License to Misbehave: Is E-communication Blurring the Line on Workplace Incivility?

Danielle Henderson

Austin Peay State University

COMM 5030: Applied Communication Theory

Dr. Christina Hicks-Goldston

July 27, 2024

Abstract

This study is an exploratory look at *workplace incivility* by following the concepts of *medium* and face-negotiation theories. With the increased use of communication *mediums* in an organizational environment in recent years, research was conducted to determine if *workplace incivility* is on the rise. Through the high use of *mediums*, these devices create a blurred line between appropriate and what is not appropriate text when sent through digital platforms—allowing for a lack of accountability when sending negative and hostile comments. *Mediums* discussed include email and instant messaging, which are referred to as *e-communications*. *Medium* communication is compared to the traditional *face-to-face* communication that would typically occur in the workplace, especially between *coworkers*. The study examines if personality traits, such as aggressiveness, assertiveness, and high ego, contribute to *workplace incivility*. When *workplace incivility* occurs, the use of self-face may be put into practice to protect one's reputation and correct the wrongful treatment of a coworker. Interview sessions were conducted with six volunteers from a high-volume production firm to discuss their experiences with *e-communication* practices versus *face-to-face* communication. The volunteers were a diverse group of men and women of varying age groups working in different firm divisions and hierarchies of the firm.

Keywords: workplace incivility, medium(s), e-communication(s), face-to-face, coworkers

License to Misbehave: Is E-Communication Blurring the Line on Workplace Incivility?

Communication *mediums* have significantly increased in recent years with a higher use of emails and instant messaging, referred to as *e-communications*, for communicating with *coworkers* in the workplace. As an organization turns to these *mediums* to keep communication flowing between *coworkers*, which provides easier accessibility, *face-to-face* communication opportunities are declining. As a result, *e-communication* platforms have significantly blurred the lines on *workplace incivility*, possibly leading to a rise in negative and hostile content. This shift in *e-communication* is in stark contrast to more traditional *face-to-face* or voice communications, often guided by facial expressions, body language, and tone of voice. The increased reliance on *e-communication* in the workplace raises the question of whether there has been a surge in *workplace incivility* among *coworkers*, a trend that should be a cause for concern.

Because of the decline in *face-to-face* communication in the workplace, concern is rising about *workplace incivility* as *mediums* allow for a lack of accountability associated with *e-communications*. The proper attention is not given to the tone used while an individual is typing text, possibly due to the lack of time, pressure to meet deadlines or attempt to manage too many tasks simultaneously. There is also a significant risk of the receiver misinterpreting the text delivered through the digital form. With *e-communication*, there is a lack of body language, facial expression, and tone of voice that otherwise would be construed through *face-to-face* communication. Regardless of intentional or accidental, hostile and negative communication can place an emotional strain, significantly impacting the receivers well-being and job performance.

This study takes things a step further, utilizing the concepts of face-negotiation theory, where personality traits are also introduced as a possibility for negative and hostile comments that can be included in both work communication *mediums* and *face-to-face* communications, due to self-face and ego personality traits. Both, which can be cause for alarm concerning *workplace incivility*, are highly

discussed in the literature review section of this study as "self-face" is a term used to describe as

someone protecting their reputation and is "particularly important in contexts where there is some risk

of embarrassment or conflict." (Lun et al., 2023, p. 259)

<div align="center">**Work Communication Medium vs. Face-to-Face Communication**</div>

The Entrepreneur/Salesperson

Research indicates that personality traits and characteristics significantly influence how

communication is given and received. Entrepreneurs and salespeople, for example, have specific

personality traits known to be aggressive at times and to demonstrate assertive behavior, which is how

they conduct themselves during the negotiation process, according to Artinger et al. (2015). The nature

of the business dictates that multiple forms of communication are required during the negotiation

process. They are *face-to-face*, *e-communication*, and voice. Because of the nature of entrepreneurialism

and salesmenship, a high level of negotiation tactics is needed for an individual to be successful. An

entrepreneur will often use "emotions and arguments as means of persuasion," (Artinger et al., 2015, p.

737) which can come across as assertive, especially when the form of communication used is *e-*

communication, where there is a lack of emotional cues for the receiver to understand. The

entrepreneur/salesperson may not realize that an assertive tone is present in the text. However, for an

entrepreneur/salesperson to succeed, Artinger et al. (2015) demonstrate that a high volume of emotion

is needed to close a deal.

