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ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF NEGATIVE AFFECTIVITY AND EMOTION REGULATION IN RECIPROCAL INCIVILITY

Ashlyn Patterson  Advisor:  University of Guelph, 2013  Dr. M. Gloria González-Morales

The current study explored the relationships between incivility, negative affect, and emotion regulation styles using an experimental design. Participants were provoked by a confederate and then given opportunities to retaliate. The experiential manipulation impacted participants in different ways, necessitating an internal analysis (N = 101). In a hierarchical regression, reappraisal and condition moderated the relationship between the amount of respect perceived and feelings of negative affect, such that less respect was associated with more negative affect only for those low in reappraisal for those in the experimental condition. A post-hoc model of moderated mediation extending these effects to include measures of enacted incivility was tested. Partial support was found for this model depending on the type of enacted incivility, such that more disrespect was associated with more negative affect and that leads to more enacted incivility, but only for those low in reappraisal. Limitations and future research directions are presented.
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The Role of Negative Affectivity and Emotion Regulation in Reciprocal Incivility

Workplace aggression, violence, bullying, and incivility are gaining popularity as topics of interest in both the media and academia. These behaviours fall under the overarching umbrella of what are known as “counterproductive work behaviours (CWB)” because they are counterproductive to the goals of the organization, and negatively related to employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Dalal, 2005). In addition, individuals who are targets of CWB’s tend to report higher levels of job tension, fatigue, turnover intentions, and burnout (Cropanzano, Howes, Garndey & Toth, 1997; Thomas, Wolper, Scott, & Jones, 2001).

Although the media puts a spotlight on workplace violence, in everyday organizational life overt forms of violence are relatively rare and the larger problem lies in the less overt forms of interpersonal conflict, such as workplace incivility (Baron & Neuman, 1998; Greenberg, 2010). Workplace incivility is defined as, “low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect” (e.g., interrupting, speaking in a condescending tone; Andersson & Pearson, p.457, 1999). Researchers have suggested that workplace incivility is of particular importance because it can escalate into more intense forms of deviance, such as bullying and violence (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Kormanik, 2011). Incivility is an important form of CWB to study because in most organizations employees have repeated contact with each other, which increases the need to engage in more covert and ambiguous types of CWB’s that are harder to punish. Similarly, repeated contact means increased opportunities for retaliation, thus making ambiguous CWB’s (i.e., incivility) more popular because they are harder for the victim to make sense of (Baron & Neuman, 1996).

In 2001, based on a sample of 1,180 public-sector employees (71% response rate) 71% reported being a victim of workplace incivility at some point in the previous five years (Cortina,
Magley, Williams & Langhout, 2001). In 2009, over two-thirds of 612 Canadian nurses (40% response rate from 5 different hospitals) reported experiencing incivility from their supervisors or coworkers in the last month alone (Laschinger, Leiter, Day & Gilin, 2009). Similarly, a survey of all university employees from a small public university indicated 75% of employees (66% response rate) reported experiencing an uncivil act at least once or twice during the past year (Cortina & Magley, 2009).

Although incivility is most often studied through the perspective of the victim, the instigator is also becoming of interest to researchers. In a study of employees from several organizations, 54% reported they themselves had behaved uncivilly at least once in the past year (Reio & Ghosh, 2009).

Incivility has several costs to both the organization and the individuals themselves. It has been estimated that workplace incivility can cost $14,000 a year per employee due to project delays and distraction from work (Pearson & Porath, 2009). For example, Pearson and Porath (2005) reported that approximately 50% of people who believed someone at work had been uncivil towards them wasted time at work worrying about future interactions with the instigator. For individuals, experiencing incivility is related to higher turnover intentions (Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008; Pearson & Porath, 2005; Pinel & Paulin, 2005), job dissatisfaction (Caza & Cortina, 2007; Laschinger et al., 2009; Lim et al., 2008; Reio & Ghosh, 2009); and poor mental (e.g., Blau & Andersson, 2005; Lim et al., 2008) and physical health (Lim et al., 2008).

In sum, an uncivil work environment destroys cooperation and collaboration, leads to retention problems and lost profits for organizations. Moreover, incivility may act as a precursor to more coercive behaviour (e.g., overt aggression, violence) through a cycle of retaliation and revenge that escalates over time (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). This process has been labeled the
“incivility spiral” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Interestingly, although the incivility spiral is a well-known phenomenon and was articulated by Andersson and Pearson more than a decade ago, it has yet to be empirically tested. Thus, the main research objective of the current paper was to empirically test the reciprocal nature of incivility with an experimental methodology that can extend research from correlational cross-sectional designs commonly used in the study of workplace incivility.

The current study looks at the combined role of negative affect and emotion regulation in reciprocal incivility. Negative affectivity (NA) involves feelings of subjective distress and other aversive moods (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). Negative affectivity is proposed as a key variable because it motivates people who experience incivility to seek retaliation. Thus, a main research question is, how does the experience of incivility influence feelings of negative affect and do feelings of negative affect subsequently lead people to retaliate with more incivility?

One method of influencing NA is by regulating the emotions people have and how they experience and express them to others (Gross, 1998b). Emotion regulation involves altering the emotions you feel and express and can decrease the experience of negative emotions (Gross & John, 2003; Mauss, Cook, Cheng & Gross, 2007; Miu & Crisan, 2011); however, some strategies are more effective than others. Thus, another research question is, how do different emotion regulation styles affect feelings of NA after experiencing incivility?

The current study adds to the body of literature on workplace incivility in several ways. First, it examines reciprocal incivility as a process rather than an isolated incident. This is important as Glomb (2002) suggests, there are no “pure” actors or “pure” targets in the workplace. Second, by using an uncivil manipulation, it also allows one to know the specific stage of the incivility spiral that is being studied; this is difficult to do using a cross-sectional
self-report survey. Third, this study is able to empirically test the role of negative affect as both an antecedent and consequence of incivility. Lastly, the incivility and emotion regulation literatures are combined and the role of emotion regulation in reciprocating incivility is explored.

In the following sections the author defines incivility in detail, describe the incivility spiral, propose the role of NA in reciprocal incivility, and describe how emotion regulation plays a key role in the experience of NA and ultimately enacted incivility. The relationships among these variables are explored using Affective Events Theory as a framework (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Affective Events Theory provides a useful structure for understanding how events at work lead to emotional reactions and how these reactions in turn influence future work behaviour.

**Understanding Incivility**

Workplace incivility, often experienced as rudeness, can manifest itself in different behaviours. Examples of these include withholding information, interrupting a colleague, and accusing someone else of incompetence (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta & Magley, 2011; Pearson & Porath, 2009) Although there are many terms in the literature used to describe deviant behaviour (e.g., bullying, harassment, abuse, victimization), incivility represents a distinct construct (e.g., Blau & Andersson, 2005). The uniqueness of incivility comes from the four key components in its definition: low-intensity, deviant behaviour, in violation of the norm of respect, and ambiguity.

First, incivility is described as “low-intensity”, meaning these types of behaviours are of lower magnitude of force. In general, these behaviours are characterized by a lack of consideration and general respect for others. They are sometimes compared to “daily hassles” because they lack the drama and intensity of a large event; however, experiencing them can wear
down an individual over time (Lazarus, 1999). Using self-report surveys (Cortina & Magley, 2009) and structured interviews (Glomb, 2002), research showed that uncivil behaviours were most commonly appraised as frustrating, annoying, and offensive, but not threatening. Thus, level of intensity is a key distinguishing feature of incivility separating it from workplace aggression and violence.

The second hallmark feature of incivility is that it is considered a form of deviant behaviour. Employee deviance is defined as voluntary behaviour that violates organizational norms and can threaten the well-being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Whereas the broader construct of “employee deviance” suggests possible harm to the organization or to other individuals, the social interactive nature of incivility emphasizes the threat of direct harm to other individuals and indirect harm to the organization itself (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999). For example, incivilities are exchanged between individuals in a dynamic interchange that affects the instigator(s), target(s), and observer(s). Although a few researchers have studied organizational incivility (e.g., Reio & Ghosh, 2009), the current study will solely look at incivility as a reflection of interpersonal deviance.

The third feature of incivility is that it violates organizational norms of respect. The broader construct of workplace deviance is defined as voluntary behaviour that violates significant organizational norms (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Incivility is a specific type of deviant behaviour that violates norms for mutual respect. For example, making snide remarks about a coworker is disrespectful behaviour that goes against a shared moral understanding among employees. A shared moral understanding is important because it allows for cooperation among employees (Hartman, 1996). Although each workplace can have a unique set of norms for respect, Andersson and Pearson (1999) suggest workplace norms consist of “basic moral
standards and others that have arisen out of the tradition of that community…[however], in every workplace there exist norms for respect for fellow coworkers – and incivility is in violation of these norms” (p.455).

The final key feature of incivility is the ambiguous intent to harm. For example, one may behave uncivilly to covertly harm the target, or out of ignorance, oversight, or personality (Lim et al., 2008; Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000). This type of ambiguity creates uncertainty and stress for victims who are often unsure of how to make sense of the situation and create an appropriate response (Lim et al., 2008). This type of behaviour is also problematic for HR departments because there is often a lack of general awareness of incivility, and this lack of understanding hinders employers from clearly identifying uncivil behaviour and designing interventions to address it (Estes & Wang, 2008). The ambiguous nature of incivility distinguishes it from psychological aggression, which involves a clear intent to harm the target (Cortina, 2008).

**The Spread of Incivility**

Pearson and colleagues (2000) discuss several ways in which incivility can spread through an organization, most notably though a *non-escalating uncivil exchange* and an *escalating spiral*. The first way is in a *non-escalating uncivil exchange*, in which two employees engage in uncivil behaviour toward each other in a circular fashion (no escalation). For example, two employees may simply not get along and interrupt or ignore each other at work; however, their behaviour never escalates to the point where the uncivil behaviour turns into bullying or harassment.

Andersson and Pearson (1999) describe the *non-escalating uncivil* in which uncivil behaviour leads to more uncivil behaviour. It begins when an employee (“Party A”) instigates an
uncivil behaviour toward another employee (“Party B”). Party B then must perceive this behaviour as something that violates the norm of mutual respect and feel interactional injustice (i.e., the quality of interpersonal treatment employees’ perceive; Bies & Moag, 1986). This leads to state negative affect (NA). The NA experienced by Party B triggers the desire for reciprocation and leads Party B to engage in a similar uncivil behaviour directed towards Party A. The desire for reciprocation is based on the “negative norm of reciprocity”, which suggests the perception of an unprovoked aggressive act will be followed by counteraggression rather than counterdeterrence (Helm, Bonoma & Tedeschi, 1972). Essentially, people are more likely to harm those who have harmed them.

