Article:
Niven, K, Connolly, C, Stride, CB et al. (1 more author) (2022) Daily Effects of Face-to-face and Cyber Incivility via Sadness, Anger and Fear. Work and Stress, 36 (2). pp. 147-163. ISSN 0267-8373

https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2021.1976882

Daily Effects of Face-to-face and Cyber Incivility via Sadness, Anger and Fear

Many workers are subjected to incidents of rudeness and ignorance at work. Emerging evidence suggests that exposure to such incivility has an immediate impact on people's well-being and commitment. In this article we contribute to this nascent area of enquiry by investigating the role of discrete emotions in explaining how exposure to incivility translates into detrimental daily consequences, and by examining whether the role of emotions varies depending on whether incivilities occur during face-to-face versus online interactions. In a diary study of 69 workers, we find that face-to-face incivility has a pronounced daily impact on workers' exhaustion and turnover intention, and that this impact is mediated by increased feelings of sadness and anger, but not fear. In contrast, cyber incivility only affects workers' emotional exhaustion as a result of increases in sadness. Our findings provide insight into the mechanisms of daily effects of workplace incivility and the divergent daily effects of face-to-face versus cyber incivility.

Keywords. Incivility, cyber incivility, discrete emotions, anger, sadness, fear

As much as 96% of the workforce is estimated to have been directly exposed to workplace incivility (Porath & Pearson, 2010), that is, low intensity deviant interpersonal behaviors, such as putting someone down and ignoring someone, that are typically at least somewhat ambiguous in terms of intent to harm (Cortina et al., 2001). Not only is incivility highly prevalent within the workplace, but it also has substantial detrimental consequences for those who are exposed to it. For example, an emerging body of evidence demonstrates the deleterious effects of incivility on employees' daily well-being and commitment to their organizations (e.g., Zhou et al., 2015), which over time can lead to behavioral issues, including enactment of counterproductive work behaviors, such as retaliation or withdrawal in the form of absence or organizational exit (e.g., Pearson et al., 2000). Although research is clear that exposure to incivility is harmful for workers, less is known about *why* it translates into poorer daily outcomes. That is, why does exposure to acts of mild rudeness that may not even be intentionally uncivil lead to people feeling emotionally exhausted and thinking about leaving their jobs by the end of the workday? This question is important, because the pathways through which incivility transmits its daily effects may extend to explaining the longer-term impact of incivility and thereby suggest promising avenues for intervention.

Incivility does not only occur when we interact with others face-to-face within organizations. It can also occur during technology-mediated interactions, a phenomenon referred to as 'cyber incivility'. The burgeoning literature on this topic suggests that cyber incivility also has substantial daily negative effects on people (e.g., Yuan et al., 2020), and the prevalence of cyber incivility might be expected to grow, as employees are increasingly using technology to communicate with their colleagues, particularly since the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic (Brynjolfsson et al., 2020). Research on cyber mistreatment emphasizes how the online environment changes how people communicate and how others interpret their communications (Farley et al., 2016). Yet we know surprisingly little about the relative

effects of face-to-face and cyber incivility, and whether they stimulate daily effects via the same pathways.

In this article, we focus on emotion as the key pathway through which incivility transmits effects on daily emotional exhaustion and the intention to quit one's job. Specifically, we explore three discrete emotions: sadness, anger and fear. According to affective events theory, emotions are feeling states experienced in relation to workplace events that shape job-related well-being and attitudes (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Prior studies have identified incivility as a salient workplace event that elicits intense emotional responses (e.g., Bunk & Magley, 2013), but research on the potential mechanistic role of emotion in explaining the effects of incivility is underdeveloped. We present a diary study that seeks to advance this area of research, in which we assessed workers' daily experiences of incivility, emotion, and the outcomes of interest, over a month-long period.

Our study contributes a more comprehensive and robust understanding of why incivility has negative daily effects on well-being and commitment. While previous studies have linked incivility to emotion, they have either studied single emotions (e.g., Lim et al., 2018) or relied on retrospective study designs (e.g., Porath & Pearson, 2012). By studying three discrete emotions, and examining their effects simultaneously, we can provide a clearer picture of which emotions determine the daily effects of incivility. This is important because emotions are prompted by distinctive patterns of appraisals of the events in one's work environment (Lazarus & Lazarus, 1994), meaning that not all negative emotions may be of equal salience. Moreover, by using a daily diary study design, our research aligns with conceptualizations of incivility as a daily hassle (Sliter et al., 2010). As Gabriel et al. (2019) argue, questions about connections between events (e.g., incivility) and states (e.g., emotion, feelings of exhaustion) are intraindividual in nature, meaning that between-persons designs, such as one-off surveys, involve misalignment between theory and operationalization. Diary designs further avoid

issues of retrospective recall in which people may struggle to accurately remember specific instances or their recollections may become biased.

We further contribute by expanding the current understanding of the daily effects of incivility in contrasting face-to-face and cyber incivility. With many companies planning to introduce permanent home-based working in the near future (Shearmur, 2020), the salience of cyber incivility is set to increase over the coming years. Yet the literatures on face-to-face and cyber incivility have developed quite separately. For example, few studies have compared the effects of both types of incivility, and while there is some early indication that emotions may be relevant to understanding how face-to-face incivility impacts people, emotions have only been studied as antecedents rather than consequences of cyber mistreatment, to our knowledge (e.g., Vranjes et al., 2018). As a result, Cortina and colleagues (2017) suggest that it is critical to build knowledge on how experiences and effects of incivility differ in the online domain, in order to understand whether assumptions about uncivil in-person interactions are equally relevant in the cyber context. We address their call, by examining whether the role of emotions as an explanatory mechanism in the relationship between incivility and outcomes is comparable for face-to-face and cyber incivility. Developing this understanding will in turn assist organizations as they look for ways to counteract the impact of face-to-face and cyber incivility.

