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Despite a wealth of research on the antecedents and outcomes of workplace incivility, little is known about the effect of individual differences on perceptions of incivility. The current study sought to examine whether personality and additional individual difference characteristics were predictive of perceptions of incivility. A sample of 295 working adults were exposed to vignettes depicting workplace interactions that could be interpreted as uncivil, and were asked to rate the degree to which each of these were perceived as rude, as well as to describe how they would hypothetically respond to a subset of these items. Results indicated that conscientiousness, narcissism, and hostile attribution bias were positively related to perceptions of incivility. Qualitative analysis demonstrated that the majority of participants would not escalate the described situations. Analyses additionally demonstrated that customer- and coworker-perpetrated incivility were perceived as more uncivil than supervisor incivility. Theoretical and practical implications of these findings for future incivility research are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

In the past three decades, negative workplace behaviors have become a focal topic within industrial organizational psychology research. Hundreds of studies have been conducted to investigate the many relationships between these behaviors and outcomes at the organization, group, and individual levels (e.g., Bowling & Beehr, 2006). While this literature originally focused on topics such as workplace aggression, bullying, deviance, and other interpersonal counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWBs), more recently it has largely incorporated research on workplace incivility.

Andersson and Pearson first described incivility in 1999. They defined incivility as “low intensity, deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms of mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others” (p. 457). Some examples of uncivil conduct include sarcasm, making critical remarks, making jokes, interrupting, staring at others, and giving the silent treatment. Moreover, the authors described how a series of uncivil encounters may result in an upward “incivility spiral” of negative organizational events that may eventually lead to a tipping point and, as a result, acts of more serious workplace aggression (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Some well-established negative outcomes of workplace incivility include decreased levels of employee health and job satisfaction (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001; Leiter, Laschinger, Day, & Oore, 2011; Lim, Cortina, & Magley, 2008), organizational productivity (Estes & Wang, 2008) and organizational commitment (Pearson & Porath, 2005), as well as increased levels of employee turnover (Lim, Cortina, & Magley, 2008; Reio & Ghosh, 2009), stress (Ferguson, 2012; Penney & Spector, 2005), strain (Raver & Nishii, 2010), and emotional exhaustion (Cortina et al., 2001; Leiter et al., 2011; Sliter, Jex, Wolford, & McInnerney, 2010).
Uncivil behaviors are characterized as low-level, relative to more serious forms of mistreatment, and are ambiguous in nature (Andersson & Perason, 1999). Despite its measurement along with other types of negative workplace behaviors, incivility is a unique construct within the area of workplace mistreatment. For example, incivility differs from the related constructs of bullying and social undermining, which involve a clear intent to harm. Moreover, compared to other forms of mistreatment incivility reflects peoples’ interpretations about how actions make them feel: even though an uncivil behavior may be unintentional, it is defined primarily by the victim’s interpretation of the behavior (Porath & Pearson, 2009).

While research on incivility has dominated the workplace mistreatment literature in recent years, this common workplace phenomenon remains an issue within the workplace, and deserving of further study. Incivility is the most common type of mistreatment in the workplace: it is estimated that up to 98 percent of the workforce experiences incivility, with up to 50 percent experiencing this negative behavior at least weekly (Porath & Pearson, 2013). Moreover, the high prevalence rate of incivility is a growing concern for organizations, as estimates have shown that incivility can cost businesses up to $14,000 per employee annually due to distraction, loss of work time, and project delays (Porath & Pearson, 2010). These statistics are alarming, both fiscally for organizations, and personally for employees who experience workplace incivility.

Thus, uncivil behaviors, when perceived as negative by victims, can have serious, negative effects on both victims and organizations alike. While much attention has been given to the myriad negative outcomes of incivility, there has not been much research on the processes by which people decide what is and what is not incivility. For instance, stable individual differences (i.e., personality) may play a part in the appraisal process by which behaviors are labeled as
incivility; however, such characteristics were not a central part of Andersson and Pearson’s original model of incivility. The authors discussed the idea of “hot temperament,” referring to specific behavioral characteristics that remain unchanged over a person’s lifetime. This discussion is centered on the idea that those who are impulsive, emotionally reactive, and rebellious are more likely to respond to stressful situations with incivility, escalating uncivil exchanges into an incivility spiral (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). However, outside of their hypothesis that hot temperament is related to escalation, the paper does not discuss the idea of stable individual differences as an antecedent to the overall incivility process. Given that Andersson and Pearson’s model focuses on the incivility spiral as an important antecedent of increased counterproductive workplace behaviors such as aggression and violence, attention must be given to understanding the process of perceiving incivility and whether certain individual differences may predispose an individual towards perceiving ambiguous social interactions as uncivil. In short, it is important to build an understanding of what impacts perceptions of incivility in order to curb escalation of the incivility spiral. The current study focused on the relationship between individual differences and incivility perceptions in a sample of working adults. Below, some of the extant research on incivility and its relationships with personality factors and individual difference variables is outlined.

**Defining Incivility**

Incivility has been the subject of much research and debate over both its definition and where it fits within the broader realm of negative workplace behaviors. Incivility is completely distinct from physical aggression and violence; however, depending on the situation, the definition of incivility can overlap with psychological aggression. When there is clear intent to harm a target or the organization, then uncivil behavior overlaps with psychological aggression.
When behaviors lack a clear intent – or, in other words, are ambiguous – incivility is distinct from the psychological aggression construct, as outcomes of such behaviors may result in accidental harm, which differs from the current definitions of psychological aggression (e.g., Lawrence & Leather, 1999; Lawrence & Leather, 2003).

Broadly, incivility is a type of antisocial employee behavior, which is defined as “any behavior that brings harm, or is intended to bring harm, to an organization, its employees, or its stakeholders,” (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997, pg. vii). More specifically, incivility can be categorized within antisocial employee behavior as a type of employee deviance. Employee deviance is defined as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both” (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p. 556).

Based on Andersson and Pearson’s definition, the three key aspects of incivility include norm violation, ambiguous intent, and low intensity (Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001). Each of these characteristics helps to distinguish incivility from other types of workplace deviance. First, norm violation refers to behaviors that disturb mutual respect within the workplace. The definition of workplace incivility implies that uncivil behavior disrupts mutual respect within a workplace, even though norms may differ from one organization to the next (Lim et al., 2008).

Second, ambiguous intent is the characteristic of incivility that helps to separate the construct from other forms of workplace aggression. Aggression is typically defined as involving a clear intent to harm someone, either physically or psychologically (Neumann & Barron, 1998). It is possible for uncivil behavior to overlap with other forms of aggression if it is motivated by a desire to harm coworkers or the organization (e.g., Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Lagerspetz, 1994).
but if the perpetrator displays an ambiguous intent to harm, the uncivil act is distinct from aggression. Perpetrators of incivility may display this behavior for various reasons outside of a direct intent to harm. For instance, perpetrators may act uncivil due to ignorance or misunderstanding (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Pearson et al., 2001). Moreover, because any negative outcomes resulting from incivility may be unintentional, victims of incivility may experience distress in processing and understanding the interaction.

Third, low intensity refers to the low-level nature of uncivil behavior. That is, incivility is at a lower magnitude of deviance compared to aggression (Pearson et al., 2001), and can even involve nonverbal behaviors, such as staring at, rolling one’s eyes at, and/or ignoring, colleagues.

These three characteristics help incivility stands out in comparison to other workplace aggression constructs, such as social undermining (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002), bullying (Hoel & Cooper, 2001), abusive supervision (Tepper, 2007), and interpersonal conflict (Spector & Jex, 1998). Social undermining is any “behavior intended to hinder, over time, the ability to establish and maintain positive interpersonal relationships, work-related success, and favorable reputation,” (Duffy et al., 2002, p. 332). Additionally, social undermining is characterized by a clear intent to harm a target, whether in terms of relationships, work-related successes, or reputation. Bullying is defined as “instances where an employee is repeatedly and over a period of time exposed to negative acts (i.e., constant abuse, offensive remarks or teasing, ridicule, or social exclusion) from co-workers, supervisors, or subordinates,” (Einarsen, 2000; Henschcovis, 2011, p. 501). The defining characteristics of this form of mistreatment include its persistence over time, its frequency, and the power imbalance between the perpetrator and victim. Bullying additionally involves a clear intent to harm. Lastly, interpersonal conflict is an organizational stressor that involves disagreement between employees (Spector & Jex, 1998). Whereas study of
other constructs in the workplace mistreatment literature involves outcomes of the constructs, interpersonal conflict is meant as a measure of a mutually stressful interaction itself, rather than the outcome. However, the construct has been regularly included in mistreatment research, and was included in Bowling and Beehr’s (2006) meta-analysis on correlates of harassment.

