Running Head: LEADER DOMINANCE & INCIVILITY

Are Dominant Communications Perceived as Uncivil? Exploring the Moderating Roles of Leader Gender and Organizational Uncertainty

By
Megan Manels-Murphy

A Thesis Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Masters of Science in Applied (I/O) Psychology

August 2021, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Approved:	Dr. Camilla Holmvall Supervisor
Approved:	Dr. Kevin Kelloway Committee Member
Approved:	Dr. Dianne Ford Committee Member
Approved:	Dr. Wendy Carroll External Examiner
Date:	August, 19th 2021

Table of Contents

List of Tables....4

Acknowledgements....5

Abstract....6

Are Dominant Communications Perceived as Uncivil? Exploring the Moderating Roles of Leader Gender and Organizational Uncertainty....7

Background....11

Incivility....11

Prevalence and Negative Outcomes of Incivility....13

Gender and Incivility....15

Theoretical Lenses Underlying Differences in Dominance Displays....17

Gender Stereotypes....17

Role Congruity Theory....18

Expectancy Violation Theory....18

Communion and Agency....19

Uncertainty....21

Methods....24

Participants and Design....24

Procedure....26

Manipulation....27

Organizational Stability 27

District Manager (Leader) Gender 28

District Manager (Leader) Behaviour 28

Measures 29

Primary Dependent Variable: Incivility 29

Manipulation and Stimulus Checks 30

Race of Manager 30

Gender of Manager 30

Manager Dominance 31

Manager Warmth 31

Organizational Uncertainty 31

Job Insecurity 31

Demographic Information 32

Exploratory Measures 32

Results 32

Data Cleaning and Screening 32

Attention and Stimulus Checks 33

Dominance and Organizational Stability Manipulation Checks 35

Main Analyses 43

Discussion 50

Possible Theoretical Implications.....57

Limitations.....61

Future Research 65

Conclusion 68

References.....69

Appendix - Vignette 87

List of Tables

Table 1: Participant Condition Distribution 35

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelation for All Variables 37

Table 3: Multivariate Findings from MANOVA Assessing Dominance, Warmth, Job Insecurity & Organizational Uncertainty 38

Table 4: Univariate Findings from MANOVA Assessing Dominance, Warmth, Job Insecurity & Organizational Uncertainty 39

Table 5: Significant Simple Main Effects Assessing Job Insecurity & Organizational Uncertainty 43

Table 6: Multivariate Results from MANOVA Assessing Direct Incivility, Indirect Incivility and Legitimacy 45

Table 7: Univariate Results from MANOVA Assessing Direct Incivility, Indirect Incivility and Legitimacy 46

Table 8: Estimated Marginal Means for Incivility Outcomes as a Function of Leader Gender, Behaviour & Organizational Stability.....49

Acknowledgements

I would like to begin by thanking my supervisor, Dr. Camilla Holmvall, to whom I owe a great deal for offering consistent support and guidance throughout this journey. Thank you for your patience with all the missteps I made along the way and for pushing me to think more critically which ultimately led to a paper and defense I can be proud of. This was a particularly challenging year, and I am so happy to have had you in my corner.

I'd also like to thank my committee members Dr. Dianne Ford, Dr. Kevin Kelloway and Dr. Wendy Carroll who have been unbelievably accommodating and supportive.

To my parents, Sandy and Robert, I cannot thank you enough for the endless love and encouragement you have always given me. You consistently go above and beyond any expectations for me and have believed in me every step of the way. Without you, none of this could be possible. I love you.

I would like to thank all my friends and family members who have been incredibly supportive throughout my entire master's degree. A special thank you to Ehsan, I'm so grateful to have made such a caring and kind friend! To Ryleigh and Lianne, despite being in separate provinces during a global pandemic, you not only managed to keep me company on some of my longest nights, studying and writing until the early morning but somehow, you made it fun! I'm so thankful for you.

Finally, to my little family, Logan, Bentley and Levi. Thank you for keeping my spirits high, for making sure I get out and enjoy life even when I was overwhelmed with work, for making me laugh every single day and for ALWAYS being there when I needed a shoulder to lean on. I love you more than life itself.

Are Dominant Communications Perceived as Uncivil? Exploring the Moderating Roles of Leader Gender and Organizational Uncertainty

By: Megan Manels-Murphy

Abstract

Drawing on the workplace incivility literature and theoretical lenses on gender (e.g., Role Congruity Theory; Eagly & Karau, 2002), I predicted that female (vs. male) leaders displaying dominant (vs. neutral) behaviours would be perceived as more uncivil. Based on Uncertainty Management Theory (van den Bos & Lind, 2002), this pattern was expected to be exacerbated within an unstable (vs. stable) organization. Using an online experimental design, participants (N=815) were randomly assigned to one of eight vignettes that manipulated leader behaviour, leader gender and organizational stability. Results revealed no significant interactions for three measures of incivility. There was a significant main effect of leader behaviour, however; dominant (vs. neutral) leaders were perceived as more uncivil. Additional analyses found that dominant (vs. neutral) leaders were perceived as less warm and also increased feelings of job insecurity and organizational uncertainty, especially within a stable organization. Limitations, implications and future research avenues are discussed.

August 2021

Are Dominant Communications Perceived as Uncivil? Exploring the Moderating Roles of Leader Gender and Organizational Uncertainty

Incivility is a type of interpersonal mistreatment that is hazardous to workplaces (Schilpzand et al., 2016) and is highly prevalent; the majority of employees have directly or indirectly experienced incivility at work (Porath & Pearson, 2013). Andersson and Pearson (1999) define incivility as low-intensity discourteous or rude acts with ambiguous intent to harm. More recent literature has questioned some components of the existing definition. Specifically, Miner and colleagues (2018) proposed, for example, that ambiguous intent may not be a necessary condition of incivility. Nevertheless, broad examples of actions that are widely used to assess incivility include: not paying attention to someone's views, interrupting, or speaking over someone, and doubting someone's judgment (Cortina et al., 2001; 2013; Matthews & Ritter, 2015). Given the more subtle and potentially ambiguous nature of incivility as a deviant workplace behaviour, its effects are largely dependent on the perception and appraisal of those who experience it (e.g., Cortina & Magley, 2009; Gabriel et al., 2018).

The instigator's characteristics, such as their power or gender, can influence the target's perception of the uncivil interaction including judgments of its acceptability (Carmona-Cobo et al., 2019) and the extent of its consequences (e.g., negative affect; Cortina & Magley, 2009). For example, Motro and colleagues (2021) found that when male and female team members engaged in the same uncivil action, there was a greater decrease in the team's overall positive affect in response to a female (vs. male) instigator. Similarly, in a vignette study set in a male-dominated field depicting an uncivil

interaction, female leaders were perceived as more uncivil compared to male leaders when assessed by an observer (Carmona-Cobo et al., 2019).

Previous studies have found an overlap between agency and incivility, such that agentic actions may be viewed as uncivil (Gabriel et al., 2018; Motro et al., 2021). Additionally, past research has speculated that female instigators, especially those in positions of power, may be judged more harshly when engaging in potentially uncivil actions due to gender stereotypes (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2018; Motro et al., 2021; Porath et al., 2008) which dictate that women should be communal and not agentic, whereas stereotypes for men typically support agency and not communion (Eagly, 1987; Rudman et al., 2012). This relationship between gender and reactions to agentic actions can be explained by Role Congruity Theory, which posits that when engaging in negative actions such as those that might be considered agentic, those for whom such actions are more counter-stereotypical (women) are judged more harshly than when the actions are in line with gender stereotypes (men; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Rudman & Glick, 1999; 2001; Rudman et al., 2012).

That said, there is also evidence that suggests the penalty toward women who express agency is more nuanced than earlier studies explain. Specifically, those who display negative counter-stereotypical traits (e.g., dominance) may be perceived negatively (Livingston et al., 2012; Rudman et al., 2012; Williams & Tiedens, 2016), but those who display positive counter-stereotypical traits (e.g., self-reliance) are not (Schaumberg & Flynn, 2017). For example, Schaumberg and Flynn (2017; Study 4) found that women expressing self-reliant agentic behaviour were perceived to be better

leaders in comparison to self-reliant men, whereas dominant female leaders were perceived as worse leaders than self-reliant female leaders and marginally worse leaders than dominant male leaders. Thus, engaging in agentic-dominant behaviour, which can include interrupting, demanding something from another, power-seeking and so on, is generally seen as more acceptable for men (vs. women) (Motro et al., 2021; Williams & Tiedens, 2016). Indeed, women have been shown to receive backlash when behaving in a domineering manner (Livingston et al., 2012; Williams & Tiedens, 2016).

In the present study, I focus on judgments of agentic-dominant behaviour as it has been shown to have some overlap with incivility (Motro et al., 2021) and is directly tied to gender stereotypes (Rudman et al., 2012). Thus, the first goal of the current study is to assess whether female leaders who express agentic-dominant traits to their employees are perceived as more uncivil relative to male leaders who express the same agentic-dominant traits.

Beyond individual characteristics, it is also important to consider environmental or organizational factors and their influence on perceptions of incivility. Indeed, as stated by Pearson and colleagues (2000) “evaluating an incident to determine whether it is an incivility involves examining the actions and perceptions of the instigator, the target, any observers of the incident, and the social setting in which the incident took place” (p.126). For instance, individuals facing uncertainty in the workplace often feel a lack of control (Bordia et al., 2004) and may experience stress and anxiety (DiFonzo & Bordia, 2002). In uncertain situations, information seeking is a coping mechanism individuals may use in an attempt to regain control (Fung et al., 2018; Huang & Yang, 2020); in doing so, they

may become more aware of subtle cues and changes in their environment. Researchers have suggested that uncertainty in one's role or environment may incite greater vigilance and increased perceptions of incivility (Carmona-Cobo et al., 2019) and greater perceptions of mistreatment (van den Bos & Lind, 2002). Specifically, information seeking would cause the individual under threat to be more perceptive during their interactions (e.g., analyzing tones, body language).

However, threat may also limit individuals' ability to process information objectively. Indeed, previous studies suggest that when faced with uncertain situations individuals can become overwhelmed leading them to engage in more close-minded thinking regarding their attitudes and values (McGregor et al., 2001). Arguably, close-minded thinking may lead to greater use of heuristic processing including the use of stereotypes. Threat-Rigidity Theory (Staw et al., 1981) postulates that when individuals are under threat, they may be prone to reverting to well-learned mechanisms and more narrow information processing, leading stereotypes to be particularly likely to influence reactions to others' behaviour (Holsti, 1971).