Effects of Incivility

It has been well-established that persistent exposure to uncivil acts at work over time can lead to detriments for employees. For instance, in Cortina and colleagues' (2001) seminal study, exposure to incivility over the past five years was associated with psychological distress, job dissatisfaction, and job withdrawal. However, incivility researchers have increasingly signalled the importance of understanding the day-to-day effects that exposure to incivility can exert on employees (Beattie & Griffin, 2014). This shift has been stimulated by

claims that, as a low intensity form of deviance, incivility is best seen as a daily hassle (Sliter et al., 2010), whose effects are experienced more intensely in the short-term (Meier & Spector, 2013), meaning that retrospective surveys might underestimate the impact of incivility on people's working lives. Accordingly, a small corpus of evidence has built up, demonstrating the daily implications of exposure to incivility (e.g., Beattie & Griffin, 2014; Hershcovis et al., 2017; Lim et al., 2018; Nicholson & Griffin, 2015; Vahle-Hinz et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2015).

While the evidence to date has helped to develop a good understanding of the daily effects of incivility, research so far has yet to comprehensively address the question of *why* incivility influences employees' daily outcomes. Here, we suggest that exposure to incivility is likely to stimulate employees' daily negative emotions, which in turn will increase their levels of emotional exhaustion and intention to quit their jobs. Emotions are relatively short-term, intense, affective reactions that result from appraisals about the transactions people have with their environment (Lazarus & Lazarus, 1994). The idea that emotion is a proximate outcome of incivility that is responsible for its downstream consequences is intuitive, given that emotions are commonly conceptualized as mechanisms explaining why work events shape people's attitudes and behaviors (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

Emotions have been considered in relation to workplace incivility in a few prior studies. Some of these studies (e.g., Kabat-Farr et al., 2018; Porath & Pearson, 2012) involve participants retrospectively reporting how they felt in relation to a specific single incident of incivility. While those studies provide insight into the types of emotions that might be experienced, their findings may not give the most accurate understanding of the real impact of incivility, because retrospective recall biases and issues of the precision of memory for events from potentially several months ago might shape how people report on the emotions they experienced in the immediate aftermath of an event and even on the event itself

(Robinson & Clore, 2002). Thus, recollections over long periods of time are unlikely to be true reflections of people's experiences and responses at the time. In two other studies, a diary design has been used, collecting data pertaining to incivility and the emotions experienced in its aftermath, relatively soon after their occurrence. However, both of these studies captured only one emotion (hostility in Lim et al., 2018; embarrassment in Hershcovis et al., 2017). Thus, while there is initial support for the proposition that emotions form a pathway between exposure to incivility and its daily effects, it remains unclear which emotions are the key drivers of incivility's effects.

Here, we address this lack of clarity over which emotions are most salient in determining the effects of incivility by studying multiple emotions simultaneously, focusing in particular on sadness, anger and fear, each of which is a plausible affective response when a worker is exposed to incivility. Sadness is a low arousal aversive emotion (Russell, 1980), which originates in response to events that signify loss, where one expects low coping potential (Smith & Lazarus, 1993). The sense of loss and inability to cope that characterize sadness might well be evoked when people are exposed to workplace incivility. As a disruption to the normal conventions of social interaction, incivility may lead to feelings of loss around one's identity as a valued organizational member who deserves fair and respectful treatment, one's self-worth, and one's perceived status (Pearson et al., 2001). Feelings of low ability to cope are likely to stem from restrictions about appropriate conduct in the workplace that may constrain more active coping behaviors, such as retaliation (e.g., Geddes & Callister, 2007). Moreover, the low-intensity and ambiguous nature of incivility can make it difficult to cope through social support, as targets may be reluctant to explain their feelings to others for fear of appearing hypersensitive (Pearson et al., 2000).

Anger is a high physiological arousal aversive emotion (Russell, 1980), characterized by the appraisal that an injustice has occurred that another person or entity is responsible for

(Smith & Lazarus, 1993). When a person acts uncivilly towards another, for example by addressing them in a manner that is unprofessional or rude, this shows a lack of regard and respect for that person's welfare (Lim & Cortina, 2005). This lack of regard is likely to be appraised by the target as an interactional injustice, in the sense that it violates norms of fair treatment (Bies & Moag, 1986). Moreover, the target of such incivility is likely to blame the instigator for this perceived injustice, because even when intentions are ambiguous people often appraise blame based on the effects of behavior (e.g., in this case, feeling affronted or disrespected; Alicke, 2000). Thus, exposure to incivility might evoke feelings of anger.

Like anger, fear is a high physiological arousal aversive emotion (Russell, 1980). It arises in response to events that are appraised as a danger or threat (Smith & Lazarus, 1993). While acts of incivility are lower in intensity compared to other forms of mistreatment, such as physical violence, they might still evoke the appraisal of threat and therefore feelings of fear. According to Porath and Pearson (2012), it is well established that minor incivilities are a substantial contributor towards fear of crime, because they lead neighborhood residents to question the efficacy of forces to maintain public order (e.g., Taylor & Covington, 1993). Similarly, in workplaces, workers may feel threatened and therefore fearful when exposed to minor incivilities because these behaviors represent an erosion of trust in the organization to maintain order and to protect worker safety. Pearson et al. (2000) also suggest that the subtle and somewhat ambiguous nature of incivility can create a sense of suspense in targets about what might happen next, which can induce further feelings of threat and fear.

Hypothesis 1. Incivility will increase daily sadness.

Hypothesis 2. Incivility will increase daily anger.

Hypothesis 3. Incivility will increase daily fear.