While incivility is a low-level negative behavior, Andersson and Pearson (1999) did postulate that a series of uncivil encounters could result in an “incivility spiral” of negative organizational events that may eventually lead to a tipping point and, as a result, acts of more serious workplace aggression. Both psychologists and criminologists have found that interpersonal violence often begins with rude comments and minor mistreatment (Felson & Steadman, 1983; Goldstein, 1994). In this way, even minor transgressions can result in larger-scale organizational conflict over time. Because a behavior must initially be appraised and defined as uncivil in order for the incivility spiral to initiate, understanding how individual differences might predict individuals’ perceptions of incivility in the workplace is an important first step in ultimately reducing negative organizational events or acts of workplace aggression.

**Personality Traits and Incivility**

While previous studies have focused on the relationship between individual differences and the antecedents and outcomes of incivility, fewer studies have examined them in concert with the perception of incivility. Previous studies have investigated personality differences in relation to incivility, but only with the traits of agreeableness, neuroticism, and extraversion. Milam and colleagues (2009) examined these traits in association with targets of incivility, and found that agreeableness related negatively to workplace incivility and neuroticism related positively to incivility. Additionally, they found support for the mediational hypotheses that low agreeableness and high neuroticism could provoke incivility from others. Specifically, those
rated low in agreeableness by their coworkers tended to report more incivility than those rated high in agreeableness by their coworkers, regardless of whether incivility was measured from the perspective of the individual or the coworker (Milam, Spitzmueller, & Penney, 2009). These findings suggest that coworkers may be engaging in uncivil behaviors as a result of the negative or annoying behaviors displayed by those low in agreeableness, whereas those high in agreeableness may be more likely to give others the “benefit of the doubt” by attributing ambiguous behaviors to the situation rather than their coworkers. Moreover, study findings suggested that for people high on neuroticism, experienced incivility might be a function of a negative general evaluation of the individual’s surroundings, and that those high in neuroticism may exhibit unusual social behaviors (e.g., nervousness) that are perceived by coworkers as provocative behaviors inviting incivility toward the neurotic individual (Milam et al., 2009). These results provide initial support for the idea that certain personality traits might predispose individuals toward experiencing incivility.

More recent research has provided additional preliminary evidence for the relationship between personality factors and perceptions of incivility (Sliter, Withrow, & Jex, 2015). Using a series of vignettes depicting low-level mistreatment from supervisors, coworkers, and customers, Sliter and colleagues examined whether personality variables, trait anger, and positive and negative affect predicted perceptions of incivility within a sample of students. These researchers found that agreeableness, emotional stability, and openness were negatively related to perceptions of incivility, whereas positive affect, negative affect, and trait anger were positively related to perceptions of incivility.

Theoretically, there are several potential mechanisms by which personality may affect the perception of incivility as suggested by models of the stress process within the workplace.
According to Bowling & Jex (2013), both differential sensitivity and perception may impact the stress process. Differential sensitivity suggests that personality might predispose some individuals to being hypersensitive to stressors, and perception suggests that personality might impact individuals’ perceptions of the work environment. Both of these mechanisms could impact the appraisal of incivility.

Additionally, personality might impact the experience of stressors through both primary and secondary appraisal, as outlined by Lazarus and Folkman in their transactional model of stress (1984). The transactional model of stress states that a person’s experience of stress is a product of the interaction between the environment and the person’s perceptions, and that one’s primary and secondary appraisals of the event determine whether the event is interpreted as a stressor. First, in order for an event to become a stressor, it must be perceived as threatening by the person (primary appraisal). Second, this judgment is modified by whether or not the person perceives they have enough psychological or physical resources to cope with the event (secondary appraisal).

Previous research has supported the idea that personality traits are central to the appraisal of environmental stressors. Costa and McCrae (1990) outlined the types of effects the five-factor model of personality (“The Big Five”) might have on appraisals. For instance, they posited that high levels of some traits, such as trait anger, negative affectivity, and conscientiousness, might predispose people to appraise some events as threatening. Moreover, they suggested that high levels of positive affectivity, emotional stability, agreeableness, extraversion, and openness might predispose people to be less likely to perceive events as threatening. The following sections will describe the proposed relationships between each personality variable and incivility perceptions.
HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

The Five-Factor Model of Personality

**Agreeableness.** The personality trait of agreeableness is defined as a person exhibiting courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, soft-hearted, and tolerant behaviors (Barrick & Mount, 1991). In turn, individuals with low agreeableness are more likely to exhibit argumentativeness, mistrust, and skepticism. These behaviors may lead individuals low in agreeableness to be more likely to perceive incivility in ambiguous situations (e.g., Milam et al., 2009). Moreover, research has found that agreeableness was negatively related to perceptions of incivility in students, suggesting that those higher in agreeableness are less likely to appraise ambiguous events as uncivil (Sliter et al., 2015).

*Hypothesis 1:* Agreeableness will be negatively related to the perception of incivility.

**Extraversion.** Extraversion is a personality trait encompassing sociability, gregariousness, assertiveness, talkativeness, and activity (Barrick & Mount, 1991). The opposite of extraversion is introversion, which is characterized as being quiet, introspective, and reserved. Previous research has suggested that because extraverted individuals experience more positive social interactions than introverted people, they may be less likely to notice ambiguous or small-scale negative social interactions (e.g., Milam et al., 2009). Therefore, these individuals may be less likely to appraise events as uncivil.

*Hypothesis 2:* Extraversion will be negatively related to the perception of incivility.

**Emotional stability.** Emotional stability is a trait characterized by level-headedness, appropriate emotional reactions, and calmness. Neuroticism is the antithesis to emotional stability, and involves anxiety, hostility, self-consciousness, and impulsiveness (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Because neuroticism is associated with general appraisal of events as invoking
negative emotions, emotional stability is expected to relate negatively with perceptions of incivility. Moreover, Gallagher (1990) suggested that selective attention bias might explain the relationship between neuroticism and the perception of stressors, such that neuroticism is positively related to threat appraisal even in minor negative events. In turn, those higher in emotional stability may be less likely to make such an appraisal in the event of a minor negative event.

Hypothesis 3: Emotional stability will be negatively related to the perception of incivility.

Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness is a trait characterized by organization, attention to detail, and persistence; a person low in this trait might be easy-going, but also exhibit disorganization (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Previous research has found that conscientiousness is related positively to the appraisal of stressors, suggesting that people high in conscientiousness may hold higher standards for social interactions (Gartland, O’Connor, & Lawton, 2012). Thus, those higher in conscientiousness should be more likely to appraise ambiguous breaches in social etiquette as uncivil.

Hypothesis 4: Conscientiousness will be positively related to the perception of incivility.

Openness. Finally, openness to experience is a trait defined by imagination, open-mindedness, and liberalism (Barrick & Mount, 1991). People high on this trait are also more accepting of others, and similar to those high in agreeableness or extraversion, may be less likely to appraise minor interpersonal violations as uncivil.

Hypothesis 5: Openness will be negatively related to the perception of incivility.

The Dark Triad

Machiavellianism, narcissism and psychopathy are commonly referred to as the “Dark Triad” of personality. While some research has provided preliminary support to suggest a
relationship between the “Big Five” personality variables and incivility perceptions, the Dark Triad have yet to be examined with respect to incivility perceptions. The three constructs comprising the dark triad have some similar characteristics: all three involve behavioral tendencies for self-promotion, emotional coldness, duplicity, and aggressiveness (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). In addition to clinical research demonstrating the links between these constructs (e.g., Hart & Hare, 1998), the development of sub-clinical measures of each construct has allowed the study of these empirical relationships within normal populations. While there is evidence for the overlap of the characteristics of the three constructs (e.g., Fehr, Samsom, & Paulhus, 1992; Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995; McHoskey, 1995), research has also demonstrated that despite the moderate intercorrelations between the measures, they are not equivalent (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

**Machiavellianism.** Machiavellianism is characterized by manipulation and exploitation of others, deception, self-interest, and cynicism towards morality. The construct was developed using statements selected from Machiavelli’s original books (Christie & Geis, 1970). Initial research found that respondents who agreed with the statements more commonly displayed cold and manipulative behaviors in both laboratory and real-world settings (Christie & Geis, 1970; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Because individuals high in Machiavellianism display manipulation, self-interest, and cynicism towards others, they may be more likely to interpret ambiguous situations as uncivil.