Thus, a second purpose of this study is to evaluate whether, when under high (vs. low) threat conditions, operationalized in the current study via organizational instability, agentic-dominant female (vs. male) leaders are perceived as more uncivil. Specifically, those under threat (vs. not under threat) may take more notice of potentially uncivil actions due to information seeking and may evaluate those actions in line with gender stereotypes due to biases, leading to a greater penalty against female (vs. male) leaders.

In the sections that follow, I outline the background and theory for the current study in more detail.

Background

Incivility

The term workplace incivility was coined in 1999 by Andersson and Pearson, who were influenced by the work of many scholars before them in the realm of workplace deviance (i.e., Ashforth, 1994; Baron & Neuman, 1996; Bjorkqvist et al., 1994; Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997; Kinney, 1995; O'Leary-Kelly et al., 1996; Perlow & Latham, 1993; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; VandenBos & Bulatao, 1996). The authors note that incivility can be distinguished from other deviant work behaviour because it is generally passive, low intensity, and ambiguous in its intent to harm, whereas other forms of mistreatment reflect higher intensity actions and have clearer intent to harm (e.g., aggression, bullying). In more recent work, there has been a discussion regarding the ambiguity and organizational norms components of incivility, such that these may vary on a case-by-case basis (Miner et al., 2018).

Researchers have also drawn a distinction between forms of incivility labelled *overt* and *covert,* respectively (see also Yuan et al., 2020). Carmona-Cobo et al. (2019) describe covert incivility as more indirect and subtle acts of incivility. Some examples of this form are ignoring colleagues, not participating in a collaborative project, and not paying attention in a meeting or during a presentation. In contrast, overt incivility reflects more obvious and sometimes public instances of undermining or questioning judgment,

for example, gossiping, public reprimands, or making accusations about competence or credibility in front of others.

More overt forms of incivility have been included in many studies (e.g., Clark, 2008; Cortina et al., 2013; Politis, 2017; Tarraf, 2012); however, it has been argued that such actions not only overlap with other forms of deviant workplace behaviour (e.g., aggression), stripping incivility of its unique definition but further, such actions may lack the ambiguity which the original definition highlights (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Hershcovis, 2011; Matthews & Ritter, 2015).

In the present research, I focus on more *covert* acts of incivility which are more likely to maintain the ambiguous intent and subtle nature of the construct. By maintaining the ambiguity and subtlety, there is less objective information available to the "target," likely leaving greater room for interpretation of the instigator's actions, potentially based in, or influenced by, stereotypes. Further, my focus is to identify the relationship between perceptions of incivility and dominant behaviour which has been acknowledged as a form of incivility (Gabriel et al., 2018). Indeed, existing incivility scales capture some actions which may align with the definition of dominance, for example, paying little attention to employee views or opinions (Cortina et al., 2001), interrupting employees (Cortina et al., 2013), and failing to consult with them (Martin & Hine, 2005). My narrower focus on a specific form of incivility (covert) is in keeping with more recent research, which highlights more nuanced findings depending on how incivility is measured or manipulated (Carmona-Cobo et al., 2019; Tarraf, 2012). Although the intent to harm

when behaving uncivilly may often be unclear, research supports that it is nevertheless associated with many negative employee and organizational outcomes.

Prevalence and Negative Outcomes of Incivility

In a 2010 study, Porath and Pearson reported that 96% of the employees they had surveyed in the past five years had experienced incivility in their workplace (the sample was taken across various industries). This number is nearly four times that of their 1998 poll on incidents of workplace rudeness (which now would likely be labelled as experienced incivility) and is also a significant increase from a 2001 report by Cortina and colleagues, who found that 71% of those polled were a target of incivility (the sample was taken from employees in the federal court system). This pattern of data may indicate an increase in incidents of workplace incivility, which is of concern as there have been many negative effects associated with this form of mistreatment (Porath & Pearson, 2010; 2013; Schilpzand et al., 2016).

According to a 2016 review by Schilpzand and colleagues, evidence suggests that incivility can lead to varied negative outcomes, across four broad categories: affective (e.g., emotional exhaustion, negative affect, increased stress and depression), attitudinal (e.g., decreased motivation and job satisfaction), cognitive (e.g., decreased perceptions of fairness and task-related memory), and behavioural (e.g., decreased productivity). For example, in a large-scale survey, 63% of those who experienced incivility reported they lost time at work trying to avoid the offender and 80% reported they had lost time worrying about the incident (Porath & Pearson, 2010). The same study also showed that participants had noticed a decline in their performance, creativity, presence, productivity,

and effort following uncivil incidents (Porath & Pearson, 2010). A more recent study using a large sample of employees from various jobs noted similar findings as incivility was a significant predictor of production deviance (absenteeism, lateness, and lack of effort) and withdrawal (Welbourne & Sariol, 2017).

Beyond workplace outcomes, incivility can affect one's overall well-being and it can also bleed into employees' personal lives. Results from a large sample of employees found that incivility had a moderate negative correlation with overall mental health, which in turn, was also highly correlated with physical health (Lim et al., 2008). Additionally, it has been shown that some choose to rely on family members by venting and seeking support when targeted by incivility (Cortina et al., 2001) and thus negative affect may impact a wider scope of individuals than just direct targets or those inside the workplace (Park & Haun, 2018).

Overall, these findings indicate that experienced incivility can have a negative and significant impact on an individual's personal life as well as their work-life, which in turn also affects the organization as a whole (Porath & Pearson 2010; Schilpzand, et al., 2016). In fact, for those who experience incivility, the cost to the company is estimated to be approximately $14,000 per employee (Porath & Pearson, 2010). If the person instigating the incivility is a leader, the cost could be millions as leaders interact with many employees and often set the tone of the workplace (Porath & Pearson, 2013).

Given the negative consequences that may ensue from perceived incivility, understanding factors that may influence judgments of incivility is of paramount importance. In the current research, I consider both characteristics of the instigator (in

terms of leader gender) as well as characteristics of the context (via uncertainty) in the prediction of incivility judgments.

Gender and Incivility

When examining gender differences in incivility, specifically instigator gender differences, there have been mixed findings in the literature. For example, Pearson and Porath (2005) found that men were twice as likely to instigate incivility in comparison to women. On the other hand, a more recent study suggests that women may be more likely to instigate incivility when it is directed toward other women, particularly toward agentic women (Gabriel et al., 2018). Moreover, a meta-analysis of target-reported experiences of incivility suggests that women report greater experienced incivility than men, although the gender effect size was very small (McCord et al., 2018).

However, when looking specifically at *perceptions* of incivility rather than reported experiences, there is less literature. One exception is the work of Carmona-Cobo et al. (2019), who examined perceptions of incivility based on power dynamics. Participants (who were high school students) read a text-based vignette in which they were witnesses to an uncivil interaction between a leader (instigator) and their subordinate (target). They found an effect of leader gender, such that when asked to judge the same uncivil situation, participants perceived more incivility in the incident when the instigator was a female (vs. male) leader. Additionally, an experimental study by Motro and colleagues (2021) manipulated incivility and instigator gender among team members. They manipulated incivility through feedback and negotiation vignettes delivered via live computer chat rooms where a confederate team member behaved uncivilly through

dominant and assertive expressions. They hypothesized that because negotiations require a level of assertiveness and general agency, that this context may reinforce the negative stereotyping backlash women face when they instigate incivility. Results showed that uncivil (vs. civil) behaviour from female (vs. male) team members led to a greater decrease in team positive affect as well as a decrease in team creativity. Further, positive affect was not affected when the male team member behaved uncivilly (vs. civilly). These findings support the notion that women are at a disadvantage when behaving uncivilly and the behaviour in question is related to specific agentic traits.

In the current study, agency was chosen as the focal manipulated variable as a number of researchers have posited a connection between incivility and agency (Carmona-Cobo et al., 2019; Gabriel et al., 2018; Motro et al., 2021). Researchers speculate that uncivil behaviour is more correlated with agency such as dominance and assertiveness, rather than with communion and for this reason, they posit that women displaying more agentic-dominant actions will be subject to a harsher response because such actions are negatively viewed, as they are counter-stereotypical traits (Motro et al., 2021).

This speculation is supported by empirical evidence. For example, Livingston and colleagues (2012) investigated the effects of gender and race on dominant leader status[1] reviews. They found that White female (and Black male) leaders received lower ratings when engaging in dominant versus communal actions whereas this dominance penalty

[1] Status was calculated by the combination of variables measuring: subordinate performance, admiration from subordinates, perceived respect from colleagues and their estimated salary.

pattern did not hold for White male (or Black female) leaders. These findings suggest that race and gender may interact to influence dominance penalties. Similarly, Schaumberg and Flynn (2017) conducted multiple experimental studies investigating the nuances of various positive versus negative agentic traits and their impact on leader evaluations as a function of gender. They found (Study 4) that dominant women received worse evaluations than women displaying positive agency (self-reliance). The dominant female leader was also rated marginally lower than the dominant male leader.

In their meta-analysis investigating penalties for dominant women, Williams and Tiedens (2016) found, when comparing dominant women to dominant men, a small effect for differences in likeability (d = -.19), a medium effect for hireability (d = -.58) but no significant difference in perceived competency. The present study adds to the existing dominance literature as very few past studies investigating gender differences have considered perceived incivility as an outcome. The existing literature draws on *Role Congruity Theory* and *Expectancy Violation Theory* to explain potential dominance penalties for women. I review these theoretical lenses next.

Theoretical Lenses Underlying Gender Differences in Dominance Displays

Gender Stereotypes. Stereotypes are widely held assumptions, oversimplifications or generalizations of a particular group (Eagly et al., 2000). One way in which individuals are stereotyped is based on their gender through expected gender roles. Interestingly, gender stereotypes are not purely descriptive (traits that are *typical* for a man or woman), they can also be prescriptive or proscriptive. These latter categories refer to the idea that a specific trait or behaviour is how men or women *should* behave

(prescriptive) or how men and women *should not* behave (proscriptive or negative counter-stereotypical, i.e., traits that are incongruent with expectations; Rudman et al., 2012). Further, the traits typically associated with masculine stereotypes are often agentic (e.g., assertiveness, independence, ambition, dominance) whereas traits associated with feminine stereotypes are often communal (e.g., warmth, cheerfulness, empathy) (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998; Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman et al., 2012; Spence et al., 1975).

