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The purpose of the current study is to replicate a previous study by Sliter, Withrow, and Jex (2015) that sought to determine whether personality characteristics influence how individuals perceive uncivil behaviors in the workplace. The original study is the only one that has attempted to isolate incivility perceptions from the reported experience of incivility. The original study determined that positive affect and trait anger were the strongest predictors of perceived incivility. Results from the current study show the same pattern. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.
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Perceptions of Workplace Incivility Based on Personality Characteristics: A Replication

Overview

The original study conducted by Sliter and colleagues (2015) is unique because it is the only one to study how personality characteristics influence the appraisal process involved in the experience of incivility. Uncivil behaviors, by definition, are mild and very open to the interpretation of the person on the receiving end. Although previous studies attempted to study individual differences of victims of incivility, they were designed in a way that confounded perceived incivility with experienced incivility. In other words, reports of incivility are a product of people actually being targeted by others, combined with a personal sensitivity to appraise ambiguous social situations in negative ways. As such, the primary goal of the original and this study, is to better understand what personality characteristics might predispose people to perceive incivility in seemingly ambiguous situations.

Given the replication crisis that is evident in psychological research, it is crucial to adapt a meta analytic thinking approach when interpreting the impact of research findings. This means that we should not rely solely on results of single studies. In order to accomplish this, direct as well as conceptual replications of individual studies are important. This is particularly true for cases where the number of studies focused on answering a particular research question is limited, such as the study which was conducted by Sliter and colleagues (2015).

To accomplish the replication, every aspect of the methods in this study mimicked the original as closely as possible. With access to the original materials, students at the University of Guelph participated in an online vignette study, where they were presented with several ambiguous and potentially uncivil workplace interactions. Once participants indicated how rude
they perceived the interaction to be, they filled out several personality questionnaires, which were then used to evaluate how personality traits are related to perceptions of incivility.

**The Ambiguous Nature of Incivility**

Workplace mistreatment has become a focus of interest in organizational psychology in the past two decades. Whereas much of the research initially focused on topics like workplace aggression, deviance, bullying, and abusive supervision, a more recent trend has started focusing on low-level discourteous behaviours, known as incivility. Incivility has been defined as “low-intensity deviant behaviour(s), with an ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect” (Anderson & Pearson, 1999, p.457).

There are three characteristics that make incivility unique from other constructs of workplace mistreatment. First, incivility is characterized by low-intensity acts, meaning that although they may be perceived as offensive, they are not overtly threatening (Cortina & Magley, 2009; Glomb, 2002). Second, incivility involves ambiguous intentions, meaning that it is not explicitly clear whether the uncivil behaviour was intentional or not (Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008; Pearson, Anderson & Porath, 2000). Lastly, incivility involves a form of deviant behaviour, meaning that there is a violation of organizational norms for mutual respect (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Although this form of workplace mistreatment is of low intensity in nature, it has substantive negative effects on employees and consequences for the organization as a whole. From an affective perspective, employees who report incivility at work have been found to be more emotionally exhausted (Kern & Grandey, 2009; Sliter et al., 2010), depressed (Lim & Lee, 2011; Miner et al., 2010), and also reported a greater level of overall stress (Adams & Webster, 2013; Cortina et al., 2001; Kern & Grandey, 2009; Lim & Cortina, 2005). From an attitudinal
perspective, incivility has been associated with lower levels of organizational commitment (Lim & Teo, 2009), lower motivation (Sakurai & Jex, 2012), and lower satisfaction with the job (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim & Cortina, 2005), coworkers and supervisors (Bunk & Magley, 2013), and life in general (Lim & Cortina, 2005; Miner et al., 2010). Behaviorally, reported incivility has been found to be related to the reciprocation of deviant and counterproductive behaviours (Bunk & Magley, 2013; Penney & Spector, 2005), as well as decreases in aspects of work performance such as task-performance (Chen et al., 2013; Giumetti et al., 2013), creativity (Porath & Erez, 2007), and citizenship behavior (Porath & Erez, 2007; Taylor et al., 2012).

Perhaps one of the more intriguing characteristics of uncivil behavior is the ambiguity in the intention to cause harm. This means that targets of incivility may not clearly discern whether the perpetrator is being intentionally uncivil or accidentally rude. This, in turn allows for a certain degree of personal interpretation, perception, and appraisal to play a role in terms of assessing whether an uncivil act has occurred or not. For example, imagine that on the way in to work, you hold the door for a colleague, and your colleague walks right through without acknowledging you. One could interpret the colleague’s intentions as blatantly rude and uncivil, whereas someone else could think that the co-worker might simply have too much on their mind and that this occurrence was an accident.

Therefore, the ambiguity in the intentions by the enactor and the perceptions by the target of these workplace occurrences creates a matrix of outcomes (see Figure 1). On one axis is whether intent was there or not, and on the other is whether the situation or behaviour was perceived as intentional or not. Incivility can be perceived by a target if an occurrence is deemed intentional, even if the enactor did not have any intent to harm. For this reason, incivility
becomes partly a matter of perception or of appraisal, and individual differences should be examined as key antecedents of this appraisal.

**Theoretical Background**

There are several theories that explain the idea that incivility involves a degree of perception. The most prominent one is the Transactional Model of Stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). According to this theory, psychological stress, and the ensuing consequences, do not develop from environmental factors alone. Rather, it is the interplay between individual factors, such as personality differences, and environmental stressors, such as uncivil behaviour, that determine whether an event is perceived as stressful. It is this dynamic person-environment relationship that explains why different individuals may perceive the same event as negative, neutral, or even positive.

More specifically, the transactional model of stress outlines two cognitive appraisal processes that occur when individuals are confronted by an environmental stressor. During primary appraisal, individuals make an evaluation of the relevance of the stressor to their well-being, as either threatening, challenging or irrelevant (Lazarus, 1991). Secondary appraisal assesses the individual’s available coping options or resources for dealing with the stressor (Lazarus, 1991). Both of these appraisal processes interact with one another to influence the degree to which an individual is affected by the stressful event.

This process is vital to the understanding of how uncivil behaviours can affect the target. The primary appraisal of a potentially uncivil encounter may be categorized as irrelevant, with no emotional reaction, and therefore no negative consequences should occur. However, individuals will be more likely to experience the negative consequences of incivility if they appraise the encounters as threatening or harmful to their values, goals, or self-esteem.
Furthermore, even if a threat appraisal is made, the effects could be mitigated through secondary appraisal, provided that the individual possesses appropriate coping mechanisms. Therefore, it could be argued that differences in individual characteristics can predispose certain individuals to experiencing the same uncivil event differently, as well as influence how they respond to these stressors.

Another theory that relates to this line of thought is the Trait Activation Theory (Tett & Guterman, 2000; Tett & Burnett, 2003), which proposes that personality traits and trait-relevant situational cues interact to explain how people will react and behave in certain situations. This theory proposes that certain situational cues or experiences are trait-relevant, meaning that they will activate the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses for individuals that possess a relevant personality trait. In the words of Tett and Guterman (2002, p.398), “the principle of trait activation formalizes the trait-situation relationship by holding that the behavioral expression of a trait requires arousal of that trait by trait-relevant situational cues”. According to this theory, environmental events are more likely to activate a response in some individuals and not in others, based on their personality. This is to further the point that when confronted with the same situation, individuals might activate very different emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses, which will influence their recollection of those occurrences, if they are asked to report on them. In other words, personality characteristics may be inflating or deflating the self-reported measures of incivility in the current literature.

These theories indicate that individual differences can play a major role in the interpretation of uncivil or ambiguous acts in the workplace. Although individual differences have often been studied in relation to the enactors of incivility (e.g., Ones & Viswesvaran, 2001; Parkins, Fishbein, & Ritchey, 2006), far less work has attempted to investigate the individual
differences of targets of incivility. One of the reasons why little attention has been given to exploring these individual differences, is that these results could easily be misconstrued as a way of blaming the victim (Nowling & Beehr, 2006).

**Victims of Incivility**

An intriguing study by Milam et al. (2009) is one of the few studies that investigated personality differences in the targets of incivility. More specifically, the researchers wanted to find out how neuroticism, agreeableness, and extraversion were related to reports of workplace incivility. The researchers used surveys to assess self-reported experiences of incivility in the workplace as well as self-assessments of personality traits. It was concluded that agreeableness was negatively related to workplace incivility, and neuroticism had a positive relationship (Milam et al., 2009). The researchers also assessed a mediational model, which suggested that neuroticism and low agreeableness might provoke incivility from others, consistent with the victim precipitation theory (Milam et al., 2009).

The Milam et al., (2009) was based on the victim precipitation theory, which is the idea that certain individuals are more likely to become victimized based on their personality characteristics (Aquino & Bradfield, 2000). According to this theory, some individuals may exhibit certain patterns of behavior, or portray themselves in ways that actually places them in a greater risk for uncivil acts (Milam et al., 2009). More specifically, Victim Precipitation Theory (Olweus, 1978) differentiates between two victim types. The submissive victim, who is characterized as weak, anxious, and insecure, and the provocative victim, who portrays an anxious or aggressive reaction pattern. This is an example of another theory that purports that differences on an individual level may in fact be putting people at greater risk of being targeted with incivility. However, recent advancements in the incivility literature have called for a
reconceptualization of victim precipitation theory to shift the blame from the victim to the enactor. This paradigm shift to studying the characteristics that influence perpetrators to harass, victimize, or be uncivil towards other individuals is labeled perpetrator predation (Cortina et al., 2017), and it may be a more useful approach to studying uncivil occurrences in the workplace.