In turn, feelings of sadness, anger and fear are likely to be responsible for the downstream consequences of incivility. While discrete emotions are thought to be linked to

distinctive patterns of behavioral outcomes (e.g., as per Frijda's, 1986, action readiness theory), the impact on affective and attitudinal outcomes is often less differentiated (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Rather, we expect each of sadness, anger and fear to increase people's levels of emotional exhaustion and their intention to leave their organization.

People usually attempt to minimize unpleasant states like sadness, anger and fear. This is in part due to the aversive nature of those states, which means that people want to alleviate their experiences of them (Tice et al., 2001), and in part due to the expectations and requirements of many jobs that these emotions are not appropriate to be displayed (Grandey, 2000). Attempts to reduce unpleasant emotions are effortful, as emotion regulation requires suppressing a spontaneous response (i.e., the original emotion) and over-riding it through controlled strategic action (Tice et al., 2001). As such, experiences of sadness, anger and fear typically result in emotional exhaustion, through the effortful and draining regulation that they prompt (Totterdell et al., 2012).

The experience of unpleasant emotions like sadness, anger and fear is also linked to having thoughts about leaving one's organization. When aversive emotions are experienced, they induce the desire to avoid the source of those emotions (Lopez-Kidwell et al., 2018) – in this case, the person who acted uncivilly. However, because the source of the emotion cannot always be avoided (e.g., if it is one's manager or team member or a customer that one is required to serve), the desire to avoid the source of unpleasant emotion is often experienced more broadly as a desire to avoid the organization. The desire to avoid the organization can be manifested behaviorally, such as through absenteeism, or cognitively, through thinking about and intending to quit one's job (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010).

Our arguments above suggest that exposure to incivility will evoke discrete unpleasant emotions and these emotions will in turn increase detrimental work-related affective and attitudinal consequences. We therefore propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4. There will be an indirect effect of incivility on (a) daily emotional exhaustion and (b) daily turnover intention, via sadness.

Hypothesis 5. There will be an indirect effect of incivility on (a) daily emotional exhaustion and (b) daily turnover intention, via anger.

Hypothesis 6. There will be an indirect effect of incivility on (a) daily emotional exhaustion and (b) daily turnover intention, via fear.

Face-to-face and cyber incivility

Our theorizing thus far suggests that exposure to incivility will be associated with daily increases in the experience of sadness, anger and fear, which in turn will explain why incivility increases daily emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions. But will this be true for all types of incivility? A key point of differentiation in the incivility literature is between incivilities that occur during face-to-face encounters versus online interactions. Research focusing on cyber incivility, i.e., "*communicative behavior exhibited in computer-mediated interactions that violate workplace norms of mutual respect*" (Lim & Teo, 2009, p. 419), shows that incivility that occurs via online channels has harmful consequences, including on a daily basis (e.g., Park et al., 2018; Park & Haun, 2018). Here, we consider whether the proposed mediated effects of incivility on emotional exhaustion and turnover intention via discrete emotions apply equally to face-to-face and cyber incivilities.

The nature of the cyber environment is quite different to in-person interactions, containing a lack of supervision and greater anonymity (Cortina et al., 2017). As communication via technology involves a lower capacity to send and observe facial expressions and body language than in-person communication, and through some online media (e.g., email) the opportunity for immediate clarification is reduced due to asynchronicity, cyber interactions are also typically more ambiguous (Kock, 2005). Together, these factors mean that face-to-face and cyber incivilities might be experienced differently

and translate into divergent effects. On the one hand, the lack of supervision and greater anonymity inherent in cyber interactions might encourage more frequent or severe incivilities that provoke a more intense emotional response, compared with in-person incivilities. Greater ambiguity might also mean that targets of online incivilities are more likely to interpret even benign words as being offensive. On the other hand, the lack of social cues available in most forms of technology-mediated communications may mean that messages will be relatively duller in emotional tone (Kock, 2005). In contrast, incivilities during face-to-face interactions might be more emotionally impactful, for example, because they might appear to be more threatening and because the relatively lower ambiguity may make assignment of blame more straightforward. Thus, it is unclear whether exposure to cyber incivility will have stronger or weaker daily effects on emotion and, in turn, exhaustion and turnover intention.

Existing empirical research provides limited insight into this issue. To date, emotion has not been studied as an outcome of cyber incivility. Moreover, very few studies of the broader effects of incivility consider both face-to-face *and* cyber incivility. Those that do have relied on student participants (McCarthy et al., 2020; Scisco et al., 2019), or have applied retrospective survey designs rather than studying daily effects (Heischman et al., 2019), and do not consider mediating variables, such as emotions. This prior research also reports conflicting patterns of findings. For example, whereas Heischman et al. (2019) found stronger negative outcomes for face-to-face than cyber incivility, McCarthy and colleagues (2020) reported the reverse pattern in one of their studies. Meanwhile, Scisco et al. (2019) reported no differences in effects for the majority of the measures they captured. The mixed pattern of findings in previous research, alongside the competing theoretical perspectives, means that we do not form an a priori hypothesis; instead, we tackle the issue in an exploratory manner by studying the mediated effects of face-to-face and cyber incivility separately to enable comparisons.

Method

Design and participants

We conducted a diary study using a sample of working adults obtained through a graduate education website of a US university teachers' college. Participants were working in various industries while also attending graduate school. We asked participants to complete diary entries on a purpose-built app, named the 'incivility tracker', designed for use on smartphones. Participants were signalled in the late afternoon every day over a month-long period and were asked to complete the app survey if they had worked on that day. Participants received a $30 gift certificate in return for their participation.

A total of 81 participants completed the app survey at least once, with the number of entries they provided varying between 1 and 27. However, as discussed below, our analysis procedure required the presence of lagged daily observations, meaning that some participants were excluded from the analysis based on their reporting patterns. The final sample included in our analyses therefore comprised 69 participants, who collectively provided 636 observations. Of the final sample, 80% were male and they had a mean age of 27 years (*SD* = 7 years). The distribution of respondents' highest education level was 7% at Grade School, 45% with an Undergraduate degree, and 48% with a Postgraduate degree. Full-time employees made up 51% of the analysis sample and part-time employees were the remaining 49%. Occupations of the sample included teachers, accountants, physical therapists, maintenance personnel, counsellors, consultants, administrators, and bankers, amongst others.