Role Congruity Theory. Role Congruity Theory suggests that an individual's positive affect, outlook, and confidence in their role is heightened when the demands or characteristics of the role align with their group's typical social roles and associated traits (Eagly & Karau, 2002). In the proposed context, leadership expectancies and characteristics are generally agentic, which align with more masculine traits than with more communal, feminine ones (Diekman & Eagly, 2000; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Women who present more agentic characteristics are often viewed as "cold" by their members (Eagly & Karau, 2002). To this point, Motro et al. (2021) argue that female instigators of incivility will insight more negative reactions as they "violate societal expectations of conforming to standards of communality and kindness" (p. 561).

Expectancy Violation Theory. Expectancy Violation Theory (Jussim et al., 1987) is similar to Role Congruity Theory but takes a more nuanced approach, although it shares the position that agency is incongruent with feminine stereotypes (and communion with masculine stereotypes). Expectancy Violation Theory posits that the perceptions of an individual portraying counter-stereotypical behaviour are dependent on whether the trait is seen as a negative or positive stereotype violation, such that non-stereotypical

positive behaviour is rewarded but non-stereotypical negative behaviour is punished (Schaumberg & Flynn, 2017).

For example, self-reliance is a traditionally masculine prescriptive trait and is a positive characteristic; thus, self-reliant women are rated higher in comparison to self-reliant men as self-reliance is not expected of them (i.e., it is a positive counter-stereotypical trait; Schaumberg & Flynn, 2017). On the other hand, when women possess negative counter-stereotypical (proscriptive) traits such as dominance, they may be scrutinized and judged negatively, and it may be assumed that they also lack more communal traits (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Consistent with dominance backlash effects for women, other studies have found that women are viewed more negatively than men when they display characteristics such as anger (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008), self-promotion (Rudman, 1998), assertiveness (Costrich et al., 1975), and competition (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004).

Communion and Agency. In their 2017 paper, Schaumberg and Flynn evaluated differences in female (vs. male) leader evaluations when exhibiting dominant, self-reliant, or neutral agentic traits. Although not consistent across studies, there is some evidence that suggests that when warmth cues are absent, female leaders who behave dominantly (negative counter-stereotypical trait) are perceived as less communal than self-reliant female leaders (positive counter-stereotypical trait). On the other hand, there was no evidence of a difference for male leaders under the same comparison (Schaumberg & Flynn, 2017).

Further, in Study 1, Heilman and Okimoto (2007) found that in a male-dominated field, when leaders were described in ways that might be viewed as dominant, for example, as having been praised for their performance, effectiveness and "aggressive achievement focus" and describing themselves as having done what it took to be successful, female leaders were perceived to be more hostile in their interpersonal interactions than male leaders. When communal cues were explicitly added to the leader descriptions, however, female and male leaders were perceived similarly. These findings highlight the extremely nuanced effect that dominant and communal cues or behaviours may have on leader perceptions as a function of gender.

Taken together, the existing literature suggests that female leaders may be judged more harshly when displaying negative counter-stereotypical actions including dominance and unless warmth is portrayed, research suggests the presence of proscriptive traits may eliminate the communality assumption for women (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Schaumberg & Flynn, 2017). Thus, I expect a greater dominance penalty for female leaders relative to male leaders. As such, I propose the following hypothesis:

> ***Hypothesis 1:*** There will be a two-way interaction between leader behaviour and leader gender such that incivility ratings will vary more for female leaders as a function of leader behaviour. Specifically, there will be a stronger penalty, via higher incivility ratings, for women relative to men when they display dominance relative to more neutral behaviour.

Uncertainty

Instigator characteristics are not the only contextual aspect expected to influence perceptions of leader incivility; characteristics of the environment may also lead individuals to be differentially vigilant for cues that may alter perceptions of incivility. One such environmental factor is organizational instability which may lead to feelings of uncertainty and job insecurity. Organizational instability is of high interest as we are in the midst of an unprecedented global pandemic and millions of people across the world are currently facing these obstacles; thus, organizational instability and its impact are a priority to explore (Pacheo et al., 2020). Furthermore, multiple studies have identified a relationship between job insecurity, stress and well-being that supports the importance of considering these constructs (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Cheng et al., 2005; Cuyper et al., 2008; Storseth, 2006; Yaşlıoğlu et al., 2013)

Uncertainty occurs when "details of a situation are ambiguous, complex, unpredictable, or probabilistic; when information is unavailable or inconsistent; when people feel insecure in their state of knowledge or the state of knowledge in general" (Brashers, 2001, p.478). van den Bos and Lind (2002) explain that the definition of uncertainty is broad as it can encompass a plethora of situations. In the context of the workplace, and specifically, when considering environmental factors, uncertainty can manifest at an individual level in terms of role ambiguity (Mignerey et al., 1995) or job insecurity (Casey et al., 1997; Torkelson et al., 2016), as well as at an organizational level in terms of organizational change (Albrecht & Hall, 1991; Allen et al., 2007) or a merger (van den Bos & Lind, 2002). In their review of *Uncertainty Management Theory,* van den

Bos and Lind (2002) state that, typically, individuals in an uncertain situation aim to eliminate the uncertainty or find a way to make it manageable.

One prominent way individuals tend to seek control over their experienced uncertainty in the workplace is through perceived fairness (van den Bos & Lind, 2002). In uncertain situations, when employees perceive fairness exists, they feel as though they are seizing some form of control; in contrast, if unfair treatment exists, they will likely feel uneasy, which will exacerbate their feelings of uncertainty and its associated stress (van den Bos & Lind, 2002). Support for this notion was found in van den Bos et al.'s (2006) study; following a company-wide reorganization, employees reported lower levels of uncertainty and higher levels of job security when they perceived the change process to be fair (vs. unfair). These findings are relevant to the present study as norm violations can be perceived as unfair (Andersson & Pearson, 1999) and are also a key factor in the incivility literature. Thus, those in an uncertain situation may be more likely to perceive and be more influenced by norm violations such as incivility (Lee & Jensen, 2014).

Consistent with van den Bos and Lind (2002), another method individuals may use to minimize or eliminate feelings of uncertainty is to seek out information (Fung et al., 2018; Huang & Yang, 2020). This leads to hypervigilance which can cause more awareness of subtle cues in their environment and in interactions to help them make sense of the situation (Allen et al., 2016). This awareness may lead to greater perceptions of incivility via more subtle and ambiguous behaviour.

Finally, consistent with Threat-Rigidity Theory (Staw et al., 1981), uncertainty can also make individuals more rigid towards their attitudes and beliefs. Uncertainty can

lead to increased stress, anxiety, and heightened emotional responses (Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001; Standfier, 2004), which causes uncertain individuals to revert to preconceived categorizations, or learned heuristics (Staw et al., 1981; *also see*: Bazerman & Neale, 1986). This is due to the fact that those in stressful situations have trouble processing unfamiliar stimuli, thus they rely on learned generalizations (Staw et al., 1981).

In more practical terms, a stressful situation can increase one's likelihood to rely on stereotypes. For example, Schaller et al. (2003), found that when participants were in an uncomfortable situation (a dark room vs. a well-lit room) they were more likely to perceive Black men as dangerous. Additionally, Staw and colleagues (1981) indicate that even if one is aware that their most familiar or dominant thoughts are inappropriate, under stress (specifically, in a changing environment) due to a lack of flexibility, an individual may still use this problematic stereotypical interpretation.

Therefore, in the context of the present study, should an individual be presented with an uncertain situation, operationalized as organizational instability, it would be logical to expect that they feel heightened stress which could cause them to seek information to minimize their stress and thus be more likely to notice incivility in their work environments. However, their ability to process this information may be impaired as they are likely to rely more heavily on internal biases including gender stereotypes. Thus, drawing on Uncertainty Management Theory (van den Bos & Lind, 2002) and Threat-Rigidity Theory (Staw et al., 1981) and associated research findings, I propose the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a three-way interaction between leader behaviour, leader gender, and organizational stability, such that the negative impact for female (vs. male) leaders when displaying dominance, assessed via perceptions of incivility, will be exacerbated under conditions of organizational instability (vs. stability).

Methods

Participants and Design

This research was funded by a SSHRC (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council) Insight grant held by the faculty supervisor (as the Principal Investigator). A between-subjects online vignette-based experiment was used to test the hypotheses.

The eligibility criteria for the sample included those residing in Canada, the United States, or the United Kingdom, who were currently employed in a full-time, non-managerial or non-supervisory position. Further, only those who were at least 18 years old and were fluent in English (to ensure a full understanding of the vignette and the proceeding measures) were recruited. Participants were recruited through Prolific using their pre-screening questions (Prolific, 2014).

In order to determine the necessary sample size, an a-priori G-Power analysis was conducted, using 0.80 power, 0.05 alpha, 8 conditions and an effect size of 0.10 as the points of reference. The analysis computed a necessary sample size of approximately 790, thus, a sample of 900 individuals was recruited to allow for variance in the quality of responses (i.e., incomplete, ineligible, or other reasons a response may not be included in the analyses). The effect size was estimated considering the multiple variables involved,

using effect sizes reported in the relevant literature. Specifically, gender differences for incivility have generated a small effect size, (d = .06; McCord et al., 2018) whereas the dominance literature has found a larger range of effect sizes contingent on the dependent variable under analysis (e.g., likeability d = -.19, hireability d = -.58; Williams & Tiedens, 2016). Dominance has also been viewed as a proscribed (counter-stereotypical) trait for women, d = -.68 (Rudman et al., 2012). Further, in the uncertainty literature, a feeling of lack of control as a consequence of organizational change had small to medium effect sizes for both perpetrated (r = -.186) and experienced incivility (r = -.480; Torkelson et al., 2016).