Unfortunately, because Milam and colleagues (2009) used a self-reported measure of experienced incivility, it is impossible to determine whether individuals are more likely to be actual victims of intentional perpetrators, or whether they are simply more likely to appraise neutral behaviour as uncivil, which would make them more prone to over-report these acts. In other words, it is impossible to tell whether coworkers are intentionally targeting employees, or if the employees are perceiving ambiguous social encounters as rude. Because actual experience is confounded with perception, it is difficult to know whether certain personality types are more likely to be targeted or if they are simply more sensitive to these ambiguous interactions. For this reason, it is necessary to study these phenomena separately.

The only known study that attempted to study the appraisal side separately from the experience was conducted by Sliter and colleagues (2015). Using a vignette methodology, these researchers exposed university students to ambiguous workplace scenarios and had them rate how rude the enactor (co-worker, customer, or supervisor) was in their opinion. Participants also filled out personality measures to assess their levels on the Big 5 personality traits, Positive and Negative Affect, as well as Trait Anger. The findings indicated that personality factors influenced the way that participants appraised the scenarios. Specifically, participants who were high on agreeableness, emotional stability, and openness were less likely to perceive the scenarios as rude or uncivil. On the other hand, participants who were high in trait anger, positive affect, and negative affect were more likely to label the scenarios as rude. When all of
variables were analyzed together under a regression model, the largest predictors of incivility appraisals were individuals who were high in trait anger and positive affect. This study indicates that subtle individual differences may impact whether behaviours in the workplace are initially labeled as uncivil.

**Need for Replication**

On a broader level, it is a well-established belief that our published research literature is fundamentally flawed and can be considered untrustworthy (Simmons, Nelson, & Simonsohn, 2011). Recent failed attempts to replicate selected publication in the field of psychology, has even left some proponents to assert that we are currently in a state of crisis (Pashler & Wagemakers, 2012). There are many complex and interrelated reasons why this, so called replication crisis, is occurring. For example, the publication bias, or the way in which studies are systematically more likely to be published if they find support for a hypothesis, can on its own lead to a greater degree of false positives in our literature (Ioannides, 2005).

Not only does the publication bias contribute to the file-drawer effect whereby studies with smaller or non-significant effects do not get published (Rosenthal, 1979) which is a major problem in its own right, but it also places systemic pressure on scientists to obtain strong, novel, and significant results. This pressure can influence them to conduct, analyze, and report their research in unethical ways in order to increase this likelihood. These behaviors vary in their severity, but can include; omitting failed experiments, forming hypotheses after examining the data (HARKing), and collecting additional participants until nonsignificant results become significant ($p$-hacking), to name just a few (Simmons et al., 2011)

This is not to say that Sliter and colleagues have taken part in any unethical research practices. However, according to Cumming (2014) a single study can rarely, if ever, be
considered definitive. For this reason, additional evidence is necessary to have a certain degree of conviction in the findings of Sliter et al. (2015) specifically, but also any study across all sciences. One of the best ways to obtain additional evidence is through replication studies. Because of this, replications have started to gain popularity and have recently re-emerged as a priority for both scientists and journals worldwide (Anderson & Maxwell, 2016). The idea of replication is not a new one however, as it has been labeled as the “cornerstone” (Simons, 2014, p. 76) and “Supreme Court” (Collins, 1985, p.19) of science. Simons (2014) even went as far as to say that replication is “the best and possibly the only believable evidence for the reliability of an effect” (p.76).

As previously mentioned, the Sliter et al. (2015) study is the only study that attempted to measure how personality differences may affect the incivility appraisal process. However, what makes this study an even stronger candidate for replication is the fact that contrary to theoretical backing, several of the original hypotheses were not supported. In fact, one hypothesis specifically, that positive affect will be negatively related to perceptions of incivility, was supported in the opposite direction and was found to be one of the strongest predictors of incivility appraisals. This finding is interesting because it not only contradicts theory, but also past research findings which showed that individuals who are high in negative affect report greater experiences of incivility (Naimon, Mullins & Osatuke, 2013). In fact, positive affect has often been ignored in incivility studies which makes the findings of Sliter et al. (2015) that much more unique.

It is well established that replicability is considered an essential criterion if an effect is to be accepted in the scientific literature (Lebel, Berger, Campbell, & Loving, 2017). Therefore, if this finding can be replicated, not only will the robustness of the original scientific finding will
be enhanced, but perhaps an important variable of interest can be incorporated into future theory and research on incivility. Therefore, the replication crisis in psychology, coupled with the fact that results from a single study cannot be trusted, is reason enough to pursue a replication of the Sliter et al. (2015) study on how personality characteristics influence incivility perceptions.

**Personality Traits and Incivility**

The following section will outline the expected relationship between personality traits and perceived incivility. The personality traits of interest include agreeableness, extraversion, emotional stability, conscientiousness, openness to experience, negative affectivity, positive affectivity, and trait anger.

*Agreeableness*

Agreeableness as a construct, has also been referred to as likeability (Mcrae & Costa, 1985), friendliness (Guilford & Zimmerman, 1949), or social conformity (Fiske, 1949). In a general sense, this trait is characterized by courteousness, flexibility, good-nature, cooperation, forgiveness, softheartedness, and tolerance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). People low in this trait can be characterized as skeptical, mistrustful, and argumentative. Individuals low in agreeableness may perceive incivility where it does not exist given their mistrustful and skeptical nature. Research conducted by Shewchuk, Elliott, MacNair-Semands, and Harkins (1999), showed that agreeableness has a negative relationship with the primary appraisal of stressors. For this reason, it is predicted that individuals high in agreeableness will be less likely to perceive an ambiguous act as uncivil or rude. The Sliter et al. (2015) study supported this hypothesis ($b = -.08, p = .05, R^2 = .01$) when testing agreeableness as a single predictor. However, it was not supported when all of the predictors were considered in a combined model.

*Hypothesis 1:* Agreeableness will be negatively related to perceptions of incivility
Extraversion

Extraversion, also at times referred to as surgency (McCrae & Costa, 1985) refers to individuals who are sociable, gregarious, assertive, talkative, and active (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Introversion, which exists on the other end of the spectrum, can be characterized by individuals who are introspective, quiet, and reserved. Research also shows that extroverts spend considerably more time in social situations and tend to have more friends (Watson & Clark, 1997). Not only do extroverts engage in more social interactions, but they also experience them as more positive compared to introverts. Accordingly, it is presumed that they are less likely to notice small breaches in social etiquette. Furthermore, as Sliter and colleagues (2015) point out, extroverts may not be offended by workplace incivility because they have so many other positive social experiences that they can draw on. However, in their study the hypothesis that extroverts will be less likely to perceive incivility was not supported in either the independent or combined models. Given that there is a strong theoretical rationale to support the initial hypothesis, this question needs to be further examined.

Hypothesis 2: Extraversion will be negatively related to perceptions of incivility

Emotional Stability

Emotional stability is a personality trait that is characterized by level-headedness, appropriate emotional reactions, and calmness. This trait is more commonly known by the trait on the opposite side of the spectrum, neuroticism. Neurotic individuals are characterized as anxious, depressed, angry, embarrassed, emotional, worried, and insecure (Barrick & Mount, 1991). According to Magnus, Diener, Fujita and Pavot (1993) neurotic individuals tend to experience a greater amount of negative life events than other individuals because of their essential negative nature. Furthermore, even positive events tend to invoke negative emotions in
neurotic individuals (Brief, Butchr, & Roberson, 1995). Lastly, it has been found that there was a positive relationship between threat appraisals and neuroticism (Galagher, 1990). This evidence seems to suggest that low emotional stability is likely to lead individuals to perceive uncivil behaviour in mild negative events, whereas emotionally stable individuals may give the enactor the benefit of the doubt. This hypothesis was in fact supported by the original study ($b = -.10, p = .05, R^2 = .02$) when emotional stability was tested as a single predictor. However, no significant effect was found in the combined model.

**Hypothesis 3:** Emotional Stability will be negatively related to perceptions of incivility

*Conscientiousness*

Conscientiousness is a personality trait that is evident in individuals who are dependable, thorough, organized, hard-working, and detail-oriented (Barrick & Mount, 1991). On the other hand, individuals low in conscientiousness can be easy-going and disorganized. Because of their high attention to detail, conscientious individuals are predicted to pick up on subtle deviations from the acceptable norms of behavior and therefore become more likely to appraise ambiguous situations as more uncivil. In fact, research by Gartland, O’Connor and Lawton (2012) demonstrated that conscientiousness is positively related to stress appraisals. The original research by Sliter and colleagues found support for this hypothesis in the independent ($b = .09, p = .05, R^2 = .01$), as well as combined ($b = .10, p = .01$) models.

**Hypothesis 4:** Conscientiousness will be positively related to perceptions of incivility

*Openness*

Openness to experience is a trait that has been related to scientific and artistic creativity (Feist, 1998), as well as to divergent thinking, low religiosity, and a politically liberal orientation (McCrae, 1996). It has also been characterized by intelligence, curiosity, originality, and open
mindedness (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Due to this liberal mindset and open-mindedness, these individuals are generally more accepting of other individuals. According to Sliter et al. (2015) open individuals are more likely to ascribe the behaviors of others to external factors, as opposed to internal ones, thus giving a favorable judgement in the absence of full evidence when encountering subtle forms of social contract violations. The original study supported this hypothesis when assessing openness as an independent predictor ($b = -.10, p = .01, R^2 = .01$), as well as when it was considered in the combined model ($b = -.15, p = .00$).