Accountability

The rise of *workplace incivility* through the use of a *medium* may result from the lack of

accountability associated with *e-communications*. Bleize et al. (2022) have shed light on the pressing

need for more accountability in *e-communications*, especially in messaging applications. The current lack

of accountability often results in the inclusion of aggressive content, including derogatory, offensive, or

harmful material for the receiver. As demonstrated by the study by Bleize et al. (2022), when more than

two individuals are involved in an *e-communication* thread, there is a tendency for others to follow suit

and conform to the aggressors' behavior. This underscores the urgent need for a shift in *medium*

communication norms towards more accountability.

Personality Traits

Organizations whose business model is structured around sales require a significant number of

salespeople or contracted entrepreneurs on staff for the business to be profitable. The personality traits

of these individuals are known to be aggressive and assertive and can impact the psychological well-

being of other employees within the organization. Through the research conducted by Bucă et al. (2016),

the HEXACO model of personality was studied, which demonstrated a relationship between employees'

overall well-being in the workplace and their personality traits. The HEXACO model consists of seven

factors: honesty, modesty, emotionality, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness.

Through this study, Bucă et al. (2016) stated that extraversion, agreeableness, and openness are the

most vital personality traits for psychological well-being in the workplace. The honesty factor had no

bearing on an employee's psychological well-being as they "do not contribute to employee happiness at

work." (Bucă et al., 2016, p. 34)

In addition to the aggressive and assertive personality traits associated with salespeople and due

to the nature of how they conduct their business, salespeople often experience what is known as trait

anger. Trait anger is described as "the general tendency of individuals to experience and express anger,"

sometimes allowing a situation to "affect the cognitive process" and "trigger aggression." (Ding et al.,

2024, p. 501) Unfortunately, because of the stress associated with the nature of the sales industry, anger

can sometimes be inappropriately directed at an organization's employee, leaving the employee

experiencing embarrassment and finding themselves the victim of *workplace incivility*. Hashemi &

Shrivastava (2024) states that the humiliation the employee experiences causes harm to their self-

esteem and creates a toxic work environment for the individual, ultimately impacting their job

performance.

Organization's Role

Organizations have a responsibility to their employees to offer a safe and toxic-free work

environment. Hashemi & Shrivastava (2024) examines how when an organization fails to provide a safe

and toxic-free work environment, and the incivility employees experience is left unchecked, the lack of

job performance will impact the organization's bottom line. Over time, employees may become

disengaged from the organization, express a decreased commitment to the organization, and experience

increased work burnout. Over time, if management fails to address any incivility occurring in the

workplace, the organization will eventually experience an employee turnover as workers seek other

opportunities.

Workplace Incivility

Workplace incivility can be defined as "a low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to

harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect, which is assumed to be

discourteous and careless." (Jelavic, 2022, p. 575) According to the study, those who carry out *workplace*

incivility are known to have type-A personalities and high egos. With the extensive use of

communication *mediums* such as email and instant messaging, uncivil treatment can be quickly

delivered through *e-communication* due to its constant accessibility. Often, *face-to-face* communication

still occurs, and with both forms of communication, it is not always clear as to whether the intent is

genuinely meant to be hostile, as *workplace incivility* is a low-intensity form of abuse. Often, the intent

of the communication is left up to the receiver's interpretation.

Kroencke et al. (2023) examine how communication can be defined as three different modes:

face-to-face, computer-mediated (for the purpose of this study, the term *e-communication* will be used),

and mixed episodes, which is a combination of *face-to-face* and computer-mediated. All three modes are

commonly used today for work-related contexts and social interactions. As demonstrated in the study, when used positively, these forms of communication are suitable for a person's overall well-being, with *face-to-face* communication having the highest impact. While research is still needed to understand *e-communications'* impact on well-being, one positive is the "unlimited opportunities to communicate with others anytime and anywhere" (Kroencke et al., 2023, p. 438) offers. However, this form of communication could be less significant than *face-to-face* because of the limitations surrounding *e-communication*, i.e., lack of visible cues that include body language and facial expressions.