Following data cleaning, the final sample consisted of 815 participants, 50.2% of whom identified as men, 49.3% as women and 0.5% as a different gender category. The sample was predominantly Caucasian (83.1%), and the remaining participant race breakdown consisted of Southeast Asian (5.5%), Black (4.4%), Latinx (1.5%), West Asian (0.9%), and Other (4.7%). The average participant age was 34.7 years old (SD = 9.58) and the majority had at minimum received their High School Diploma (97.7%) and over half had also received a Bachelor's Degree or higher. The average amount of work experience was 13.6 years (SD = 9.81). The most common occupation industry category among participants (from a list drawn from Statistics Canada, 2020) was Educational Services (15.1 %), the second was Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (12.7%) and the third was Finance and Insurance (11.3%).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from two separate ad postings on the *Prolific* platform, each targeting a different gender demographic (one recruited participants who identified as men and the second recruited participants who identified as women or a different gender category). This process was used in order to strive for equal gender distribution of men and women.

The study was advertised as an examination of leader-employee interactions. Individuals who chose to take part in the study were directed from the *Prolific* recruitment ad to the online survey which was created and distributed via *Qualtrics* (Prolific, 2014; Qualtrics, 2005). Two separate but identical *Qualtrics* surveys were created for each recruiting stream. The participants were first prompted with the consent form, and once they provided consent, they answered screening questions (using Prolific's pre-screening wording) to confirm their eligibility. Once they passed all necessary screens, participants were then randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions.

The conditions were created using a vignette which depicted participants' involvement as an employee in a fictitious, mid-sized insurance company, Inglis Insurance. A gender-neutral industry was chosen to limit possible biases that are present in male- or female-dominated industries which could influence participants' perception of specific behaviours (namely dominance) across gender (Carmona-Cobo, et al., 2019; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). A scan of employee gender distributions across various industries from Statistics Canada led to the choice of the insurance industry (46% male,

54% female: Statistics Canada, 2020). Participants were instructed to imagine that they were truly an employee at Inglis Insurance with three years of tenure interacting with the district manager for their region. The district manager was presented as being Caucasian. The choice to keep the race of the district manager stable (and Caucasian) across all conditions was based on research by Livingston and colleagues (2012), who found the dominance penalty was present for Caucasian women but not for Black women.

Prior to the launch, all eight vignettes were reviewed by two subject matter experts, graduate students who conduct research in the area of incivility and gender differences. Minor changes were suggested and introduced into the vignette in order to make the manipulations stronger. The order of the vignette components and scales were not varied. The screen containing the vignette was on a timer to ensure that participants could not move forward for at least one minute and 45 seconds in an effort to encourage them to fully read the vignette.

Manipulation

Three variables were manipulated in the vignettes: the organizational stability of Inglis Insurance (stable or unstable), the district manager's gender (male or female), and the district manager's behaviour (neutral or dominant) (see Appendix for the vignettes).

Organizational Stability. As highlighted above, in these scenarios, Inglis Insurance was described as either stable or unstable following the entry of a new competitor in their area. To emulate these conditions the company was either said to be prospering and thriving through the competition with mentions of the possibility for company growth in the next few years (stable) or struggling, negatively impacted by the

competition and planning cutbacks (unstable) (Bruckmuiller & Branscombe, 2010; Cameron et al., 1987). The unstable condition was designed to create feelings of organizational uncertainty and job insecurity.

District Manager (Leader) Gender. The district manager was identified as either male (Mark Sullivan) or female (Mary Sullivan) depending on the condition. When the full name was not noted, the associated gender pronouns (he/him for Mark, or she/her for Mary) were used throughout the vignette.

District Manager (Leader) Behaviour. Throughout the interaction depicted in the vignette, the district manager either behaved in a dominant or neutral manner. Specifically, the dominant version of the interaction included: describing the leader as having a will to power (Okimoto & Brescoll, 2010; Schaumberg & Flynn, 2017), a stern expression and loud voice (Copeland et al., 1995), demanding action from the employee (Livingston et al., 2012), taking charge of the conversation (Bryan et al., 2011) and interrupting the employee when they spoke (e.g. Farley, 2008; 2010; LaFrance, 1992). In the neutral condition, the manager was described as having a calm facial expression and a normal voice, using collaborative language when describing the steps for the project moving forward and actively listening to the suggestion made by the participant.

Following the vignette, participants were presented with a series of relevant measures including the primary dependent variables (as described below), a series of exploratory variables, demographic questions as well as manipulation, stimulus, and attention check items. Finally, they were presented with the feedback form.

Measures

Unless otherwise noted, all measures used a 7-point Likert scale where *1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree and 7 = strongly agree.*

Primary Dependent Variable: Incivility

Incivility was assessed using two direct measures. The first was a 5-item measure from Bhatt's (2017) master's thesis which was adapted to fit the context of the current study (i.e., the instigator was the district manager). Sample items include "My district manager's behaviour toward me was inappropriate" and "My district manager's behaviour toward me was uncivil". This measure was chosen as it has been successfully used in a previous thesis with a similar methodology and purpose. The second measure was a 4-item scale from Porath and Pearson (2012), it was also a direct measure of incivility, and included items such as "My district manager was rude to me" and "My district manager did not respect me". This scale was chosen as it had been published and used by two authors who have done extensive work researching incivility. For both scales, the items were created based on the description of incivility provided within Andersson and Pearson's original article (1999).

A measure of indirect incivility was originally included as a more exploratory variable but was added as a main dependent variable due to a multicollinearity issue addressed in *Results,* and to encompass objective observations of incivility (rather than just perceptions as in the direct measures). Cortina and colleague's 12-item *Workplace Incivility Scale* (2013) was adapted for the purpose of this study. Specifically, five items

were selected from the original scale as they applied to the current vignette. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed their district manager engaged in the listed activities during their interaction. A couple of example items are: “my district manager interrupted or spoke over me,” and “my district manager gave me hostile looks, stares or sneers.”

Finally, a measure of legitimacy was added which captured the component of the incivility definition reflecting the violation of social norms (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). The 7-item measure was adapted from Porath and colleagues (2008). Participants were asked to rate their agreement with each statement; sample items include: “My district manager was entitled to behave the way they did,” and “In general, if I was in the position of my district manager, it makes sense that I would act the way they did.” This measure assessed perceptions of the acceptability and appropriateness of the district manager’s actions.

Manipulation and Stimulus Checks

Race of manager. Participants were asked, “What was the ethnic or racial background of your district manager in the scenario?” and the response options were: Black, Latinx, Indigenous, Arab, White (Caucasian), Southeast Asian, West Asian, and Other.

Gender of Manager. Participants were also asked to identify the gender of their district manager with a single item, “My district manager in the scenario was a:” and the response options were Man and Woman.

Manager Dominance. Wiggins and colleagues (1988) Interpersonal Adjective Scale-Revised was used to assess dominance. The measure included eight adjectives under the sub-facet of assured-dominance. Participants were asked to rate their agreement of how well each adjective described the district manager. Sample adjectives include: assertive, dominant and self-confident.

Manager Warmth. Again, Wiggins and colleagues' (1988) Interpersonal Adjective Scale-Revised was used to assess warmth. The measure included eight adjectives under the sub-facet of warmth-agreeableness. Participants were asked to rate their agreement of how well each adjective described the district manager. Sample adjectives include: kind, warm-hearted and softhearted. This measure was included because, although warmth may not have been directly manipulated, the vignettes were designed to be devoid of warmth cues.

Organizational Uncertainty. A 6-item measure of uncertainty was created specifically for this study. This measure was included in order to assess participants' feelings about the status of the organization. The items were chosen as they were identified as either synonyms or antonyms of the word "uncertain" and/or were included as part of the organization description in the applicable condition. Participants were asked to indicate their perceptions regarding the state of the company. The items for this scale were "uncertain, stable, thriving, unstable, prospering and struggling".

Job Insecurity. Six items from the Job Security Index (Probst, 2003) were chosen as a second manipulation check for the uncertainty manipulation, to assess the participants' feelings of insecurity in their position. Participants were asked to indicate the

extent to which they agreed that each of the words/phrases described their future at Inglis Insurance. Sample items include “unpredictable” and “unknown”.

Demographic Information

Finally, participants were asked a few standard demographic questions such as their age, race, gender, their highest level of education, years of work experience and the industry in which they work.

Exploratory Measures

A series of exploratory measures which could be related to the relationships under investigation were also added to the study; these include a measure of: Civility Norms (Walsh et al., 2012), Interpersonal Justice (Colquitt, 2001), Likeability (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007), Job-Related Affective Well-Being (Van Katwyk et al., 2000) and Trust (Mayer & Davis, 1999). However, for the purpose of the current thesis, only the variables outlined above will be considered.

Results

Data Cleaning and Screening

The combination of the male and female plus other gender-identity recruitment ads yielded a total of 896 eligible responses[2]. After removing those who exited the study prior to being assigned an experimental vignette, 886 remained. All analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 27. Preliminary data cleaning and

[2] Data from individuals who were disqualified due to screening question misinterpretation or who clicked the wrong answer were kept when they attempted the survey a second time, provided they passed all attention and stimulus checks.

univariate assumption checking were performed. Three dummy-coded binary variables were computed based on the scenario assigned, one for each independent variable (i.e., leader gender, leader behaviour and organizational stability). All scale variables were computed by calculating the mean score of all relevant items. Note that one item of missing data was allowed when computing scale means. Primary analyses used listwise deletion.

General assumptions were tested. Standardized scores for each variable were computed and saved to screen for univariate outliers. Two cases exceeded the +/- 3 z-score threshold, both were on the dominance measure. Analyses involving the dominance measure were conducted both with and without the identified outliers. The outliers did not have a significant influence on the results as there were no significant changes when they were removed, thus, the outliers were retained in the data set (Field, 2018). There were normality violations present for each variable of interest according to the Shipro-Wilks test ($p < .001$). However, due to the large sample size, as per the central limit theorem, it is unlikely that the abnormalities would be influential when conducting a parametric test (le Cessie et al., 2020).

Attention and Stimulus Checks

I created filters to screen out participants who failed attention checks or stimulus checks (leader race and gender). Stimulus checks differ from manipulation checks as the former are designed to assess whether a participant can recognize or recall information based on group membership or the manipulation. Stimulus checks are often categorical questions that are objective in nature (Ejelöv & Luke, 2020). On the other hand,

manipulation checks are normally more subjective and are direct assessments of the effect of a manipulation on the construct of interest (Ejelöv & Luke, 2020). Thus, manipulation check analyses were handled differently, a process explained below.