**Hypothesis 5:** Openness to experience will be negatively related to the perceptions of incivility

**Affectivity**

Negative affectivity (NA) refers to the tendency or predisposition to experience negative emotions such as anger and contempt more readily and frequently. Positive affectivity (PA), on the other hand, refers to the predisposition to experience positive emotions like joy and excitement on a more regular basis. NA is associated with a more pessimistic outlook whereby these individuals will interpret the behaviors of others in a negative light (Marshall et al., 1992). Because of this, it is thought that NA will influence the appraisal process in a way that will relate to higher rates of incivility appraisals. Although, Sliter and colleague’s (2015) study established a significant relationship between these two variables in the independent model ($b = .10, p = .00, R^2 = .01$), negative affect lost its significance as a predictor when all of the variables were analyzed in a combined model.

**Hypothesis 6:** Negative affect will be positively related to perceptions of incivility

On the other side of the affectivity spectrum, Sliter et al., (2015) hypothesized that individuals high in PA will be less likely to appraise the ambiguous situation as uncivil. The
researchers rationalized that individuals high in PA “might not focus on, or recognize, environmental stressors because they are (a) less likely to feel threatened, and (b) less likely to interpret the behavior of others in a manner inconsistent with their positive belief in the world” (p.29). Interestingly, the results of their study produced significant results, but in the opposite direction in both the individual ($b = .13, p = .00, R^2 =.02$), as well as combined ($b = .21, p = .00$) models. Therefore, individual high in PA were actually more likely to notice small breaches of social etiquette and appraise them as rude. In fact, PA was one of the best predictors of incivility appraisals in a regression model that combined all of the personality traits. This is a finding that goes against intuition, and for this reason, it is important to attempt to confirm these results. To stay true to the original study, the hypothesis will remain in the direction that was initially theorized.

**Hypothesis 7**: Positive Affect will be negatively related to perceptions of incivility

**Trait Anger**

Spielberger, Krasner and Solomon (1988) have defined trait anger as the tendency for individuals to perceive a wide range of stimuli as anger-inducing. Therefore, it is predicted that those who are high in trait anger would likely perceive a wide variety of situations as threatening and would be more likely to become angry on a regular basis. Sliter et al. (2015) found support for this hypothesis, and along with PA, trait anger was one of the best predictors of incivility appraisals when testing it as a single predictor ($b = .18, p = .00, R^2 =.01$), as well as when testing it in a combined model ($b = .18, p = .00$).

**Hypothesis 8**: Trait anger will be positively related to perceptions of incivility

All of the hypotheses are consistent with the original study in order to make it easier to compare the success of the replication. Replication success will primarily be measured through
significance testing, whereby the results of the replication study will be directly compared with the original in terms of the direction and the significance of the effect. According to Anderson and Maxwell (2016), this method of assessing replication success can be especially enlightening in cases where the original study resulted in counter intuitive or unexpected findings. This is precisely the case with the Sliter et al. (2015) study.

Several other methods will be compared and contrasted on an exploratory level to evaluate the success of the replication. These methods include; establishing prediction intervals around the correlations of the original study to evaluate whether the replication correlations fall within them, testing whether results of the original and replication studies are significantly different from each other, assessing whether the results of the replication fall within the confidence intervals of the original study’s results, and assessing whether the results of the original study fall within the confidence intervals of the replication results. All of these methods will be further discussed in the exploratory analysis section.

Method

Procedure

In order to conduct a complete replication, all aspects related to the procedure were, as closely as possible, aligned to the original study. The sample was recruited from the University of Guelph, and the only requirement for participation was that individuals were (a) enrolled as full-time students at a University, and (b) were 18 years old or older at the time of the study. Due to the composition of the Guelph student population, it was predicted that the respondents would match the original sample in terms of gender and ethnicity, which was reported as 72% female, and 73% white in the original study.
A safeguard power analysis was conducted using the results of the original study. The original study produced an $R^2 = .12$, 95% CI [.07, .16], with an N = 708. Using the lower bound CI from the original study, the safeguard power analysis for multiple regression with 9 predictors, determined that an N of 220 would be necessary, with the power = 80.

Participants were recruited through the Psychology SONA research pool system to participate in an online-based Qualtrics study and received appropriate credits for their participation. Because the study was estimated to be completed in 30 minutes, 0.5 SONA credits were allocated to each student for their participation. As an additional incentive, participating students had an option to enter into a draw to win one of three iPads upon their completion of the study.

Consistent with the original study, participants were asked to read several incivility vignettes that depicted ambiguous workplace situations in a randomized order. The intentions of the enactor (either a customer, a co-worker, or a supervisor) were specifically designed to be ambiguous, consistent with the definition of incivility. After reading each vignette, participants were asked to rate the perceived rudeness of the enactor to establish their perception of incivility scores.

After completing the vignettes, participants completed several personality measures in random order. The order of items within each personality scale were also randomized in order to avoid any order effects. Lastly, participants completed the demographics form and were given the option to provide their name and e-mail to be entered into a draw to win one of three iPads. If participants chose to participate in the draw, they were redirected to a different survey where they could provide their personal information. This last step was necessary to separate participant identifying information from their data so that they could remain anonymous.
Measures

*Incivility Perceptions.* Incivility perceptions were measured using vignettes that were constructed and used in the original study. These vignettes consisted of 22 ambiguous interpersonal work situations. These situations were designed to be ambiguous, so that they were likely to produce variability in perceptions of incivility. There was a total of 10 vignettes that represented situations of co-worker incivility. An example of a co-worker incivility vignette is *As you head down the hallway to a meeting, your coworker is walking in front of you to the same meeting. They turn their head, see you behind them, and then continue walking at the same pace.* An additional 6 vignettes that represented supervisor incivility. An example is *You submitted several ideas of work to your supervisor. However, your supervisor did not mention any of your ideas at all during the team meeting when discussing the feasibility of every team member’s ideas.* The last 6 vignettes represented customer incivility, an example of which is *You are working to resolve an issue that a customer is having. The customer keeps sighing audibly as you talk with your manager.*

Incivility perceptions for each vignette were assessed using a one-item measure which asked *How rude was the coworker/customer/supervisor?* To which the participants responded on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1-*Not at all rude* to 6-*Extremely rude.* Mid-points of the Likert-scale were not labelled. Due to the fact that there was an inconsistent number of vignettes across different sources (i.e., more coworker items, compared to customer or supervisor), responses from similar sources of incivility were averaged to determine an overall score for each source category. To determine overall perceptions of incivility, the average of the three scores was calculated. The overall measure showed an adequate internal reliability (α = .84).
There are several additional questions that each participant was required to answer after they rated the rudeness of each vignette. These questions were neither theorized nor hypothesized about in the original study, and were thus not analyzed or discussed by the original authors. These additional questions were as follows; (1) *I would consider responding in kind*, (2) *Given the opportunity, I would actually respond in kind*, (3) *I would consider escalating the situation*, and (4) *Given the opportunity, I would actually escalate the situation*. Participants answered these questions on a 6 point Likert type scale, ranging from 1-*Strongly Disagree* to 6-*Strongly Agree*. Incivility vignettes can be found in Appendix A.

**Big 5 Personality Traits.** To measure the big 5 factors of personality, the researchers used the Five Factor Personality Inventory from the International Personality Item Pool (Goldberg, 1999). This scale consists of 10 items that are dedicated to each personality trait, for a total of 50 items. Participants were asked to describe themselves as they generally are now, in comparison to other people of the same sex and relative age group. Participant answer on a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 - *Very Inaccurate* to 5 – *Very Accurate*. Internal consistency was deemed acceptable (conscientiousness .81, agreeableness .80, openness .78, extraversion .88, and emotional stability .84). This measure can be found in Appendix B.

**Affectivity.** Positive and negative affectivity were assessed using the Positive and Negative Affectivity Scale (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The scale consists of a total of 20 items, equally divided between PA and NA constructs. The questions consisted of one-word, emotionally based adjectives. Participants estimated to what extent they generally feel in the manner that is described in the question on a 5-point Likert Scale from 1 - *Very Slightly or Not at All* to 5 – *Extremely*. Internal consistency of the positive affect subscale (α = .86), as well
as the negative affect ($\alpha = .87$) subscale was deemed acceptable. This measure can be found in Appendix C.

**Trait Anger.** Trait Anger was assessed with the Trait Anger Scale (TAS; Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, & Crane, 1983). This 15-item scale presents several statements with which participants can either agree or disagree. Sample items include *I am quick tempered* and *I am a hotheaded person*. Participants answered on a 5-point Likert Scale from 1 – *Strongly Disagree* to 5 – *Strongly Agree*, with higher scores indicating higher levels of trait anger. Again, the internal consistency was acceptable ($\alpha = .88$). This measure can be found in Appendix D.

**Demographics.** Participants completed a demographic questionnaire asking to self-report age, gender, and ethnicity.

There were several measures that were part of the original study although, Sliter and colleagues (2015) did not outline specific hypotheses, nor did they present the results of analysis relating to these constructs. However, in order to keep the study as true to the original as possible, these measures were included in the replication and were explored with subsequent exploratory analyses.

**Self-Esteem.** Self-esteem was measured using the scale developed by Zimprich, Perren, and Hornung (2005). This scale consists of 8 items, with Likert Scale responses ranging from 1 – *Strongly Disagree* to 5 – *Strongly Agree*. Sample items include: *I certainly feel useless at times* (R), and *On the whole, I am satisfied with myself*. This measure can be found in Appendix E.

**Locus of Control.** Locus of Control was assessed using James’ (1957) scale. This scale consists of 11 items, with Likert Scale responses ranging from 1 – *Strongly Disagree* to 5 – *Strongly Agree*. Sample items include: *I have usually found that what is going to happen will
happen, regardless of my actions, and Success is mostly a matter of getting good breaks. This measure can be found in Appendix F.

Self-Monitoring. Self-Monitoring was assessed using Snyder and Gangestad’s (1986) Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS). This scale consists of 18 items, with Likert Scale responses ranging from 1 – Strongly Disagree to 5 – Strongly Agree. Sample items include: I find it hard to imitate the behaviour of other people (R), and I guess I put on a show to impress or to entertain others. This measure can be found in Appendix G.