Through visual and vocal cues, *face-to-face* communication allows a better understanding of what the other person is trying to convey according to Lun et al. (2023). Individuals concerned with saving face or self-face, terms used to describe a person's concerns for protecting their reputation and image, will pay close attention and be aware of how they present themselves to another party. The study shows that self-face is higher in the workplace than in personal life, as protecting one's reputation plays a massive role in a person's success. This underscores the importance of maintaining a positive self-face in the professional sphere, as it can significantly impact one's career trajectory. Often, hierarchy within an organization will drive an individual's awareness of their demeanor, including body language and vocal tone, while communicating *face-to-face* with an individual of higher status.

Mehmood et al. (2024) examined how hostile or adverse events occurring in the workplace can cause psychological problems for an employee, impacting their overall well-being and job performance. Hostile behaviors include "mistreatment, ill mannerism, nasty comments, and disrespectful behaviors." (Mehmood et al., 2024, p. 2) This hostile form of *workplace incivility*, which happens through both verbal and nonverbal *mediums*, creates a toxic work environment for the employee and leaves them dissatisfied with their working conditions, often resulting in disengagement. The employee is no longer committed to the organization, and if the matter is reported to management and left unchecked, the employee will often seek employment elsewhere. In addition to lack of commitment and willingness to

quit, research on *workplace incivility* also shows that employees experience "low productivity, low job commitment, low organizational loyalty, self-blaming, badley effected psychological and physical well-being." (Mehmood et al., 2024, p. 4)

Significant research has focused on determining the possible causes of *workplace incivility*, how to prevent becoming uncivil to others, and coping mechanisms for dealing with being the victim of incivility. Indicators of causes of uncivil behavior include aggressive triggers, lack of sleep, and a failure to consider outcomes. Osgood et al. (2016) conducted a study on self-control, where it was determined whether counting to ten aids in acting uncivil. The argument is that self-control and counting to ten may help suppress the urge to react negatively when triggered and that "training self-control decreases aggression over time." (Osgood & Muraven, 2016, p.105) Another study conducted by Osgood et al. (2021) argued that sleep deprivation is also a trigger for *workplace incivility* through the ego-depletion effect, "[e]go-depletion theory posits that one's ability and/or motivation to use self-control diminishes after a significant exertion." (Osgood & Muraven, 2021, p. 81) However, there is still a great deal of study needed on this theory.

Osgood et al. (2021) describes anger as a set of feelings that often result in a desire to hurt another and can often produce aggressive behavior. When this aggressive behavior is conducted in the workplace, *workplace incivility* is present, impacting relationships among *coworkers* and "undermining team cohesion and performance." (Osgood et al., 2021, p. 81) The team dynamic is then compromised, and the organization suffers. Sleep deprivation is a significant trigger for anger and poor self-control.

Workplace Incivility, a prevalent issue, is a deviant for decreasing employee performance. Shockingly, research reveals that "98% of employees experience incivility in the workplace," (Turek, 2023, p. 107), leading to a reduction in job performance and an estimated financial revenue loss of "$14,000 per employee annually." (Turek, 2023, p. 107) The ways in which *coworkers* demonstrate *workplace incivility*, such as "taking credit for someone else's work, spreading rumors, demonstrating

ostracism or biased criticism of other people's work, and omitting select individuals when giving

information" (Turek, 2023, p. 109) are alarming. When *workplace incivility* occurs, it is crucial for

organizational leaders to take the initiative to improve the work environment, demonstrate support for

the targeted employee, and bring work production back to peak performance.

Ostracism, a particularly damaging form of *workplace incivility*, can occur through *e-

communication*, *face-to-face* communication, or both and triggers an emotional stressor that is

"considered as critical since it leads to emotional responses and instigation of counterproductive work

behaviors" (Zeeshan et al., 2024, p. 55) for the victim. The study conducted by Zeeshan et al. (2024)

highlights ego and sense of entitlement as personality traits of the aggressor who targets an individual

for intentional ostracism. Therefore, the organizational culture and environment plays a pivotal role in

preventing ostracism from occurring in the workplace.

Zhang et al. (2019) examines face-negotiation theory, referencing *face-to-face* communication

which can significantly impact an organization's culture and environment. When *workplace incivility*

occurs through *e-communication* and is then followed by *face-to-face* communication, and if called for,

apologies are easily exchanged. *Face-to-face* communication is described as "provid[ing] a

comprehensive organizaning framework for expounding cultural, individual, and situational influences on

facework and conflict behavior," (Zhang et al., 2019, p. 505) because of the visual and verbal cues

provided during the *face-to-face* communication processes. With the emotional indicators displayed,

face-to-face communication can often influence forgiveness.