Measures

The app survey included two measures of workplace incivility, both based on the classic Cortina et al. (2001) measure, which contains seven items, all describing specific uncivil behaviors, such as "made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you". In both cases, participants were asked to what extent people at work subjected them to each of the seven

behaviors that day, using a 1-5 scale ("not at all" to "a great extent"). In the first measure, participants specifically referred to behaviors that occurred during face-to-face interactions, while in the second they reflected on online transactions. For both face-to-face and cyber scales, internal consistency reliability was high (face-to-face: multilevel alpha within subjects = .803, between subjects = .966; multilevel omega within subjects = .835, between subjects = .958; multilevel H within subjects = .848, between subjects = .974; cyber: multilevel alpha within subjects = .830, between subjects = .969; multilevel omega within subjects = .855, between subjects = .981; multilevel H within subjects = .897, between subjects = .999).

Participants then completed three single item measures asking the extent to which they had experienced the emotions of sadness, anger and fear that day, on a 1-10 scale. Finally, they responded to two single item measures capturing emotional exhaustion and intention to quit, both answered on a 1-10 scale. Specifically, they were asked to indicate "the extent to which you have felt emotionally exhausted while at work today" (response scale ranging from "not at all exhausted" to "extremely exhausted"), and "the extent to which you have intended to quit your job today" ("no intention to quit" to "strong intention to quit").

Analysis procedure

Given the multilevel structure of our data, with daily observations (level 1) nested within participants (level 2), we tested our hypotheses using a sequence of nested multilevel models, fitted using Mplus v8 software. In line with our theory and hypotheses, we focused on the within-person level of analysis, and centered predictor variables around person mean scores. We began with the unconditional model, in which the variance of our mediators (sadness, anger and fear) and outcomes (exhaustion and turnover intention) was simply partitioned into within and between subject components. We then added the lag effects, i.e., the previous observation, of these mediators and outcomes as respective controls for each of them. For each mediator and outcome variable, the lagged value was the most recent

observation from within the previous two days. We chose to use lagged values from more than one day previously in order to recognize that participants did not all work on consecutive days of the week, given the high prevalence of part-time workers in the sample - but restricted them to a maximum of two days prior to ensure that the emotions, exhaustion and intention to turnover captured would still be relevant.

Then, to test our hypotheses, we in turn added paths to regress our outcomes directly upon our predictors, our mediators upon our predictors (testing hypotheses 1, 2 and 3), and our outcomes on our mediators. To test the significance of the mediated effects (i.e., indirect paths) explicitly (hypotheses 4, 5 and 6) we calculated and tested indirect effects from incivility to exhaustion and turnover intention within the model.

Models were fitted using maximum likelihood estimation. To assess model improvement as paths were added, we tested the decrease in model deviance, which has a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the number of extra parameters added. When testing model improvement, and the effects of predictor and mediator variables, the $p < .05$ level of statistical significance was applied, with 95% confidence intervals computed for indirect effects using Monte Carlo simulation (Preacher & Selig, 2012).

Results

Table 1 shows the bivariate correlations between study variables at the observation level. Table 2 gives the relative fit, variance components, and tests between our competing models, with the path estimates from our final model given in Table 3. Finally, Table 4 displays the indirect effects for our mediation analyses.

[Insert tables 1 and 2 about here]

Adding paths from both person-mean-centered face-to-face and cyber incivility to person-mean-centered sadness, anger and fear (Table 2, Model 4) significantly improved model fit (Δ Dev = 22.78 on 6 df, $p < .001$; within subjects variance explained in sadness =

5.6%; in anger, 9.4%; in fear, 1.5%). As shown in Table 3, the paths between face to face incivility and anger and sadness were positive and significant (sadness: B = 0.675, $p < .001$; anger: B = 1.217, $p < .001$); however, the path to fear was not significant (B = 0.161, $p = .374$). In contrast, cyber incivility had a marginal effect on sadness only (sadness: B = 0.483, $p = .059$; anger: B = 0.245, $p = .589$; fear: B = 0.396, $p = .172$). These results support hypotheses 1 and 2 in relation to face-to-face incivility only, but not hypothesis 3.

[Insert table 3 about here]

Model fit was likewise improved by adding paths from our mediators (emotions) to our outcomes of exhaustion and turnover intention (Table 2, Model 5: Δ Dev = 547.53 on 6 df, $p < .001$; within subjects variance explained in exhaustion = 18.6%; in turnover intention, 33.1%). Five out of the six paths were positive and statistically significant at $p < .005$ (see Table 3). The only non-significant path was that between fear and emotional exhaustion.

Significant indirect effects (see Table 4) were found between face-to-face incivility and emotional exhaustion, operating via both sadness (indirect effect = 0.231, 95%CI = 0.102, 0.377) and anger (indirect effect = 0.303, 95%CI = 0.126, 0.498); and between face-to-face incivility and turnover intention, operating via both sadness (indirect effect = 0.247, 95%CI = 0.086, 0.423) and anger (indirect effect = 0.212, 95%CI = 0.041, 0.413). However, there were no indirect effects between face-to-face incivility and either outcome variable operating via fear. Face-to-face incivility also exhibited direct effects (shown in Table 3) on emotional exhaustion (B = 0.378, $p = .039$) and turnover intention (B = 0.327, $p = .044$). The total effects of face-to-face incivility on both outcomes were significant and positive (on exhaustion: B = 0.913, $p < .001$; on turnover intention: B = 0.831, $p < .001$).