Control variables

Like the original study, sex was statistically controlled for in the first step of the hierarchical regression. This was done because sex has been shown to affect perceptions of similar constructs such as justice (Parker, Baltes, & Christiansen, 1997), and sexual harassment (Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001).

Analysis

Data Screening

There were several indices that were used to identify and eliminate careless responses from the data set. The first was to eliminate all participants who answered ‘no’ to a self-report indicator of data quality that has been built into the survey (i.e., “Did you take the entire survey seriously? Please answer this question HONESTLY; how you answer will not affect whether you receive credit. We simply need to know this for our results; if a survey isn't taken seriously, it could impact our results, so we would omit that survey from the analysis”). This question was included in the original study, and is similar to the best practice recommendations for data screening by Desimone, Harms, and Desimone (2015).
The next step was to eliminate careless responses based on response time. Following the recommendation of Huang, Curran, Keeney, Poposki, and DeShon (2012), a minimum threshold of 2 seconds per question must be met in order to remain in the study sample. The threshold for the current study is 480 seconds, given that there is a total of 240 questions in the survey. All participants who failed to meet this standard were eliminated from further analysis.

The next step involved the handling of missing data. Some missing data is expected due to legitimate reasons, such as in the case of the follow-up demographic question where participants are asked to enter their race if none of the given options apply to them. Under this circumstance, it is expected that most participants would leave this option as blank which will result in some missing data. However, this is the only case where data is expected to be missing for legitimate reasons.

On the other hand, illegitimately missing data could be caused by participants choosing to skip questions or drop out of the survey before it is complete. Given that this survey was considered as low-risk, and did not ask about sensitive topics (i.e., illegal activities, sexual behaviour, racism, etc.) it is highly unlikely that respondents will skip questions due to discomfort with the content. Although a small percentage of skipped questions can be expected and be effectively dealt with, individual cases that contained 5% (12 unanswered questions) or more were considered as careless responses and were subjected to listwise deletion. Missing data in cases that had not been deleted up to this point were subjected to mean imputation, where the mean for a given variable was calculated using complete data and substituted in place of the missing values. Using this technique is a conservative approach because the mean for the distribution of the variable does not change. Furthermore, the imputations were done at the level
of the individual question and thus did not greatly influencing the total scores on a particular scale.

Multivariate outliers were evaluated using three different tests; Mahalanobis, leverage, and Cook’s test. Mahalanobis distance is a measure of the multivariate distance from the point where all relevant variable means intersect. As suggested by Tobachnick and Fidell (2012), a conservative probability estimate of \( p < .001 \) for the \( \chi^2 \) value was used as a cutoff for this test. Leverage is represented as a standardized score of how much influence each participant has on the overall slope. Leverage values can range from 0 which indicates that there is no influence whatsoever, to 1 which indicates that there is complete influence (Field, Miles, & Field, 2012). As suggested by Stevens (2002), a cutoff score of \( ((3 \times k) + 2)/N \) was used for this test. Lastly, Cook’s distance measures the overall influence of a single participant on the model as a whole. A cutoff score of \( (4/N - k - 1) \) was used for Cook’s distance, as recommended by Belsey, Kuh, and Welsch (2004). Cases that failed at least two out of three multivariate outlier tests were deleted.

**Hypothesis testing**

To test the hypotheses, the same statistical analyses as the original study were utilized: hierarchical regression. Gender was controlled for in the first step, with each predictor in the subsequent models. To directly test each hypothesis, models where the specific trait of interest was the only predictor on perceptions of incivility were analyzed to stay consistent with the analysis of the initial study. Next, to gain a better understanding of the importance of each personality trait, a model that included all 8 traits in the regression equation was analyzed. Only overall perceptions of incivility were considered for hypothesis testing. However, sources of incivility were more closely examined in subsequent exploratory analyses because the original study did not include direct hypotheses about these relationships.
Results

Demographics and Descriptive Statistics

A total of 711 University of Guelph students participated in the study. However, several participants had to be removed according to the previously mentioned criteria in the order that follows. Firstly, 47 cases were removed because they answered that they did not take the survey seriously. Secondly, an additional 127 cases were removed because they did not meet the time threshold that was established for the survey. Thirdly, 47 cases were removed for having more than 5% of missing data. Lastly, 5 cases were removed because they failed two out of three multivariate outliers test

After data was cleaned, only 485 cases remained as usable data for analysis. The demographics of the current sample closely resembled that of the original study in most respects. The participants in the current study were predominantly female (68%), identified as White/European (73%), with an average age of 19 years ($SD = 2.72$). Compared to the demographics of the original study, which were 72% female, 73% White/European, with an average age of 21.2 ($SD = 4.64$). The only noticeable difference between the two studies is the average participant age.

Hypothesis Testing

To test the proposed hypotheses directly, hierarchical regression was utilized in which gender was controlled for in the first step and each predictor was added independently in the second. The first model found a significant effect of gender on incivility $F(1, 483) = 30.19, p < .001, R^2 = .06$, such that women reported significantly more incivility compared to men ($b = 0.33, t(483) = 5.49, p < .001$). This coefficient of multiple determination was subtracted from each subsequent model to determine the unique variance that is explained by each personality
variable after controlling for gender. These results are summarized in Table 3. It is important to note that although different sources of incivility were analyzed, results are only discussed based on independent effects of each personality trait on overall perceptions of incivility to stay consistent with the original study.

Hypothesis 1, that agreeableness will negatively relate to perceptions of incivility, was not supported. Hypothesis 2, that extraversion will negatively relate to the perception of incivility, was also not supported. Hypothesis 3, which proposed that a negative relationship between emotional stability and incivility perceptions exists was supported ($b = -0.10, p = 0.02, R^2 = 0.01$). Hypothesis 4, which posited a positive relationship between conscientiousness and incivility, was not supported. Hypothesis 5, that openness will have a negative relationship with perceptions of incivility was not supported. Hypothesis 6, which stated that negative affect will be positively related to perceptions of incivility was supported ($b = 0.08, p = 0.01, R^2 = 0.01$).

Hypothesis 7, which suggested a negative relationship between positive affect and perceptions of incivility was supported, but in the opposite direction ($b = 0.09, p = 0.01, R^2 = 0.01$), consistent with the findings of the original study. Lastly, hypothesis 8, that trait anger will positively relate to perceptions of incivility, was supported ($b = 0.19, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.04$).

To gain a better understanding of the relative effects of each personality variable, all traits were added to a regression model to simultaneously predict incivility perceptions. Gender was once again controlled for and partialled out. In this model, emotional stability and negative affect were no longer significant predictors of perceptions of incivility. However, positive affect ($b = 0.17, p = 0.02$), and trait anger ($b = 0.24, p < 0.001$), continued to positively predict perceptions of incivility. Interestingly, in the combined model, extraversion became a significant variable ($b$
= -.09, \( p = .04 \), negatively predicting incivility perceptions, consistent with Hypothesis 2. These results are summarized in Table 4.

**Exploratory Analysis**

Differences in incivility perceptions based on the source of the incivility (customer, coworker, or supervisor) were analyzed. This was examined using repeated measures ANOVA. Due to the fact that Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity was significant at \( p < .05 \), the Greenhouse-Geisser Correction was used. With this correction, the ANOVA was significant (\( F(2, 968) = 14.48, p < .001, \eta^2 = .009 \)). Pairwise comparisons with a Bonferroni correction were computed. Coworker incivility perceptions (\( M = 3.76, SD = 0.73 \)) were rated significantly lower than both supervisor incivility perceptions (\( M = 3.92, SD = 0.75, p = .01 \)) and customer incivility perceptions (\( M = 3.91, SD = 0.83, p = .01 \)). However, there was no significant difference between customer and supervisor perceptions of incivility. Furthermore, personality effects on perceptions were explored across different sources. These results can be explored in Tables 5 – 10.

Consistent with the original study design, data on three additional personality variables were collected. These three traits were self esteem, locus of control, and self monitoring. Although these traits were neither hypothesized, nor analyzed in the original study, they were explored in the replication. Exploratory analysis determined that neither self-monitoring, nor self-esteem had a significant impact on incivility perceptions, in either the independent or combined models. On the other hand, locus of control was positively related, such that external locus of control predicted higher incivility perceptions. This effect held true in both the independent (\( b = .13, p = .01, R^2 = .01 \)), and combined models (\( b = .11, p = .03 \)). Interestingly,
when locus of control was added as a predictor to the combined model, extraversion lost its significance as a predictor.

Data regarding the additional questions for each vignette was also explored. There was a total of 4 additional questions that examined the likelihood of considering responding in kind, actually responding in kind given the opportunity, considering to escalate the situation, and actually escalating the situation given the opportunity. Each of these four questions were independently treated as the criterion variable in a regression model using all of the personality variables that were collected. This was done to examine whether certain personality traits might predispose certain individuals to take subsequent action in these ambiguous work situations. Findings indicated that neither gender, nor any other personality characteristic predicted considering responding in kind, or actually responding in kind given the opportunity. However, significant effects were obtained in terms of considering escalating the situation. More specifically, openness was negatively related \( (b = -.22, p < .01) \), positive affect was positively related \( (b = .36, p < .01) \), and trait anger was also positively related \( (b = .37, p < .01) \). Furthermore, when it came to actually escalating the situation given the opportunity, agreeableness was negatively related \( (b = -.19, p < .01) \), openness was negatively related \( (b = -.23, p < .01) \), positive affect was positively related \( (b = .34, p < .01) \), and trait anger was also positively related \( (b = .36, p < .01) \). Interestingly, positive affect and trait anger were once again the strongest predictors of both considering to, and actually escalating the situation given the opportunity. Complete results can be reviewed in Tables 11 and 11.