In another study conducted by Zhang et al., (2014) the face is described as "an individual's

claimed sense of favorable image in the context of social and relational networks, and facework refers to

the behavior that people use to enact self-face." (Zhang et al., 2014, p. 373) The study further examines

how emotions significantly impact *face-to-face* communication, culture, and environment. According to

the study, "Americans are found to experience more ego-focused emotions." (Zhang et al., 2014, p. 377)

Theoretical Framework

Defining Work Communication Medium

Work communication *medium* is used to describe "all types of social interactions that occur through the use of technological devices such as computers or phones." (Kroencke et al., 2023, p. 438) For this study, the *mediums* of communication are email and instant messaging and are referred to as *e-communication*. Work communication *mediums* provide "unlimited opportunities to communicate with others anytime and anywhere" (Kroencke et al., 2023, p. 438), giving *coworkers* unlimited access to their colleagues. With the use of communication *mediums*, two opportunities present themselves for *workplace incivility* to occur.

1. The sender may not take the time to check their text for tone and come across as hostile and negative to the receiver. This unintentional hostility may cause emotional stress for the receiver.

2. The sender may intentionally send hostile and negative text, knowing there is no concern for accountability present in the workplace and disregard the potential impact on the receiver. This intentional hostility can have a significant negative impact on the receiver, underscoring the urgency of addressing *workplace incivility*.

Defining Face-to-Face Communication

Face-to-face communication is "social interaction" (Kroencke et al., 2023, p. 438) between two or more individuals. Expression and meaning are delivered more precisely during *face-to-face* communication, as visible emotions are present and easily observed. With *face-to-face* communication, both parties are highly aware of the other's presence at that moment. Concepts of face-negotiation theory were used to discuss personality traits such as self-face and ego and the role these traits may have on a sender's ability to send hostile and negative comments through communication *mediums*.

Face-negotiation theory "provides a sound explanatory framework for explicating cultural, individual, and situational influences on facework behavior and conflict styles." (Zhang et al., 2014, p. 373)

The concepts of *medium* and face-negotiation theories provide a framework for studying the potential surge in *workplace incivility* with an estimated 98% of employees claiming to have experienced incivility in the workplace during some point of their career (Turek, 2023, p. 107). With the increasing reliance on *e-communication* in the workplace, it is crucial to address whether this trend has led to a surge in *workplace incivility*, a concern that should motivate organizations to take appropriate action to prevent incivility with the working environment. When lines about what is intentional and what can be claimed as accidental are blurred, an organization's culture becomes lost, and the workplace environment becomes toxic.

Method

The method used to conduct research for this study was an individual interview process with a sample of six individuals from a commercial real estate services firm—the interviewees were a diverse group of men and women. The men and women were pulled from the four different departments of the firm, which include brokerage, project management, property management, and research. The interviewees were selected from ages 21 to 70 and ages were divided into 10-year increments. The sample size also included individuals within different hierarchies of the firm.

Each interviewee was contacted via *e-communication* and asked if they would be interested in participating in the study. It was explained at the front end that the interview would take at least 30 minutes and that there was a list of 11 questions. It was explained to each interviewee why the interview request was being made and the subject matter involving concepts of theories on *medium* and *face-to-face* communications. After receiving approval to participate in the interview, a 30-minute meeting was scheduled to fit the interviewee's schedule. Management's approval was received prior to conducting

the interviews, considering the interviews would take place at the office and during regular business hours.

<div align="center">**Results**</div>

Interviews were conducted with a sample of six individuals from a commercial real estate services firm. The sample was diverse, using both men and women from different age groups. The age groups were a collection of people ranging from 21 to 70 and ages were broken down into 10-year increments. The interviewees were pulled from the four divisions of the firm, including brokerage, project management, property management, and research and from different hierarchies. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the interviewee profiles.

