998). Intergenerational ambivalence: A new approach to the study of parent-child relations in later life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 413–425. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353858>
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P. & Tracy, S. J. (2012). Answering five key questions about workplace bullying: How communication scholarship provides thought leadership for transforming abuse at work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26 (1), 3–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318911414400>
- Marsden, P. V., & Campbell, K. E. (1984). Measuring tie strength. *Social Forces*, 63(2), 482–501. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/63.2.482>
- Mansour-Cole, D., & Scott, S. (1998). Hearing it through the grapevine: The influence of source of layoff information and leader–member-relations on survivors' justice

- perceptions. *Personnel Psychology*, 51(1), 25–54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1998.tb00715.x>
- McClelland, G.H., Irwin, J.R., Disatnik, D., & Sivan, L. (2017). Multicollinearity is a red herring in the search for moderator variables: A guide to interpreting moderated multiple regression models and a critique of Iacobucci, Schneider, Popovich, and Bakamitsos (2016). *Behavioral Research Methods*, 49, 394–402. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0785-2>
- Mehra, A., Dixon, A. L., Brass, D. J., & Robertson, B. (2006). The social network ties of group leaders: Implications for group performance and leader reputation. *Organization Science*, 17(1), 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0158>
- Meier, L. L., & Gross, S. (2015). Episodes of incivility between subordinates and supervisors: Examining the role of self-control and time with an interaction-record diary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(8), 1096–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2013>
- Meier, L. L., & Spector, P. E. (2013). Reciprocal effects of work stressors and counterproductive work behavior: A five-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(3), 529–539. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031732>
- Methot, J. R., Melwani, S., & Rothman, N. B. (2017). The space between us: A social-functional emotions view of ambivalent and indifferent workplace relationships. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1789–1819. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316685853>
- Mignonac, K., & Herrbach, O. (2004). Linking work events, affective states and attitudes: An empirical study of managers' emotions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19, 221–240. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-004-0549-3>
- Milam, A. C., Spitzmueller, C., & Penney, L. M. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012683>
- Mills, J., & Clark, M. S. (1982). Exchange and communal relationships. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, (Vol. 3, pp. 121–144). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Miner, K. N., Diaz, I., Wooderson, R. L., McDonald, J. N., Smittick, A. L., & Lomeli, L. C. (2017). A workplace incivility roadmap: Identifying theoretical speedbumps and alternative routes for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(3), 320–337. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000093>
- Miner, K. N., Settles, I. H., Pratt-Hyatt, J. S., & Brady, C. C. (2012). Experiencing incivility in organizations: The buffering effects of emotional and organizational support. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(2), 340–372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00891.x>
- Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159–1168. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1159>

- Mitchell, M. S., Cropanzano, R., & Quisenberry, D. (2012). Social exchange theory, exchange resources and interpersonal relationships: A modest resolution of theoretical difficulties. In K. Tornblom & A. Kazemi (Eds.), *Handbook of social resource theory: Theoretical extensions, empirical insights, and social applications* (pp. 99–118). New York, NY: Springer.
- Morrison, E. W. (2002). Newcomers' relationships: The role of social network ties during socialization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6), 1149–1160. <https://doi.org/10.5465/3069430>
- Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 391–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639802400305>
- Nicholson, T., & Griffin, B. (2015). Here today but not gone tomorrow: Incivility affects after-work and next-day recovery. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(2), 218–225. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038376>
- Obstfeld, D. (2005). Social networks, the *tertius iungens* orientation, and involvement in innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1), 100–130. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2005.50.1.100>
- Olson, B. J., Nelson, D. L., & Parayitam, S. (2006). Managing aggression in organizations: what leaders must know. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(5), 384–398. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730610677981>
- Osatuke, K., Leiter, M., Belton, L., Dyrenforth, S., & Ramsel, D. (2013). Civility, respect and engagement at the workplace (CREW): A national organization development program at the Department of Veterans Affairs. *Journal of Management Policies and Practices*, 1(2), 25–34.
- Park, Y., Fritz, C., & Jex, S. M. (2015). Daily cyber incivility and distress: The moderating role of resources at work and home. *Journal of Management*, 44(7), pp. 2535–2557. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315576796>
- Pauksztat, B., & Salin, D. (2020). Targets' social relationships as antecedents and consequences of workplace bullying: a social network perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03077>
- Paulin, D., & Griffin, B. (2017). Team Incivility Climate Scale: Development and validation of the team-level incivility climate construct. *Group & Organization Management*, 42(3), 315–345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601115622100>
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, J. W. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations*, 54(11), 1387–1419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267015411001>
- Pearson, C., & Porath, C. L. (2009). The cost of bad behavior: How incivility is damaging your business and what to do about it. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 18(6). <https://doi.org/10.1108/hrmid.2010.04418fae.002>