Several alternatives to the basic non-escalating uncivil exchange also exist. For example, there are multiple exit points whereby one party can stop the uncivil exchanges. For instance, Party A can apologize to Party B; thus, the pattern of incivility stops. Similarly, Party B can ignore an uncivil act from Party A and give him or her the “benefit of the doubt.” In this case, Party B is exiting the uncivil exchange and no spiral will occur. Unfortunately, little is known as to why certain individuals choose to stop the cycle and others perpetuate the cycle.

In contrast, a tipping point can also occur whereby after a buildup of perceived injustices, a small injustice can lead to a strong retaliatory response (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). This tipping point is where a non-escalating uncivil exchange turns into an escalating spiral. Therefore, this tipping point reflects what happens when uncivil behaviours are no longer ambiguous and become overtly aggressive; consequently, they are more likely to be experienced as harassment and aggression rather than incivility. However, a non-escalating uncivil exchange can maintain itself for a long period of time without getting noticed. Thus, the more prevalent problem lies within uncivil interactions that happen in an organization before the tipping point
occurs. As a result, the current paper will solely focus on the reciprocal spiral before the tipping point.

Felson and Tedeschi (1993) theorized that people often retaliate to restore justice. Similarly, Kim and Smith (1993) speculated that the sense of injustice occurring from a victim’s subjective perceptions leads to vengeful feelings and the desire for revenge. Using 346 working professionals from a variety of industries who participated in an online survey, Bunk, Karabin, and Lear (2011) found empirical support for these claims. Using a cluster analysis to determine response patterns of deviance justification, they found individuals who engaged in incivility justified their actions as either a form of retaliation against future attacks, or as a display of one’s power to prevent future attacks against them.

**Affective Events Theory and Incivility**

Within the many types of incivility spirals, negative emotions play an important role in perpetuating incivility. Affective Events Theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) provides an important theoretical framework for looking at both affect and incivility in the workplace. Originally, AET was used to examine how affective reactions influence job satisfaction in the workplace.

AET can also be applied to studying how affective reactions relate to workplace incivility. According to AET, events that happen at work influence affective reactions employees have, which then drive future work behaviour. In this model, affective reactions are the central phenomenon and behavioural outcomes, such as incivility, are the consequences of affective reactions. The central role of affectivity makes AET an appropriate theory for studying how people react to incivility and why people who have been targets of incivility reciprocate with similar acts. AET also emphasizes the fluctuation of affect levels over time, suggesting the need
to look at proximal events at work. Therefore, a specific uncivil act is the most useful unit of measurement, rather than looking at a climate of incivility.

In this paper, AET is a useful framework to better understand the relationships between incivility, NA, and emotion regulation. More specifically, the core of AET is that events at work (e.g., incivility) can lead to feelings of negative affectivity, which in turn lead to affect-driven behaviours (e.g., enacted incivility). Thus, NA should act as a mediator of experiencing incivility and enacting incivility. Within these core relationships, the role of dispositions is important. In particular, the relationship between targeted incivility and feelings of NA is moderated by an individual’s dispositions (e.g., emotion regulation style). This moderation suggests that being the target of incivility leads to NA, which leads to enacted incivility; however, feelings of NA after experiencing incivility can change based on how individuals regulate their emotions. Overall, AET suggests NA should play a central role in understanding incivility and emotion regulation styles may be important in whether or not individuals who experience incivility subsequently experience NA.

The Role of Negative Affect (NA)

According to AET, the role of affective reactions is integral in the relationship between experiencing an uncivil act and engaging in a reciprocal uncivil act. Few studies, however, have investigated the processes developing in this relationship. NA can be defined as a state or a trait. As a trait, NA reflects a mood-disposition that is relatively stable and predisposes individuals to be relatively distressed, upset, and have a negative view of themselves (Watson & Clark, 1984). Within the workplace deviance literature, some researchers have studied the role of NA as a trait in relation to overall negative well-being (e.g., Haga, Kraft & Corby, 2007; Kemeny et al., 2011).
Aquino and colleagues (1999) proposed that individuals high in trait NA tend to report more victimization because they focus more on the negative than the positive. Thus, they are more likely to report ambiguous events, such as incivility, as negative. Sampling employees from a public utility, Aquino et al. (1999) found trait NA to be positively related to perceived victimization. A more recent meta-analysis also found support for the positive correlation between victim NA and self-reported workplace harassment (Bowling & Beehr, 2006), suggesting trait NA may be a key variable to explain perceived incivility.

When examining the incivility spiral, the experience of NA plays a role in perpetuating the cycle of uncivil interactions. In this situation, NA is described as an emotional state experienced after a triggered uncivil incident. Recent research has looked at NA as a state involved in perpetuating deviant behaviour (e.g., Ghosh, Dierkes, & Falletta, 2011; Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001; Vlahou, Vanman & Morris, 2011). Similarly, Andersson and Pearson (1999) describe NA as an emotional state triggered by incivility that occurs over and above of the influence individual trait NA. Thus, the current study aims to examine how state NA mediates the relationship between experiencing incivility and enacting incivility, while controlling for individual trait NA.

**Negative Affect and Incivility**

Non-experimental research provides support for the mediating role of NA between the experience of a negative work event and subsequent negative behaviour. For example, using self-report surveys from 209 university employees, Sakurai and Jex (2012) found negative emotions experienced as a result of a coworker mediated the relationship between coworker incivility and work effort. Similarly, using self-report survey responses from 292 employees at various organizations, Fox, Spector and Miles (2001) found a pattern whereby the positive relationship
between job stressors (e.g., conflict, work autonomy) and participants’ enacted CWB’s (e.g., starting an argument with a coworker) was partially mediated by the participant’s general negative emotions towards their job. In line with AET, these findings suggest work events lead to affect driven behaviours at least partially due to affective reactions.

In three experiments using undergraduate students, Porath and Erez (2007) explored the mediating role of negative affect on the relationship between witnessing incivility and an observers’ subsequent task performance. They looked at three sources of rudeness: an authority figure, a third party, and reflecting on a past incident involving rude behaviour. In contrast to their expectations, they found a direct negative relationship between witnessing rudeness and performance; there was no support for the mediating role of NA. A similar experiment conducted by the Porath and Erez (2009) also found a negative relationship between witnessing rudeness from an authority figure (Study 1) and a peer (Study 2) and participant task performance. However, this relationship was mediated by participant reports of NA, supporting AET.

Although performance is not directly a retaliatory behavior, it is an affect-driven behavior and is an immediate behavioural outcome of an affective state (Brief & Weiss, 2002). These two studies were very similar; however, they present contradictory results with respect to the role of NA.

One speculation about why NA was not a significant mediator was that the use of self-report measures for NA played a role, or other processes that were not measured mediated the relationship between rudeness and performance (Porath & Erez, 2007). There were also several small differences between the 2007 and 2009 studies. For example, in 2007 participants were alone in the room witnessing incivility and in 2009 participants were in groups of five. In addition, the 2007 rudeness manipulation was unrelated to participant reports of NA, whereas the
2009 rudeness manipulation was related to participant NA. Thus, although it is unclear why there are mixed results, it suggests more experimental research linking incivility and NA needs to be conducted.

Given that affective reactions play a role in how uncivil acts influence work behaviour, it is important to look at affective reactions in relation to the incivility spiral. Within the incivility spiral, incivility is predicted as is both an antecedent and consequence of negative affectivity. For example, experienced incivility leads to feelings of NA and those feelings lead to enacted incivility.

Ghosh and colleagues (2011) conducted a study focusing on the incivility spiral among protégés and mentors. More specifically, relationships between negative mentor behaviours (distancing behaviour and manipulative behaviour), NA experienced by the protégé, and the protégé’s enacted incivility against the mentor were explored. Both mentor distancing behaviour and manipulative behaviour were categorized as “uncivil” because they are types of interpersonal deviant behaviour that are common examples of negative mentoring experiences. Online surveys were sent to 55 HR managers and 26 part-time graduate students. After controlling for self-report bias and negative reciprocity (i.e., tendency to return negative treatment with negative treatment), results showed that NA experienced by the protégé mediated the relationship between perceptions of mentor distancing behaviour and the frequency in which protégé’s enacted uncivil behaviours toward their mentor (Ghosh et al., 2011). Given that distancing behaviour is a form of incivility, these findings suggest NA is both a consequence of experienced incivility and an antecedent of reactive incivility.

In contrast, Ghosh et al. (2011) did not find that NA mediated the relationship between mentor’s manipulative behaviour (instead of distancing behaviour) and enacted incivility toward
the mentor. Ghosh et al. (2011) speculated that the mediating effect of NA on mentor’s manipulative behaviour and enacted incivility might be moderated by variables not measured in the study. Given that overtly manipulative behaviour is less ambiguous, it may fall outside the definition of incivility and help explain the difference in results between mentor distancing behaviour and manipulative behaviour.

The study by Ghosh and colleagues provides evidence that incivility can breed more incivility; however, there are several flaws that limit the transfer of findings to the incivility spiral itself. First, self-report surveys were used and previous researchers have suggested this is problematic because it does not allow one to know where in the incivility spiral that study is capturing (e.g., Cortina et al., 2001). Second, using a mentor-protégé relationship to study the incivility spiral is problematic because employees are less likely to retaliate against someone of higher power than equal power (e.g., Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001; Porath, Overbeck & Pearson, 2008). Finally, negative affectivity was measured by asking participants how often they experience NA as a result of their mentor’s behaviour; this suggests the type of NA that was measured was not directly state NA but more similar to trait NA (i.e., of how individuals feel in general toward their mentors behaviour).

To summarize, the current study aims to look at state NA and its role in the initial stages of the incivility spiral. Past research is still unclear as to how NA affects retaliatory behaviour; however, it likely plays an important role. For example, Tedeschi and Felson (1994) suggested that feelings of NA lead individuals to be less attentive to norms of respect and less concerned about future consequences of behaviour. Other researchers speculate the experience of NA creates a tendency for people to dwell on failures and other negative events, resulting in more
negative interpersonal relations (Brief, Butcher & Roberson, 1995). Looking at NA as part of the spiral process will help clarify the relationships between incivility and NA.

**Emotion Regulation**

As Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) suggest, “the experience of affect is intricately tied to the appraisal of that event” (p.17). Thus, one way to alter feelings of NA is through how an individual appraises a negative event. Andersson and Pearson (1999) theorized that individuals with a “hot temperament”, who are impulsive and high in emotional reactivity act as facilitators of the incivility spiral. Thus, different emotion regulation styles may alter how individuals are likely to appraise and experience incivility at work.

**What is Emotion Regulation?**

Emotion regulation is one aspect within the larger domain of “emotional intelligence.” Within the workplace, emotional intelligence is associated with higher job satisfaction, less burnout, lower work-family conflict, less frustration, and higher affective commitment (Brackett, Palomera, Mojsa, Reyes & Salovey, 2010; Carmeli, 2003; Suliman & Al-Shaikh, 2007). Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) model of emotional intelligence involves four-branches: perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thinking, understanding emotions, and managing emotions. The fourth branch, *managing emotions*, reflects how people identify the most adaptive way to regulate their own feelings (Lopes, Brackett, Nezlek, Schutz, Sellin & Salovey, 2004). In a sample of college students, Lopes and colleagues (2003) found students with higher scores on the *managing emotions* scale had higher quality interactions with friends and were more liked and valued by the opposite sex.