[Insert table 4 about here]

The indirect effects from cyber incivility were far less pronounced (Table 4); cyber incivility only indirectly impacted exhaustion via sadness (indirect effect = 0.166, 95%CI =

0.007, 0.307). Neither the total effect of cyber incivility on exhaustion nor on turnover intention was statistically significant (on exhaustion: B = -0.125, p = .780; on turnover intention: B = 0.570, p = .146). Thus, hypotheses 4 and 5 were supported in relation to face-to-face incivility only (with the exception of hypothesis 4a, which was also supported for cyber incivility). However, there was no evidence in support in hypothesis 6.

Discussion

This article contributes greater understanding on the daily effects of workplace incivility and the role played by emotions in explaining these effects. Our findings extend existing research by studying a wider range of discrete emotions than considered in previous studies of the daily effects of incivility (e.g., Hershcovis et al., 2017; Lim et al., 2018). By studying multiple emotions as simultaneous mechanisms, we are able to provide insight into which emotions play an explanatory role over and above others that may be experienced. Our findings show that while two discrete emotions (sadness and anger) are salient in conveying the daily effects of incivility on the outcomes of emotional exhaustion and turnover intention, fear is not a relevant mechanism. Although experiences of fear were associated with increased feelings of emotional exhaustion and intentions to quit one's job, exposure to incivility did not evoke fear in our participants. The emotion of fear is elicited when an appraisal of threat is made, and arguably this would be quite an intense reaction when considering the nature of the behaviors that typically constitute incivility (e.g., being put down, being address unprofessionally; Cortina et al., 2001). Although experiences of incivility might accumulate over time to elicit feelings of fear, our findings suggest that, in isolation, daily incivilities are not experienced as sufficiently threatening to induce fear.

Our findings further contribute by providing insight into the extent to which the mediated daily effects of incivility via emotion apply when considering both face-to-face and cyber incivility. While studies of each type of incivility independently have indicated both to

cause important impairments to employees (e.g., Park et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2015), emotions have only been studied as antecedents of cyber mistreatment (e.g., Vranjes et al., 2018), meaning that the potential for emotions to explain the daily detrimental effects of cyber incivility was unknown. More generally, our understanding of their relative effects has been hampered by the fact that the few previous studies that include both types of incivility suffer from methodological issues that limit the confidence of conclusions in application to day-to-day workplace incivility (e.g., use of student samples: McCarthy et al., 2020; Scisco et al., 2019; reliance on retrospective reports: Heischman et al., 2019).

A notable pattern in our findings in this regard was that while face-to-face incivility showed robust daily effects in the outcomes studied, cyber incivility had much less apparent effects (it only exhibited an indirect effect on daily emotional exhaustion via sadness). The findings we observe in this respect are consistent with those reported in Heischman et al.'s (2019) survey study, which found stronger associations between face-to-face incivility and detrimental outcomes, including burnout and turnover intention, in comparison to cyber incivility. Our findings contribute beyond those already reported by suggesting that one reason why exposure to cyber incivility may not have as large an impact on such outcomes is that it does not evoke an intense emotional response. This can be interpreted in light of Kock's (2005) media naturalness theory, in which he explains that online communications can be duller in emotional tone due to the deprivation of emotional cues, e.g., through facial expressions. As high physiological arousal emotions (Russell, 1980), anger and fear might be especially unlikely emotions in response to cyber incivility. Regarding anger in particular, the ambiguity inherent in cyber communications may make it difficult to determine blame, which is the appraisal that underpins this emotion.

The pattern of results differentiating face-to-face and cyber incivility is interesting, as it suggests that working online makes people less vulnerable to the daily effects of incivility. In

line with this suggestion, Sutton (2017) discusses how physically distancing oneself from people known for rudeness can be an effective coping strategy. Indeed, it may be the case that being physically separated from the perpetrator of uncivil acts makes acts of incivility less severe than when the perpetrator remains present in one's work environment, as the perpetrator's presence may serve as a constant reminder of the experience, thus evoking stronger, more intense emotions. However, this is not to say that cyber forms of mistreatment more broadly are without impact; for example, studies have shown that cyberbullying, where acts occur repeatedly over time, is linked to emotional exhaustion (Farley et al., 2016). Moreover, the effects of cyber incivility might be felt more strongly beyond the working day, given the omnipresence of email and social media (Yuan et al., 2020).

In practical terms, our findings underscore the importance of organizations dealing with incidents of incivility that are directed towards their workers. Incivility that occurs during face-to-face interactions may be particularly crucial to focus on, given that our findings show it predicts highly significant daily increases in sadness, anger, how emotionally exhausted people feel and their turnover intentions. Given that negative emotions, like those we study, are predictors of employees' counterproductive work behaviors, including withdrawal and verbal abuse (Yang & Diefendorff, 2009), and that emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions can translate into mental health detriments (Bovier et al., 2009) and organizational exit (Griffeth et al., 2000), respectively, it seems likely that, over time, the feelings and thoughts we studied may translate into poor longer-term outcomes, including damage to employee well-being, the development of 'incivility spirals', and actual turnover behavior (e.g., Pearson et al., 2000). One possibility for action is to focus on the ways in which employees give meaning to the incivility that is directed towards them, given that appraisals about the meaning of an event give rise to the emotions that channel the outcomes of incivility (Smith & Lazarus, 1993). For example, organizations could seek to enhance

employees' feelings about being valued members and their perceptions of their coping ability, in order to reduce a sadness response. Actions such as introducing safe spaces to discuss behaviors that have caused unease, better reporting systems, and clearer standards of acceptable behavior might prove helpful in this respect.