Interactions between gender and personality traits were examined to determine whether or not gender and personality play unique roles in determining incivility perceptions. No
significant interactions were found between gender and personality characteristics, indicating that personality and gender play unique roles in perceptions in this study.

As previously mentioned, a simple significance test was used to assess the success of this particular replication given the circumstances of the original study’s results. However, it was interesting to explore and compare other methods of comparisons, and as such, several additional analyses were conducted to determine the success or failure of the replication results. First and foremost, prediction intervals were calculated for each correlation in the original study. A prediction interval takes into account the original effect size, along with the sample sizes of both the original study and the planned replication to produce a range of results that can be expected in a replication due to sampling error (Spence & Stanley, 2016). Accordingly, if the replication correlation falls within the prediction intervals that were established, it suggests that the observed deviation is not greater than what could be expected due to sampling error alone. If, however, the replication correlation falls outside of the prediction interval, then it could be indicative of a replication failure. Although this method was not directly hypothesized about, it is an indirect way to measure the success of the replication. The correlation table from the original study has been enhanced with prediction intervals and can be found in Table 1. The replication correlation table can be found in Table 2, where correlations that do not fall into the prediction intervals have been bolded.

Another method of assessing replication success that has been suggested in the literature is to examine whether or not the original study effect size is within the confidence intervals of the replication effect size (Open Science Collaboration, 2015). However, Nelson, Simmons, and Simonsohn (in press), claim that this approach inflates failure to replicate rates by ignoring the uncertainty around the original study’s effect size. Alternatively, one could test whether the
effect size of the replication falls within the confidence intervals of the original study, as suggested by Gilbert, King, Pettigrew, and Wilson (2016). However, this approach deflates failure to replicate rates by ignoring the uncertainty around the replication study’s effect size (Nelson et al., in press). Nevertheless, both of these tests have been conducted. The results can be found in Table 13 for the independent model results, and Table 14 for the combined model results.

Lastly, replication success was measured by determining whether or not the results of the two studies are significantly different from each other. To accomplish this, a significance test of the difference between the original and the replication regression coefficients was conducted for each variable of interest, where the null hypothesis was that the two regression coefficients were equal. Following the prescribed steps Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle, and Piquero (1998) a $z$-value for each pair of coefficients was calculated. The $z$ statistic associated with each hypothesis is presented in Tables 13 and 14.

**Discussion**

It should be noted that although the original authors only focused on the independent effects of each personality characteristic to test their hypotheses, it is perhaps more meaningful to examine the effects of variables in the combined model. This is because the independent regression effects of personality characteristics are equivalent to simple regressions that have been controlled for gender. The combined model, on the other hand, takes into consideration the covariance of all of the variables, which paints a more complete picture in terms of the influence each variable has on the criterion. As such, the results of both approaches are discussed below.

The results of the replication are consistent with the original study in some very important ways, but also deviate from the findings in some respects. Overall, the current study
found fewer personality characteristics to be significant predictors of perceptions of incivility both in the independent as well as the combined models (see Tables 13 and 14). When considering each personality trait independently, agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness, did not have a significant effect on perceptions. Whereas these same traits, apart from extraversion, produced significant effects in the original study. However, the results for emotional stability, positive affect, negative affect, and trait anger were similar to the original study both in their effect size, as well as the direction of the relationship. More specifically, low emotional stability, and high positive affect, negative affect, and trait anger were predictive of incivility perceptions.

When it comes to the combined model of the current study, negative affect and emotional stability lost their significance. Three personality variables remained as significant predictors; trait anger, positive affect, and surprisingly, extraversion. In this case, extraversion negatively predicted perceptions, consistent with hypothesis 2. Interestingly, emotional stability and negative affect, also lost their significance in the original study leaving trait anger and positive affect as the strongest predictors of incivility perceptions. Although extraversion was a significant predictor in the current combined model, and conscientiousness along with openness were significant predictors in the original combined model, these personality characteristics were considerably weaker when compared to trait anger and positive affect in terms of the effect size.

The fact that positive affect and trait anger were consistently the strongest predictors, and negative affect and emotional stability were insignificant in both combined models, is perhaps the most intriguing finding of the replication. This is especially interesting when considering the fact that positive affect was initially theorized to negatively predict incivility perceptions,
whereas negative affect along with emotional stability are often used as controls in incivility research because they are considered to strongly impact appraisals (Sliter, Sliter, & Jex, 2012).

It is perhaps easier to rationalize trait anger as a strong predictor of incivility. Trait anger is defined as the tendency for individuals to perceive a wide range of stimuli as anger-inducing. It makes sense that a predisposition to negatively react to a variety of environmental conditions would predispose one to be more perceptive of, as well as negatively appraise, ambiguous social situations that breach social etiquette.

Furthermore, Meier and Semmer (2013) found that perpetrators of incivility also tend to be high in trait anger. It seems that individuals who are high in trait anger are more likely to both appraise and enact incivility. This would support the incivility spiral hypothesis which states that incivility begets incivility (Anderson & Pearson, 1999), and this seems to be particularly true for individuals high in trait anger. The exploratory findings of this study support this, showing that individuals who are high in Trait Anger are more likely to consider escalating the situation, as well as actually escalate the situation if they were given the opportunity. Future studies could further examine the retaliatory behaviors in response to uncivil acts in order to confirm this assertion.

Positive affect as a predictor of incivility perceptions, on the other hand, is perhaps a less intuitive relationship because at first glance it goes against common sense as well as against the results of previous studies. However, we can explain this phenomenon using Fredrickson’s (2004) Broaden and Build Theory of Positive Emotions. According to this theory, positive emotions broaden one's awareness and encourage novel, varied, and exploratory thoughts and actions. These positive experiences cause positive spirals whereby positive emotions give rise to more positive emotions through the broadening of the thought and action repertoires. Because
people who are high in positive affect may find themselves in these positive spirals of emotion, it is likely that they become more sensitive to any social or organizational violations that may occur. Firstly, because their awareness is broadened so they may simply be more attentive to these acts. Second, any negative occurrences, even minor ones, may be more evident to these individuals because they have a positively heightened equilibrium state. Sliter and colleagues (2015) also explore this possibility in their discussion, stating that it may be that “people who are high in positive affect have higher standards for how people should treat each other, and may be more prone to detecting incivility” (p.37).

The current literature has never examined positive affect in its relation to enactment of incivility or to retaliatory behaviour. However, the exploratory findings of the study suggest that positive affect could play an important role in these behaviours as well. It seems that not only are high positive affect individuals more likely to perceive ambiguous acts as rude, but they are also more likely to escalate the situation if they are given the chance. Of course, these are only exploratory findings and for this reason must be confirmed in future studies to be considered reliable. However, if these results can be replicated, it would provide further support for the incivility spiral perspective and broaden our understanding of social interactions in the workplace.

In terms of the other exploratory findings of this study, it is perhaps not surprising that external locus of control had a positive impact on incivility perceptions. This seems to make sense from a post hoc evaluation. Because individuals with an external locus of control attribute their successes and failures to external factors, they may be more inclined to notice fluctuations in their external, as opposed to internal, states. In fact, Folkman (1984) stated that external locus of control is likely to increase threat appraisals, whereas Parkes (1984) found that individuals
who are high on external locus of control are worse at coping with stressors once they are appraised as threats. Based on this, locus of control should be examined in future studies in its relation to perceptions of incivility.

Another interesting finding, was that gender strongly correlated with perceptions of incivility ($r = .24$), which was substantially higher than the original study ($r = .14$). In fact, gender had a larger correlation than any personality factor. Furthermore, in terms of its predictive effect, gender had the strongest effect when considered in the single predictor model, and explained more variance than all the personality variables combined in the multiple predictors model. Previous studies have also found that females tend to report more experiences of incivility, which led to a creation of selective incivility perspective. Selective incivility posits that incivility can be understood as a modern manifestation of gender and racial discrimination (Cortina, 2008). Support for this theory is evident in several studies that show the disproportionately higher rate at which females report incivility (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta & Magley, 2013; Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001).

This study, as well as the original study, show that at least part of these reports can be explained through the lens of a predisposition to perceive ambiguous acts in the workplace as uncivil. However, this assertion needs to be treated with caution, because although it is entirely possible that women might be more sensitive to breaches in social etiquette, it can also be the case that because females are intentionally targeted with incivility more often than males, that these actual experiences may impact future perceptions. However, a typical “incivility score” is more likely to be a combination of actual experiences coupled with perceptions, as opposed to one of these factors alone. It is important to note that no significant interactions were found.
between gender and personality characteristics, indicating that personality and gender play unique roles in perceptions.

When comparing the differences in sources of incivility, it is interesting to note that supervisor incivility was not rated significantly higher than other sources. This was specifically the case in the original study, and the authors explained this finding through the lens of anticipatory justice, whereby employees have higher expectations of just conduct from their superiors which would make violations more noticeable. However, this study found that individuals rated customer incivility equally as rude as supervisor incivility, whereas the standards for coworker conduct was substantially lower because those occurrences were rated as less uncivil.

**Theoretical Implications**

The original study was the first study to examine incivility while separating perceptions from experiences. To make the distinction between perceived and experienced incivility, it might be useful to imagine two perspectives. In the first perspective, a persons’ dispositions may make them more likely to fall prey to victimization or uncivil acts from enactors in the workplace, consistent with the model of perpetrator predation established by Cortina et al. (2017). However, the other perspective, posits that trait differences may predispose certain individuals to perceive ambiguous situations as more rude or uncivil consistent with the both Trait Activation Theory and the Transactional Model of Stress (Tett & Guterman, 2000; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Both of these perspectives are likely to influence reports of incivility.