The idea of managing emotions leads into the study of emotion regulation. Emotion regulation itself is defined as “the processes by which individuals influence which emotions they
have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions” (Gross, p.275, 1998b). These processes can be automatic or controlled and regulate both positive and negative emotions. Whereas both moods and emotions influence individuals at work, emotions are more intense, have a shorter duration and are directed toward specific events or objects; thus, studying how one manages emotions in response to an uncivil event is more appropriate than how one manages moods (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

**Emotion Regulatory Processes**

Originally, Gross (1998a) proposed a process model of emotion regulation that consisted of two types of regulation: antecedent-focused and response-focused. Antecedent-focused styles regulate emotions by manipulating the input of the system. Four examples of these include: situation selection, situation modification, attentional deployment, and cognitive change. *Situation selection* involves purposefully avoiding certain people or situations in order to avoid emotional impact. *Situation modification* involves modifying the environment (e.g., asking a neighbour to turn down loud music) to reduce potential emotional impact. *Attentional deployment* is used to alter what one pays attention to through the use of distraction (e.g., focusing on something else) or concentration (e.g., gardening to absorb cognitive resources; Gross, 1998b). Lastly, *cognitive reappraisal* involves altering how one interprets an event by reappraising or reframing it in a different context.

Within the workplace, situation selection, situation modification, and attentional deployment may be difficult strategies to employ because employees have to engage in all types of situations. In contrast, cognitive reappraisal is something that can be used by employees to deal with situations they are forced into. Thus, the current paper will focus on cognitive reappraisal as an antecedent-focused style of emotion regulation.
Unlike antecedent-focused styles, which focus on the input, response-focused styles regulate emotions by manipulating the output. For example, expressive suppression involves changing the behavioural cues and expression of emotion rather than the experience of emotion. An example of this is keeping a poker face during a game while holding a great hand of cards. Similar to cognitive reappraisal, suppression is also a common emotion regulation style. For example, using a sample of employed students, Diefendorff, Richard, and Yang (2008) found that 70% of employed students admitted using cognitive reappraisal and 63% reported engaging in suppression at work during the last 30 days.

In order to study both cognitive reappraisal and suppression, Gross and John (2003) developed the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ). Using an exploratory factor analysis, they found the two-factor model provided the best fit for the data suggesting cognitive reappraisal and suppression are distinct constructs. A confirmatory factor analysis reaffirmed the finding that individuals who use reappraisal were no more likely to use suppression than individuals who did not use reappraisal (Gross & John, 2003). Using a sample of undergraduates, they also found no gender differences in the use of reappraisal; however, men engaged in more suppression than did women (Gross & John, 2003). Thus, based on how common these two styles are, their independence from each other, and their potential to be used in situations that are hard to control, this paper will examine one antecedent-focused (i.e., reappraisal) and one response-focused (i.e., suppression) emotion regulation style.

**Antecedent-Focused Emotion Regulation: Cognitive Reappraisal**

In general, reappraisal as an emotion regulation style is related to positive outcomes. For example, Gross and John (2003) found individuals who use reappraisal experience and express less negative emotion in general compared to individuals who do not use reappraisal. Using a
cross-cultural sample of students, Haga et al. (2007) found cognitive reappraisal to have a significant small positive correlation with life satisfaction and a significant small negative correlation with depressed mood. Although these studies did not look at a single provocative event, they suggest reappraisal is correlated with overall reduced negative-emotion experience and improved well-being.

In order to capture the effects of reappraisal in a more immediate context, experimental research is often conducted. Using only female students who scored very high or very low on the reappraisal scale of the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ; Gross & John, 2003), Mauss et al. (2007) asked participants to view an emotionally neutral film clip and complete a counting task. The experimenter then provoked the participants by telling them they were moving too often and were not speaking loud enough. In comparison to low reappraisers, high reappraisers reported less anger, less negative emotion, and greater positive emotion while being provoked by the experimenter (Mauss et al., 2007). This study suggests that following provoked anger, a reappraisal can help reduce the experience of negative emotion.

Reappraisal not only reduces the self-reported experience of negative emotion, it also reduces physiological signs of stress and frustration. For example, in the same study by Mauss and colleagues (2007), compared to low reappraisers, high reappraisers showed less physiological wear after the anger provocation (Mauss et al., 2007). This finding suggests participants who naturally use reappraisal show less physiological responses to anger compared to both low reappraisers and high suppressors. Thus, these participants might also be less affected by the experience of incivility and less likely to retaliate.
Response-Focused Emotion Regulation: Expressive Suppression

Unlike cognitive reappraisal, suppression can reduce the expression of emotion but not the experience of emotion. For example, as described above in the Gross (1998a) study, participants who were told to suppress their emotions did not overtly react any differently from the reappraisal group when watching a “disgusting film.” Suppressors, however, reported more disgust and had more physiological responding compared to reappraisers.

The concept of emotional labour, or the process of regulating emotions at work typically using suppression or faking, is an important requirement in some jobs (i.e., police officers). The use of suppression, however, is not always healthy for employees. For example, Sliter, Jex, Wolford and McInerney (2010) found that the use of emotional labour on the job, after experiencing customer incivility, led to emotional exhaustion for a sample of bank tellers. Moreover, among police officers, the use of surface acting (i.e., faking emotions), mediated the relationship between social stressors (e.g., incivility) and outcomes such as turnover intentions, emotional exhaustion, and psychological distress (Adams & Buck, 2010). These findings suggest hiding emotions does not reduce the experience of emotion and can be potentially damaging to the individual.

Suppression, as an emotion regulation style, can also have negative consequences for overall well-being. For example, a cross-sectional sample from Norway, Australia, and the United States, showed the habitual use of suppression is negatively correlated with life satisfaction and positively correlated with depressed mood (Haga et al., 2007). In a different sample of undergraduates, those who commonly suppressed emotions also reported less life satisfaction, lower self-esteem, and less optimism (Study 5, Gross & John, 2003). In addition, suppression is also related to less social support and more avoidance in close relationships (Study
The use of suppression in relation to depressed mood and less social support may influence how negatively someone reacts to the experience of incivility.

The negative outcomes of suppression also extend to other individuals who are not directly suppressing their own emotions (Gross, 2002). For example, in an experimental setting, the partner of someone using suppression showed greater increases in blood pressure compared to the partner of someone using reappraisal. Gross (2002) speculated this was because someone using suppression gives off few emotional cues and is harder to interact with. Thus, suppressors may be more likely to perpetuate an incivility spiral because they have a harder time managing their emotions and make it harder for other people involved to interpret their actions.

Maladaptive vs. Adaptive Emotion Regulation

In their recent review, Roberton, Daffern and Bucks (2012) suggested adaptive emotion regulation styles are ones that allow individuals to successfully function in their environment and engage in goal-directed behaviours. In contrast, maladaptive emotion regulation styles are those that do not allow the emotional experience to run its course or do not allow an individual to contain the emotional experience sufficiently. Similar to Roberton and colleagues (2012), the majority of research supports the notion that cognitive reappraisal is a more adaptive and effective emotion regulation style than is suppression (e.g., Demaree, Robinson, Pu & Allen, 2006; Gross, 1998a; Gross & John, 2003; Miu & Crisan, 2011). Thus, it is possible that reappraisal is a more adaptive way to handle experiences of incivility than is suppression.

Reappraisal and Suppression in relation to AET

Weiss and Cropanzano’s (1996) AET can be used to explain how experiencing incivility leads to an affective reaction that triggers the enactment of uncivil retaliatory behaviour. Emotion regulation, however, can alter how work events influence affective reactions. In
particular, the use of reappraisal changes how an individual views the uncivil act. For example, if an employee is the target of incivility yet he or she appraises that event as a miscommunication, the experience of NA will be reduced compared to the event being appraised as a personal attack. Thus, using reappraisal may reduce feelings of NA in an ambiguous situation.

In contrast, suppression does not influence how emotions are experienced. For example, a targeted employee using suppression may feel personally attacked but not outwardly express those feelings. Externally it would be difficult to tell the difference between an individual who is using reappraisal or suppression. The main difference internally however, is that reappraisers would feel less NA whereas suppressors would still experience NA. This significant difference plays an important role in future uncivil behaviour. Thus, it is proposed that after experiencing incivility, cognitive reappraisal will reduce feelings of NA and thus reduce the probability of enacted incivility. In contrast, after experiencing incivility, suppression will lead to more feelings of NA and thus increase the probability of enacted incivility.

Hypotheses

H1a: The relationship between experienced incivility and feelings of negative affect is moderated by an individual’s emotion regulation style, such that the relationship is stronger for individuals high in suppression than individual’s low in suppression.

H1b: The relationship between experienced incivility and feelings of negative affect is moderated by an individual’s emotion regulation style, such that the relationship is stronger for individuals low in reappraisal than individual’s high in reappraisal.

H2: Negative affect mediates the relationship between experienced incivility and enacted incivility.
Method

Participants

This study consisted of 120 female participants who were randomly assigned to either the control ($N = 55$) or experimental ($N = 65$) group. Based on similar research studies with similar numbers of predictors, it was expected that 100 participants would be sufficient to find a significant effect if one exists (e.g., Porath & Erez, 2007; Porath & Erez, 2009). An a priori power analysis indicated with a medium effect size, 146 participants were needed, and with a large effect size 67 participants would be sufficient to find an effect if one exists at a power of .95. Participant’s age ranged from 18 to 24 years ($M = 19.62$, $SD = 1.27$). All participants were recruited from the psychology undergraduate subject pool and received 0.5 course credits for participation. Similar to Mauss et al. (2007), the current study only used females in order to eliminate the effects of gender differences in anger regulation and aggression (e.g., Bettencourt & Miller, 1996; Timmers, Fischer & Manstead, 1998). A manipulation check to see if participants believed the cover story was used and participants who scored lower than a five on an 11-point scale, ranging from 1 (did not believe at all) to 11 (believed completely) were removed from this study. This resulted in a total of 101 participants with 52 in the control group and 49 in the experimental group.

Procedure

As part of the mass testing process, participants completed the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ) and Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS - trait) in a mass online survey. Participants were then recruited for a 30-minute study on “Personality and Taste Preference”. Upon arrival at the lab, participants were asked to read and sign a consent form and were randomly assigned to either the control or experimental condition. The only differences
between groups were that those in the experimental condition experienced four types of incivility from the confederate throughout the experiment: a dirty look, an interruption, a loud phone call, and an intentional delay (explained in more detail below). The experimenter explained the cover story to the participant and gave her a personality questionnaire to fill out and a clipboard to write on. The questionnaire served as a “filler task” intended to improve the realism of the cover story and to give the confederate time to show up late.