Table 1

Interviewee Profiles

Gender		Age Groups		Divisions	
Male:	2	21-30:	0	Brokerage:	2
Female:	4	31-40:	3	Project Management:	1
		41-50:	1	Property Management:	1
		51-60:	1	Research:	1
		61-70:	1	C-Suite:	1

Provided is a breakdown of each interviewee's responses and thoughts on their experiences with work communication *mediums* and *face-to-face* communication. In answering the 11 questions, some had very similar responses, while there were only a couple whose answers differed. The first question asked the interviewees to gauge their use of work communication *mediums* versus their *face-to-face* communications in an average 40-hour work week. Followed by questions on negative and positive comments received through mediums and *e-communication* versus *face-to-face* interactions. Table 2 provides a complete overview of answers, and a list of the questions asked is included in the appendix section at the end of this study.

Table 2

Interview Results

Questions	Results				
	20%	**40%**	**60%**	**80%**	
How often would you say you use e-communication mediums, i.e. email or instant messaging in a 40-hour work week?	0	1	2	3	
	Yes	No	Depends		
Received negative or hostile comments through work communication mediums?	6	0			
Received positive comments through work communication mediums?	6	0			
Witnessed negative or hostile comments through work communication mediums?	5	1			
Witnessed positive comments through work communication mediums?	5	1			
Sent negative or hostile comments through work communication mediums?	1	5			
Sent positive comments through work communication mediums?	6	0			
Experienced face-to-face communication within the same workday after receiving negative comments from that same person?	4	2			
Does communication mediums result in better outcomes?	0	3	3		
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being negative and 5 being positive, rate your overall experience with work communication mediums.	0	0	2	2	2

Interviewee 1

This interviewee stated that they use work communication *mediums* 60% of the time compared

to *face-to-face* communication and expressed having received hostile comments from a coworker

through *e-communication*. They recalled experiencing feelings of being undervalued, insulted, and

disrespected. When asked to describe the next *face-to-face* interaction with the sender of the hostile

comments, they explained how they were still emotionally distraught and uncomfortable. However, the

sender's demeanor was as if nothing had ever happened. They also shared that they witnessed hostility

in a group *e-communication* thread, which made them consider the content unnecessary and

unprofessional. Overall, they would instead use *face-to-face* communication but expressed that *e-

communication* adds another communication layer for collaboration.

Interviewee 2

Interviewee 2 uses work communication *mediums* 80% of the time during a standard 40-hour work week. This interviewee expressed having received hostile comments in both *e-communication* and *face-to-face* communication. They expressed feelings of being belittled and small. They also expressed feelings of anger when receiving hostile comments through *e-communication*. During the *face-to-face* communication with the same sender, they stated how the sender was aggressive at first but then calmed down. The aggressive demeanor of the sender made the interviewee feel uncomfortable, but they knew the conversation had to be held. They shared that the sender later came around and apologized. The interviewee also witnessed hostile comments in a group *e-communication* thread, which made them want to jump to the receiver's defense.

Interviewee 3

This interviewee stated that a safe estimate of work communication *medium* use is up to roughly 60%, compared to lesser use in previous years. They also stated that they have received hostile comments through *e-communications*. However, these comments were not received from an individual inside the organization, and they never saw the individual *face-to-face*. They also shared that they witnessed hostile comments in a group *e-communication* thread but could not recall the situation's specifics or the comments.

Interviewee 4

Interviewee 4 stated a high volume of work communication *medium* use at roughly 80%. Like Interviewee 3, they also experienced hostile comments through *e-communication* but were received by someone outside the organization. The interviewee shared witnessing hostile comments in a group communication thread, stating that the comments were from someone in a leadership role and felt as though the conversation should have been discontinued from the group thread and discussed in person behind closed doors. They also shared that they preferred *face-to-face* communication over the use of a

medium as it presents the opportunity to read body language and facial expressions and listen to tone of voice. They stated that using a communication *medium* allows messaging to get easily misinterpreted.

Interviewee 5

This interviewee expressed the lowest use of work communication *mediums*, with roughly 40% use. They shared that they have received hostile comments and stated that the comments are usually sent through *e-communication*. When hostile comments are received, they pursue the sender and insist that the conversation be continued through *face-to-face* communication. The interviewee stated that they always prefer having the opportunity to observe physical and facial expressions and to listen to tone of voice, especially when dealing with conflict. *Face-to-face* results in a better-resolved outcome, as *e-communication* allows for a conflict to drag out and go without achieving a complete resolution. Things can get lost in the weeds of digital platforms.