Limitations of this research include the relatively small sample size ($N = 69$), when compared to the average number of participants ($N = 83$) in organizational diary studies reviewed by Gabriel et al. (2019). However, simulation research has demonstrated that for fixed lower-level effects in multilevel modeling (i.e., the analysis we present here), sample sizes greater than 30 show minimal bias in the accuracy of regression coefficients and variance components, while those above 50 also show minimal impact on the accuracy of standard errors (Maas & Hox, 2004, 2005). This is likely because, as Gabriel and colleagues (2019) acknowledge, for the type of effects we test for, "analyses hinge on power at Level 1" (p. 975). In other words, the power of the analysis that we present here is based on the number of observations rather than the number of participants. The presence of significant effects in the data further supports that our study is unlikely to be underpowered.

Our use of single item indicators for our mediator and outcome variables can also be considered a limitation. Single item indicators are commonly used in diary research, due to constraints on working participants' time and the high demand associated with repeated surveys (Ohly et al., 2010), and it has been suggested that single-item measures can be preferable when the construct being studied is sufficiently unidimensional (Sackett & Larson, 1990), as is the case with the constructs in the present research.

A further limitation is the concern for common method bias, given that all variables in the study were self-reported (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Reliance on self-report data is commonplace for studies of incivility and its effects, as the target of incivility is best placed to report their experiences and feelings. Moreover, our decision to center predictor variables

around person mean scores minimizes this concern to some extent, as it effectively removes person-level variance and therefore reduces issues around social desirability and other 'common rater' confounds. Nevertheless, replicating this research using a larger sample and multi-item measures, and considering the use of alternative data sources, will encourage greater confidence in our findings.

An important direction for future research will be to extend our findings by studying more differentiated online media through which incivility can be communicated. The extent to which online media deprive individuals of social cues and restrict the opportunity for immediate clarification varies substantially. It remains to be tested whether incivility delivered via synchronous video channels has effects much closer to that which occurs face-to-face, in comparison to incivility over less rich and natural media, such as email. Given that we observed direct effects of face-to-face incivility even in the presence of the indirect effects via sadness and anger, future studies might also consider a broader range of discrete negative emotions, including, for example, guilt and embarrassment. A further opportunity for future research involves studying daily behavioral outcomes of workplace incivility. While negative emotion states often lead to common affective and attitudinal outcomes, as seen in the present study, their behavioral consequences can be more differentiated, as emotions are imbued with distinctive action tendencies that make certain types of behavior more likely to occur (Frijda, 1986). Thus, future research might build on our findings that have established sadness and anger as key mechanisms of the daily effects of face-to-face incivility by studying their role in predicting divergent behavioral outcomes. Finally, future studies might seek to capitalize on the benefits of diary research methods, like that adopted here (in terms of accuracy of reports on incivility and its immediate impact), to study the longer-term effects of incivility, for example, by combining weekly diaries of incivility and emotion over say six months with baseline and follow-up surveys tracking more distal consequences across the study period.

References

Alicke, M. D. (2000). Culpable control and the psychology of blame. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(4), 556-574. doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.4.556

Bakker, A. B., & Costa, P. L. (2014). Chronic job burnout and daily functioning: A theoretical analysis. *Burnout Research*, *1*(3), 112-119. doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2014.04.003

Beattie, L., & Griffin, B. (2014). Day-level fluctuations in stress and engagement in response to workplace incivility: A diary study. *Work & Stress*, *28*(2), 124-142. doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2014.898712

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (pp. 43-55). JAI Press.

Bovier, P. A., Arigoni, F., Schneider, M., & Gallacchi, M. B. (2009). Relationships between work satisfaction, emotional exhaustion and mental health among Swiss primary care physicians. *The European Journal of Public Health*, *19*(6), 611-617. doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckp056

Brynjolfsson, E., Horton, J., Ozimek, A., Rock, D., Sharma, G., & Ye, H. Y. T. (2020). Covid-19 and remote work: An early look at us data. *Unpublished work*.

Bunk, J. A., & Magley, V. J. (2013). The role of appraisals and emotions in understanding experiences of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*(1), 87-105. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030987

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *6*(1), 64-80. doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Magley, V. J., & Nelson, K. (2017). Researching rudeness: The past, present, and future of the science of incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *22*(3), 299-313. doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000089

Farley, S., Coyne, I., Axtell, C., & Sprigg, C. (2016). Design, development and validation of a workplace cyberbullying measure, the WCM. *Work & Stress*, *30*(4), 293-317. doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2016.1255998

Frijda, N. H. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge University Press.

Gabriel, A. S., Podsakoff, N. P., Beal, D. J., Scott, B. A., Sonnentag, S., Trougakos, J. P., & Butts, M. M. (2019). Experience sampling methods: A discussion of critical trends and considerations for scholarly advancement. *Organizational Research Methods*, *22*(4), 969-1006. doi.org/10.1177/1094428118802626

Geddes, D., & Callister, R. R. (2007). Crossing the line (s): A dual threshold model of anger in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*(3), 721-746. doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.25275495

Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*(1), 95-110. doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.95

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 463–88. doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600305

Heischman, R. M., Nagy, M. S., & Settler, K. J. (2019). Before you send that: Comparing the outcomes of face-to-face and cyber incivility. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, *22*(1), 1-23. doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000081

Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*(1), 24-44. doi.org/10.1002/job.621

Hershcovis, M. S., Ogunfowora, B., Reich, T. C., & Christie, A. M. (2017). Targeted workplace incivility: The roles of belongingness, embarrassment, and power. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *38*(7), 1057-1075. doi.org/10.1002/job.2183

Kabat-Farr, D., Cortina, L. M., & Marchiondo, L. A. (2018). The emotional aftermath of incivility: Anger, guilt, and the role of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *25*(2), 109-128. doi.org/10.1037/str0000045

Kock, N. (2005). Media richness or media naturalness? The evolution of our biological communication apparatus and its influence on our behavior toward e-communication tools. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, *48*(2), 117-130. doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2005.849649

Lazarus, R. S., & Lazarus, B. N. (1994). *Passion and reason: Making sense of our emotions*. Oxford University Press.