When the confederate arrived, the experimenter gave her the same personality questionnaire to fill out and explained that there is only one clipboard. In the control condition, the confederate simply grabbed a magazine on a nearby table and started filling out the questionnaire. In the experimental condition, the confederate looked around and saw a magazine and said, “I guess I’ll just use this instead”, giving a dirty look to the participant.

The experimenter then turned to the participant and asked if she has any food allergies. In the control condition, the confederate waited until the experimenter asked her about her own allergies and responded, “I don’t like seafood.” In the experiential condition, as the participant was responding, the confederate interrupted and said, “I don’t like seafood.” The experimenter then left the room after all allergies had been recorded.

In the control condition, participants were left to fill out the questionnaires in silence. In the experimental condition, the confederate answered a phone call and proceeded to walk outside of the room but still within hearing range. In a loud voice, she said, “Sorry I’m busy right now. I’m stuck in this experiment with another person who took the only clipboard there is. I’m stuck using a stupid magazine that’s so hard to write on. I hope this doesn’t last long I don’t really want to be partnered with her for a long time. Ok I have to go now I’ll call you later.” The confederate then returned to the room and finished filling out her questionnaire.
The experimenter returned to the room to collect the “filler” questionnaire and give the participant and confederate the PANAS (state version) and a taste preference inventory (see Appendix A) to fill out. The experimenter also reminded both participants that they were not allowed to bring their cell phones with them into the taste preference task.

After all the questionnaires had been completed, the participant was taken to another room and given instructions regarding the taste preference task (see Appendix B). The experimenter also gave the participant the confederate’s taste preference questionnaire (see Appendix C). In order to minimize demand characteristics, the experimenter indicated that she was unaware of the confederate’s responses on the preference inventory (Ayduk, Gyurak & Luerssen, 2008). Once the participant left the room, the confederate filled out the “confederate questionnaire” to indicate if all incivility manipulations had been enacted and to make note of any unusual reactions from the participant (see Appendix D).

The taste preference task finally began. In a room alone, the participant was asked to pick a slip of paper from an envelope. Every time the participant drew a folded slip revealing, “Category 5: Hot and Spicy.” The experimenter then left and returned with a tray carrying three types of hot sauce (mild, medium, and hot), a cup with a lid, a teaspoon, and a tablespoon. Participants then followed the instructions from the experimenter (see Appendix E). After the participant administered the hot sauce, she was asked to record what type of hot sauce she chose and to specify on a 21-point scale the rating that the confederate had given for spicy foods. This ensured the participant knew the confederate did not like spicy foods. The experimenter then took the cup of hot sauce away and left the room.

A few minutes later the experimenter returned and informed the participant that there was going to be a short delay. In the control condition, the participant was told the delay was due to a
computer glitch; however, the study would likely go over 30 minutes allotted and the experimenter was very sorry but there is nothing that can be done. In the experimental condition, the participant was told the delay was because the confederate was on the phone. The experimenter said, “I’m really sorry I tried to tell her to get off the phone but she refused. I’m not sure how she got her phone since there are no cell phones allowed in this experiment. It’s likely this experiment will go over the allotted 30 minutes I’m very sorry but there is nothing that can be done.” The experimenter then left the room.

A few minutes later the experimenter returned to the participant carrying an envelope that contained a gluten-free cracker and explained that the confederate had “selected this flavour from a variety of flavours which ranged from neutral to very dry in taste. Participants were asked to consume it and to evaluate their liking of it using a 9-point scale (1 = extreme disliking; 9 = extreme liking). They were also asked to fill out the PANAS (state-version).

After the participant had finished with the cracker, she was asked to pick a slip of paper from an envelope. Every time the participant drew a folded slip revealing, “Category 2: Tart.” The experimenter then left and returned with a tray carrying three types of tart juice (neutral, tart, and very tart) and a cup with a lid. Participants then followed the instructions from the experimenter (see Appendix F). After the participant administered the juice, she was asked to record what type of juice she chose and to specify on a 21-point scale the rating that the confederate had given for tart foods. This ensured the participant knew the confederate did not like tart foods.

Before taking the juice away, the experimenter gave the participant another questionnaire (see Appendix G) to fill out and explained that the researchers were currently trying to build a database of research participants who may like to take part in similar future studies. The
experimenter then read the following script, “These studies will help inform a marketing company on how to better market their foods to their target audience. Since a real company will use this database it is important to have high quality participants. You will receive monetary compensation and coupons for different types of food. Please fill out this questionnaire regarding the database and your experience in this study.” The juice was then taken away and the participant was given time to fill out the questionnaire.

The experimenter returned and the participant was debriefed, thanked, apologized to, and asked to rate the extent to which they believed the cover story and the manipulation on a scale from 1 (“did not believe at all”) to 11 (“believed completely”). They were also asked to write down how much they would have liked to give the confederate if they knew there would be no consequence, on a scale from 1 (“I wanted to give a lot less”) to 11 (“I wanted to give a lot more”). Participants were also asked to complete a second consent form once they are informed of the deception.

Measures

Cognitive Reappraisal

In order to measure the habitual use of cognitive reappraisal, Gross and John’s (2003) Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ) was used (see Appendix H). The cognitive reappraisal score is a 6-item subscale asking participants how they typically deal with negative emotions they experience. Sample items include, “I control my emotions by changing the way I think about the situation I’m in” and “When I want to feel more positive emotions (such as joy or amusement), I change what I’m thinking about.” Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with these statements on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This was measured in the prescreening questionnaire filled
out before participants were allowed to sign up for the study. In the current study, the internal consistency was $\alpha = .82$.

**Expressive Suppression**

Expressive suppression, another emotion regulation style, was also measured using Gross and John’s (2003) ERQ (see Appendix H). This subscale consisted of 4-items asking including, “I keep my emotions to myself” and “When I am feeling negative emotions, I make sure not to express them.” Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with these statements on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. This was measured in the prescreening questionnaire filled out before participants were allowed to sign up for the study. In the current study, the internal consistency was $\alpha = .78$.

**Trait Negative Affect**

Trait Negative Affect was assessed using Watson et al.’s (1988) Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; see Appendix I). This consists of a 10-item negative affect scale representing NA at both high and low levels of arousal (e.g., guilty, afraid, irritable, nervous, upset, distressed, hostile). In order to capture *trait* NA, Watson et al. (1988) recommend using more long-term instructions; thus, participants were asked to rate each item based on how they feel in general from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely). This was measured in the prescreening questionnaire filled out before participants were allowed to sign up for the study. In the current study, the internal consistency was $\alpha = .87$.

**State Negative Affect**

State Negative Affect was also assessed using Watson et al.’s (1988) 10-item negative affectivity scale from the PANAS (see Appendix J). Examples of feelings used to in this scale include: distressed, upset, and irritable. In order to capture *state* NA, Watson et al. (1988)
suggest using more short-term instructions; thus, participants were asked to rate how they feel in
the moment. For example, participants were asked how they feel right now at the present
moment for each item on a scale of 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely). State NA was
measured twice: once in the waiting room and once after the participant tasted the dry cracker. In
the current study, the internal consistency was $\alpha = .63$ at Time 1 and $\alpha = .75$ at Time 2.

*Enacted Incivility: Hot Sauce*

Enacted incivility was measured by both the amount and type of hot sauce chosen by the
participant. The use of hot sauce as a measure of aggression was developed by Lieberman and
colleagues (1999) and has been validated and used in past laboratory experiments (e.g., Barlett,
Branch, Rodeheffer & Harris, 2009; Dewall, Twenge, Bushman, Im, & Williams, 2010;
Klinesmith, Kasser & McAndrew, 2006; Warburton, Williams & Cairns, 2006). Originally,
Lieberman et al. (1999) only used the amount of hot sauce as a measure of aggression; however,
in their recent review of laboratory aggression paradigms, Ritter and Eslea (2005) suggest it is
also important to give participants more alternatives. They also suggest giving a range of
spiciness intensities to choose from, which Barlett et al. (2009) later added to their experiment.
Thus, the current study used two measures representing enacted incivility: amount of hot sauce
(measured in milliliters) and the degree of spiciness chosen (1, 2, or 3).

*Enacted Incivility: Tart Juice*

A second measure of enacted incivility was measured by the amount and type of juice
chosen by the participant. The use of tart juice in eliciting negative reactions was developed by
Lieberman and colleagues (1999) and used in their experiment in addition to the hot sauce. The
current study used two measures representing a second form of enacted incivility: amount of
juice (measured in milliliters) and type of juice (1, 2, or 3).
Enacted Incivility: Recommendation

A final measure of enacted incivility was measured by the participant’s response to the following question, “I would not recommend my partner be included in the database.” Responses were on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) such that a higher rating represents more incivility. This survey item was measured within a larger questionnaire filled out after participants have administered the tart juice.

Amount of Respect Perceived

As a manipulation check, participants were asked to rate the item, “I felt my partner treated me with respect during this study” on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). This item was included in the database questionnaire and measured right before participants were debriefed.

Results

Manipulation Check

Descriptive statistics and correlations are presented in Table 1. In order to determine if the experimental manipulation was successful, an independent samples t-test was conducted to see if there were significant differences in how much respect participants felt between conditions. As expected, those in the control group ($M = 6.48, SD = .94$) perceived more respect than did those in the experimental group ($M = 4.42, SD = 1.88$; $t(69.57) = 6.87, p < .001$). However, the means suggested that on average those in the experimental group perceived a neutral amount of respect. There was a large amount of variability in the experimental group (as seen in the standard deviation) suggesting not everyone perceived the same amount of respect after being the target of incivility. In contrast, the control group had a lot less variability in the amount of respect perceived (as seen in the standard deviation).
Independent samples t-tests were conducted in order to determine if there were any significant differences between the control and experimental groups in the measures of enacted incivility. Results suggested four of the five measures did not show any significant group differences (see Table 2). This suggests the experimental manipulation may not have been effective.

It is recommended that when an experimental manipulation works in a different way than intended, it is possible to use the manipulation check as the independent variable in further data analysis because responses to the manipulation check are more informative than the original group assignment (Wilson, Aronson & Carlsmith, 2010). Thus, it appears that the amount of respect perceived is a more important variable than what experimental condition participants were assigned to. To account for this, “respect” was used as the independent variable and the “condition” participants were assigned to was added as a moderator to the proposed analyses.