Interviewee 6

Interview 6 shared that a high volume of work communication *mediums* is used at 80%. While the interviewee expressed having received hostile comments through *e-communication*, they also stated that the sender was someone outside the firm. They expressed how, when reading the comments, they were in disbelief that someone would send these negative comments to someone else. They recalled experiencing emotions of not feeling good. They also experienced *face-to-face* communication with the sender shortly after receiving the hostile comments and sensed the uneasiness. The interviewee stated how there was an overwhelming presence of having and used the term "elephant in the room." They also said the issue at hand needed to be resolved despite the emotions they were feeling at the time. Above all else, the interviewee prefers *face-to-face* communication.

<div align="center">

Conclusion

</div>

Interviews conducted for the research of this study demonstrate that *workplace incivility* is present when using work communication *mediums* within organizations. All six interviewees

acknowledged experiencing hostile or negative comments through *e-communications*. The results are not surprising, considering an overwhelming 98% of American employees reported experiencing incivility in the workplace at some point during their careers, according to Turek (2023). Three of the six interviewees expressed the emotional strain the hostile comments took on them, while the other three did not express having been phased by the hostile comments they received. Four interviewees shared that they had a *face-to-face* conversation with the sender of the hostile comments shortly after receiving them. These four interviewees had common feedback that while they may have experienced emotions, they knew the conversations needed to be held. Personality traits such as self-face and ego did not come into play regarding the hostile comments. However, specific questions regarding personality were not asked. Therefore, regardless of having received hostile comments through *e-communication*, all six interviewees expressed happiness with using communication *mediums* for work, acknowledging neutral to positive experiences. Half said that it depends on the situation or project as to whether they prefer communicating through *mediums* versus *face-to-face* communication.

Recommendations

Further research is needed to determine if *workplace incivility* is rising due to the increased use of work communication *mediums*. Due to this study's small sample size, more evidence is needed to arrive at a sound conclusion to this theory. While the study provides evidence indicating incivility is present in the workplace, whether it is on the rise is still being determined. It also needs to be clarified whether the increased use of communication *mediums* and lack of accountability associated with using these *mediums* is the cause. The nature and environment of the business where the interviews were conducted could be the reason behind the presence of *workplace incivility*, as it was clear that all six interviewees had experienced hostile comments, both through *e-communication* and *face-to-face*, at some point during their career with the organization. It is recommended that using a larger sample size from various types of organizations be used to conduct additional research on this theory.

References

Artinger, S., Vulkan, N., & Shem-Tov, Y., (2015). Entrepreneurs' Negotiation Behavior. *Small Business*

   Economics, 44(4), 737-757. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-014-9619-8

Bleize, D. N. M., Anschütz, D. J., Tanis, M., & Buijzen, M., (2022). Testing a First Online Intervention to

   Reduce Conformity to Cyber Aggression in Messaging Apps. *PLoS One (Public Library of Science),*

   17(8), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0272615

Bucă, A., Călin, M. & Mincu, L., (2016). The Relationship Between Hexaco Model of Personality and

   Employee Well-Being. *Romainian Journal of Experimental Applied Psychology, 7(1)*, 26-37.

   https://research-ebsco-

   com.ezproxy.lib.apsu.edu/c/nirwsu/viewer/pdf/se2jtekx6n?route=details

Ding, J. L., Wu, Y. W., & Yan, W. J., (2024). Unraveling the Complex Interactions of Psychological Factors

   Contributing to Cyber Reactive Aggression Among College Students: Network and Mediation

   Analyses. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 39(3-4),* 499-518.

   https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605231198809

Hashemi, B., & Shrivastava, A., (2024). Impact of Workplace Incivility on Choice of Coping Strategies: A

   Mixed Method Study. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health, 39(2),* 194-216.

   https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2024.2337942

Jelavic, S. R., (2022). Systematization of Antecedents and Effects of Workplace Incivility. *Interdisciplinary*

   Description of Complex Systems 20(5), 574-589.

   https://indecs.eu/index.php?s=x&y=2022&p=574-589

Kroencke, L., Harari, G. M., Back, M. D., & Wagner, J., (2023). Well-Being in Social Interactions:

   Examining Personality-Situation Dynamics in Face-to-Face and Computer-Mediated

   Communication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: Personality Processes and*

   Individual Differences, 124(2), 437-460. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000422

Lun, V. M. C., Smith, P. B., Grigoryan, L., Torres, C., Papastylianou, A., Lopukhova, O. G., Sunar, D.,