Hypothesis 6: Machiavellianism will be positively related to the perception of incivility.

**Narcissism.** Narcissism is characterized by grandiosity, pride, egotism, and a lack of empathy. A measure of subclinical narcissism was originally developed by Raskin and Hall (1979), who refined their measure as a sub-clinical version of the Diagnostic and Statistical
Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM)-defined personality disorder, retaining facets related to grandiosity, entitlement, dominance, and superiority. One scale commonly used to assess narcissism is the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979), which includes items related to extreme attention seeking, vanity, self-focus, and exploitation in interpersonal relationships (Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006; Millon & Davis, 1996). According to the DSM, narcissists often have an inflated sense of self-worth, and they may be dismayed when they are not treated in line with their high expectations (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Moreover, because narcissism involves vanity, individuals high in this trait may be more likely to interpret ambiguous situations as uncivil due to inflated feelings of self-worth.

Hypothesis 7: Narcissism will be positively related to the perception of incivility.

Psychopathy. Psychopathy is characterized by antisocial behavior, impulsivity, thrill seeking, selfishness, and a lack of remorse (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). The self-report psychopathy (SRP) scale was created using items that differentiated clinically-diagnosed psychopaths from non-psychopaths (Hare, 1985), and was validated in non-criminal samples (Forth, Brown, Hart, & Hare, 1996). Previous research has shown that individuals with psychopathy are more reactive to stress (Noser, Zeigler-Hill, & Besser, 2014). Moreover, because individuals high in non-clinical psychopathy demonstrate antisocial behavior and a lack of empathy and remorse, they may be more likely to perceive ambiguous interactions as uncivil.

Hypothesis 8: Psychopathy will be positively related to the perception of incivility.

Additional Individual Difference Variables and Incivility

In addition to personality variables, two individual difference variables may impact the relationships between personality characteristics and perceptions of incivility.
Hostile attribution bias. Hostile attribution bias is a type of cognitive bias that refers to systematic errors made when people evaluate or try to find reasons for others' behaviors (Kelley, 1967). Specifically, it refers to the tendency for an individual to appraise external events as signaling hostility from others. A stable individual difference variable, hostile attribution bias indicates how a person’s cognitive appraisal of negative outcomes may predict anger and subsequent aggression (Adams & John, 1997; Dodge & Coie, 1987; Douglas & Martinko, 2001). Attributional styles, including hostile attribution bias, are related to, but distinct from, other organizational research constructs (e.g., negative affectivity, trait anger) that may affect the relationship between personality and incivility perceptions. While negative affectivity is related to subjective distress, hostile attribution bias refers to a cognitive process that affects a person’s appraisal of an event. Moreover, although studies have found a direct link between hostile attribution bias and trait anger (Wilkowski & Robinson, 2008), the subtle differences between the two require additional study. Research has shown that interventions aimed at decreasing hostile attribution bias have been found to also reduce anger and aggression (e.g., Guerra & Slaby, 1990; Hudley & Graham, 1993).

Literature has suggested that the likelihood of individuals responding aggressively to negative situations depends partly on their judgment causality (Greenberg & Alge, 1998; Mack, Shannon, Quick, & Quick, 1998; Martinko & Zellars, 1998; Neuman & Baron, 1998; Weiner, 1995). In other words, people may respond differently to situations depending on where they attribute the cause of the negative situation. Research has shown that attributions and attributional styles are related to behavior in organizations. Specifically, aggressive participants exhibit a greater tendency to attribute hostile intent to others’ actions even when the “perpetrator’s” actions are ambiguous (Dodge & Coie, 1987; Nasby, Hayden, & DePaulo, 1980).
Given that incivility is characterized by an ambiguous intent to harm, individuals with differing attributional styles may respond differently to uncivil events. Moreover, individuals with the hostile attribution bias may experience an enhanced effect of the relationship between personality characteristics and perceptions of incivility.

*Hypothesis 9:* Hostile attribution bias will be positively related to incivility perceptions.

*Hypothesis 10:* Hostile attribution bias will moderate the relationships between personality traits and incivility perceptions. Specifically, relationships will be stronger for those with high hostile attribution bias.

**Equity sensitivity.** Equity sensitivity is a component of equity theory (Adams, 1963; Adams, 1965). Equity theory is a motivational theory that suggests that individuals compare the ratio of their efforts and rewards to the perceived ratios of referent others, and that people experience tension when these ratios are not equal (Adams, 1965). This tension is based on what has been defined as the “norm of equity” (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978; Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978), which was determined based on Adams’ (1963, 1965) postulating that all individuals are equally sensitive to equity and prefer that their ratios be equal to those of comparison others (Woodley & Allen, 2014). In order to reduce the tension produced by under-reward or over-reward, individuals may change their own effort, influence the efforts of referent others, or change the referent other they compare themselves to. Both laboratory and field studies have shown support for the norm of equity (e.g., Austin & Walster, 1974; Goodman, 1974); however, other empirical research has suggested that individual differences may play a part in the endorsement of the norm of equity (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1985). As a result, equity sensitivity was introduced as a way of differentiating how strongly individuals endorse the norm of equity. *Equity sensitivity* is a personality trait that is based on an individual’s preferred input-
to-outcome ratios. Huseman et al. (1987) defined three typologies of equity sensitivity. First, *benevolent* individuals are those who prefer giving more than they receive when compared to their referent others, and score higher on measures of equity sensitivity. Second, *equity sensitive* individuals adhere most closely to the norm of equity as described above, and score nearer to the mean on equity sensitivity measures. Finally, *entitled* individuals are those who prefer to receive more than they give in comparison to their referent others, and score low on equity sensitivity (Huseman et al., 1987).

Equity sensitivity was theorized by Huseman et al. (1987) to be helpful in improving our understanding of individuals’ behavior within organizations, and subsequent research has displayed that equity sensitivity affects pay satisfaction, as well as the performance of prosocial behaviors in a team environment (Akan, Allen, & White, 2009; Miles, Hatfield, & Huseman, 1989). Moreover, equity sensitivity has been found to moderate the relationship between perceptions of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs; Blakely, Andrews, & Moorman, 2005), and the relationship between self-efficacy and work attitudes (O’Neill & Mone, 1998). More recently, construct validation work on equity sensitivity revealed that equity sensitivity was negatively correlated with both Machiavellianism and psychopathy, and that it predicted unique variance in both, (it was uncorrelated with narcissism; Woodley & Allen, 2014). These previous research findings suggest that equity sensitivity is important in our understanding of work attitudes and behaviors, and that it may be an important individual difference variable in predisposing individuals to perceive incivility.

*Hypothesis 11:* Equity sensitivity will be positively related to incivility perceptions, such that *entitlement* will be positively related to incivility perceptions.
Hypothesis 12: Equity sensitivity will be negatively related to incivility perceptions, such that benevolence will be negatively related to incivility perceptions.

Hypothesis 13: Equity sensitivity will moderate relationships between personality traits and incivility perceptions. Specifically, relationships will be stronger for individuals high in entitlement.

Hypothesis 14: Equity sensitivity will moderate relationships between personality traits and incivility perceptions. Specifically, relationships will be weaker for individuals high in benevolence.

Exploratory Analyses

In addition to examining the relationships between personality characteristics and incivility perceptions, the current study also examined whether the source of incivility impacts the relationship between personality and incivility perceptions. Previous studies examining sources of incivility have found mixed results (e.g., Hershcovis & Barling 2010; Porath & Erez, 2007), suggesting that while incivility can stem from multiple sources, there is currently not a consensus on the differences in effects when sources of incivility vary (Schilpzand, De Pater, & Erez, 2016). Examining the processes of incivility by source will allow researchers and practitioners to provide more targeted research and intervention efforts.