**Main Analyses**

Descriptive statistics and correlations by experimental group are presented in Table 3 (experimental) and Table 4 (control). Hypothesis 1, which predicted suppression (H1a) and reappraisal (H1b) would moderate the relationship between the amount of respect participants’ felt and participants’ feelings of negative affect was tested using a hierarchical multiple regression. Although there were not separate hypotheses for the role of negative affect Time 1 and negative affect Time 2, all hypotheses were tested with both. Thus, two separate regressions were conducted for each dependent variable: negative affect Time 1 and negative affect Time 2. All predictor variables were centred in order for ease of interpretation. Trait negative affect was included as a control variable in the first step.
Negative Affect Time 1. Results are presented in Table 5 and show that the overall regression was significant, \( R^2 = .22, F(12, 88) = 2.10, p = .024 \). In step one, trait negative affect was a significant predictor of negative affect Time 1, \( R^2 = .13, F(1, 99) = 14.49, p < .001 \). In step two the main effects were entered, \( R^2 = .16, F(5, 95) = 3.63, p = .005 \). Neither respect (\( B = -.03, SE = .02, t(95) = -1.22, 95\% CI [-.07, .02], p = .227 \)), suppression (\( B = .01, SE = .03, t(95) = .55, 95\% CI [-.04, .06], p = .583 \)), reappraisal (\( B = -.00, SE = .03, t(95) = -.09, 95\% CI [-.07, .06], p = .930 \)), nor group membership (\( B = .03, SE = .08, t(95) = .44, 95\% CI [-.12, .18], p = .663 \)) were significant predictors of negative affect Time 1.

In step three, the two-way interaction terms were entered. As seen in Table 5, the group by respect, group by reappraisal, group by suppression, respect by suppression and respect by reappraisal interactions were not significant predictors of negative affect Time 1. Given the proposed hypotheses and the new moderator “group membership”, the three-way interactions are of particular importance. In step four, the three-way interactions were entered. The suppression by respect by group interaction was not significant (\( B = .03, SE = .04, t(88) = .61, 95\% CI [-.06, .11], p = .545 \)), not supporting Hypothesis 1a. The reappraisal by respect by group interaction, however, was significant (\( B = .12, SE = .05, t(88) = 2.23, 95\% CI [.01, .23], p = .028 \)).

In order to explore this three-way interaction, two two-way interactions were conducted: one for the experimental condition (see Figure 1) and one for the control condition (see Figure 2). Given the small sample sizes in each group, low coefficients, and lack of correlation with variables of interest, the suppression variable was removed from further analyses.

For the experimental condition, the overall regression using negative affect Time 1 was significant, \( R^2 = .25, F (4, 44) = 3.65, p = .012 \), accounting for a total of 25.0\% of the variance in negative affect Time 1 (see Table 6). Consistent with the previous regression, respect (\( B = -.04, \))
SE = .03, \( t(45) = -1.32 \), 95% CI [-.09, .02], \( p = .193 \) and reappraisal (B = .01, SE = .06, \( t(45) = .19 \), 95% CI [-.11, .14], \( p = .851 \)) were unrelated to negative affect Time 1; however, the interaction between respect and reappraisal was significant (B = .06, SE = .03, \( t(44) = 2.08 \), 95% CI [.002, .13], \( p = .044 \)).

This interaction was explored using Aiken and West’s (1991) suggestions on how to test simple slopes. First, two regression equations were computed, one for individuals with reappraisal scores one standard deviation above the mean and one for individuals with reappraisal scores one standard deviation below the mean. Two new product terms were then created by multiplying each new reappraisal (high and low) variable and the centred variable of respect. Two hierarchical regressions were then conducted, one looking at Reappraisal High and the new product term, and one looking at Reappraisal Low and the new product term. This allowed the significance of the “respect and negative affect” slope to be tested for people high on reappraisal and people low on reappraisal separately.

![Figure 1. Moderating effects of reappraisal on the relationship between respect and negative affect Time 1 in the experimental condition.](image-url)
As shown in Figure 1, for those high in reappraisal, respect is not significantly related to feelings of negative affect, \( B = .03, SE = .04, t(44) = .72, 95\% CI [-.05, .11], p = .473 \); however, for those low in reappraisal, respect is significantly related to feelings of negative affect, \( B = -.08, SE = .03, t(44) = -2.35, 95\% CI [-.14, -.01], p = .023 \), such that the less respect participants felt, the more negative affect they felt. This finding supports Hypothesis 1b.

For the control condition, the overall regression using negative affect Time 1 was not significant, \( R^2 = .16, F (4, 47) = 2.18, p = .086 \) (see Table 7). Neither respect (\( B = .02, SE = .05, t(47) = .35, 95\% CI [-.08, .11], p = .726 \)), reappraisal (\( B = .13, SE = .10, t(47) = 1.31, 95\% CI [-.07, .32], p = .196 \)), nor the interaction between respect and reappraisal (\( B = -.06, SE = .04, t(47) = -1.45, 95\% CI [-.14, .02], p = .154 \)) were significantly related to negative affect Time 1. This finding does not support Hypothesis 1b. To summarize, Hypothesis 1a was not supported and Hypothesis 1b is supported in the experimental condition but not in the control condition.

![Figure 2](image_url)

*Figure 2. Moderating effects of reappraisal on the relationship between respect and negative affect Time 1 in the control condition.*
Negative Affect Time 2. A hierarchical multiple regression was conducted looking at the effects of respect, suppression, and reappraisal on negative affect Time 2. Again, trait negative affect was controlled for. The overall regression, using all key variables, was not significant, $R^2 = .17$, $F(12, 88) = 1.46$, $p = .155$ (see Table 8). This finding does not support Hypothesis 1a or 1b. Overall, Hypothesis 1a (moderating role of suppression) was not supported and Hypothesis 1b (moderating role of reappraisal) was partially supported (using negative affect Time 1 and the experimental condition) by the two regression analyses.

Mediation Model. Hypothesis 2 originally proposed that the relationship between respect and the amount of enacted incivility a participant engages in would be mediated by feelings of negative affect. Findings presented above, however, suggest that reappraisal and experimental condition moderate the relationship between respect and negative affect Time 1. Thus, the most appropriate way to test the proposed mediation model with negative affect Time 1 is to test a model of moderated mediation. In contrast, the hierarchical multiple regressions did not find a significant moderation between respect, suppression, reappraisal, group membership and negative affect Time 2. Thus, the best way to test the mediation model with negative affect Time 2 is to test a model of simple mediation.

Moderated Mediation Model: Negative Affect Time 1.

Based on the results from Hypothesis 1a, for participants in the experimental condition the relationship between respect and feelings of negative affect is contingent on the participant’s emotion regulation style of reappraisal, such that the negative relationship between respect and negative affect only exists for those low in reappraisal. This finding suggests that the simple mediation model presented above (negative affect mediates the relationship between respect and enacted incivility) would only be applicable to individuals low in reappraisal. For those high in
reappraisal, there is no relationship between respect and negative affectivity, and thus no possible mediation.

As a result, by combining Hypothesis 1 and 2, a model of moderated mediation was tested whereby reappraisal moderates the relationship between respect and negative affect, and negative affect mediates the relationship between respect and enacted incivility (see Figure 3). It is expected that this model will only hold true for individuals low in reappraisal and in the experimental condition. Given the findings from Hypothesis 1a and importance of group membership, the moderated mediation analysis was only conducted on those in the experimental condition. The control condition showed no effects of a significant respect by reappraisal interaction; thus, a model of moderated mediation is not appropriate. As presented above, suppression does not moderate the relationship between respect and negative affect; thus, it was excluded from this analysis. Moreover, the moderated relationship between respect and negative affect was only significant when predicting negative affect Time 1 and not negative affect Time 2; thus, the model of moderated mediation was only tested with negative affect Time 1.

In order to test this model, guidelines presented by Preacher, Rucker, and Hayes (2007) were followed. The moderated mediation analysis extended the moderating relationship between respect, negative affect, and reappraisal to include outcome measures of enacted incivility. Five models were tested so that each of the measures of enacted incivility (hot sauce type, hot sauce amount, tart juice type, tart juice amount, database recommendation), as the dependent variables, was tested at a time.
All five models (regardless of enacted incivility included) tested the same initial moderating effect of reappraisal on respect and negative affect Time 1. As shown in Table 6, the interaction between reappraisal and respect predicted negative affect Time 1. This is similar to the test of Hypothesis 1a.

In order to determine if the moderated mediation models are significant, the relationship between negative affect and enacted incivility is important, because the moderation already exists. The results are presented in Tables 9 through 13, one table per criteria. Two of the five types of enacted incivility showed evidence of moderated mediation through significant paths from negative affect to enacted incivility: hot sauce type ($B = .51, SE = .21, t = 2.43, p = .019$; see Table 9) and the database recommendation ($B = -1.66, SE = .76, t = -2.18, p = .034$; see Table 13). In order to explore the moderated mediation, we looked at whether the moderated mediation path was significant for those individuals one standard deviation above the mean and one standard deviation below the mean on reappraisal.

Preacher and colleagues (2007) suggest that with small sample size, bootstrapping may be useful in probing the nature of the effects at both high and low levels of the moderator (reappraisal). A number of other scholars have also noted bootstrapping can work reasonably well with original samples that have low numbers of participants (e.g., Stine, 1985; Zhang,
Pantula & Boos, 1991). As per Preacher and Hayes (2008) recommendations, 5000 resamples were conducted to create 95% confidence intervals. Bias-corrected confidence intervals were used as they can further improve confident intervals and inferences (e.g., Preacher et al., 2007; MacKinnon, Lockwood & Williams, 2004). If zero falls outside of the confidence interval, the conditional indirect effect is significant and therefore moderated mediation is found.

As expected, the moderated mediation model was significant only for those low in reappraisal when looking at the outcome variables of hot sauce type (boot indirect effect = -.05, \( SE = .03 \), Sobel \( z = -1.72 \), \( p = .085 \), CI \([-13, -.003]\)) and database recommendation (boot indirect effect = .15, \( SE = .09 \), Sobel \( z = 1.62 \), \( p = .106 \), CI \([.02, .40]\)). This suggests that in the experimental condition and for those low in reappraisal, feelings of disrespect are related to engaging in more incivility, and this relationship is mediated by feelings of negative affectivity. This model, however, only suggests partial mediation because the direct path between respect and enacted incivility is still significant for both hot sauce type (\( B = -.10, SE = .04, t = -2.44, p = .019 \)) and the database recommendation (\( B = -.35, SE = .14 t = -2.50, p = .016 \)).

**Simple Mediation Model: Negative Affect Time 2.**

In order to test the model of simple mediation using negative affect Time 2, Baron and Kenny (1986) suggest four steps that need to be met to determine if mediation exists. First, the independent variable (respect) needs to be correlated with the outcome (hot sauce, tart juice, database) variable. Second, the independent variable needs to be correlated with the mediator (negative affect). Third, the mediator needs to affect the outcome variable. Finally, to show full mediation, the effect of the initial variable on the outcome variable should be zero when controlling for the mediator variable.
Although the first step is met, the second step is not; respect is not significantly correlated with negative affect Time 2 ($r = -.10, p = .300$). Thus, consistent with Baron and Kenny’s (1986) commonly used criteria for testing mediation, this model cannot be tested. More recently, however, Hayes (2009) suggests the model can still be tested because the mediation model should take into consideration the entire indirect path not just the significance or non-significance of individual paths. To be thorough, the proposed model whereby negative affect mediates the relationship between respect and enacted incivility was tested. Preacher and Hayes (2004) macro was used and bootstrapping was used to create 5000 resamples. None of the mediation models were significant.