For the attention check items, I created two new variables, such that those who chose the correct answer were coded as 1 and any other answer was coded as 0. Each attention check item was embedded within an existing measure to ensure participants were reading every item. The first attention check asked participants to choose "neutral" and the second asked them to choose "strongly agree". The same coding was used for the leader race stimulus check, that is, White/Caucasian was coded as 1 and any other race was coded as 0[3]. A fourth variable was computed which compared the leader gender manipulation assigned based on the vignette against the participant's answer to the leader gender question. Once again, all those who correctly identified the leader's gender based on their assigned conditions were coded as 1 and those who answered incorrectly were coded as 0.

Finally, a new variable was created, which was the sum of the stimulus check and attention check variables. A score of 4 indicated that an individual had correctly answered all four questions. Those who did not receive a score of 4 were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a final sample size of N=815. The distribution of participants across all eight conditions can be seen in Table 1. It is noteworthy that participant gender

[3] Four participants indicated either in the survey or via prolific email that their response to the leader race question was inaccurate and they provided the correct response. For each instance, their response was changed accordingly.

was similarly distributed across conditions. For male and female participants, each cell contained between 47 to 53 individuals of each gender. Those who identified as "other" gender (four individuals) were not present in all conditions.

Table 1

Participant Condition Distribution

Leader Gender	Behaviour	Organizational Stability	*N*
Male	Neutral	Stable	101
		Unstable	104
	Dominant	Stable	100
		Unstable	107
Female	Neutral	Stable	99
		Unstable	101
	Dominant	Stable	106
		Unstable	97

Note: N =815

Dominance and Organizational Stability Manipulation Checks

Intercorrelations and descriptive statistics for all variables are presented in Table 2. In order to evaluate whether the manipulations of leader behaviour and organizational stability were successful, a 2 (leader gender: male vs. female) x 2 (leader behaviour: neutral vs. dominant) x 2 (organizational stability: stable vs. unstable) MANOVA was conducted including dominance, warmth, job insecurity and organizational uncertainty as the dependent variables.

Prior to conducting the manipulation check analysis, assumptions specific to conducting the MANOVA were tested. Mahalanobis values were saved when considering the four dependent variables, which indicated that there was evidence of multivariate

outliers (Barnett & Lewis, 1984), and Cook's distance identified that two of the outliers were influential. Cook's distance calculations were conducted including the four dependent variables both overall and within each cell. The MANOVA analysis was conducted with and without the two cases identified as influential and given a lack of changes in the significance of the findings (multivariate and univariate), both outliers were included in the reported results.

Next, to test for homogeneity of variance, Levene's test for equality of variance was examined. Levene's test yielded significant results (indicating unequal variance) for three of the four dependent variables (dominance, $p = .255$; warmth, $p = .021$; job insecurity, $p < .001$; and organizational uncertainty, $p < .001$). Additionally, Box's M was calculated to assess the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. The results from this test were significant indicating that the independent variables were not homogenous ($p < .001$). Research indicates that in cases where the data is heterogeneous, Wilk's lambda is a more robust test for the MANOVA rather than Pillai's trace, thus the former was reported for the following analyses (Ates et al., 2019). Finally, none of the dependent variables violated the assumption for multicollinearity.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for All Variables

	Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Behaviour[a]	---	---	---										
2.	Org. Stability[b]	---	---	-.01	---									
3.	Leader Gender[c]	---	---	.00	-.02	---								
4.	Direct Incivility (Bhatt)	3.93	2.13	.90**	-.01	-.03	**.98**							
5.	Direct Incivility (Porath & Pearson)	3.59	1.96	.86**	.00	-.02	.96**	**.95**						
6.	Legitimacy	3.91	1.81	-.83**	.03	.03	-.91**	-.89**	**.97**					
7.	Indirect Incivility	3.26	1.38	.78**	.00	-.02	.85**	.84**	-.81**	**.83**				
8.	Dominance	5.57	0.92	.59**	-.05	.00	.61**	.61**	-.57**	.55**	**.87**			
9.	Warmth	2.82	1.36	-.73**	-.03	.06	-.81**	-.80**	.80**	-.74**	-.63**	**.98**		
10	Organizational Uncertainty	3.95	1.82	.10**	.83**	-.02	.12**	.13**	-.11**	.17**	.05	-.16**	**.97**	
11	Job Insecurity	4.55	1.46	.30**	.65**	-.03	.36**	.37**	-.36**	.37**	.23**	-.41**	.81**	**.95**

Note: p<.001=**, *N*=813. Scale reliabilities (α) are on the diagonal in bold. All variables were measured on a 7-point Likert scale.

[a] Leader behaviour: *Neutral* was coded as 0 and *Dominant* was coded as 1. [b] Organizational stability: *Stable* was coded as 0 and *Unstable* was coded as 1. [c] Leader gender: *Male* was coded as 0 and *Female* was coded as 1.

The analysis primarily aimed to assess four relationships: the effect of the leader behaviour manipulation (dominant vs. neutral) on dominance and warmth outcomes as well as the effect of the organization stability manipulation (stable vs. unstable) on perceptions of job insecurity and organizational uncertainty. These relationships will be discussed in greater detail below using univariate results for support. All means presented when discussing MANOVA results are estimated marginal means relevant to the main effect or interaction presented.

All multivariate results for this MANOVA can be found in Table 3 and all univariate results can be found in Table 4. Notably, there were 2 significant multivariate main effects: leader behaviour $F(4,803) = 262.35$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .567$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .433$ and organizational stability, $F(4,803) = 476.40$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .704$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .296$ as well as a significant interaction between leader behaviour and organizational stability, $F(4,803) = 17.55$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .080$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .920$.

Table 3

Multivariate Findings from MANOVA Assessing Dominance, Warmth, Job Insecurity & Organizational Uncertainty

Effect	***Wilks' Lambda***	***F***	**η^2**
Leader Gender	.991	1.78	.009
Leader Behaviour	.433	262.35**	.567
Organizational Stability	.296	476.40**	.704
Leader Gender x Leader Behaviour	.994	1.13	.006
Leader Gender x Organizational Stability	.999	.286	.001
Leader Behaviour x Organizational Stability	.920	17.55**	.080
Leader Gender x Leader Behaviour x Organizational Stability	.998	.456	.002

Note: p<.001=**, *N*=814.

Table 4

Univariate Findings from MANOVA Assessing Dominance, Warmth, Job Insecurity & Organizational Uncertainty

Effect	Dependent Variable	*F*	η^2
Leader Gender	Dominance	.00	.000
	Warmth	6.24*	.008
	Job Insecurity	.59	.001
	Organizational Uncertainty	.05	.000
Leader Behaviour	Dominance	424.96**	.345
	Warmth	951.00**	.541
	Job Insecurity	157.65**	.164
	Organizational Uncertainty	29.64**	.035
Organizational Stability	Dominance	2.88 ^{t}	.004
	Warmth	1.71	.002
	Job Insecurity	738.63**	.478
	Organizational Uncertainty	1859.94**	.698
Leader Gender x Leader Behaviour	Dominance	3.27 ^{t}	.004
	Warmth	.39	.000
	Job Insecurity	1.71	.002
	Organizational Uncertainty	.99	.001
Leader Gender x Organizational Stability	Dominance	.15	.000
	Warmth	.00	.000
	Job Insecurity	.05	.000
	Organizational Uncertainty	.80	.001
Leader Behaviour x Organizational Stability	Dominance	2.23	.003
	Warmth	2.33	.003
	Job Insecurity	45.50**	.053
	Organizational Uncertainty	9.24*	.011
Leader Gender x Leader Behaviour x Organizational Stability	Dominance	.10	.000
	Warmth	.75	.001
	Job Insecurity	.16	.000
	Organizational Uncertainty	1.00	.001

Note: $p < .10 = {}^{t}$, $p < .05 = *$, $p < .001 = **$, N=814.

The first relationship to be considered was whether the leader behaviour manipulation was effective, such that those in the dominant condition would rate the

leader as significantly higher in dominance than those in the neutral condition. Results suggest that the manipulation was effective; there was a significant univariate main effect of leader behaviour, $F(1,806) = 424.96$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .345$, such that those in the dominant condition ($M = 6.11$, $SE = .037$) rated the leader as higher in dominance than those in the neutral condition ($M = 5.03$, $SE = .037$). Despite the significant difference between the dominant and neutral leader conditions as it pertained to perceptions of dominance, the estimated marginal means indicate that in both conditions, perceived dominance was generally high (above the midpoint of the scale).

Additionally, the univariate organizational stability main effect on assessments of dominance approached significance ($p = .090$) as did the interaction between leader behaviour and leader gender ($p = .071$). There were no other significant univariate main effects or interactions for the dominance measure.

Next, though not manipulated in the study, perceptions of warmth were analyzed to assess if they were equivalent across conditions. There was a significant univariate main effect of leader behaviour, $F(1,806)= 951.00$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .541$, such that those in the dominant condition ($M = 1.84$, $SE = .045$) rated their leaders as significantly less warm than those in the neutral condition ($M = 3.83$, $SE = .046$). Although there was a significant difference between the dominant and neutral leader conditions as it pertained to perceptions of warmth, the estimated marginal means indicate that overall (both conditions) perceived warmth was generally low (below the midpoint of the scale). Interestingly, there was also a main effect of leader gender on perceptions of warmth, $F(1,806)= 6.24$, $p = .013$, $\eta^2 = .008$. Female leaders ($M = 2.91$, $SE = .046$) were rated as significantly warmer than male leaders ($M = 2.75$, $SE = .045$). Although the univariate

effect suggests that regardless of the female leader's behaviour, there was still an assumption of greater warmth associated with the female gender stereotype, the MANOVA did not show a significant multivariate effect of leader gender. Thus, the interpretation and significance of these results should be reviewed with caution. There were no other significant univariate main effects or interactions when assessing warmth.

The next two outcome variables were included to assess the efficacy of the organizational stability manipulation. When considering job insecurity, the findings revealed that the manipulation was successful as there was a significant univariate main effect of organizational stability, $F(1,806)= 738.63$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .478$ such that those in the unstable condition ($M = 5.49$, $SE = .049$) experienced greater feelings of job insecurity than those in the stable condition ($M = 3.59$, $SE = .049$). Unexpectedly, there was also a main effect of leader behaviour, $F(1,806)= 157.65$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .164$; those in the dominant condition ($M = 4.98$, $SE = .049$) reported greater feelings of job insecurity than those in the neutral condition ($M = 4.10$, $SE = .050$).