Because these two studies isolated perceptions by controlling for the actual experience, they provide a unique viewpoint through which one can interpret previous studies of individual differences on targets of incivility. On one side, there have been studies which have shown that
individuals who are higher in negative affect, neuroticism, and low in agreeableness, are likely to report higher incidences of incivility (Milam et al., 2009; Naimo, Mullins & Osatuke, 2013). On the other side, the findings from the current study showed that the aforementioned personality characteristics tend to have a weak effect on perceptions of incivility when assessed independently, and none of them show a significant effect when considered in the combined model. These two findings taken together suggest that individuals with these traits (i.e., high NA and Neuroticism, and low Agreeableness) are in fact more likely to be targets of uncivil behaviours at a higher rate compared to others, because these personality characteristics do not strongly influence appraisal patterns. These findings taken together provide indirect support for the perpetrator predation model of incivility.

**Practical Implications**

From a practical standpoint, organizations should be careful about the conclusions that they draw from these findings. Although it is true that some individuals might come to work with a predisposition to label ambiguous behaviours as rude or uncivil, whereas others may be more likely to be targeted by perpetrators based on their personalities, it is important to treat these finding with appropriate caution.

Sliter et al. (2015, p. 39) recommend that “organizations might attempt to place employees high in such traits in jobs that do not require high levels of interactions with others”. However, this recommendation falls under a victim precipitation perspective, which states that individuals possessing certain characteristics are partly to blame for their misfortunes. Under this lens, organizations could be likewise advised to focus intervention efforts on those targets (i.e., high in positive affect, and trait anger). Efforts could be directed to teach them ways of reappraising work situations, or teaching them behavior modification techniques. This approach
is ultimately flawed because it places the onus on the victim for managing the misconduct of others.

On the other hand, a more holistic approach grounded in this research, could see organizations focus on interventions that decrease incivility and promote civility in the workplace. For example, everyone can participate in the creation of civil conduct protocols and also learn about how individual differences can predispose some to experience interpersonal stressors differently. Furthermore, employees could collectively be trained on how to prevent the activation of negative emotions, or how to prevent the translation of negative emotions into negative actions such as aggression or incivility (Cortina et al., 2017).

**Directions for Future Research**

As a reminder, incivility appraisals were assessed by a response to the following question: *How rude was the coworker/customer/supervisor?* Even though this measure taps into the perceptions of the enactor’s behaviour, it does not tap into the enactor’s intention. For this reason, it does not necessarily infer the experience of incivility. It would be erroneous to suggest that individuals that are high in Trait Anger or PA actually experience more incivility, or even that they are negatively affected by these appraisals.

Although the perspective that a higher sensitivity to breaches of emotional etiquette would translate to stronger reactions is interesting, it cannot be confirmed on the basis of this study. Even though this option is possible, it is also possible that certain traits may act as buffers or coping mechanism to the subsequent experience of stress. For example, Chou, Yan, Che, and Meier (2015) found that employees who are high on internal locus of control, and high on emotional stability were less likely to experience NA at the end of the day due to experiences of incivility. Likewise, Kabat-Farr, Cortina, and Marchiondo (2016) reported that incivility resulted
in feelings of NA and Guilt at the end of the day, especially for individuals who self-identified as highly committed. These findings provide evidence that personality characteristics play an important role in terms of how incivility impacts individuals, showing further that there is a distinction between reports of incivility and the subsequent consequences of that appraisal. Clearly there seem to be individual differences that mediate the effects of experienced incivility, and these should be studied in more detail.

Although we now have support that high PA and high trait anger individuals are sensitive to perceptions of rudeness, we do not know how these personality traits impact secondary appraisals in terms of how these individuals respond to the stressful situation. It can be hypothesized, for example, that an individual high in PA that appraises an uncivil act could simply “brush it off” by focusing on other positive interactions, whereas an individual that is high in Trait Anger could ruminate and react with negative affect and retaliation. These hypotheses could be the focus of future studies.

Future studies need to examine this complex process in more detail. More specifically, incivility perceptions should be studied in a model where they act as mediators between personality characteristics and subsequent reports of incivility, negative consequences related to incivility, and behavioural response patterns.

**Limitations**

The present study is limited in much the same ways as the original. Most importantly it is limited in generalizability by its use of experimental vignettes. Although it is true that this design was able to isolate the appraisal process by controlling for the experience, vignette methodologies have previously been criticized for having low ecological validity. Vignette methodologies dilute the complexities of real-world social interactions, and for this reason may
not realistically elicit the same reactions from participants. This means that the way a person reacts to a hypothetical and imagined situation, will not necessarily translate to the same reaction when they encounter that situation in real life. Future studies could attempt to mitigate this limitation by attempting to achieve the same effects in naturalistic or laboratory setting.

Furthermore, the use of a student sample can likewise pose a threat to the generalizability of the results to the general population. It would be interesting to examine whether the same patterns exist in a working population.

Assessing the Replication

As previously mentioned, alternative methods have been employed to measure whether or not the replication has been successful. When examining Tables 1 and 2, one can see that there are several replication correlations that do not fall within the prediction intervals that surround the original correlations. Most notably, the correlations between agreeableness and four other variables (i.e., emotional stability, openness, conscientiousness, and positive affect) have failed to replicate. Other failures to replicate include the correlation between emotional stability and gender, as well as extraversion and conscientiousness. However, it is important to note that all of the correlations with the overall incivility score fall within the prediction intervals of the original study, providing indirect support for the success of the replication.

Furthermore, when examining Tables 13 and 14, it becomes clear that evaluating replication success is not a simple task. Based on these results it can be said with a fair degree of confidence that only one of the hypotheses, that openness should predict lower incivility perception, failed to replicate. This can be said because it failed all four tests of the evaluation criteria. Although there are several hypotheses that were successfully replicated using all four tests (i.e., positive affect), there are some hypotheses that have mixed results (i.e.,
agreeableness). Therefore, deciding on the criteria for replication evaluation can have a significant impact on whether or not results are deemed replicable.

**Conclusion**

This replication study confirms the finding of the original study by showing that positive affect and Trait Anger are in fact two of the strongest predictors of incivility perceptions. Of particular interest is the confirmatory finding of positive affect as strong predictor of perceptions of incivility, especially considering that it is usually negative affect that is controlled for in incivility studies, under the guise that it has a strong impact on perceptions, as opposed to actual experiences of incivility. This finding, however, corroborates the finding that it is in fact positive affect, that may have the stronger impact on perceptions of incivility, and that it should be treated as an important variable of interest in future studies related to perceptions of incivility in particular, and perception of other workplace stressor more broadly.

This study furthers our understanding of the difference between perceptions of incivility and experience of incivility as they relate to target personality differences. It is important to understand that these personality characteristics are likely to inflate reports of incivility in the workplace whether or not those acts are intentional mistreatments or simply ambiguous social situations. Therefore, understanding what makes an individual more likely to perceive uncivil, or rude behavior is useful in our understanding of social interactions in the workplace. Armed with this understanding, researchers are able to focus on investigating whether personality characteristics mediate departure points after an uncivil event has taken place, as well as whether they influence how individuals are affected by negative appraisals of incivility.
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Table 1.  
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Study Variables in the Original Study, Along with Prediction Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1-Male,</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.11,</td>
<td>.33]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-16,</td>
<td>.08]</td>
<td>[13,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-31,</td>
<td>-.69]</td>
<td>[.08,</td>
<td>[.14,</td>
<td>[.36]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.31,</td>
<td>.36]</td>
<td>[.04,</td>
<td>[.19]</td>
<td>[.14,</td>
<td>[.36]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-17,</td>
<td>.07]</td>
<td>[.34,</td>
<td>[.43]</td>
<td>[.12,</td>
<td>[.34]</td>
<td>[.14,</td>
<td>[.36]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-09,</td>
<td>.15]</td>
<td>[-27,</td>
<td>-.05]</td>
<td>[-31,</td>
<td>-.09]</td>
<td>[-27,</td>
<td>-.56]</td>
<td>[-37,</td>
<td>-.15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anger</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-08,</td>
<td>.16]</td>
<td>[-33,</td>
<td>-.11]</td>
<td>[-20,</td>
<td>-.03]</td>
<td>[-26,</td>
<td>-.04]</td>
<td>[-28,</td>
<td>.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Incivility</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.03,</td>
<td>.25]</td>
<td>[-14,</td>
<td>.10]</td>
<td>[-12,</td>
<td>.12]</td>
<td>[-24,</td>
<td>-.02]</td>
<td>[-03,</td>
<td>.20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.00,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.09,</td>
<td>.31]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * indicates p < .05; ** indicates p < .01. M and SD are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% prediction interval for each correlation.
Table 2.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Study Variables in the Replication Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender ($1=$Male, $2=$Female)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agreeableness</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.12, .29]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extraversion</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.11, .07]</td>
<td>[.07, .24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emotional Stability</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.40, -.24]</td>
<td>[-.07, .11]</td>
<td>[.13, .30]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.04, .21]</td>
<td>[.05, .23]</td>
<td>[-.22, -.04]</td>
<td>[-.01, .16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Openness</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.18, -.01]</td>
<td>[.16, .33]</td>
<td>[.10, .27]</td>
<td>[.06, .23]</td>
<td>[.00, .18]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PA</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.21, -.04]</td>
<td>[.16, .33]</td>
<td>[.10, .27]</td>
<td>[.06, .23]</td>
<td>[.00, .18]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. NA</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.05, .22]</td>
<td>[-.21, -.04]</td>
<td>[-.33, -.16]</td>
<td>[-.69, -.58]</td>
<td>[-.23, -.05]</td>
<td>[-.20, -.03]</td>
<td>[-.30, -.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trait Anger</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overall Incivility</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. $M$ and $SD$ are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% confidence interval for each correlation. Bolded numbers represent correlations that do not fall within the prediction intervals of the original study.
Table 3. Summary of Independent Effects of Personality Characteristics on Overall incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[LL, UL]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[LL, UL]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[LL, UL]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.08, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.11]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.00]</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.05]</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.07]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.00]</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>[-0.18, -0.01]</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>[-0.20, -0.02]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-0.01, -0.03]</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.09]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.09]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.00]</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.11]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.00]</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.18]</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.18]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.02]</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.16]</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.18]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.02]</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>[0.11, 0.27]</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>[0.12, 0.29]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.07]</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. A significant $b$-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights; $beta$ indicates the standardized regression weights; $sr^2$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared; $r$ represents the zero-order correlation. $LL$ and $UL$ indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
Table 4.
Regression Results Using Overall Incivility as the Criterion in a Combined Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$beta$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>2.11**</td>
<td>[1.17, 3.04]</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>[0.14, 0.32]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>[.01, .08]</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>[0.19, 0.45]</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.18]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.21]</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>[-0.21, -0.01]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>[-0.17, -0.00]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.14]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.12]</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.06]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .01]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.06]</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.09]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.10]</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>[0.06, 0.27]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[-.00, .04]</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>[0.06, 0.28]</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.09]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.12, 0.08]</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>[0.15, 0.38]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>[.01, .07]</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .127**$
95% CI [.06..17]