**Discussion**

The main purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between enacted incivility, negative affect, and emotion regulation styles after exposing participants to incivility, using Affective Events Theory as a framework.

First, the role of individual emotion regulation in moderating the relationship between work events (incivility) and affective reactions was examined (hypothesis 1a and 1b). Based on preliminary findings, it appeared that the experimental manipulation did not affect all participants in the same way; thus, an internal analysis was conducted using the manipulation check instead of experimental condition as the independent variable. In addition, “condition” was added as a moderator variable to the main analyses. Results showed that the relationship between perceived respect and negative affect (Time 1) was moderated by reappraisal and condition, such that less perceived respect was associated with more negative affect only for those low in reappraisal only for those in the experimental condition.
Second, given the results of the internal analysis, a model of moderated mediation was tested on the experimental condition alone. This model extended the moderation analyses to include outcome variables of enacted incivility. Results showed support for this model only for two types of enacted incivility: type of hot sauce and database recommendation.

**Main Findings**

**Reappraisal as a Moderator.** In the current study, reappraisal, in combination with experimental condition, moderated the relationship between respect and negative affect (Time 1), indicating the negative relationship only holds for those participants who reported low reappraisal and who were exposed to an uncivil confederate. Thus, feeling disrespected is only related to feelings of negative affect for those who have a hard time regulating and reappraising their emotions. In contrast, those who are able to reappraise their emotions by altering how they interpret a disrespectful event are less likely to feel negative affectivity. This finding coincides with past research suggesting reappraisal is an adaptive form of emotion regulation that is generally associated with less negative emotions and more positive outcomes (Gross & John, 2003; Roberton et al., 2012).

Reappraisal works as an antecedent-focused type of emotion regulation, which means emotions are regulated before any emotional response tendencies can be detected. People who engage in reappraisal typically do so by reevaluating either the situation or their capacity to handle the situation in order to reduce the feelings of negative emotions after a negative event. In the current study, based on a non-significant simple main effect, individuals high in reappraisal reported similarly low negative affect after experiences of both respect and disrespect; this suggests reappraisal may be a beneficial skill in handling experiences of disrespect. In contrast,
those who are low in reappraisal are more negatively affected and report more negative emotions as a result.

**Condition as a Moderator.** As mentioned above, the moderating role of reappraisal on the relationship between respect and negative affectivity was significant in the experimental condition but not in the control condition. Reappraisal is a strategy whereby a negative event is reinterpreted in a more positive way. In the experimental condition participants had a clear negative event they were able to reappraise: incivility from the confederate. In the control condition, however, participants did not experience a negative event; thus, there was nothing to reappraise. This suggests that in the control condition participants’ regulatory style of reappraisal would not change the emotions they experienced during the study. Moreover, participants in the control condition reported high amounts of experienced respect ($M = 6.48, SD = .94$) resulting in an inability to find significant results due to a ceiling effect. Given that there was a large amount of variability in experiences of respect among those in the experimental condition, future research should consider whether having a control condition is necessary.

In retrospect, the ambiguous nature of incivility would involve that targets of incivility may differ in their norms of respect and perceptions of which behaviours are considered uncivil. Moreover, the experience of incivility occurs through the eyes of the target. Thus, using a dichotomous variable to measure whether or not individuals felt they had been targets of incivility is not ideal. Instead, the amount of rudeness or disrespect they felt is a more useful variable than dichotomously assuming everyone who is the target of incivility will perceive it as such.

**Role of Suppression.** The relationship between respect and negative affect was not moderated by suppression. It was hypothesized that the negative relationship between respect
and negative affect would be exacerbated for individual’s high in suppression because suppression is a maladaptive regulation strategy. Other research suggests suppressors are more likely to experience negative emotions than non-suppressors because whereas suppression allows people to disguise how they feel, it does not change the actual emotional experience (Gross & John, 2003). Moreover, suppressors often feel even worse because they are aware they are being inauthentic in how they are expressing themselves emotionally (Gross & John, 2003).

One possible explanation for the non-significant finding in the current study is that because suppression is a response-focused style of emotion regulation, it occurs after emotions have already manifested. Thus, suppressing one’s emotion does not change how much emotion is felt. This would suggest the relationship between respect and negative affect would be consistent among individuals high and low in suppression. Instead, the main difference between suppressors and non-suppressors may be in their behavioural expression. Given that suppression involves changing emotional expression, it may have been more appropriate to examine participants’ behavioural response tendencies rather than their emotional experiences. For example, it would be interesting to study differences between high and low suppressors in facial expressions or other subtle behaviours that participants may have showed while the incivility was occurring.

**Negative Affect Time 1 and Time 2.** It is important to note that the moderating effect of reappraisal was only significant when using negative affect Time 1 as the dependent variable, not negative affect Time 2. A sign that the measure of negative affect Time 2 may be problematic is that it was not significantly correlated with trait negative affect ($r = .18, p = .226$). This is counterintuitive because trait levels of negative affect should have some influence on state levels of negative affect. Additionally, Yasuda and colleagues (2004) conducted a structural equation
model to determine how much variability in state negative affect was due to everyday fluctuations and how much was due to trait negative affect. Over three weeks they found between 48.2% and 60.6% of variance in state negative affect was due to state-dependent fluctuations, and the rest was due to individual disposition.

In contrast to negative affect Time 2, negative affect Time 1 was positively correlated with trait negative affect ($r = .38; p = .008$), similar to previous findings (e.g., Brondolo, Brady, Thompson, Tobin, Cassells, Sweeney, McFarlane & Contrada, 2008; Cohen, Doyle, Skoner, Fireman, Gwaltney, & Newsom, 1995). Thus, if negative affect Time 2 were truly tapping into a measure of state negative affect, it would likely be significantly correlated with trait negative affect.

Another possible explanation for the non-significant moderation of reappraisal between respect and negative affect Time 2 involves when each item was measured. Negative affect Time 1 was measured directly after the participant experienced incivility from the confederate. Thus, there should be a closer link between the respect they perceived and the negative affect they felt directly after. In contrast, negative affect Time 2 was measured after the participant had administered hot sauce and had experienced a second smaller instance of incivility. Interestingly, negative affect Time 2 was positively correlated with the amount ($r = .44, p = .002$) and type ($r = .35, p = .013$) of hot sauce they gave. This may suggest negative affect Time 2 may be less related to feelings of respect the participant perceived and more a justification or reflection of how much they retaliated against the confederate.

**Model of Moderated Mediation.** The initial internal analysis, indicating an interaction effect between reappraisal and experimental condition, guided the analysis strategy for the proposed mediation (negative affect mediating the relationship between experienced incivility
and enacted incivility). Given that a significant relationship between experienced incivility (disrespect) and negative affect, moderated by reappraisal, was found only in the experimental condition, subsequent analysis needed to be focused on the participants who actually were exposed to the uncivil confederate (experimental condition). The results showed evidence of negative affect partially mediating the relationship between respect and enacted incivility for two types of enacted incivility: hot sauce type and the database recommendation. This model of mediation, however, was only significant for those low in reappraisal. This finding is not surprising, individuals low in reappraisal have a harder time regulating their emotions, and therefore the experience of feeling disrespected triggers feelings of negative affect, which, in turn, leads them to engage in uncivil behaviour. In contrast, those with average or high reappraisal scores are less emotionally affected by disrespect, thus they may not feel negative affect nor engage in incivility as a result.

Our findings suggest that for individuals low in reappraisal, feeling disrespected is associated with higher feelings of negative affect and those feelings are related to retaliating behaviours such as giving the confederate a more intense type of hot sauce and a lower rating on the database recommendation. Participants had three choices of hot sauce and the confederate clearly indicated that she did not like spicy food; thus, giving a hotter type of hot sauce can be construed as a deviant behaviour. Moreover, it might even indicate an escalation of retaliatory behaviour because administering hot sauce has been originally used in the past as a measure of aggressive, not uncivil, behaviour (Lieberman et al., 1999).

The failure to make the database recommendation, however, is more similar to the construct of uncivil behaviour. It consisted of a survey asking participants if they would recommend the confederate to be part of a database looking for research participants. The
database was portrayed as very appealing and, on average, participants moderately agreed that they should be included in the database. Blocking the confederate from being a part of something that was appealing suggests that participants who felt more negative affect may have been retaliating against the confederate by taking away something good from them. This is similar to the idea of “rating someone lower than they deserved”; one of the items on the revised 12-item version of the Workplace Incivility Scale (Cortina et al., 2011).

The model of moderated mediation suggests that models of simple mediation might not best capture the relationships between experiencing incivility, negative emotions, and enacting incivility. Although past research has found models of negative emotions mediating the relationship between a negative event at work and enacted incivility (e.g., Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001; Ghosh et al., 2011), those studies have strongly relied on self-report measures about past recalled events. The current model of moderated mediation suggests that the way individuals regulate their emotions is an important factor in whether or not a simple mediation model is applicable, suggesting an important boundary condition to consider.

**Other Types of Incivility.** Three of the five types of incivility showed no evidence of moderated mediation: hot sauce amount, tart juice type, and tart juice amount. The amount of hot sauce participants gave was not significantly related to the amount of respect they perceived ($r = -.26$) or the amount of negative affect ($r = .24$) they felt at Time 1. It is possible that the amount of hot sauce participants gave was more a reflection of their individual liking for hot sauce and what they perceived as a lot or a little and not a strong measure of retaliation.

The model of moderated mediation did not significantly predict the amount of tart juice. There are several possible reasons for this. First, some participants had a difficult time understanding what “tart” was and asked the experimenter to describe it. This suggests it may
have been more difficult for participants to understand what they were administering to the
congressman. It also seemed that participants gave a variety of different amounts of juice because
there was no clear amount that was the norm. This is reflected in the large standard deviation
(see Table 1).

In addition, the type of tart juice was not a good measure of enacted incivility because it
may have been difficult to grasp what the differences in all three types of juice were. For
example, participants had to pick from 1, 2, or 3 in the level of intensity. Among participants in
the experimental condition, those who perceived more respect administered a less intense type of
juice ($r = -.38, p < .001$). With the control group acting as the norm, the average intensity was
1.81, suggesting when participants did not experience disrespect they chose a moderately tart
juice. Thus, there may be evidence of a ceiling effect for those who experienced incivility
because there were only three possible choices and those people who experienced no disrespect
chose the middle option. Future research should explore more types of enacted incivility, and
give the participant more options to better understand when and how people retaliate against
targeted incivility.