      Easterbrook, M. J., Koc, Y., Selim, H. A., Chobthamkit, P., Chaleeraktrakoon, T., Gul, P., Floriano,

      L. P., Diaz-Loving, R., Kwantes, C. T., Yuki, M., Ogusu, N., van Osch, Y., Texeira, M. L. M., Hu, P.,

      Abbas, A., Tripodi, D., … Hakobjanyan, A., (2023). Need for Approval from Others and Face

      Concerns as Predicators of Interpersonal Conflict Outcome in 29 Cultural Groups. *International

      Journal of Psychology, 58(3),* 258-271. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12895

Mehmood, S., Rasool, M., Ahmed, M., Haddad, H., & Al-Ramahi, N. M., (2024). Role of Workplace

      Bullying and Workplace Incivility for Employee Performance: Mediated-Moderated Mechanism.

      PLoS One (Public Library of Science), 19(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0291877

Osgood, J. M., & Muraven, M., (2016). Does Counting to Ten Increase or Decrease Aggression? The Role

      of State Self-Control (Ego-Depletion) and Consequences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,

      46,* 105-113. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12334

Osgood, J. M., Yates, H. K., Adler, A. B., Dyches, K. D., & Quartana, P. J. (2021). Tired and angry: Sleep,

      mental health, and workplace relational aggression. *Military Psychology, 33(2)*, 80-91.

      https://doi.org/10.1080/08995605.2021.1897490

Turek, D., (2023). How and When Workplace Incivility Decrease Employee Work Outcomes. A

      Moderated-Mediated Model. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 45(4),* 107-124.

      https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2023.2224479

Zeeshan, M., Batool, N., Raza, M. A., & Mujtaba, B. G., (2024). Workplace Ostracism and Instigated

      Workplace Incivility: A Moderated Mediation Model of Narcissism and Negative

      Emotions. *Public Organization Review, 24,* 53-73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-023-

      00754-w

Zhang, Q., Oetzel, J. G., Ting-Toomey, S., & Zhang, J., (2015). Making Up or Getting Even? The Effects of

        Face Concerns, Self-Construal, and Apology on Forgiveness, Reconciliation, and Revenge

        in the United States and China. *Communication Research, 46(4),* 503-524.

        https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215607959

Zhang, Q., Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J. G., (2014). Linking Emotion to the Conflict Face-Negotiation

        Theory: A U.S. – China Investigation of the Mediating Effects of Anger, Compassion, and

        Guilt in Interpersonal Conflict. *Human Communication Research, 40(3),* 373-395.

        https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12029

Appendix

Interview Questions

Basic Information:

1) Gender – Male or Female

2) Age range – 21-30; 31-40; 41-50; 51-60; 61-70

3) Division – C-Suite; Brokerage; Project Management; Property Management; Research

Questions:

1) How often would you say you use communication mediums, i.e., email or instant messaging, for work versus face-to-face or voice communications in a standard 40-hour work week? 20%, 40%, 60% or 80%

2) Have you ever received negative or hostile comments through work communication mediums? Yes or No. Who were the comments from, coworker, client, or manager? What were the circumstances surrounding the comments? How did it make you feel?

3) Have you ever received positive comments through work communication mediums? Yes or No. Who were the comments from, coworker, client, or manager? What were the circumstances surrounding the comments? How did it make you feel?

4) As a participant in a group communication thread via work communication mediums, have you witnessed negative or hostile communication occur between two other individuals on the thread? What were your thoughts while you were watching these events?

5) Same question as 4 but for positive communication?

6) Have you ever intentionally sent negative or hostile comments to another person via work communication mediums? Why did you send the comments? How did it make you feel after? Did you regret sending the email?

7) Same question as 6 but for positive communications?

8) Have you ever experienced a face-to-face conversation within the same workday after receiving

    negative or hostile comments through work communication mediums? Yes or No. In your

    opinion, what was the person's demeanor towards you? Were you comfortable or uncomfortable

    during the face-to-face conversation?

9) How would you rate your overall experience with work communication mediums, 1 being

    negative and 5 being positive?

10) Would you say that work communication mediums receive better outcomes when it comes to

    work-related projects than the more traditional face-to-face communication?

11) Would you like to elaborate or add any additional comments on your overall experiences with

    work communication mediums?