There was also a significant interaction between leader behaviour and organizational stability in predicting job insecurity, $F(1,806)= 45.50$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .053$. There were significant mean differences between the dominant and neutral conditions across *both* levels of organizational stability: stable organization ($M_{diff} = 1.35$, $p <.001$); unstable organization ($M_{diff} = 0.41$, $p <.001$). However, the difference between the dominant and neutral conditions, when measuring feelings of job insecurity, was three times larger in the stable organization versus the unstable organization. The estimated marginal means for this interaction can be found in Table 5.

The final variable to be considered was organizational uncertainty, and the results indicated that the manipulation of organizational stability was successful. Specifically, there was a significant univariate main effect of organizational stability, $F(1,806) = 1859.94$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .698$; such that those in the unstable condition perceived greater feelings of organizational uncertainty ($M = 5.45$, $SE = .049$) relative to those in the stable condition ($M = 2.44$, $SE = .049$). There was also a significant main effect of leader behaviour $F(1,806)= 29.64$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .035$, such that those in the dominant condition ($M = 4.13$, $SE = .049$) had significantly higher organizational uncertainty scores than those in the neutral condition ($M = 3.75$, $SE = .050$).

Finally, once again, there was evidence of a two-way interaction between leader behaviour and organizational stability, $F(1,806)= 9.24$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .011$. However, the nature of the interaction was slightly different than that for the job insecurity analysis as there was only a significant difference between the leader behaviour conditions across one level of organizational stability, not both. Simple main effects indicate that within the stable organization, those exposed to a dominant leader reported significantly greater organizational uncertainty compared to those exposed to a neutral leader ($M_{diff} = 0.59$, $p <.001$). Whereas, for participants assigned to the unstable organization, there was no significant difference in perceptions of organizational uncertainty between the leader behaviour conditions ($M_{diff} = .17$, $p = .089$). Estimated marginal means for this interaction can also be found in Table 5.

Table 5

Significant Simple Main Effects Assessing Job Insecurity and Organizational Uncertainty

Outcome Variable	Organizational Stability	Leader Behaviour	*M*	*SE*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	Mean Difference (Dominant – Neutral)
Job Insecurity	Stable	Neutral[a]	2.92	.070	2.78	3.06	1.35**
		Dominant[b]	4.27	.069	4.13	4.40	
	Unstable	Neutral[a]	5.29	.070	5.15	5.43	0.41**
		Dominant[b]	5.69	.070	5.56	5.83	
Organizational Uncertainty	Stable	Neutral[c]	2.14	.070	2.00	2.28	0.59**
		Dominant[d]	2.73	.069	2.60	2.87	
	Unstable	Neutral[c]	5.37	.070	5.23	5.50	.17[t]
		Dominant[d]	5.53	.070	5.40	5.67	

Note: $p<.10$ = [t], $p<.001$=**, N=814.

[a] The neutral conditions (stable vs. unstable) were significantly different (M_{diff} = 2.37**)

[b] The dominant conditions (stable vs. unstable) were significantly different (M_{diff} = 1.43**)

[c] The neutral conditions (stable vs. unstable) were significantly different (M_{diff} = *3*.23**)

[d] The dominant conditions (stable vs. unstable) were significantly different (M_{diff} = 2.80**)

Main Analyses

To test the main hypotheses a 2 (leader gender: male vs. female) x 2 (leader behaviour: dominant vs. neutral) x 2 (organizational stability: stable vs. unstable) MANOVA was conducted examining direct incivility, legitimacy, and indirect incivility as dependent variables.

Once again, prior to conducting the main analyses, assumptions specific to conducting the MANOVA were tested. First, the original three dependent variables intended for the MANOVA and follow-up analyses were two direct measures of incivility (Bhatt, 2017; Porath & Pearson, 2012) as well as the legitimacy measure (Porath et al.,

2008). However, together, these violated the assumption of multicollinearity. To address this violation Bhatt's direct measure of incivility was not included in the analyses. This decision was made as that particular measure had correlations greater than the recommended 0.9 threshold (Field, 2018) with the other two dependent variables (legitimacy and Porath & Pearson's direct measure of incivility). Removing this variable addressed the multicollinearity assumption violation. Additionally, a new measure was added in its place (Cortina et al., 2013) which was an indirect measure of incivility (i.e., assessing actions that would be viewed as uncivil).

Next, the remaining assumptions were tested using the updated set of dependent variables. Similar to the manipulation check MANOVA, many of the same violations were found for the main analysis MANOVA. Cook's distance was calculated including all three dependent variables overall and within each cell. The results identified one significant influential outlier, once again it was retained as there was a lack of change in the significance of the findings when it was removed. Next, Levene's test for equality of variance yielded significant results (indicating unequal variance) for two of the three dependent variables (direct incivility (Porath & Pearson's, 2012), $p = .085$; legitimacy, $p = .016$; indirect incivility, $p < .001$). Moreover, Box's M was also significant ($p < .001$) indicating that the independent variables were not homogenous. For these reasons, Wilk's lambda was reported for the main analyses as well (Ates et al., 2019).

Following the necessary changes caused by the assumption violations highlighted above, the main 2x2x2 MANOVA was conducted. Hypothesis 1 predicted a two-way interaction between leader gender and leader behaviour which is included in the 2x2x2 MANOVA needed to evaluate Hypothesis 2 (a 3-way interaction). Thus, both hypotheses

were evaluated in the same analysis. All multivariate MANOVA results can be found in Table 6 and all univariate MANOVA results can be found in Table 7.

Table 6

Multivariate Results from MANOVA Assessing Direct Incivility, Indirect Incivility and Legitimacy

Effect	***Wilks' Lambda***	***F***	η^2
Leader Gender	.997	.70	.003
Leader Behaviour	.239	851.40**	.761
Organizational Stability	.995	1.24	.005
Leader Gender x Leader Behaviour	.995	1.22	.005
Leader Gender x Organizational Stability	.996	1.19	.004
Leader Behaviour x Organizational Stability	.996	1.16	.004
Leader Gender x Leader Behaviour x Organizational Stability	.994	1.71	.006

Note: p<.001=**, *N*=814.

Table 7

Univariate Results from MANOVA Assessing Direct Incivility, Indirect Incivility and Legitimacy

Effect	Dependent Variable	*F*	η^2
Leader Gender	Direct Incivility	1.22	.002
	Legitimacy	2.02	.003
	Indirect Incivility	.72	.001
Leader Behaviour	Direct Incivility	2220.10**	.734
	Legitimacy	1745.87**	.684
	Indirect Incivility	1238.27**	.606
Organizational Stability	Direct Incivility	.15	.000
	Legitimacy	1.37	.002
	Indirect Incivility	.15	.000
Leader Gender x Leader Behaviour	Direct Incivility	.02	.000
	Legitimacy	.64	.001
	Indirect Incivility	1.98	.002
Leader Gender x Organizational Stability	Direct Incivility	.81	.001
	Legitimacy	1.47	.002
	Indirect Incivility	3.30 ^{t}	.004
Leader Behaviour x Organizational Stability	Direct Incivility	.28	.000
	Legitimacy	.87	.001
	Indirect Incivility	.44	.001
Leader Gender x Leader Behaviour x Organizational Stability	Direct Incivility	.84	.001
	Legitimacy	3.02 ^{t}	.004
	Indirect Incivility	.20	.000

Note: $p<.10 = {}^{t}$, $p<.001$=**, N=814.

Hypothesis 1 predicted a two-way interaction between leader behaviour and leader gender. Specifically, I expected that female leaders displaying high (vs. low) agentic dominance would be perceived as more uncivil than male leaders who displayed high (vs. low) agentic dominance. There was no significant interaction between leader behaviour and leader gender, $F(3,804)= 1.22$, $p = .301$, $\eta^2 = .005$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .995$. Therefore, there was no support for Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that there would be a three-way interaction between leader behaviour, leader gender, and organizational stability such that the negative impact for female leaders (vs. male leaders) when displaying dominance, assessed via higher perceptions of incivility, would worsen in an unstable (vs. stable) organization. There was no significant three-way interaction, indicating that the data did not support the hypothesis $F(3,804)= 1.71$, $p = .163$, $\eta^2 = .006$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .994$. Estimated marginal means can be found in Table 8. It is noteworthy however, that there was a significant multivariate main effect of leader behaviour, $F(3,804)= 851.40$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .761$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .239$. Univariate tests indicated a main effect of leader behaviour for all incivility measures as well (see Table 7).

For both direct and indirect measures of incivility, those in the dominant condition reported significantly greater levels of perceived incivility, direct incivility ($M = 5.25$, $SE = .050$) and indirect incivility ($M = 4.33$, $SE = .043$) in comparison to those in the neutral condition, direct incivility ($M = 1.90$, $SE = .050$) and indirect incivility ($M = 2.18$, $SE = .043$). Consistent with these patterns, when rating the legitimacy of the leader's behaviour, those in the dominant condition ($M = 2.42$, $SE = .050$) rated the leader's conduct as significantly less legitimate than those in the neutral condition ($M = 5.41$, $SE = .051$).

In summary, the results of the MANOVA indicate that while there were main effects both on a multivariate and univariate level for leader behaviour, there were no other significant findings from the main analysis[4].

[4] The MANOVA was also conducted when considering participant gender as an additional variable to investigate possible participant gender main effects and interactions. Only those who identified as male (N = 408), or female (N = 402) were included as there were only four individuals who identified as a different gender category which would have created very uneven sample sizes between groups. The analysis uncovered no changes in the existing significant univariate or multivariate findings (i.e., main effect of leader gender, leader behaviour, organizational stability, or any related interactions). There were also no significant multivariate or univariate findings involving participant gender but there were a few new univariate findings which approached significance. These were (1) a main effect of participant gender for the direct incivility measure (p = .070), (2) an interaction between leader behaviour and participant gender for the indirect measure of incivility (p = .082), (3) an interaction between leader behaviour, organizational stability, and participant gender for legitimacy (p = .092), and (4) an interaction between leader gender, leader behaviour and participant gender for direct incivility (p = .093).