*Note.* * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. A significant $b$-weight indicates the $beta$-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights; $beta$ indicates the standardized regression weights; $sr^2$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared; $r$ represents the zero-order correlation. $LL$ and $UL$ indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
Table 5.
Summary of Independent Effects of Personality Characteristics on Customer Incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.12]</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.08]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>[-0.18, 0.00]</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>[-0.17, 0.00]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>[-0.20, 0.01]</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>[-0.17, 0.01]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.09]</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.07]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.12, 0.14]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.08, 0.09]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.16]</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.12]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .01]</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.20]</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.18]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>[0.08, 0.28]</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>[0.07, 0.24]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[-.00, .05]</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. A significant $b$-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights; $\beta$ indicates the standardized regression weights; $sr^2$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared; $r$ represents the zero-order correlation. LL and UL indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
Table 6.
Regression Results Using Customer Incivility as the Criterion in a Combined Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>beta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>sr²</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>2.16**</td>
<td>[0.95, 3.36]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>[0.30, 0.64]</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>[0.17, 0.36]</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.10]</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.22]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.15]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-.01,.01]</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>[-0.27, -0.05]</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>[-0.25, -0.05]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-.01,.04]</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.20]</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.18]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-.00,.01]</td>
<td>-1.6**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>[-0.19, 0.06]</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>[-0.15, 0.04]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-.01,.01]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.15]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.10]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-.00,.00]</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.29]</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.22]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-.01,.02]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.13]</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>[-0.12, 0.12]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-.00,.00]</td>
<td>1.2**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>[0.10, 0.38]</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>[0.09, 0.32]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-.00,.05]</td>
<td>1.7**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .112** \]
\[ 95\% \text{ CI} [.05, .15] \]

Note. * indicates \( p < .05 \); ** indicates \( p < .01 \). A significant \( b \)-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. \( b \) represents unstandardized regression weights; \( beta \) indicates the standardized regression weights; \( sr^2 \) represents the semi-partial correlation squared; \( r \) represents the zero-order correlation. \( LL \) and \( UL \) indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
Table 7.
Summary of Independent Effects of Personality Characteristics on Coworker Incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$beta$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.17]</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.13]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.01, .01]</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.14]</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.15]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>[-0.23, -0.05]</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>[-0.23, -0.05]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[-.01, .04]</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.08]</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.07]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.10]</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.07]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>[0.03, 0.23]</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.20]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .03]</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.16]</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.16]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>[0.15, 0.33]</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>[0.14, 0.31]</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>[.01, .09]</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. A significant $b$-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights; $beta$ indicates the standardized regression weights; $sr^2$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared; $r$ represents the zero-order correlation. LL and UL indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
Table 8.
Regression Results Using Coworker Incivility as the Criterion in a Combined Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>beta</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>2.22**</td>
<td>[1.16, 3.28]</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>[0.08, 0.27]</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>[−0.00, 0.05]</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>[0.13, 0.42]</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>[−0.01, 0.18]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[−0.01, 0.02]</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>[−0.01, 0.24]</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>[−0.11, 0.09]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[−0.00, 0.00]</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>[−0.10, 0.09]</td>
<td>−0.08</td>
<td>[−0.21, 0.06]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[−0.01, 0.01]</td>
<td>−.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>−0.08</td>
<td>[−0.21, 0.06]</td>
<td>−0.04</td>
<td>[−0.15, 0.06]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[−0.00, 0.01]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>−0.04</td>
<td>[−0.15, 0.06]</td>
<td>−0.04</td>
<td>[−0.13, 0.06]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[−0.00, 0.01]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>−0.08</td>
<td>[−0.21, 0.04]</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>[−0.16, 0.03]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[−0.01, 0.01]</td>
<td>−.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>[0.09, 0.33]</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>[0.07, 0.29]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[−0.00, 0.04]</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>[−0.19, 0.05]</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>[−0.18, 0.05]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[−0.01, 0.01]</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>[0.15, 0.39]</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>[0.14, 0.37]</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.07]</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .128**$
95% CI[.06,.17]

Note. * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. A significant $b$-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights; beta indicates the standardized regression weights; $sr^2$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared; $r$ represents the zero-order correlation. LL and UL indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
Table 9.  
Summary of Independent Effects of Personality Characteristics on Supervisor Incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.17]</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.01]</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.06]</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>[-0.12, 0.06]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.01]</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>[-0.15, 0.04]</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>[-0.15, 0.04]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.01]</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.15]</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.01]</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.21]</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.16]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.02]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.21]</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.18]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.02]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.16]</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.15]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.02]</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>[0.05, 0.24]</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>[0.05, 0.22]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.04]</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. A significant $b$-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights; $\beta$ indicates the standardized regression weights; $sr^2$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared; $r$ represents the zero-order correlation. LL and UL indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
Table 10.
Regression Results Using Supervisor Incivility as the Criterion in a Combined Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>( beta )</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>( sr^2 )</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>( R^2 = .063^{**} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>1.95**</td>
<td>[0.82, 3.07]</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>[0.04, 0.23]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .03]</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>[0.06, 0.37]</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>[0.04, 0.23]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[.01, .02]</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.23]</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.17]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>[-0.19, 0.00]</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>[-0.20, 0.00]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[.01, .02]</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.19]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.18]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[.00, .01]</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.12]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.10]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[.00, .00]</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.19]</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.14]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[.01, .01]</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.27]</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.23]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[.01, .02]</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.12, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.13]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[.00, .00]</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>[0.09, 0.35]</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>[0.09, 0.32]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[.00, .05]</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** * indicates \( p < .05 \); ** indicates \( p < .01 \). A significant \( b \)-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. \( b \) represents unstandardized regression weights; \( beta \) indicates the standardized regression weights; \( sr^2 \) represents the semi-partial correlation squared; \( r \) represents the zero-order correlation. \( LL \) and \( UL \) indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
### Table 11.

Regression Results Using Considering Escalating the Situation as the Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>1.66**</td>
<td>[0.49, 2.83]</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.16]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-.01, .01]</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.29]</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.18, 0.00]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>[-0.28, 0.00]</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.12]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[.00, .00]</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.08, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.10]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[.00, .00]</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>[-0.18, 0.11]</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>[-0.18, 0.00]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[.01, .02]</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>[-0.24, 0.00]</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>[-0.23, -0.06]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[.00, .04]</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>[-0.35, -0.08]</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>[-0.23, -0.06]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[.01, .08]</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>[0.22, 0.50]</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>[0.17, 0.37]</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>[.01, .08]</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.15]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[.00, .00]</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>[0.23, 0.50]</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>[0.19, 0.42]</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[.02, .09]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .191**$

Note. * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. A significant $b$-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights; $beta$ indicates the standardized regression weights; $sr^2$ represents the semi-partial correlation squared; $r$ represents the zero-order correlation. $LL$ and $UL$ indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
Table 12.

Regression Results Using Actually Escalating the Situation as the Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>beta</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>sr²</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>1.32*</td>
<td>[0.19, 2.46]</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>[-0.11, 0.06]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>[-0.20, 0.11]</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>[-0.22, -0.04]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.00, .03]</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>[-0.32, -0.05]</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.19]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.20]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.16]</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>[-.00, .00]</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.18]</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>[-0.17, 0.01]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>[-0.23, 0.01]</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>[-0.24, -0.07]</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[-.00, .04]</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>[-0.37, -0.10]</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>[0.16, 0.36]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>[.01, .07]</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>[0.21, 0.47]</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.21]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.24]</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.21]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>[-.01, .02]</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>[0.23, 0.49]</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>[0.20, 0.41]</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>[.02, .08]</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .227**
95% CI[.15,.28]

Note. * indicates p < .05; ** indicates p < .01. A significant b-weight indicates the beta-weight and semi-partial correlation are also significant. b represents unstandardized regression weights; beta indicates the standardized regression weights; sr² represents the semi-partial correlation squared; r represents the zero-order correlation. LL and UL indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively.
Table 13.
Comparing Independent Model Results of the Original and Replication Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Original Study</th>
<th>Replication Study</th>
<th>Measure of Replication Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness (-)</td>
<td>-.08** [-0.16, -0.00]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion (-)</td>
<td>.00 [-0.06, 0.06]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability (-)</td>
<td>-.10** [-0.16, -0.04]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness (+)</td>
<td>.09* [0.01, 0.17]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness (-)</td>
<td>-.10** [-0.18, -0.02]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA (-)</td>
<td>.13** [0.07, 0.19]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (+)</td>
<td>.10** [0.02, 0.18]</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anger (+)</td>
<td>.18** [0.12, 0.24]</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights. $SE$ represents standard error. $LL$ and $UL$ indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Bolded cells indicate a failure to replicate the findings of the original study.
Table 14
Comparing the combined model results of the original and replication studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Original Study</th>
<th>Replication Study</th>
<th>Measure of Replication Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>95% CI [LL,UL]</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness (-)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>[-.13, .07]</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion (-)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>[-.09, .07]</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability (-)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>[-.13, .07]</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness (+)</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.18]</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness (-)</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>[-.23, -.07]</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA (-)</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>[0.11, 0.31]</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (+)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>[-.05, .11]</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anger (+)</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>[0.10, 0.26]</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates $p < .05$; **indicates $p < .01$. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights. SE represents standard error. LL and UL indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Bolded cells indicate a failure to replicate the findings of the original study.
Figure 1. Visual representation of the ambiguous nature of incivility.
Appendix A. Incivility Vignettes (Sliter, Withrow & Jex, 2015)

How rude was the customer/supervisor/coworker?