Research Question 1: How does source (supervisor, coworker, customer) relate to perceptions of incivility?

Finally, this study used an open-ended question to examine how the traits of interest are related to outcomes of incivility. Studies utilizing vignettes can be limited by the hypothetical situations depicted within them, and the previous studies examining how personality traits are related to perceptions did not make a direct link between incivility perceptions and outcomes. In
an effort to establish the link between perceptions of incivility and potential outcomes, participants were given the opportunity to provide written responses describing how they would respond if they experienced the incivility vignettes. Qualitative analysis was employed to examine whether responses escalated or de-escalated (or neither) the situation depicted in each vignette when compared with the severity of the incivility depicted in the vignette.

*Research Question 2:* How do participants hypothetically respond to the incivility described in the vignettes?

**The Current Study**

The current study aimed to serve as a replication and extension of previous work examining the relationship between individual differences and perceptions of incivility by examining the Dark Triad in addition to each of the Big 5 personality variables. Moreover, the current study examined additional individual differences that are theoretically related to perceptions of uncivil behavior: hostile attribution bias and equity sensitivity. Because appraisal of incivility can be caused by a combination of perception, provocation, and actual experience, this study focused on the *perception* of uncivil behavior using a series of vignettes that describe behaviors that could potentially be perceived as uncivil. See Figure 1 for a visual depiction of the model.
METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Power analysis for a multiple regression was conducted in G*Power to determine a sufficient sample size using an alpha of 0.05, a power of 0.80, and a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.15$; Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). Based on the aforementioned assumptions, the minimum required sample size was 123. To ensure adequate power, the desired sample size was 300 participants. Participants were recruited using Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) service, which allows researchers to recruit individuals who meet certain criteria to participate in research studies. To ensure data quality, only U.S. participants with a 96% or higher approval rating (meaning the percentage of assignments submitted by a user that have been approved) and who had previously completed at least 500 tasks were allowed to participate; additionally, screening items for the study included being at least 18 years of age and being employed at least part-time (20 or more hours per week). Participants who met these criteria were provided an informed consent form and allowed to complete the survey. Participants were instructed to complete questionnaires on incivility, Big 5 and Dark Triad personality traits, hostile attribution bias, and equity sensitivity in exchange for reimbursement of one dollar and fifty cents. In order to control order effects, the scales were randomized within the survey.

Measures

See Appendix A for a full list of measures.

Incivility. Incivility was measured using the 22-item incivility vignette scale, developed to isolate perceptions of incivility (Sliter et al., 2015). This scale consists of three subscales that measure incivility perceptions from different sources: coworker, customer, and supervisor. Participants were asked to rate each vignette based on how rude they perceived each coworker,
customer, or supervisor to be. Perceptions of incivility were measured using a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = not at all rude, and 4 = extremely rude). An example vignette includes “you are sitting alone in the break room eating lunch. Another coworker walks in and sits with their back toward you.” Additionally, for the 10 customer vignette subscale items, participants were asked to describe in text how they would respond to the situation if it happened to them at work.

**Personality.** Each of the five-factor personality traits were measured using the Five Factor Personality Inventory from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; 50 items; Goldberg, 1999; Goldberg et al., 2006). Participants were asked to respond to the statements as they see themselves, and each item is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = very inaccurate, and 5 = very accurate).

**Dark Triad.** The Dark Triad was assessed using the 12-item Dirty Dozen measure of Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and narcissism (Jonason & Webster, 2010). An example item for Machiavellianism is “I tend to manipulate others to get my way.” This measure includes four items for each trait, measured on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = disagree strongly, and 5 = agree strongly).

**Hostile attribution bias.** Hostile attribution bias was assessed using the Hostile Attributional Style Short Form (Bal & O’Brien, 2010). Items ask about responses to social interactions at work; an example is “When coworkers leave me out of social events, it is to hurt my feelings.” Each item was rated on a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = disagree very much, and 6 = agree very much).

**Equity sensitivity.** Equity sensitivity was measured using two instruments. The first was the five-item Equity Sensitivity Instrument (King & Miles, 1994). Each item in the questionnaire contains one “benevolent” statement and one “entitled” statement. An example question is “It
would be more important for me to A) help others or B) Look out for my own good”.

Participants were asked to allocate 10 points between the two statements for every item. Scores for each dimension were determined by calculating the amount of points allocated to the appropriate dimension of each question and dividing by the number of questions. The second instrument was the 13-item Equity Sensitivity Questionnaire (Kain, 2008). This questionnaire contains 5 equity-sensitive items, 4 benevolent items, and 4 entitled items, and participants were asked to rate each item with how closely it resembles their attitude towards employment (1 = least, and 5 = most). An example equity sensitive item states that “workers who put in the same effort should be rewarded equally.”
RESULTS

A summary of descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations can be found in Tables 1 and 2. Based on the descriptive statistics included in Table 1, the observed scale ranges were all close to their possible ranges. Moreover, most reliability estimates were over .8 and no estimates were lower than .7, as suggested as a cut point (Nunnally, Berstein, & Berge, 1967). Based on the chosen MTurk requirements, data were collected from a sample of 302 respondents in total. Seven respondents were removed for incomplete data or missing two or more of three validation questions, resulting in a final sample of 295 respondents.

The sample was 41% female, with a mean age of 34.7 years ($SD = 9.5$). Approximately 80% of the sample was Caucasian, 7% was African American, 6% was Hispanic, and 7% was Asian. While respondents represented 20 unique job categories, the most common job categories represented within the data were sales and office occupations (14.2%), computer and mathematical occupations (11.8%), and healthcare support occupations (11.1%). Participants worked an average of 39.8 hours per week ($SD = 6.5$).

Hypothesis Testing

A summary of all results can be found in Table 3. I used hierarchical regression to test the main effect hypotheses, controlling for sex in the first step and adding predictors in the second step. Sex was statistically controlled for in all analyses, given prior research showing that sex is related to differences in perceptions of interpersonal constructs such as justice and sexual harassment (e.g., Parker, Baltes, & Christiansen, 2007; Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001), and as is common practice in previous incivility research (e.g., Cortina et al., 2001; Sliter et al., 2015). I first ran models where the trait of interest was used as the only predictor of incivility perceptions (Table 4). Second, to examine each personality trait within its group, I ran two
models where all measured traits from either the Big Five or the Dark Triad were included in the regression equation (Tables 5 and 6). Given that the vignette items assess different sources of incivility, results will be provided across all three sources of incivility in addition to the overall score; however, only overall perceptions of incivility were considered to be supportive of the hypotheses. Moderation analyses were conducted using hierarchical regression and run on mean-centered variables.

**Big Five variables and incivility perceptions.** Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3, that incivility perceptions would be negatively related to agreeableness, extraversion, and emotional stability, respectively, were not supported. Hypothesis 4, that incivility perceptions would be positively related to conscientiousness, was supported, $\beta = .18$, $t(289) = 2.31$, $p < .05$. Hypothesis 5 predicted that incivility perceptions will be negatively related to openness, and was not supported.

**Dark Triad variables and incivility perceptions.** Hypotheses 6 through 8 predicted that incivility perceptions would be negatively related to Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy, respectively. Hypothesis 7, that incivility would be negatively related to narcissism, was supported, $\beta = .20$, $t(291) = 2.74$, $p < .01$. The predicted relationships of incivility perceptions with Machiavellianism and psychopathy (Hypotheses 6 and 8) were not supported.

**Hostile attribution bias and incivility perceptions.** Hypothesis 9 predicted that hostile attribution bias would be positively related with incivility perceptions. Hypothesis 9 was supported, $\beta = .17$, $t(291) = 3.05$, $p < .01$. Hypothesis 10 predicted that hostile attribution bias would moderate the relationships between personality traits and incivility perceptions. Specifically, this hypothesis predicted that relationships would be stronger for those with high
hostile attribution bias. This hypothesis was partially supported, with hostile attribution bias only significantly moderating the relationship between extraversion and incivility perceptions, $\beta = -0.17, t(293) = -2.29, p < .05$. Simple slopes analyses demonstrated that the relationship was stronger for individuals high in hostile attribution bias. See Figure 2 for a depiction of this interaction as suggested by Aiken and colleagues (Aiken, West, & Reno, 1991).