Table 8

Estimated Marginal Means for Incivility Outcomes as a Function of Leader Gender, Behaviour & Organizational Stability

	Leader					95% Confidence Interval	
Outcome Variable	**Gender**	**Behaviour**	**Org. Stability**	***M***	***SE***	Lower	Upper
Direct Incivility	Male	Neutral	Stable	1.87	.101	1.67	2.07
			Unstable	1.99	.100	1.80	2.19
		Dominant	Stable	5.26	.102	5.06	5.46
			Unstable	5.33	.098	5.14	5.52
	Female	Neutral	Stable	1.93	.102	1.73	2.13
			Unstable	1.79	.101	1.60	1.99
		Dominant	Stable	5.17	.099	4.98	5.37
			Unstable	5.24	.103	5.04	5.44
Legitimacy	Male	Neutral	Stable	5.42	.101	5.23	5.62
			Unstable	5.23	.100	5.04	5.43
		Dominant	Stable	2.31	.102	2.11	2.51
			Unstable	2.50	.098	2.30	2.69
	Female	Neutral	Stable	5.37	.102	5.17	5.57
			Unstable	5.60	.101	5.40	5.80
		Dominant	Stable	2.39	.099	2.20	2.58
			Unstable	2.50	.103	2.30	2.71
Incivility Indirect	Male	Neutral	Stable	2.21	.087	2.04	2.38
			Unstable	2.28	.086	2.11	2.45
		Dominant	Stable	4.21	.088	4.04	4.38
			Unstable	4.42	.084	4.25	4.58
	Female	Neutral	Stable	2.16	.088	1.99	2.33
			Unstable	2.06	.087	1.89	2.23
		Dominant	Stable	4.39	.085	4.22	4.55
			Unstable	4.31	.089	4.14	4.48

Note: N = 814

Discussion

The present study aimed to investigate how a leader's gender and the stability of the organization in which they work affect the degree to which dominant leader actions are perceived to be uncivil. Specifically, based on past research, I proposed two main hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 predicted that incivility ratings would vary more for female leaders as a function of their behaviour such that women who portrayed dominant (vs. neutral) behaviours would be penalized more, via higher incivility ratings, relative to men.

The results of the analyses indicated no evidence to support this interaction hypothesis. These findings are not consistent with previous research in this domain that not only supports the existence of a dominance penalty for women relative to men (Rudman & Glick, 1999; 2001; Rudman et al., 2012; Williams & Tiedens, 2016) but specifically, albeit evidence is limited, suggests a dominance penalty as it relates to incivility (Gabriel et al., 2018; Motro et al., 2021). Gabriel and colleagues (2018) found evidence that women who were rated as agentic due to their behaviours or certain personal characteristics (assessed using a dominance measure), were more likely to experience incivility. The authors speculated that the increased experienced incivility agentic women faced was driven by the notion that their agency was also viewed as incivility. The reason behind this is that agentic women have been labelled as rude and aggressive (Mavin et al., 2014) and have been scrutinized for violating social norms. Both of these descriptions are included in the definition of incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Motro and colleagues (2021) found evidence that when both genders

displayed identical agentic-dominant, aggressive, or uncivil behaviours, female team members created a decrease in team positive affect whereas male team members did not. Although they did not find a gender difference in incivility measurements, the methodology presented in their study, as well as the influence that affect (theoretically) can have on incivility perceptions (Andersson & Pearson, 1999) are relevant for the comparisons below.

These previous studies differ from the current research in two main ways, which may account, at least in part, for the difference in their findings. The first difference reflects the relationship dynamic between the target and the instigator. In Motro and colleagues' study (2021), they evaluated perceptions of team members, in Gabriel and colleagues' studies (2018), they evaluated instances of incivility between coworkers. In the present study, the relationship under investigation was between a subordinate and their leader. While some research has found evidence to support that female leaders are penalized more for agentic behaviour, non-gendered research examining leader behaviour has found evidence to suggest that those of higher status in an organization have more freedom to express emotions and behaviours relative to those of lower power (Conway et al., 1999; Porath & Pearson, 2012). This is likely because leaders set the tone of the workplace, so they can establish what is considered fair treatment and what behaviours are accepted, at least to a certain degree (Ekman, 1984; Porath & Pearson, 2012). Aptly, Porath and Pearson explained, "a target's social power can determine how manageable he or she perceives the mistreatment to be" (2012, p.332). This freedom of expression may partially explain the results of the current study as the instigator was a leader.

The second main difference between the present study and past research was the way in which incivility was presented. Motro and colleagues (2021) used an online chat room with a confederate to manipulate agentic and uncivil behaviours where participants interacted with their group members in real-time; Gabriel and colleagues' research (2018) examined experienced incivility through self-reports based on participants' interactions in their current workplace. Thus, the method of manipulation chosen for the current study (i.e., text vignettes) may also be partially responsible for the different pattern of results.

For example, in Gabriel and colleagues' study (2018), while collecting self-report data of experienced incivility has the added benefit of personal investment, this approach could be problematic in terms of confounding variables and determining causality. That said, the addition of personal investment and the authenticity of the incivility experienced could explain the difference between their results and the current study. The current study used a fictitious scenario which has the added challenge of trying to create experimental realism. On the other hand, Motro and colleagues (2021) also used a mock simulation, but despite the experimental design, the participants likely were more invested to a degree as they were told they were interacting with a real person online. In short, it is likely that the experimental realism in their study (Motro et al., 2021) was greater than the current study, which could account for the differences highlighted above.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that the penalty for female leaders outlined in Hypothesis 1 would be exacerbated when individuals were faced with feelings of uncertainty and job insecurity via working in an unstable organization. Once again, the results did not support the hypothesis as there was no significant interaction between leader gender, leader

behaviour and organizational stability. Although previous literature has not directly investigated the impact of leader gender and organizational stability as they pertain to perceptions of incivility for dominant-agentic leaders, there is support for the pattern hypothesized. Corroboration for the influence of instigator gender and level of dominance displayed on perceptions of, or reactions to, incivility is highlighted above (i.e., Gabriel et al., 2018; Motro et al, 2021). Further, there is also evidence to support that organizational instability should predict incivility in the workplace (Hoel & Cooper, 2000; Tokerlson et al., 2016).

The present study found that, relative to a stable organization, an unstable organization created feelings of job insecurity and organizational uncertainty. Previous research has found evidence to support the relationship between organizational instability, through organizational change or decline, and feelings of uncertainty (Rodell & Colquitt, 2009; Schweiger & Denisi, 1991) and job insecurity (Ashford et al., 1989; Baillien & De Witte, 2009). Moreover, a study by Tokerlson and colleagues found, in a large sample of Swedish employees, that organizational change and feelings of job insecurity led to greater instances of experienced incivility (2016). Additionally, job insecurity has been found to elicit stress and negative thought processes which could lead to greater perceptions of incivility (Gopalkrishnan, 2011). Thus, the relationship between organizational instability, job insecurity and their effect on self-reports of experienced incivility, is evidence in support of the current study's postulated relationship between organizational stability and perceptions of incivility. However, as no relationship was found, possible limitations for the current study which could have contributed to the lack

of evidence in support of this hypothesis will be discussed in the associated section below (see *Limitations*).

Although the primary hypotheses were not supported, the main analysis uncovered a significant effect of leader behaviour on incivility ratings. In terms of the indirect measure of incivility, leaders who displayed dominant behaviours were in fact rated as more uncivil than those who behaved in a more neutral manner. Higher rating of indirect incivility was indicative that dominant leaders were perceived to have paid little attention to the participants' opinions, interrupted them, glared at them in a hostile manner and doubted their judgement (Cortina et al., 2013). These findings are consistent with previous research (Gabriel et al., 2018; Motro et al., 2021) which has examined the connection between incivility and dominance using the earlier version of the *Workplace Incivility Scale* (Cortina et al., 2001).

Unique to the present study, direct incivility was also evaluated. This measure differed as it evaluated subjective observations of incivility directly related to its definition (i.e., describing the uncivil individual as rude or disrespectful). The results indicated that leaders who behaved dominantly were subjectively perceived as more uncivil in comparison to more neutral leaders. These findings are novel as they suggest that dominance is not only rated as highly uncivil when individuals are asked to evaluate concrete actions or behaviours but also when individuals are asked to assess and interpret behaviour (including body language and tone) subjectively in terms of rudeness and disrespect.

Finally, leaders who displayed dominance were viewed as *less* legitimate than leaders who behaved in a more neutral manner. Not only was the difference between dominant and neutral leaders significant, but the dominant leaders' average legitimacy ratings were also very low. Thus, based on adjectives included in the legitimacy items (Porath et al., 2008), it may be said that results suggest that dominant leaders' behaviours are viewed as inappropriate, entitled and minimally acceptable.

Beyond the findings pertaining to the main dependent variables of incivility ratings, there were also interesting and unexpected findings with respect to the manipulation check and warmth constructs. Warmth was assessed because communion is often evaluated in research where agency is manipulated or measured as the two are highly relevant to one another (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998; Eagly et al., 2000; Rudman et al., 2012; Spence et al., 1975). Moreover, studies have shown that, when paired with the presence of warm behaviour, leader dominance can elicit less negative reactions from subordinates which would have hindered the hypotheses of the current study (Prochzka et al., 2014). Therefore, when creating the vignettes, behaviours or descriptions which could have been viewed as warm were intentionally omitted to focus solely on the impact of dominance.

The dominance literature supports the notion that dominant female leaders can experience a backlash effect such that they are perceived more negatively in comparison to dominant men (Rudman & Glick, 1999; Rudman et al., 2012; Williams & Tiedens, 2016). However, the current study did not find evidence to support this interaction (leader gender x leader behaviour). That said, results did indicate an effect of leader behaviour on

perceived warmth, such that perceptions of warmth were very low for both the dominant leaders and neutral leaders, yet the latter were viewed as significantly warmer. Research by Heilman and Okimoto (2007) supports the notion that female leaders who behave dominantly are presumed to lack warmth, but the present study offers evidence to suggests this may be true for both male and female leaders (when no warm behaviour is explicitly present).