Overall, the current study provides an important contribution to the literature. First,
whereas past research has typically focused on participants as either the target or perpetrator of
incivility, the current study looked at the possibility that one individual could be both. This is
important because as Glomb (2002) suggests, there are no “pure” actors or “pure” targets in the
workplace. Rather, an individual is often both a target and instigator at different points in time
(Trudel & Reio, 2011).

Although still lacking enough research to reach a conclusion, some literature is available
about the role of negative affect and incivility (Ghosh et al., 2011; Porath & Erez, 2009; Sakurai
This past research, however, is typically based in cross-sectional self-report surveys. In contrast, the current study was able to examine actual behaviours of incivility rather than just reported instances of enacted incivility, thus reducing self-report bias. Another benefit of this study is that participants were artificially provoked in a controlled setting; thus, the beginning of an incivility spiral could be studied. Using only cross-sectional self-report surveys it is difficult to identify the beginning of an incivility spiral because researchers would never know at what point of entry into the spiral a specific study is capturing (Cortina et al., 2001).

Another contribution to the literature is the addition of emotion regulation in the study of reciprocal incivility. Few studies (e.g., Bunk & Magley, 2013) have explored how people regulate and appraise their emotions and behaviour in response to incivility even though it is a very important component to understand. In particular, the ambiguousness of incivility suggests people may interpret an uncivil event in many different ways and their interpretation and emotion regulation are keys to better understanding their future behaviour.

**Limitations**

This study was not without its limitations. A main limitation is the lack of generalizability of the findings due to the lack of external validity. This limitation is explored in terms of two different aspects: the population studied and the experimental context.

First, only female undergraduates participated in this study. Whereas such a homogenous sample allows for high internal validity, this may compromise the external validity because the results may not generalize to males or mixed gendered pairs. For example, Pearson and colleagues (2001) developed a model based on exploratory qualitative data that proposed the relationship between experienced incivility and individual/organizational outcomes was moderated by individual differences such as gender. Thus, men and women may be affected
differently by incivility at work. In fact, another study found gender differences in how people rated the appropriateness of uncivil behaviour at work (Montgomery, Kane & Vance, 2004). More specifically, women rated uncivil behaviour as more inappropriate than did men, suggesting possible gender differences in norms of respect. Moreover, it has been found that women reported more frequent encounters with uncivil behaviours at work (Cortina, 2008).

One potential reason for these gender differences may be attributed to gender role socialization. Females are expected to be more in tune with verbal and non-verbal cues and pay more attention to social cues in an interpersonal interaction. Supporting this notion, a meta-analysis found that of 75 studies, 68% showed a female advantage at decoding nonverbal communication, suggesting a moderate effect size (Hall, 1978). Therefore it may be useful to better understand how females and males interpret incivility in verbal and nonverbal cues. Thus, future research should explore the role of gender in retaliation to incivility by looking at it as a variable of interest rather than simply controlling for it.

Moreover, the restricted age of participants (18 to 24 years) may be a limitation of this study because of how emotional experiences change with age. For example, past research had participants read short emotion-eliciting scenarios and describe their emotional reactions. Descriptions of anger were negatively associated with age and older adults tended to describe less negative emotions than younger adults (Lockenhoff, Costa & Lane, 2008). Other research by Blanchard-Fields and colleagues (2004) also found age differences in the use of emotion regulation strategies. More specifically, older adults preferred more passive strategies whereas middle-aged adults preferred more proactive strategies. Similarly, a negative correlation with suppression and age suggests as people age, they use suppression less (Haga et al., 2007). These
findings suggest that, because emotional responses and regulation strategies may vary with age, the generalizability of this research may be limited to the range of ages in the current study.

The second aspect of external validity that represents a limitation is the artificial experimental situation in which participants were exposed to. In the workplace, participants will most likely not have the opportunity to subtly administer hot sauce or tart juice to an unfriendly coworker. Moreover, the measures of enacted incivility in the current study are likely more aggressive than the uncivil behaviours that would happen in the workplace on a day-to-day basis. Thus, the current study may have been able to detect individuals who engaged in more aggressive behaviour but was unable to detect individuals who wanted to engage in subtler forms of incivility but were not given the opportunity. Moreover, in the experimental situation the participant and confederate were strangers and did not know each other before the study, and contact after the study was unlikely. In the workplace, however, coworkers see each other daily and have clear incentives to maintain their work relationships. Thus, the current study was limited in its ability to mimic a typical instance of workplace incivility.

Another limitation of this study is the inability to examine causality. The original experimental manipulation did not show an effect on participant attitudes as expected. As a result, the manipulation check (“I felt my partner treated me with respect during this study”) became the independent variable of interest. Based on this internal analysis, the current study was no longer experimental and it is impossible to determine causation in the model of moderated mediation. Due to results from Hypothesis 1, the moderated mediation analysis became a post-hoc analysis because it was run only on those in the experimental condition; thus, future research is needed to replicate this model. Moreover, the amount of respect perceived was measured at the end of the study. This is potentially problematic because perceptions of respect
may have changed over the course of the study and may not reflect the amount of respect participant’s felt right after being the target of incivility. In addition, because the current study looked at emotion regulation style, it is impossible to know whether or not participants were engaging in a certain type of emotion regulation during this specific study. Future research should focus on more open ended questions or get people to record their thoughts in order to code what types of emotion regulation are occurring.

Lastly, the current study only assessed negative affect as a potential mediator and did not examine more discrete emotions. Whereas the majority of research has focused on the role of negative affect rather than discrete emotions, Bunk and Magley (2013) suggest that, given that workplace incivility is a very specific event, research should look at specific emotions as a result. For example, because negative affectivity combines many types of negative emotions (e.g., distressed, hostile, scared, guilty), it is hard to know if any of these specific emotions are more important than others. For instance, uncivil behaviours are commonly appraised as frustrating but not threatening (Cortina & Magley, 2009; Glomb, 2002). Moreover, Bunk and Magley (2013) found anger and guilt were more important emotions to examine in response to incivility than fear or sadness. Thus, whereas the current study is limited in its ability to disentangle the role of discrete emotions, it provides the basis for which these can be explored in future research.

**Future Research**

The current study provides preliminary support for a model of moderated mediation in which reappraisal moderates the link between experienced incivility and negative affect that carries over to enacted incivility. Moreover, it opens up several new research directions. First, AET suggests dispositions moderate the relationship between work events and affective reactions. While the current study explored the role of emotion regulation style, there are many
other individual dispositions (e.g., gender, personality) that might be important boundary conditions for the relationships between experienced incivility, negative affect, and enacted incivility.

As a widely studied individual disposition, personality may provide insight into why people react differently to workplace incivility. For example, using self-report surveys, Reio (2011) found a positive relationship between neuroticism and frustration at work, suggesting individuals high in neuroticism get more easily frustrated with negative events (e.g., incivility) at work. In addition, Taylor and colleagues (2012) found support for a model of moderated mediation whereby experiencing incivility was related to less affective commitment and less citizenship performance, and the relationship between incivility and commitment was stronger for those high in conscientiousness. Thus, individuals who are very conscientious may have a stronger reaction to experiencing incivility at work. These studies suggest personality may be an important factor in how incivility and disrespect in the workplace are interpreted and possibly how subsequent emotions are regulated.

Expanding on the role of reappraisal and suppression in the current study is also warranted. Past experimental research has relied on randomly assigning participants to either the “suppression” or “reappraisal” condition. Moreover, correlational research typically explores the role of one emotion regulation style at a time while controlling for the other. Suppression and reappraisal, however, represent two distinct constructs so an individual high in reappraisal is not necessarily also low in suppression. As a result, four interesting clusters (High-High, High-Low, Low-Low, Low-High) are possible among individual usage of emotion regulation styles. It would be interesting to further explore the differences between clusters to better understand how reappraisal and suppression relate to one another as well as incivility and negative affect. For
example, do individuals high in both reappraisal and suppression choose how they regulate their emotions depending on the negative event or do they typically use both for the same event? Are individuals low in both reappraisal and suppression able to regulate their emotions at all? How do these more complex clusters of emotion regulation styles relate to experiencing incivility, feelings of negative affect, and enacting incivility?

The current study explored how feelings of negative affect were related to retaliating against an act of incivility. In order to capture the incivility spiral, however, a more complex model needs to be tested. For example, we found that, for those low in reappraisal, feeling disrespected was related to feelings of negative affect, which led to participants giving the confederate a more intense type of hot sauce. It would be interesting to expand this and see how giving a more intense hot sauce relates to how participants felt and acted when they are the target of incivility for the second time. For example, in the current study there was a positive correlation between the amount ($r = .44, p = .002$) and type ($r = .35, p = .013$) of hot sauce given and participant reports of negative affect Time 2 (reported after the hot sauce was administered). Thus, it is possible that the act of retaliation may elevate feelings of negative affect after experiencing more incivility. These relationships should be explored to better understand how and why retaliation might intensify the experience of incivility.

Lastly, researchers should also consider designing future studies that take into consideration the process of both engaging in and responding to incivility. This process is difficult to capture looking at a single behavioural response. Recently, Beattie and Griffin (2013) used a longitudinal diary study to examine daily experiences of incivility and how individuals appraise and respond to incivility depending on both within-person variance (e.g., severity of the incident) and between-person variance (neuroticism). Similar future research should explore both
the short term and long term consequences of behavioural responses to incivility in order to better understand how individuals regulate their emotions in response to incivility as well as the long-term consequences of each emotion regulation strategy. For example, reappraisal might be an effective strategy for the first few uncivil experiences, however, over a longer period of time it may be more difficult to reappraise a negative event that continues to happen from the same perpetrator.

Using qualitative methods can also help disentangle relationships between emotion regulation, negative affect, and incivility. For example, what are the specific strategies people use to reappraise an uncivil event? Are these strategies different from reappraising other negative events at work? Gaining more detailed information about how reappraisal and suppression operate will allow researchers to a) better understand how and why people choose to “exit” an incivility spiral and b) to translate this understanding into tools to train people on how to respond to negative interpersonal events at work.

Proposed Practical Implications

These findings may also have important practical implications. First, only 1% to 6% of targets of incivility actually file formal complaints (Cortina & Magley, 2009). This makes it difficult for organizations to formally address uncivil behaviour among employees. Similarly, as Roberts, Scherer and Bowyer (2011) suggest, it is difficult for organizations to modify working conditions or reduce stress of all employees in all jobs; thus, it is important to foster characteristics of the individual to make them more resilient. Emotion regulation styles may represent one way this can be achieved. More specifically, it appears that those low in reappraisal are most likely to be negatively affected by feeling disrespected at work and react negatively to it. Given the ambiguous intent implicit in the construct definition of incivility,
consultants and organizations may want to consider different workplace interventions aimed at teaching employees how to effectively regulate their emotions. However, this type of intervention should not ignore the need of implementing civility in the workplace programs, and organizational climate interventions that foster safe and harassment free workplaces.