**Equity sensitivity and incivility perceptions.** Hypothesis 11 predicted that entitled equity sensitivity would be positively related to incivility perceptions, such that entitled individuals would be more likely to perceive incivility regardless of personality traits. Conversely, Hypothesis 12 predicted that benevolent equity sensitivity would be negatively related to incivility perceptions, such that benevolent individuals will be less likely to perceive incivility regardless of personality traits. Hypotheses 11 and 12 were not supported.

Hypothesis 13 predicted that entitled equity sensitivity would moderate relationships between personality traits and incivility perceptions, such that relationships will be stronger for individuals high in entitlement. Hypothesis 13 was partially supported, with entitled equity sensitivity significantly moderating the relationship between openness and incivility perceptions when assessed with the King & Miles scale, $\beta = 0.15, t(293) = 2.45, p < .05$. Simple slopes analyses demonstrated that the relationship between openness and incivility perceptions was stronger for individuals high in entitlement. See Figure 3 for a depiction of this interaction.

Finally, Hypothesis 14 predicted that benevolent equity sensitivity would moderate relationships between personality traits and incivility perceptions, such that relationships will be weaker for individuals high in benevolence. This hypothesis was partially supported, with benevolent equity sensitivity significantly moderating the relationship between openness and incivility perceptions when assessed with both Equity Sensitivity scales (King & Miles: $\beta = -0.13$, etc.)
t(293) = -2.15, p < .05; Kain: β = -.21, t(293) = -3.38, p < .05). Simple slopes analyses demonstrated that relationships were weaker for individuals higher in benevolence. See Figures 4 and 5 for depictions of these interactions.

Research Questions

Research Question One asked how the source of incivility (customer, coworker, or supervisor) would relate to perceptions of incivility. Results showed several significant relationships between personality variables and the coworker and customer vignette subscales, but no other obvious patterns within the relationships. Extraversion, emotional stability, conscientiousness, narcissism, and hostile attribution bias significantly predicted incivility perceptions in the coworker vignette subscale (extraversion: β = .21, t(289) = 3.0, p < .01; emotional stability: β = .19, t(289) = 2.25, p < .05; conscientiousness: β = .20, t(289) = 2.60, p < .05; narcissism: β = .17, t(291) = 2.30, p < .05; hostile attribution bias: β = .15, t(293) = 2.5, p < .05). Additionally, emotional stability, conscientiousness, narcissism, and hostile attribution bias significantly predicted incivility perceptions in the customer vignette subscale (emotional stability: β = .19, t(289) = 2.33, p < .05; conscientiousness: β = .20, t(289) = 2.59, p < .05; narcissism: β = .23, t(291) = 3.22, p < .01; hostile attribution bias: β = .21, t(293) = 3.67, p < .01).

Research Question Two asked how participants would hypothetically respond to the incivility described in the vignettes. Qualitative analyses included comparison of each written response to the corresponding uncivil vignette. Two raters independently used a categorical rating scale (0 = no response, 1 = de-escalated, 2 = neutral, 3 = escalated) to compare participants’ text responses with the severity of the incivility depicted in the vignette. Cohen’s κ was calculated to determine if there was inter-rater agreement. There was high agreement
between the two raters’ judgments ($\kappa = .98, p < .001$). Reported findings are based off of the author’s ratings.

Across the 10 vignette items, participants’ responses were overwhelmingly neutral: 73% of responses were coded as neutral, whereas 13% were coded as de-escalating the situation, and 13% were coded as escalating the situation. While at the item level all 10 items were mostly rated as neutral, some items were regarded more neutrally than others. For instance, 84% of responses to item three (You are sitting alone in the break room eating lunch. Another coworker walks in and sits with their back toward you) were neutral, and only 5% of responses were escalating. On the other hand, 25% of participants were rated as escalating the situation for item five (There is a coffeemaker on the counter in the break room. You and your coworker are standing at the counter, discussing a project they are working on. While there is enough coffee left for both of you to have some, your coworker takes the last of the coffee, pouring it into his oversized mug, and leaves the break room). The item with the highest percentage of de-escalation ratings was item 6 (You are working in your office and two of your coworkers meet each other in the hallway and begin talking and laughing. They continue to talk and laugh for about twenty minutes right outside your door), with 36% of respondents de-escalating. For a full summary of qualitative items and response ratios, see Table 7.
DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The first purpose of this study was to replicate and extend the examination of personality facets as predictors of incivility perceptions, as originally conducted by Sliter et al. (2015). Results demonstrated that several personality traits related in the predicted direction with perceptions of incivility. Out of the Big Five variables, conscientiousness was significantly related to the perception of incivility. This finding is consistent with previous findings that conscientiousness is related positively to the appraisal of stressors, such that people with high levels of conscientiousness may hold higher standards for social interactions (e.g., Gartland, O’Connor, & Lawton, 2012). Results did not replicate the original Sliter et al. (2015) study in several ways: the original study demonstrated that emotional stability and openness related negatively with perceptions of incivility, and did not find a significant relationship between conscientiousness and incivility perceptions. However, whereas the previous study utilized a student sample that did not require participants to be employed, the current study used a sample that was required to be employed at least part-time. Given the difference in samples, it is possible that the situations described within the vignettes were not strong enough to elicit significant results from a working population.

Out of the additional variables tested, both narcissism and hostile attribution bias were also positively related to the perception of incivility. The finding concerning narcissism is consistent with the DSM description of narcissism, which suggests that the narcissists’ inflated sense of self-worth may cause them to feel distress when they are not treated in line with their high expectations (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Moreover, the significant relationship between hostile attribution bias and incivility perceptions supports the idea that these
individuals may have a greater tendency to attribute hostile intent to others’ actions even when those actions are ambiguous (e.g., Dodge and Coie, 1987; Nasby, Hayden & DePaulo, 1980).

The second purpose of this study was to examine possible moderators of the personality – incivility perception relationship. Study results provided limited support for the hypothesized moderating relationships, as the majority of the tested moderator relationships were not supported. Hostile attribution bias and equity sensitivity were partially supported as moderators of the personality-perception relationship: Hostile attribution bias significantly moderated the relationship between extraversion and incivility perceptions such that the relationship was stronger for individuals high in this bias; entitled equity sensitivity moderated the relationship between openness and incivility perceptions such that relationships were stronger for individuals high in entitlement; and benevolent equity sensitivity moderated the relationship between openness and incivility perceptions, such that relationships were weaker for individuals higher in benevolence (see Figures 2-5 for depictions of these interactions). These moderator analyses provide limited support for the utility of benevolent and entitled equity sensitivity and hostile attribution bias as individual difference factors that can impact the relationship between personality variables and perceptions. These moderators should be interpreted with caution, given the small difference between slopes in the interaction graphs, and the small variance accounted for by these findings. While these findings have a small effect size, future research could provide a secondary test of hostile attribution bias and equity sensitivity as moderators within the relationships between personality and incivility perceptions.

Finally, this study explored two research questions. The first asked how the source of incivility (customer, coworker, or supervisor) relates to perceptions of incivility. Results showed several significant relationships between personality variables and the coworker and customer
vignette subscales, suggesting that incivility perceptions were uninfluenced by the interactions depicted in the supervisor vignettes. This finding is at odds with Sliter et al.’s (2015) finding that regardless of personality, individuals were more likely to perceive incivility from supervisors above coworkers and customers. As previously mentioned, this discrepancy may be due to samples; whereas the previous study utilized a student sample that did not require participants to be employed, the current study used an Mturk sample that was required to be employed at least part-time. It is possible that there was a difference in supervisory relationships between the school-age students surveyed previously and the workers surveyed for the current study. This result does not help clarify the mixed findings of multiple previous studies examining incivility source (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Porath & Erez, 2007), and future research must continue to search for consensus on the differences in effects when sources of incivility vary (Schilpzand, De Pater, & Erez, 2016).