Lim, S., Ilies, R., Koopman, J., Christoforou, P., & Arvey, R. D. (2018). Emotional mechanisms linking incivility at work to aggression and withdrawal at home: An experience-sampling study. *Journal of Management*, *44*(7), 2888-2908. doi.org/10.1177/0149206316654544

Lim, V. K., & Teo, T. S. (2009). Mind your E-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. *Information and Management*, *46*(8), 419-425. doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2009.06.006

Lopez-Kidwell, V., Niven, K., & Labianca, G. (2018). Predicting workplace relational dynamics using an affective model of relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(9), 1129-1141. doi.org/10.1002/job.2300

Maas, C. J. M., & Hox, J. J. (2004). Robustness issues in multilevel regression analysis. *Statistica Neerlandica, 58*, 127-137. doi.org/10.1046/j.0039-0402.2003.00252.x

Maas, C. J. M., & Hox, J. J. (2005). Sufficient sample sizes for multilevel modeling. Methodology: *European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioral & Social Sciences, 1*, 85-91. doi.org/10.1027/1614-2241.1.3.86

McCarthy, K., Pearce, J. L., Morton, J., & Lyon, S. (2020). Do you pass it on? An examination of the consequences of perceived cyber incivility. *Organization Management Journal, 17*(1), 43-58. doi.org/10.1108/OMJ-12-2018-0654

Meier, L. L., & Spector, P. E. (2013). Reciprocal effects of work stressors and counterproductive work behavior: A five-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(3), 529- 539. doi.org/10.1037/a0031732

Nicholson, T., & Griffin, B. (2015). Here today but not gone tomorrow: Incivility affects after-work and next-day recovery. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *20*(2), 218-225. doi.org/10.1037/a0038376

Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., Niessen, C., & Zapf, D. (2010). Diary studies in organizational research. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 9*(2), 79-93. doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000009

Park, Y., Fritz, C., & Jex, S. M. (2018). Daily cyber incivility and distress: The moderating roles of resources at work and home. *Journal of Management*, *44*(7), 2535-2557. doi.org/10.1177/0149206315576796

Park, Y., & Haun, V. C. (2018). The long arm of email incivility: Transmitted stress to the partner and partner work withdrawal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(10), 1268-1282. doi.org/10.1002/job.2289

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, *29*(2), 123-137. doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)00019-X

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, J. W. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations*, *54*(11), 1387-1419. doi.org/10.1177/00187267015411001

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879-903. doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2012). Emotional and behavioral responses to workplace incivility and the impact of hierarchical status. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*(1), 326-357. doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.01020.x

Preacher, K. J., & Selig, J. P. (2012). Advantages of Monte Carlo confidence intervals for indirect effects. *Communication Methods and Measures*, *6*(2), 77-98. doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2012.679848

Robinson, M. D., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Belief and feeling: evidence for an accessibility model of emotional self-report. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(6), 934-960. doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.934

Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*(6), 1161-1178. doi.org/10.1037/h0077714

Sackett, P., & Larson, J. (1990). Research strategies in industrial and organizational psychology. In Dunnette, M. D., & Hough, L. M. (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 419-489). Consulting Psychologists Press.

Scisco, J. L., Giumetti, G. W., Bodinger, J. F., Randall, K. J., & Shemanskis, R. N. (2019). The impacts of face-to-face and cyber incivility on performance, helping behavior, counterproductive behaviors, and physiological activity. *Occupational Health Science*, *3*(4), 409-420. doi.org/10.1007/s41542-019-00048-y

Shearmur, R. (2020, June 18th). Remote work: Employers are taking over our living spaces and passing on costs. *The Conversation*, Retrieved from https://theconversation.com/remote-work-employers-are-taking-over-our-living-spaces-and-passing-on-costs-140610

Sliter, M., Jex, S., Wolford, K., & McInnerney, J. (2010). How rude! Emotional labor as a mediator between customer incivility and employee outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *15*(4), 468-481. doi.org/10.1037/a0020723

Smith, C. A., & Lazarus, R. S. (1993). Appraisal components, core relational themes, and the emotions. *Cognition & Emotion*, *7*(3-4), 233-269. doi.org/10.1080/02699939308409189

Sutton, R. I. (2017). *The asshole survival guide: How to deal with people who treat you like dirt*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Taylor, R. B., & Covington, J. (1993). Community structural change and fear of crime. *Social Problems, 40*(3), 374–397. doi.org/10.1525/sp.1993.40.3.03x0084f

Tice, D. M., Bratslavsky, E., & Baumeister, R. F. (2001). Emotional distress regulation takes precedence over impulse control: If you feel bad, do it! *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(1), 53-67. doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.80.1.53

Totterdell, P., Hershcovis, M. S., Niven, K., Reich, T. C., & Stride, C. (2012). Can employees be emotionally drained by witnessing unpleasant interactions between coworkers? A diary study of induced emotion regulation. *Work & Stress*, *26*(2), 112-129. doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.681153

Totterdell, P. A., & Niven, K. (2014). *Workplace moods and emotions: A review of research*. Createspace Independent Publishing.

Vahle-Hinz, T., Baethge, A., & Van Dick, R. (2019). Beyond one work day? A daily diary study on causal and reverse effects between experienced workplace incivility and behaving rude towards others. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *28*(2), 272-285. doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1576633

Vranjes, I., Baillien, E., Vandebosch, H., Erreygers, S., & De Witte, H. (2018). Kicking someone in cyberspace when they are down: Testing the role of stressor evoked emotions on exposure to workplace cyberbullying. *Work & Stress*, *32*(4), 379-399. doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2018.1437233

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In Staw, B. M., & Cummings, L. L. (Eds.), *Research in organizational behaviour* (pp. 1-74). JAI Press.