**Conclusion**

This study was able to provide insight into how feelings of negative affect and emotion regulation styles relate to both experienced incivility and enacted incivility. The findings presented also emphasize the importance of looking at the processes involved in uncivil acts rather than just looking at antecedents or consequences or a single incident. This perspective is important because no one is a pure instigator or a pure target (Aquino & Lamertz, 2004). This study was also able to further the literature by addressing the mechanisms (e.g., negative affect) that drive incivility, which as Caza and Cortina (2007) note is currently lacking in the incivility literature.

Finally, this thesis provides preliminary insight into how people’s emotion regulation styles influence how they perceive incivility and choose to react and respond. More specifically, it highlights the negative consequences of not reappraising negative events. The insight into the relationships between incivility, negative affectivity, and emotion regulation styles will hopefully help inform future research and provide empirical support for workplace interventions designed to prevent incivility and incivility retaliation.
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### Tables

**Table 1.**

*Summary of Descriptive and Intercorrelations among variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</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>Experienced Respect</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</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>NA Time 1</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</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>NA Time 2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Hot Sauce</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</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>Type of Hot Sauce</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</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>Amount of Tart Juice</td>
<td>53.68</td>
<td>35.59</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</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>Type of Tart Juice Database</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</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>Database Recommendation</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</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>Suppression</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</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>Reappraisal</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</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>Trait NA</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *N = 101; *p < .05; **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Table 2.

*Means and Standard Deviations of variables by Experimental Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental (N = 49)</th>
<th>Control (N = 52)</th>
<th>t(99)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Respect</td>
<td>4.43 (1.88)</td>
<td>6.48 (.94)</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA Time 1</td>
<td>1.40 (.34)</td>
<td>1.33 (.30)</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA Time 2</td>
<td>1.30 (.42)</td>
<td>1.30 (.31)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Hot Sauce</td>
<td>4.08 (3.26)</td>
<td>4.98 (5.81)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Hot Sauce</td>
<td>1.34 (.56)</td>
<td>1.27 (.53)</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Tart Juice</td>
<td>46.61 (31.36)</td>
<td>60.35 (38.27)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Tart Juice</td>
<td>1.86 (.82)</td>
<td>1.81 (.79)</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>4.69 (1.82)</td>
<td>1.62 (1.35)</td>
<td>-9.72</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

Summary of Descriptive and Intercorrelations among variables in the Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</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>Experienced Respect</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. NA Time 1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NA Time 2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Hot Sauce</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Type of Hot Sauce</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Amount of Tart Juice</td>
<td>46.61</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Type of Tart Juice</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Recommendations</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Suppression</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reappraisal</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trait NA</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 49$; *p < .05; **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Table 4.

**Summary of Descriptive and Intercorrelations among variables in the Control Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</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>Experienced Respect</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA Time 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA Time 2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Hot Sauce</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Hot Sauce</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Tart Juice</td>
<td>60.35</td>
<td>38.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Tart Juice Database</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Recommendation</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait NA</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *N* = 52; *p < .05; **p < .01 (two-tailed)
Table 5.

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses predicting Negative Affect Time 1 from Trait Negative Affect, Respect, Reappraisal, Suppression, and Group Membership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R² (adjusted R²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Negative Affect</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.81**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step One Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13 (.12)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Two Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16 (.12)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Suppression</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Suppression</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Respect</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Three Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Respect x Suppression</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Four Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22 (.12)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 101. Bs are unstandardized coefficients.  
* p < .05. ** p < .01.*
Table 6.

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses predicting Negative Affect Time 1 from* Trait Negative Affect, Respect, and Reappraisal in the Experimental Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R² (adjusted R²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Negative Affect</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step One Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14 (.12)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Two Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18 (.12)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Three Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25 (.18)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 49. Bs are unstandardized coefficients.*

* *p < .05. ** p < .01.*
Table 7.

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses predicting Negative Affect Time 1 from Trait Negative Affect, Respect and, Reappraisal in the Control Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R² (adjusted R²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Negative Affect</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.59*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step One Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12 (10)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Two Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12 (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Three Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16 (.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 52. Bs are unstandardized coefficients.  
* p < .05. ** p < .01.*
Table 8.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses predicting Negative Affect Time 2 from Trait Negative Affect, Respect, Reappraisal, Suppression, and Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R² (adjusted R²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Negative Affect</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step One Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Two Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Suppression</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.06*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Suppression</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Respect</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Three Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Respect x Suppression</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.34*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Four Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17 (.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 101. Bs are unstandardized coefficients.  
* p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 9.

*Moderated Mediation Analysis predicting Hot Sauce Type in the Experimental Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion is Hot Sauce Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Conditional Indirect Effects</strong></th>
<th>Ind. Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Sobel Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Reappraisal</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>[-.02, .07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>[-.13, -.003]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 49. Bs are unstandardized coefficients.*
Table 10.

*Moderated Mediation Analysis predicting Hot Sauce Amount in the Experimental Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Conditional Indirect Effects</strong></th>
<th>Ind. Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Sobel Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Reappraisal</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>[-.07, .42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>[-.52, .04]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 49. Bs are unstandardized coefficients.*
Table 11.

*Moderated Mediation Analysis predicting Tart Juice Type in the Experimental Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion is Tart Juice Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditional Indirect Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Ind. Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Sobel Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>[-.10, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Reappraisal</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>[-.01, .16]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 49. Bs are unstandardized coefficients.*
Table 12.

*Moderated Mediation Analysis predicting Tart Juice Amount in the Experimental Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion is Tart Juice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>43.80</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>-16.73</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>-3.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional Indirect Effects</strong></td>
<td>Ind. Effect</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Sobel Z</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Reappraisal</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 49. Bs are unstandardized coefficients.*
Table 13.

*Moderated Mediation Analysis predicting Database Recommendation in the Experimental Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion is Database</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect x Reappraisal</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Conditional Indirect Effects</strong></th>
<th>Ind. Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Reappraisal</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>[-.23, .08]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Reappraisal</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>[.02, .40]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 49. Bs are unstandardized coefficients.*
Appendix A

Taste Preference Inventory

Instructions
Please indicate your preference for each flavour on a 21-point scale from 1 (no liking at all) to 21 (extreme liking).

___ Sweet
___ Crisp
___ Creamy
___ Salty
___ Spicy
___ Dry
___ Tart
Appendix B

Taste Preference Task Instructions

In this task, different types of foods are being examined in different experiments. Since it is necessary for the experimenter to be blind to certain specifics about the sample type and quantity of food tasted, it is important for you to select the food samples for each other.

Although today we are only examining a couple foods we are also interested in other flavours and textures; therefore, we asked you to fill out the taste preference inventory in its entirety. Since other people are often curious as to the taste preference of the other participants here is the Taste Preference Inventory of the person to whom you are paired with today.
Appendix C

Taste Preference Inventory

Instructions
Please indicate your preference for each flavour on a 21-point scale from 1 (no liking at all) to 21 (extreme liking).

16 Sweet
20 Crisp
10 Creamy
19 Salty
3 Spicy
5 Dry
4 Tart
Appendix D

Confederate Checklist

☐ Interruption manipulation
☐ Rude Comment – Clipboard manipulation
☐ Cell Phone manipulation

Anything else important to note (e.g., the participant offered her clipboard)
Appendix E

**Hot Sauce Instructions (read by experimenter)**

You have selected Category 5: Hot and Spicy. Please choose between one of the three types of hot sauce and place a quantity of your choosing into the Styrofoam cup using the plastic spoon and place the lid on top. All quantities of hot sauce are useful and you should put as much or as little in as you want. Please remember, the participant who receives the hot sauce will have to consume the entire quantity. Since you will taste other types of food later on in this study, please do not taste the hot sauce because it can affect the tasting of your sample afterwards.

The experimenter will not know how much hot sauce has been allocated since the cups are covered. Please remember the other participant today will be receiving the hot sauce to consume. When you are finished please seal the cup and return it to the experimenter.
Appendix F

Tart Juice Instructions (read by experimenter)

You have selected Category 2: Tart. Please choose between one of the three types of juice and place a quantity of your choosing into the Styrofoam cup and place the lid on top. All quantities of juice are useful and you should put as much or as little in as you want. Please remember, the participant who receives the juice will have to consume the entire quantity. Since you will taste other types of food later on in this study, please do not taste the hot sauce because it can affect the tasting of your sample afterwards.

The experimenter will not know how much juice has been allocated since the cups are covered. Please remember the other participant today will be receiving the juice to consume. When you are finished please seal the cup and return it to the experimenter.
Appendix G

Please answer the questions below using the scale provided. Remember, the other participant in the taste preference task is referred to in these questions are your “partner”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I felt the experimenter treated me with respect during this study
2. I took the taste preference task seriously
3. I think I treated my partner with respect during this study.
4. I think I should be included in the database
5. I felt my partner treated me with respect during this study.
6. I felt my partner did not take the taste preference task seriously
7. I would not recommend my partner be included in the database
8. In future studies, I would like to work with my same partner again
Appendix H

Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ)

Instructions

We would like to ask you some questions about your emotional life, in particular, how you control (that is regulate and manage) your emotions. The questions below involve two distinct aspects of your emotional life. One is your emotional experience, or what you feel like inside. The other is your emotional expression, or how you show your emotions in the way you talk, gesture, or behave. Although some of the following questions may seem similar to one another, they differ in important ways. For each item, please answer using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When I want to feel more positive emotion (such as joy or amusement), *I change what I’m thinking about*
2. I keep my emotions to myself
3. When I want to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), *I change what I’m thinking about*
4. When I am feeling positive emotions, I am careful not to express them
5. When I’m faced with a stressful situation, I make myself think about it in a way that helps me stay calm
6. I control my emotions by not expressing them
7. When I want to feel more positive emotion, *I change the way I’m thinking* about the situation
8. I control my emotions by changing the way I think about the situation I’m in
9. When I am feeling negative emotions, I make sure not to express them
10. When I want to feel less negative emotion, *I change the way I’m thinking* about the situation
Appendix I

The PANAS (Trait)

Instructions

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

___ interested  
___ distressed  
___ excited  
___ upset  
___ strong  
___ guilty  
___ scared  
___ hostile  
___ enthusiastic  
___ proud  
___ irritable  
___ alert  
___ ashamed  
___ inspired  
___ nervous  
___ determined  
___ attentive  
___ jittery  
___ active  
___ afraid
The PANAS (State)

**Instructions**

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what *extent you feel this way right now*, that is, at the present moment. Use the following scale to record your answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

___ interested
___ distressed
___ excited
___ upset
___ strong
___ guilty
___ scared
___ hostile
___ enthusiastic
___ proud
___ irritable
___ alert
___ ashamed
___ inspired
___ nervous
___ determined
___ attentive
___ jittery
___ active
___ afraid