The second research question examined participants’ qualitative responses to the vignette items, which were largely neutral or de-escalating in nature, suggesting that these ambiguous vignette items were low-level enough that participants were unlikely to escalate the situation or otherwise provoke the incivility spiral. To further examine the qualitative data, I performed a post-hoc analysis to calculate mean levels of each personality characteristic across the ten vignette items (See Tables 8A and 8B for a summary). Visual inspection of the post-hoc analyses demonstrated several possible patterns. For example, the mean level of agreeableness seems to be consistently lower for those who choose to escalate. In turn, the mean levels of extraversion, conscientiousness, and narcissism tend to be consistently higher for those who choose to escalate. However, mean differences in level of personality traits were generally small when
compared across response levels, echoing the sparse findings between personality level and incivility perceptions.

**Theoretical Implications**

The results from the current study extend the existing incivility literature in several ways. First, results provide some support for the extension of Andersson and Pearson’s (1999) model of incivility, as originally suggested by Sliter et al. (2015). As the current study demonstrated, in some cases the process of labeling behavior as uncivil involves an initial perception of incivility, which is an addition to the original model’s assertion that the process begins with the decision that interactional justice has been violated. Because this process is more complicated than their initial model suggests, stable individual differences may be an important addition to Andersson and Pearson’s model in that they impact how behaviors are initially labeled as civil or uncivil.

Findings also provide support for Bowling and Jex’s (2013) assertion that perception is one process through which personality can impact the stress process at work, in which certain personality traits affect a person’s appraisal of their work environment. While some previous research has shown that personality traits are related to self-reports of stressors (e.g., Bowling, Eschleman, & Wang, 2010; Chen & Spector, 1991), these data are likely to be a blend of both perceptions and experienced stressors. Because the current study isolated incivility perceptions from the experience of incivility, these findings add support to Sliter et al.’s (2015) claim that personality might impact whether a person appraises incivility in the first place; they also support the idea that personality impacts the appraisal of stress, as postulated by Bowling and Jex (2013). These findings suggest that personality should be included as an antecedent of primary appraisal in an expansion of the transactional model of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).
Finally, in light of the current findings, additional personality traits should potentially be taken into account when incivility is measured. Given the significant direct effects between conscientiousness, narcissism, and hostile attribution bias and incivility perceptions, these traits can impact how interpersonal encounters may be perceived as incivility. Given that these traits may impact how study participants perceive incivility, previous incivility studies that did not control for these variables may not accurately estimate the relationship between incivility and other variables.

**Practical Implications**

With subsequent replication and support in field studies, current findings could prove useful to organizations hoping to decrease incivility. Incivility is notoriously difficult to control in the workplace because of its low intensity and because targets of incivility do not often make formal complaints. Incivility is also a somewhat inevitable aspect of the work environment, because people in many organizations will work with other employees who differ in their values, personalities, and standards for acceptable social interactions (e.g., Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). A body of incivility research suggests organizations can craft interventions with the goal of reducing instances of incivility (e.g., Leiter, Day, Oore, & Spence Laschinger, 2012) and thus, the negative outcomes associated with those instances. Because the current study adds to this body of research by identifying personality factors may predispose one to perceive incivility, civility interventions could additionally help employees understand their predispositions in ambiguous situations, decreasing negative outcomes associated with incivility. Additionally, these interventions could include sensitivity training to discuss how employees can navigate differences in perceptions within the workplace. Finally, examination of the qualitative responses gathered in this study revealed that the majority of participants would respond neutrally to the
vignette situation if they experienced it in real-life. If incivility interventions focused on de-escalation tactics, workers may be better prepared to de-escalate uncivil encounters should they arise.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The current study had several limitations that may have affected its results. First, as always, the use of self-reports raises potential concerns about common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Measures were taken to attempt to reduce any common method variance by controlling for gender and including instructions that stressed the anonymity of participants’ responses. Additionally, while both measures of equity sensitivity had acceptable internal consistencies, it may be the case that equity sensitivity needed to be assessed with an improved instrument. The current study measured equity sensitivity with two different instruments, neither of which have been re-validated or widely utilized in research since their development. It is possible that in order to better understand the construct of equity sensitivity, we need to first develop updated measures of it.

Second, the observed effect sizes in this study were relatively small. However, using the vignette measure sought to disentangle the perception of incivility from participants’ experiences of incivility, whereas a typical rating on a self-report incivility scale might be a combination of one’s experience and perception, where actual experiences of incivility are combined with perceptions of incivility. Thus, it follows that we may find smaller effect sizes when examining perception alone than when we measure participants’ combined perceptions and experiences.

A third limitation is that the current study utilized a cross-sectional design, preventing a more in-depth understanding of possible cause-and-effect relationships between personality and incivility perceptions. Moreover, the use of vignettes in the current study has specific limitations,
many of which overlap with situational judgment tests (SJT). As with SJTs, participants may respond differently to the vignette than they would in a true work environment (research has demonstrated that people are poor judges of their own perceptions and actions; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1972). A participant might rate a vignette as “not rude,” whereas they may perceive the same situation as rude in a realistic situation.

There are a number of future research directions suggested by the current study. First, future research should continue to examine how personality can affect individual perceptions of ambiguous constructs like incivility. Given that the current study did not replicate many findings from the original study on this topic, additional replication studies using working samples will help to clarify the true relationship between these constructs as well as their theoretical implications. The qualitative component of this study could also be replicated, as there were only small differences in level of personality traits across response levels, echoing the lack of findings between personality level and incivility perceptions. If future studies find consistent relationships between personality and incivility perceptions, there may in turn be more robust qualitative findings. Secondly, the vignette methodology from the current study could be used to examine perceptions of more severe forms of mistreatment such as supervisor abuse or undermining. Future research could additionally focus on the separation of the perception and experience of incivility within a lab study. For example, researchers could compare participants’ reactions to hypothetical uncivil situations with their reactions to simulated uncivil encounters within a lab setting. Finally, future research should examine personality variables as antecedents of incivility and subsequent strain outcomes. As suggested by Sliter et al. (2015), a model in which incivility perceptions mediate the relationship between personality and strain outcomes could be tested.
Conclusion