Yang, J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). The relations of daily counterproductive workplace behavior with emotions, situational antecedents, and personality moderators: A diary study in Hong Kong. *Personnel Psychology*, *62*(2), 259-295. doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01138.x

Yuan, Z., Park, Y., & Sliter, M. T. (2020). Put you down versus tune you out: Further understanding active and passive e-mail incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *25*(5), 330–344. doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000215

Zhou, Z. E., Yan, Y., Che, X. X., & Meier, L. L. (2015). Effect of workplace incivility on end-of-work negative affect: Examining individual and organizational moderators in a daily diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *20*(1), 117-130. doi.org/10.1037/a0038167

Table 1. Standard deviations and intercorrelations between the main study variables at the event-level

Variables	*SD*	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
1. Face-to-face incivility	0.371	-										
2. Cyber incivility	0.293	.363**										
3. Lag sadness	1.422	.064	.012									
4. Sadness	1.418	.211**	.162**	-.075								
5. Lag anger	1.536	.049	.088*	.553**	-.102*							
6. Anger	1.628	.297**	.150**	-.063	.578**	.030						
7. Lag fear	1.083	.139**	.086*	.434**	-.063	.393**	.030					
8. Fear	1.142	.111**	.134**	.040	.272**	-.028	.241**	.153**				
9. Lag emotional exhaustion	1.739	-.003	.044	.400**	.000	.355**	.030	.197**	.031			
10. Emotional exhaustion	1.757	.179**	.052	.004	.423**	-.011	.409**	-.012	.134**	.168**		
11. Lag turnover intention	1.381	.091*	-.051	.499**	-.078	.430**	.000	.330**	.030	.410**	.067	
12. Turnover intention	1.436	.256**	.175**	.007	.559**	-.032	.484**	-.061	.367**	.046	.380**	.096*

N = 636 observations from 69 participants. All variables were person-mean-centred, so have a mean of 0 at the event level. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 2. Relative fit, variance components, and tests between competing models

Model	Deviance	Satorra Adjusted Δ Dev, Δdf	*p*	Within subject variance				
				Sadness	Anger	Fear	Emotional exhaustion	Turnover intention
1. Unconditional	11575.56	-	-	2.014	2.654	1.304	3.130	2.056
2. Add lag variables for mediators and outcomes	11516.27	22.63, 11	.020	2.010	2.666	1.271	3.004	2.011
3. Add direct effects from predictors to outcomes	11459.06	20.53, 4	< .001	2.011	2.669	1.270	2.883	1.848
4. Add predictor to mediator paths	11393.79	22.78, 6	< .001	1.899	2.419	1.250	2.884	1.848
5. Add mediator to outcome paths	11069.09	547.53, 6	< .001	1.900	2.428	1.249	2.303	1.167

N = 636 observations from 69 participants.

Table 3. Path estimates from final model

	Sadness		Anger		Fear		Emotional exhaustion		Turnover intention	
Predictor/mediator	B (95%CI)	*p*	B (95%CI)	*p*	B (95%CI)	*p*	B (95%CI)	*p*	B (95%CI)	*p*
Lag sadness	-0.016 (-0.098, 0.066)	.704					-0.006 (-0.161, 0.149)	.939	0.038 (-0.052, 0.128)	.408
Lag anger			0.083 (-0.007, 0.173)	.073			-0.047 (-0.216, 0.122)	.589	-0.030 (-0.108, 0.048)	.463
Lag fear					0.171 (-0.054, 0.396)	.138	-0.040 (-0.224, 0.144)	.671	-0.196 (-0.370, -0.022)	.027
Lag emotional exhaustion							0.188 (0.084, 0.292)	<.001		
Lag turnover intention									0.159 (0.053, 0.265)	.003
Sadness							0.343 (0.216, 0.470)	<.001	0.366 (0.203, 0.529)	<.001
Anger							0.249 (0.110, 0.388)	<.001	0.278 (0.164, 0.392)	<.001
Fear							0.000 (-0.247, 0.247)	.998	0.174 (0.064, 0.284)	.002
Face-to-face incivility – direct effect	0.675 (0.297, 1.053)	<.001	1.217 (0.862, 1.572)	<.001	0.161 (-0.194, 0.516)	.374	0.378 (0.019, 0.737)	.039	0.327 (0.008, 0.646)	.044
Cyber incivility – direct effect	0.483 (-0.019, 0.985)	.059	0.245 (-0.645, 1.135)	.589	0.396 (-0.172, 0.964)	.172	-0.351 (-0.974, 0.272)	.269	0.241 (-0.265, 0.747)	.349

N = 636 observations from 69 participants. All predictor and mediator variables were person-mean-centred.

Table 4. Indirect effects from final model

	Emotional exhaustion	Turnover intention
Predictor/mediator	B (95%CI)	B (95%CI)
Face-to-face incivility – indirect effect via sadness	0.231 (0.102, 0.377)	0.247 (0.086, 0.423)
Face-to-face incivility – indirect effect via anger	0.303 (0.126, 0.498)	0.212 (0.041, 0.413)
Face-to-face incivility – indirect effect via fear	0.000 (-0.039, 0.046)	0.045 (-0.051, 0.141)
Cyber incivility – indirect effect via sadness	0.166 (0.007, 0.307)	0.176 (-0.004, 0.427)
Cyber incivility – indirect effect via anger	0.061 (-0.162, 0.309)	0.043 (-0.150, 0.148)
Cyber incivility – indirect effect via fear	0.000 (-0.074, 0.107)	0.110 (-0.039, 0.259)

N = 636 observations from 69 participants. All predictor and mediator variables were person-mean-centred. 95% CIs were estimated via Monte Carlo simulation.