- Phillips, T., & Smith, P. (2003). Everyday incivility: Towards a benchmark. *The Sociological Review*, 51(1), 85–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.00409>
- Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2007). Does rudeness really matter? The effects of rudeness on task performance and helpfulness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1181–1197. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.20159919>
- Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. (2013). The price of incivility. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(1–2), 115–121.
- Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2012). Emotional and behavioral responses to workplace incivility and the impact of hierarchical status. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42, E326–E357. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.01020.x>
- Porath, C. L., Overbeck, J. R., & Pearson, C. M. (2008). Picking up the gauntlet: How individuals respond to status challenges. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(7), 1945–1980. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00375.x>
- Potipiroon, W., & Ford, M. T. (2019). Relational costs of status: Can the relationship between supervisor incivility, perceived support, and follower outcomes be exacerbated? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 92, 873–896. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12263>
- R Core Team (2023). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing*, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.r-project.org>
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 368–376. <https://doi.org/10.5465/255985>
- Reich, T. C., & Hershcovis, M. S. (2015). Observing workplace incivility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 203–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036464>
- Remus, W. (1996). Will behavioral research on managerial decision making generalize to managers? *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 17(1), 93–101. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1468\(199601\)17:1<93::AID-MDE744>3.0.CO;2-H](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1468(199601)17:1<93::AID-MDE744>3.0.CO;2-H)
- Revelle, W. (2023). *_psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research_*. Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. R package version 2.3.3, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>
- Rosen, C. C., Koopman, J., Gabriel, A. S., & Johnson, R. E. (2016). Who strikes back? A daily investigation of when and why incivility begets incivility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(11), 1620–1634. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000140>
- RStudio Team (2023). RStudio: Integrated development for RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA. <http://www.rstudio.com/>.
- Rungtusanatham, M., Wallin, C., & Eckerd, S. (2011). The vignette in a scenario-based role-playing experiment. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 47(3), 9–16 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-493X.2011.03232.x>

- Sakurai, K., & Jex, S. M. (2012). Coworker incivility and incivility targets' work effort and counterproductive work behaviors: The moderating role of supervisor social support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*(2), 150–161. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027350>
- Sanchez, A. (2016). Profane relations: The irony of offensive jokes in India. *History and Anthropology, 27*(3), 296–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02757206.2016.1147439>
- Schilpzand, P., & Huang, L. (2018). When and how experienced incivility dissuades proactive performance: An integration of sociometer and self-identity orientation perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(8), 828–841. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000303>
- Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*, S57–S88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1976>
- Schilpzand, P., Leavitt, K., & Lim, S. (2016). Incivility hates company: Shared incivility attenuates rumination, stress, and psychological withdrawal by reducing self-blame. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 133*, 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.02.001>
- Sliter, M., Jex, S., Wolford, K., & McInnery, J. (2010). How rude! Emotional labor as a mediator between customer incivility and employee outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Health Psychology, 15*(4), 468–481. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020723>
- Sliter, M., Sliter, K., & Jex, S. (2012). The employee as a punching bag: The effect of multiple sources of incivility on employee withdrawal behavior and sales performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(1), 121–139. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.767>
- Smart Richman, L., & Leary, M. R. (2009). Reactions to discrimination, stigmatization, ostracism, and other forms of interpersonal rejection: a multimotive model. *Psychological Review, 116*(2), 365–383. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015250>
- Smith, A. E., Hassan, S., Hatmaker, D. M., DeHart-Davis, L., & Humphrey, N. (2021). Gender, race, and experiences of workplace incivility in public organizations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 41*(4), 674–699. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X20927760>
- Sommet, N., & Morselli, D. (2017). Keep calm and learn multilevel logistic modeling: A simplified three-step procedure using Stata, R, Mplus, and SPSS. *International Review of Social Psychology, 30*(1), 203–218. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.90>
- Sparrowe, R. T., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Kraimer, M. L. (2001). Social networks and the performance of individuals and groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(2), 316–325. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069458>
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*(2), 269–292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00049-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9)