Workplace incivility is supported by a large body of research suggesting that despite its low-level qualities, the construct can have serious and long-term effects on important organizational and individual outcomes (Cortina et al., 2001; Pearson & Porath, 2009). While incivility has been widely examined, few studies have focused on the processes by which people decide what is and what is not incivility. Results from the current study provide partial support for the relationship between personality traits and incivility perceptions, suggesting that conscientiousness, narcissism, and hostile attribution bias are positively related to the perception of incivility. However, the study only partially replicated previous research examining these relationships. Also, despite incivility perceptions, qualitative responses showed that participants were unlikely to escalate the situation or otherwise provoke the incivility spiral. Future research should continue to examine the incivility perception process as well as the separation of the perception and experience of incivility. Better understanding of the process of perceiving incivility will help researchers and organizations design more effective measures and interventions to reduce incivility in the workplace and improve organizational and individual outcomes.
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## Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Observed Range</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incivility Vignette</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>1 – 3.9</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>1 – 3.7</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dark Triad</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Five</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1 – 4.9</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>2 – 5</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1.8 – 5</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1.3 – 5</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity Sensitivity (Kain)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Sensitive</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES: Benevolent</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>0 – 50</td>
<td>0 – 42</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES: Entitled</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>0 – 50</td>
<td>8 – 50</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Attribution Bias</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
<td>1 – 5.14</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1 – 4.1</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Intercorrelations among Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</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>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Equity Sensitivity</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Benevolent</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Entitled</td>
<td>-.97**</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equity Sensitivity (Kain) - Sensitive</td>
<td>.02</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equity Sensitivity (Kain) - Benevolent</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.42**</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equity Sensitivity (Kain) - Entitled</td>
<td>-03</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Equity Sensitivity (Kain) - Entitled</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.09</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Coworker Incivility Vignette</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Customer Incivility Vignette</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.64**</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supervisor Incivility Vignette</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.66**</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>9. HAB</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.12*</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>10. Negative Affect</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Positive Affect</td>
<td>1.9**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Extraversion</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Openness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Agreeable</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Conscientious</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Machiavellian</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Psychopathy</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Narcissism</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **: Correlation is significant at p < .01 (2-tailed). *: Correlation is significant at p < .05 (2-tailed). N = 296.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Agreeableness will be negatively related to the perception of incivility</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Extraversion will be negatively related to the perception of incivility</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Emotional stability will be negatively related to the perception of incivility</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Conscientiousness will be positively related to the perception of incivility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Openness will be negatively related to the perception of incivility</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Machiavellianism will be positively related to the perception of incivility</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Narcissism will be positively related to the perception of incivility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Psychopathy will be positively related to the perception of incivility</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Hostile attribution bias will be positively related to incivility perceptions</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10  Hostile attribution bias will moderate the relationships between personality traits and incivility perceptions. Specifically, relationships will be stronger for those with high hostile attribution bias</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11  Equity sensitivity will be positively related to incivility perceptions, such that entitlement will be positively related to incivility perceptions</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  Equity sensitivity will be negatively related to incivility perceptions, such that benevolence will be negatively related to incivility perceptions</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13  Equity sensitivity will moderate relationships between personality traits and incivility perceptions. Specifically, relationships will be stronger for individuals high in entitlement</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  Equity sensitivity will moderate relationships between personality traits and incivility perceptions. Specifically, relationships will be weaker for individuals high in benevolence</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Independent Effects of Personality Variables on Perceptions of Incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Customer b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Coworker b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Supervisor b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissim</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 295. Unstandardized beta is provided with standard error. Sex was partialled out in all analyses.
Table 5. Effects of Big Five Personality Variables on Perceptions of Incivility in Combined Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Customer</th>
<th>Coworker</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 295. Unstandardized beta is provided with standard error. $R^2$ represents variance explained after controlling for sex.
Table 6. Effects of Dark Triad Personality Variables on Perceptions of Incivility in Combined Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Customer</th>
<th>Coworker</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 295. Unstandardized beta is provided with standard error. $R^2$ represents variance explained after controlling for sex.*
### Table 7. Qualitative Rating Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Text</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You have been sick and missed a week of work. Today is the first day you are back at work and you realize that you aren’t up to date on some tasks so you ask a coworker for help in catching up. Your coworker says they are too busy, yet their work calendar is relatively blank. (Responses: 284)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“Speak politely to them to try to resolve the issue.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>“Politely say ok and try to catch up as best as I could.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>“…have a sarcastic remark and never speak to the person again.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You and a coworker are waiting at the printer for some documents. When your coworker’s document is finished, you notice that the paper tray is empty. She takes her documents but does not refill the paper tray. (Responses: 284)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“Ask, ‘Can you refill the paper please?’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>“I would just fill the tray and move on with life.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>“I will tell her to leave things how she found them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You are sitting alone in the break room eating lunch. Another coworker walks in and sits with their back toward you. (Responses: 282)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“I would say hello.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>“I would continue eating my lunch.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“I will…stay away from this rude person.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is your birthday and a coworker brought cake and ice cream for everyone to share. When people start to gather to celebrate, one member of the staff stays in her office and closes the door. (Responses: 284)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“I'd check on the coworker to see if they’re alright.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>“I would enjoy my cake and socializing with the coworkers that wanted to party.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Don't celebrate her birthday.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is a coffeemaker on the counter in the break room. You and your coworker are standing at the counter, discussing a project they are working on. While there is enough coffee left for both of you to have some, your coworker takes the last of the coffee, pouring it into his oversized mug, and leaves the break room. (Responses: 284)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“No biggie - life goes on.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>“I would make more coffee if I wanted it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>“I’d ask if his hands were broken.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You are working in your office and two of your coworkers meet each other in the hallway and begin talking and laughing. They continue to talk and laugh for about twenty minutes right outside your door. (Responses: 283)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>“I would step outside and ask them to please take their conversation elsewhere, as I'm trying to work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>“Maybe close the door if it is distracting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“Tell them to shut up.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You are in the middle of a meeting and your coworker decides to start text messaging. (Responses: 283)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>“Speak politely to them to try to resolve the issue.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>“I would try to ignore the behavior.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>“Give him a 'look' until he acknowledged that what he was doing was rude. Then move on.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. You tell coworker they did well on a project and their response is “I know.” (Responses: 282)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>“I tell them to keep up the good work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>“Ignore it and move on.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>“I would ask why she is so concieted [sic].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. As you head down the hallway to a meeting, your coworker is walking in front of you to the same meeting. They turn their head, see you behind them, and then continue walking at the same pace. (Responses: 282)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“I would say hello.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>“Wouldn't think much of it and go to the meeting”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“I will try to ask them what the problem is.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You walk to the break room to take a lunch break and find out that the other three members of your team decided to go out to lunch without inviting you. (Responses: 282)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“I'd ask why I wasn't included.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>“I would let it go and forgive.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>“Not confront them but make it clear you noticed.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Rating values: 1 = de-escalate; 2 = neutral; 3 = escalate.
Table 8A. Qualitative Post-Hoc Analyses (Items 1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Mean levels of each personality variable are reported. Responses were coded as follows: 1: de-escalate; 2: neutral; 3: escalate*
Table 8B. Qualitative Post-Hoc Analyses (Items 6-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Item 6</th>
<th>Item 7</th>
<th>Item 8</th>
<th>Item 9</th>
<th>Item 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean levels of each personality variable are reported. Responses were coded as follows: 1: de-escalate; 2: neutral; 3: escalate.
APPENDIX B: FIGURES

Figure 1: Model Summary

**Personality Characteristics:**
- Openness
- Conscientiousness
- Extraversion
- Agreeableness
- Neuroticism
- Machiavellianism
- Narcissism
- Psychopathy

**Individual Differences:**
- Hostile Attribution Bias
- Equity Sensitivity

**Incivility Perceptions**
Figure 2. Interaction Between Extraversion and Hostile Attribution Bias

![Graph showing the interaction between Extraversion and Hostile Attribution Bias. The y-axis represents Incivility Perceptions ranging from 1 to 5. The x-axis represents Extraversion levels, with Low and High Extraversion points. The graph compares Low HAB and High HAB conditions, with lines indicating a trend in Incivility Perceptions across Extraversion levels.]
Figure 3. Interaction Between Openness and Entitled Equity Sensitivity (King & Miles)
Figure 4. Interaction Between Openness and Benevolent Equity Sensitivity (King & Miles)
Figure 5. Interaction Between Openness and Benevolent Equity Sensitivity (Kain)
APPENDIX C: MEASURES

Incivility Vignettes (22 items)
From Sliter et al., 2015
Instructions: How rude was the coworker/customer/supervisor?

Response options: 1 = not at all rude; 4 = extremely rude

Coworker:
1. You have been sick and missed a week of work. Today is the first day you are back at work and you realize that you aren’t up to date on some tasks so you ask a coworker for help in catching up. Your coworker says they are too busy, yet their work calendar is relatively blank.
2. You and a coworker are waiting at the printer for some documents. When your coworker's document is finished, you notice that the paper tray is empty. She takes her documents but does not refill the paper tray.
3. You are sitting alone in the break room eating lunch. Another coworker walks in and sits with their back toward you.
4. It is your birthday and a coworker brought cake and ice cream for everyone to share. When people start to gather to celebrate, one member of the staff stays in her office and closes the door.
5. There is a coffeemaker on the counter in the break room. You and your coworker are standing at the counter, discussing a project they are working on. While there is enough coffee left for both of you to have some, your coworker takes the last of the coffee, pouring it into his oversized mug, and leaves the break room.
6. You are working in your office and two of your coworkers meet each other in the hallway and begin talking and laughing. They continue to talk and laugh for about twenty minutes right outside your door.
7. You are in the middle of a meeting and your coworker decides to start text messaging.
8. You tell coworker they did well on a project and their response is “I know.”
9. As you head down the hallway to a meeting, your coworker is walking in front of you to the same meeting. They turn their head, see you behind them, and then continue walking at the same pace.
10. You walk to the break room to take a lunch break and find out that the other three members of your team decided to go out to lunch without inviting you

Customer:
1. You and a customer are talking about your personal lives. As the customer finishes talking about his life, he turns around to leave when you start to talk about yours.
2. You are talking with a coworker when a customer walks up to you, interrupts your conversation, and asks you where the customer service desk is. You tell her and she quickly turns and walks away.
3. You are working to resolve an issue that a customer is having. The customer keeps sighing audibly as you talk with your manager.
4. You spend extra time outside of work to order a rare item for a customer, when it comes in the customer takes it without saying thank you.
5. A customer approaches you and asks you if you have any more of a particular item in stock. When you tell him no, he asks to speak to your manager.