1  2  3  4  5  6
Not at all rude Extremely Rude

I would consider responding in kind.
Given the opportunity I would actually respond in kind
I would consider escalating the situation
Given the opportunity, I would actually escalate the situation

1  2  3  4  5  6
Strongly Disagree
Strongly Agree

Coworker
You have been sick and missed a week of work. Today is the first day you are back at work and you realize that you aren’t up to date on some tasks so you ask a coworker for help in catching up. Your coworker says they are too busy, yet their work calendar is relatively blank.

You and a coworker are waiting at the printer for some documents. When your coworker's document is finished, you notice that the paper tray is empty. She takes her documents but does not refill the paper tray.

You are sitting alone in the break room eating lunch. Another coworker walks in and sits with their back toward you.

It is your birthday and a coworker brought cake and ice cream for everyone to share. When people start to gather to celebrate, one member of the staff stays in her office and closes the door.

There is a coffeemaker on the counter in the break room. You and your coworker are standing at the counter, discussing a project they are working on. While there is enough coffee left for both of you to have some, your coworker takes the last of the coffee, pouring it into his oversized mug, and leaves the break room.

You are working in your office and two of your coworkers meet each other in the hallway and begin talking and laughing. They continue to talk and laugh for about twenty minutes right outside your door.

You are in the middle of a meeting and your coworker decides to start text messaging.

You tell coworker they did well on a project and their response is “I know.”

As you head down the hallway to a meeting, your coworker is walking in front of you to the same meeting. They turn their head, see you behind them, and then continue walking at the same pace.
Customer
You and a customer are talking about your personal lives. As the customer finishes talking about his life, he turns around to leave when you start to talk about yours.

You are talking with a coworker when a customer walks up to you, interrupts your conversation, and asks you where the customer service desk is. You tell her and she quickly turns and walks away.

You are working to resolve an issue that a customer is having. The customer keeps sighing audibly as you talk with your manager.

You spend extra time outside of work to order a rare item for a customer, when it comes in the customer takes it without saying thank you

A customer approaches you and asks you if you have any more of a particular item in stock. When you tell him no, he asks to speak to your manager.

A customer passes you as she enters the store. You say hello and ask if there is anything in particular you can help her find. She does not acknowledge you and keeps walking.

Supervisor
You submitted several ideas of work to your supervisor. However, your supervisor did not mention any of your ideas at all during the team meeting when discussing the feasibility of every team member’s ideas.

You do not want to discuss your private life with your supervisor, but she keeps asking about your date after the weekend.

When you return from the bathroom, you find out that your supervisor took everyone’s coffee order and went on a coffee run. When the supervisor returns, she has coffee for everyone but you.

Your supervisor tosses an assignment on your desk and simply says "Do this by tomorrow" before walking away. He does not offer any more details.

You hold the door for your supervisor; your supervisor walks right on through without acknowledging you.

Your supervisor often brings in leftovers for lunch in Tupperware containers. At the end of every week, there are a few half-full Tupperware containers still in the refrigerator in the break room, and at a staff meeting the supervisor bring up how people need to contribute to cleaning the break room more.

Appendix B. Big Five Personality Inventory (Goldberg, 1992)
How Accurately Can You Describe Yourself?

Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Indicate for each statement whether it is:

1. Very Inaccurate
2. Moderately Inaccurate
3. Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate,
4. Moderately Accurate
5. Very Accurate as a description of you.

Am the life of the party.
Feel little concern for others.
Am always prepared.
Get stressed out easily.
Have a rich vocabulary.
Don't talk a lot.
Am interested in people.
Leave my belongings around.
Am relaxed most of the time.
Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.

Feel comfortable around people.
Insult people.
Pay attention to details.
Worry about things.
Have a vivid imagination.
Keep in the background.
Sympathize with others' feelings.
Make a mess of things.
Seldom feel blue.
Am not interested in abstract ideas.

Start conversations.
Am not interested in other people's problems.
Get chores done right away.
Am easily disturbed.
Have excellent ideas.
Have little to say.
Have a soft heart.
Often forget to put things back in their proper place.
Get upset easily.
Do not have a good imagination.

Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
Am not really interested in others.
Like order.
Change my mood a lot.
Am quick to understand things.
Don't like to draw attention to myself.
Take time out for others.
Shirk my duties.
Have frequent mood swings.
Use difficult words.

Don't mind being the center of attention.
Feel others' emotions.
Follow a schedule.
Get irritated easily.
Spend time reflecting on things.
Am quiet around strangers.
Make people feel at ease.
Am exacting in my work.
Often feel blue.
Am full of ideas.
Appendix C. Positive Affectivity, Negative Affectivity Scale (PANAS)

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotion. Read each item and then circle the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you generally feel this way. Use the following scale to record your answers:

**Response scale:**
1: Very slightly or not at all
2: A little
3: Moderately
4: Quite a bit
5: Extremely

1. Interested
2. Distressed
3. Excited
4. Upset
5. Strong
6. Guilty
7. Scared
8. Hostile
9. Enthusiastic
10. Proud
11. Irritable
12. Alert
13. Ashamed
14. Inspired
15. Nervous
16. Determined
17. Attentive
18. Jittery
19. Active
20. Afraid
Appendix D. Trait Anger Scale (Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, & Crane, 1983)

Below are statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the scale, please indicate the degree of your agreement by selecting the number that corresponds with the statement.

Response scale:
1: Strongly disagree
2: Somewhat Disagree
3: Neither Agree nor Disagree
4: Somewhat Agree
5: Strongly agree

Items comprising the Trait Anger Scale:
1. I have a fiery temper
2. I am quick-tempered
3. I am a hotheaded person
4. I get annoyed when I am singled out for correction
5. It makes me furious when I am criticized in front of others
6. I get angry when I'm allowed down by others' mistakes
7. I feel infuriated when I do a good job & get a poor evaluation
8. I fly off the handle
9. I feel annoyed when I am not given recognition for doing good work
10. People who think they are always right irritate me
11. When I get mad, I say nasty things
12. I feel irritated
13. I feel angry
14. When I get frustrated, I feel like hitting someone
15. It makes my blood boil when I am pressured
Appendix E. Self-Esteem (Zimprich, Perren, & Hornung, 2005)

Below are statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the scale, please indicate the degree of your agreement by selecting the choice that corresponds with the statement.

*Response scale:*

1. Strongly disagree
2. Somewhat Disagree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Somewhat Agree
5. Strongly agree

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
2. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
3. I can handle the “ups” and “downs” in life quite well.
4. In my relationships to others, I act self-confidently.
5. I think that nobody really understands me.
6. I have the impression that teachers and class-mates treat me like an outsider.
7. I have the impression that behind my back teachers and class-mates talk dismissively about me.
8. I have the impression that many school-mates tend to avoid contact with me.
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
10. Oftentimes, I feel unhappy.
Appendix F. Locus of Control (James, 1957)

Directions:
Below are statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the scale, please indicate the degree of your agreement by selecting the number that corresponds with the statement.

Response scale:
1: Strongly disagree
2: Somewhat Disagree
3: Neither Agree nor Disagree
4: Somewhat Agree
5: Strongly agree

Items:

1. I have usually found that what is going to happen will happen, regardless of my actions.
2. Many times I feel that we might just as well make many of our decisions by flipping a coin.
3. Getting a good job seems to be largely a matter of being lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.
4. It is difficult for ordinary people to have much control over what politicians do in office.
5. It isn’t wise to plan too far ahead because most things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
6. When things are going well for me, I consider it due to a run of good luck.
7. Success is mostly a matter of getting good breaks.
8. I think that life is mostly a gamble.
9. There’s not much use in worrying about things … what will be will be.
10. Many times I feel that I have little influence over things that happen to me.
11. Success in dealing with people seems to be more a matter of the other person’s moods and feelings at the time rather than one’s own actions.
Appendix G. Self Monitoring (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986)

Directions:
Below are statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the scale, please indicate the degree of your agreement by selecting the number that corresponds with the statement.

Response scale:
1: Strongly disagree
2: Somewhat Disagree
3: Neither Agree nor Disagree
4: Somewhat Agree
5: Strongly agree

Items:
1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.
2. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.
3. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.
4. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.
5. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain others.
6. I would probably make a good actor.
7. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.
8. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.
9. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.
10. I'm not always the person I appear to be.
11. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone or win their favor.
12. I have considered being an entertainer.
13. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.
14. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.
15. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going.
16. I feel a bit awkward in public and do not show up quite as well as I should.
17. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).
18. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.