- Spence Laschinger, H. K., Leiter, M., Day, A., & Gilin, D. (2009). Workplace empowerment, incivility, and burnout: Impact on staff nurse recruitment and retention outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 17(3), 302–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2009.00999.x>
- Taylor, S. G., Bedeian, A. G., Cole, M. S., & Zhang, Z. (2017). Developing and testing a dynamic model of workplace incivility change. *Journal of Management*, 43(3), 645–670. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314535432>
- Taylor, S. G., & Kluemper, D. H. (2012). Linking perceptions of role stress and incivility to workplace aggression: The moderating role of personality. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(3), 316–329. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028211>
- Taylor, S. G., Locklear, L. R., Kluemper, D. H., & Lu, X. (2021). Beyond targets and instigators: Examining workplace incivility in dyads and the moderating role of perceived incivility norms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(8), 1288–1302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000910>
- Tepper, B. J., & Henle, C. A. (2011). A case for recognizing distinctions among constructs that capture interpersonal mistreatment in work organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 487–498. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.688>
- Thomas, C. L., Johnson, L. U., Cornelius, A. M., Cobb, H. R., Murphy, L. D., & Vega, D. (2022). Incivility begets incivility: Understanding the relationship between experienced and enacted incivility with customers over time. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 37, 1255–1274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-022-09795-2>
- Tremmel, S., & Sonnentag, S. (2018). A sorrow halved? A daily diary study on talking about experienced workplace incivility and next-morning negative affect. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(4), 568–583. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000100>
- Trudel, J., & Reio Jr, T. G. (2011). Managing workplace incivility: The role of conflict management styles—antecedent or antidote? *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(4), 395–423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20081>
- Uchino, B. N., Holt-Lunstad, J., Uno, D., Campo, R., Reblin, M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Winkelman, P. (2007). The social neuroscience of relationships. In Eddie Harmon-Jones & Piotr Winkielman (Eds.), *Social neuroscience: Integrating Biological and Psychological Explanations of Social Behavior* (pp. 474–487), New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Van Jaarsveld, D. D., Walker, D. D., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2010). The role of job demands and emotional exhaustion in the relationship between customer and employee incivility. *Journal of Management*, 36(6), 1486–1504. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310368998>
- Venkataramani, V., & Dalal, R. S. (2007). Who helps and harms whom? Relational antecedents of interpersonal helping and harming in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 952–966. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.952>

- Vickers, M. H. (2006). Writing what's relevant: Workplace incivility in public administration: A wolf in sheep's clothing. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 28(1), 69–88. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25610779>
- Vittinghoff, E., Shiboski, S. C., Glidden, D. V., & McCulloch, C. E. (2005). *Regression methods in biostatistics: Linear, logistic, survival, and repeated measures models*. New York, NY: Springer
- Walsh, B. M., Magley, V. J., Reeves, D. W., Davies-Schriels, K. A., Marmet, M. D., & Gallus, J. A. (2012). Assessing workgroup norms for civility: The development of the Civility Norms Questionnaire-Brief. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 407–420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9251-4>
- 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), 1063–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>
- Wegge, J. (2006). Communication via videoconference: Emotional and cognitive consequences of affective personality dispositions, seeing one's own picture, and disturbing events. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 21, 373–318. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15320751hci2103_1
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. In Staw, B. M. & Cummings, L. L. (Eds.). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18. Greenwich, CT: Elsevier. Science/JAI Press, 1–74.
- Wesselmann, E. D., Ren, D., & Williams, K. D. (2015). Motivations for responses to ostracism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(40), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00040>
- Wickham, H. (2011). The Split-Apply-Combine Strategy for Data Analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 40(1), 1–29. <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v40/i01/>
- Wickham, H. (2016). ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis. Springer-Verlag, New York. <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>
- Wickham, H., & Bryan, J. (2023). readxl: Read Excel files. R package version 1.4.2, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readxl>
- Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., Müller, K., & Vaughan, D. (2023). dplyr: A grammar of data manipulation. R package version 1.1.2, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>
- Wickham, H., Vaughan, D., & Girlich, M. (2023). tidyr: Tidy messy data. R package version 1.3.0, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr>
- Wiseman, J. P., & Duck, S. (1995). Having and managing enemies: A very challenging relationship. Paper presented as a plenary address at the 2nd Conference of International Network on Personal Relationships held at University of Iowa, Iowa City, May 11–15, 1989, Sage Publications, Inc.

- Yang, J., & Treadway, D. C. (2018). A social influence interpretation of workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(4), 879–891. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2912-x>
- Yao, J., Lim, S., Guo, C. Y., Ou, A. Y., & Ng, J. W. X. (2022). Experienced incivility in the workplace: A meta-analytical review of its construct validity and nomological network. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(2), 193–220. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000870>
- Zhou, Z. E., Meier, L. L., & Spector, P. E. (2019). The spillover effects of coworker, supervisor, and outsider workplace incivility on work-to-family conflict: A weekly diary design. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40, 1000–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2401>