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

_Supervisor:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Responses are combined across vignettes to develop an incivility perception score. Means of the three subscales can be averaged to account for the additional coworker incivility items.
Personality (50 items)
From the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) (Goldberg et al., 2006)
Instructions: On the following pages, there are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then choose the option that corresponds to the number on the scale.

Response Options: 1: Very Inaccurate, 2: Moderately Inaccurate, 3: Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate, 4: Moderately Accurate, 5: Very Accurate

Neuroticism
1. *Often feel blue.
2. *Dislike myself.
3. *Am often down in the dumps.
4. *Have frequent mood swings.
5. *Panic easily.
6. Rarely get irritated.
7. Seldom feel blue.
8. Feel comfortable with myself.
10. Am very pleased with myself.

Extraversion
11. *Feel comfortable around people.
14. *Am the life of the party.
15. *Know how to captivate people
16. Have little to say.
17. Keep in the background.
18. Would describe my experiences as somewhat dull.
19. Don't like to draw attention to myself.
20. Don't talk a lot.

Openness
21. *Believe in the importance of art.
22. *Have a vivid imagination.
23. *Tend to vote for liberal political candidates.
24. *Carry the conversation to a higher level.
26. Am not interested in abstract ideas.
27. Do not like art.
28. Avoid philosophical discussions.
29. Do not enjoy going to art museums.
30. Tend to vote for conservative political candidates.

Agreeableness
31. *Have a good word for everyone.
32. *Believe that others have good intentions.
33. *Respect others.
34. *Accept people as they are.
35. *Make people feel at ease.
36. Have a sharp tongue.
37. Cut others to pieces.
38. Suspect hidden motives in others.
39. Get back at others.
40. Insult people.

**Conscientiousness**
41. *Am always prepared.
42. *Pay attention to details.
43. *Get chores done right away.
44. *Carry out my plans.
45. *Make plans and stick to them.
46. Waste my time.
47. Find it difficult to get down to work.
48. Do just enough work to get by.
49. Don't see things through.
50. Shirk my duties.

*Positively keyed items

**Scoring Instructions:**
1. For + keyed items, the response "Very Inaccurate" is assigned a value of 1, "Moderately Inaccurate" a value of 2, "Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate" a 3, "Moderately Accurate" a 4, and "Very Accurate" a value of 5.
2. For - keyed items, the response "Very Inaccurate" is assigned a value of 5, "Moderately Inaccurate" a value of 4, "Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate" a 3, "Moderately Accurate" a 2, and "Very Accurate" a value of 1.
3. Once numbers are assigned for all of the items in the scale, just sum all the values to obtain a total scale score.
**The Dark Triad (12 items)**

**From The Dirty Dozen (Jonasen & Webster, 2010)**

Instructions: On the following pages, there are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then choose the option that corresponds to the number on the scale.

Response options: 1 (disagree strongly) – 9 (agree strongly)

**Machiavellianism:**
1. I tend to manipulate others to get my way.
2. I have used deceit or lied to get my way.
3. I have use flattery to get my way.
4. I tend to exploit others towards my own end.

**Psychopathy:**
5. I tend to lack remorse.
6. I tend to be unconcerned with the morality of my actions.
7. I tend to be callous or insensitive.
8. I tend to be cynical.

**Narcissism:**
9. I tend to want others to admire me.
10. I tend to want others to pay attention to me.
11. I tend to seek prestige or status.
12. I tend to expect special favors from others.
Hostile Attribution Bias (7 Items):
Instructions: Please consider how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.
Response options: 1 (disagree very much) – 6 (agree very much)

1. When coworkers leave me out of social events, it is to hurt my feelings
2. If coworkers do not appreciate me enough, it is because they are self-centered
3. If coworkers work slowly on a task I assigned them, it is because they do not like me
4. If people are laughing at work, I think they are laughing at me
5. If coworkers ignore me, it is because they are being rude
6. Coworkers deliberately make my job more difficult
7. When my things are missing, they have probably been stolen
Equity Sensitivity (5 items)
From King & Miles, 1994
Instructions: The questions below ask what you would for your relationships to be with any organization for which you might work. On each question, divide 10 points between the two choices (choice A and choice B) by giving the most points to the choice that is most like you and the fewest points to the choice that is the least like you. For example, you could give the same amount of points to each choice (e.g., 5 points to choice A and 5 points to choice B). Make sure to allocate all 10 points per question between each pair of possible responses.

In any organization I work for:
1) It would be more important for me to:
   _____ A. Get from the organization
   _____ B. Give to the organization

2) It would be more important for me to:
   _____ A. Help others
   _____ B. Watch out for my own good

3) I would be more concerned about:
   _____ A. What I received from the organization
   _____ B. What I contributed to the organization

4) The hard work I do should:
   _____ A. Benefit the organization
   _____ B. Benefit me

5) My personal philosophy in dealing with the organization would be:
   _____ A. If I don’t look out for myself, nobody else will
   _____ B. It's better for me to give than to receive
Equity Sensitivity Questionnaire (13 items)
Kain (2008)
Instructions: Please respond to these items consistent with your attitude towards work/employment. Choose the answer most consistent with your view.

Response options: 1 (Least) - 5 (Most)

Equity Sensitive:
1. Workers who put in the same effort should be rewarded equally
2. My efforts and rewards should be equal to my co-workers
3. People who receive the same rewards as I do should work equally as hard
4. When I exert the same effort as other workers, I should be rewarded equally
5. I should work equally as hard as people who receive the same rewards as I do

Benevolent:
6. I don’t mind putting lots of effort towards company goals even when I receive a smaller reward than I deserve
7. As long as it is in the best interest of the company and my co-workers, I can tolerate receiving low rewards
8. I don’t mind being rewarded the smallest for my efforts as long as I have helped my co-workers
9. I can tolerate receiving a small reward for my effort as long as it is in the best interest of the company

Entitled:
10. It does not bother me when I am over-rewarded for my effort compared to my co-workers
11. I don’t mind receiving a large reward for a small amount of effort
12. I don’t mind receiving more than I give to the company
13. I don’t mind receiving a large reward even when I do not deserve it
APPENDIX D: CONSENT LETTER

Informed Consent

The purpose of this study is to improve our understanding of how individuals identify interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. Interpersonal mistreatment is any mistreatment that occurs between individuals in the workplace who know each other or work together. This study is being conducted by Alison Bayne, a graduate student in the psychology department at Bowling Green State University.

Understanding how people identify interpersonal mistreatment will help organizations take steps to ease the negative effects of mistreatment on individuals. In short, while you will not receive any direct benefits for participating in this research, you will be helping to increase our understanding of how people in the workplace interact with each other, which is beneficial to society in general. The risks associated with participating in this study are no greater than those encountered in daily life. You will be asked to complete a short survey consisting of a few short questionnaires. **It should take less than 15 minutes to answer the questions, and you will be paid $1.50 for your participation through Amazon's Mechanical Turk service.** **WARNING:** The researchers will carefully review every line of the data and participants who are found to have carelessly responded will not be paid (i.e., marking all of the same response; responding in ways that are noticeably contradictory).

You must be 18 years old and be employed at least part-time to participate in this study. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you are free to withdraw at any time. Deciding to participate or not will not affect any relationship you may have with Bowling Green State University. You may also freely decline to respond to any questions without loss of credit. Declining to respond to particular questions will not be penalized.

To protect your anonymity, your data will be stored on password-protected laptops of the researchers involved in the project. In addition, your anonymity will be protected through the MTurk system, which does not allow us to contact you directly. For your security, after you finish making and submitting your choices, please clear your browser history and page cache, and do not leave the survey open if using a public computer or a computer others may have access to; in addition, you may want to complete the survey on a personal (non-public) computer.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this study or your participation in it, you may contact the principal investigator, Alison Bayne, at abayne@bgsu.edu or (419) 372-4404, or her advisor, Dr. Steve Jex, at sjex@bgsu.edu or (407) 823-3912. If you have any questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may also contact the Chair, Institutional Review Board at 419-372-7716 or orc@bgsu.edu.

By clicking "next," you are consenting to participate in this study.