The manipulation check analyses investigating feelings of organizational uncertainty and job insecurity yielded interesting findings. Evidence from the current study suggests that leaders displaying dominant behaviours elicited greater feelings of job insecurity and organizational uncertainty when compared to leaders who behaved in a neutral manner. Research has shown an association between bullying and feelings of job insecurity (Silla et al., 2009). Additionally, Tokerlson and colleagues (2016) found an increase in instigated incivility in a workplace undergoing a negative organizational change, causing feelings of job insecurity. Research has also found that a negative relationship with one's leader (e.g., abusive supervision or poor leader-member exchange) was associated with higher feelings of job insecurity (Huang et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2019). Thus, the three relationships highlighted above, as well as the premise that dominance has a significant overlap with incivility (Gabriel et al, 2018) and a consequence of incivility is often negative affect (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Motro et al., 2021), could possibly explain why dominant leaders created more feelings of job insecurity. While there is some research examining this association (leader behaviour and job insecurity), there is a lack of research investigating how leader behaviour causally

influences job insecurity and organizational uncertainty. This is an area in need of attention (see *Future Research*).

Interestingly, there were also significant interactions between leader behaviour and organizational stability for predicting both job insecurity and organizational uncertainty. Dominant (vs. neutral) leaders elicited greater feelings of organizational uncertainty, but this pattern was only observed in a stable organization (not in an unstable organization). Moreover, dominant (vs. neutral) leaders elicited a higher sense of job insecurity in both unstable *and* stable organizations. That said, the difference between feelings of job insecurity when interacting with a dominant versus neutral leader, while still significant, was very small in the unstable organization. In the unstable organization, individuals were exposed to negative stimuli related to the organization, that is, indicators of decline such as defining the organization as "struggling" or "negatively impacted," and there were also discussions of cutbacks and financial loss. For this reason, their feelings of insecurity and stress would already have been high, and thus an interaction with a dominant leader would not have been as influential. However, for those in a more stable organization who are not exposed to such stress-inducing stimuli, interacting with a dominant (vs. neutral) leader would have a greater influence in causing stress and job insecurity.

Possible Theoretical Implications

Based on Role Congruity Theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) and Expectancy Violation Theory (Jussim et al., 1987) which both speculate that dominant women (vs. men) are perceived more negatively as dominance is a negative counter-stereotypical trait

for women, I expected to find an interaction between leader behaviour and leader gender on incivility ratings. This prediction is based on Andersson and Pearson's (1999) original theory which postulates that incivility is a violation of social norms, thus, as dominant women (vs. men) are perceived as violating expectancies of gender norms, I expected they would also be viewed as more uncivil. Further, experimental findings in the past have substantiated these theories as they have found evidence to support a negative backlash toward dominant women (Livingston et al., 2012; Rudman & Glick, 1999; Rudman et al., 2012). That said, the effect of leader behaviour in the current study, which found that dominant leaders were perceived as more uncivil than neutral leaders regardless of gender, may be consistent, in part, with Role Congruity Theory.

Broadly, Role Congruity Theory suggests that an individual will be positively evaluated when their behaviours are viewed as congruent with the characteristics expected of their social role and negatively evaluated for characteristics that are incongruent (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Although this theory primarily focuses on how this phenomenon influences female leaders as their stereotypes do not align with leader expectations, the same logic could be used to speculate that excessive dominance is also not in line with leadership expectations. It is important to note that agentic-dominance in milder forms (i.e. assertiveness, power-seeking) has been suggested to be congruent with leadership characteristics (e.g. Eagly & Karau, 2002; Livingston et al., 2012; Rudman & Glick, 2001). However, it is unlikely, based on the current findings, that excessively dominant actions that overlap with incivility (i.e., interruption, hostile looks or paying

little to no attention to others' opinions; Cortina et al., 2013) would be viewed as desirable leader traits.

Although low experimental realism may in part explain the lack of gender findings, the current findings may also suggest that not only are female leaders negatively perceived for dominant behaviour, which is interpreted as uncivil but male leaders may also be negatively perceived as uncivil *when* dominant behaviours are excessive. Further support for this relationship from the current study comes from the fact that the dominant (vs. neutral) leaders' actions were viewed as less legitimate regardless of gender. The legitimacy measure assessed perceptions of the appropriateness of the leader's actions, thus lower legitimacy (as found for dominant leaders) could be indicative of perceived role incongruity. Future research could investigate the existence of this relationship by manipulating dominance more subtly excluding any behaviours which overlap with measures or definitions related to incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Cortina et al., 2001; 2013; Gabriel et al., 2018).

Additionally, the findings from the manipulation check analyses involving job insecurity and organizational uncertainty were consistent with Uncertainty Management Theory (van den Bos & Lind, 2002). First, the main effect, which found that organizational uncertainty and job insecurity were greater in the unstable (vs. stable) organization is simply evidence which confirmed that the uncertainty manipulation was effective. The results become interesting when considering the role of leader behaviour. Specifically, dominant (vs. neutral) leaders were found to cause greater feelings of job insecurity and organizational uncertainty in the stable organization. There was also a

difference between dominant and neutral leaders when assessing job insecurity in the unstable organization as well but not when assessing organizational uncertainty.

These findings may tie into Uncertainty Management Theory as it largely focuses on the relationship between perceptions of fairness and uncertainty, such that those in uncertain situations experience less feelings of uncertainty when they perceive to be treated fairly (van den Bos & Lind, 2002). In the dominant vignette for the current study, the leader is described as appearing stern, with a loud voice and they dominate the conversation in an egocentric manner (i.e., they constantly use language like "I am in charge" or "you need to do this"). When presented with such behaviour in a meeting with an important member of a leadership team, this could create feelings of stress and perhaps uncertainty for the individual as they may question if their leader values them. That said, a primary component of the dominance vignette involved the leader interrupting the participant when they were trying to share their ideas for a company project for which they prepared a pitch. This interruption and inability to present their idea would likely be viewed as unfair. Therefore, as per Uncertainty Management Theory (van den Bos & Lind, 2002), the interruption and lack of regard for their effort could diminish perceptions of fairness and in turn increase feelings of uncertainty which manifest as feelings of job insecurity and organizational uncertainty.

These findings contribute to the existing theory and add to the organizational uncertainty literature as they provide preliminary evidence that certain leader behaviours themselves may create feelings of organizational uncertainty or job insecurity even when the organization is objectively flourishing (see *Future Research*).

Limitations

In re-examining the main hypotheses, it is necessary to dissect the issues present when conducting this study to appreciate its limitations and provide guidance for future research in this area. First, a meaningful strength of the study is its chosen methodology as it was a true experimental design. Nevertheless, in order to manipulate the target variables, a vignette was used which highlights a main limitation of the current study. The choice to manipulate constructs intended to elicit subconscious biases via a text vignette; that is, using "paper people" (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014), presents drawbacks. A 2014 review by Aguinis and Bradley examined trends and outcomes of text vignettes across 30 different business-related journals. Following their analyses, they provided a list of best practice recommendations for vignette studies.

First, it is a good choice if manipulating and controlling for multiple variables is necessary, which was the case for the current study. Further, when there is an issue with conducting the experiment using alternative methods (e.g., ethical dilemmas, time, or cost issues), the authors recommend "paper people." However, it was recommended that text vignettes be used to measure explicit outcomes, that is topics that participants would be aware of and willingly discuss (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014). The authors explained that, because "paper people" are not as realistic and the personal stakes are not the same as in reality, they may not elicit the same subconscious feelings or internal processes. This may have been the case for the present study, that is, the subconscious biases that accompany perceptions of counter-stereotypical behaviour from female leaders (i.e.,

dominance) (Cuddy et al., 2008) may not have been elicited. This suggests the study may have had low experimental realism.

Morales and colleagues (2017) outline best practice recommendations to maximize experimental realism across various types of experiments. They recommend the following: (1) that the manipulated construct be portrayed in such a way that simulates a realistic interaction (i.e., no unbelievable or unlikely elements), (2) that the environment or setting of the experiment resembles the setting in which the event would actually take place for the participant, and (3) when feasible, operationalize the dependant variable so it is a behavioural outcome.

An improved experiment using the guidelines outlined above might involve conducting a study within an organization or in a post-secondary classroom. For example, using four confederates (dominant male, female and neutral male, female), with permission from the individual in charge, they could enter an organization under the premise that they are “coaches” there to help employees who volunteer to take part in a short work-related competition complete with a reward at the end. The employees could be offered the option to change coaches and asked to complete a short survey about their coach after their first session, which would involve a measure of incivility and other related constructs.

Should an in-person experimental design not be possible, another alternative could be to conduct a study using a similar methodology as presented by Motro and colleagues (2021). In lieu of conducting a text-based vignette-style experiment as in the present study or an in-person field experiment in the workplace as highlighted above, an

interactive online experiment could be conducted. This would increase experimental realism in comparison to a text-based vignette as the conversation would be in real-time and the participant would be told the interaction is real, rather than hypothetical (Morales et al., 2017; Motro et al., 2021). An example of an interactive online experiment would be if participants were told to take part in a group activity for which they must interact with their partners via online chat. One individual from the group would be appointed as the leader at "random" (a confederate). To increase personal investment in the activity and in turn, experimental realism, it would be announced to the team members before the activity began that the leader will be asked to decide how the reward will be divided amongst them. Specifically, they would choose to divide it based on individual contribution to the task at hand (i.e., those who contribute more would receive a greater percentage of the reward). This element would add the necessary investment to better simulate reality, which would likely create more negative affect for the participants when presented with the dominant behaviour from their leader (e.g., interruption, dominating the conversation).

An alternative and perhaps complementary approach to avoid the possible limitations discussed regarding experimental realism would be to conduct a large-scale diary study as opposed to an experiment, investigating real instances of dominance and perceptions of incivility across multiple organizations. This would also increase external validity and possibly the generalizability of the findings. However, this would also create a greater challenge in determining causality but could perhaps provide some

complementary correlational evidence to support the relationship between leader gender, dominance, incivility and feelings of uncertainty or job insecurity.

Another limitation relates to the manipulation of leader behaviour used in this study. The manipulation was designed to be devoid of warmth cues; however, the neutral leader vignette was perceived as colder than intended. In creating the vignettes, I conducted extensive research on dominant behaviour to properly manipulate that variable, and the rest of the vignette was crafted to appear as "neutral" as possible. Although there was a significant difference between the dominant and neutral leader ratings of dominance, the scores from both were relatively high, suggesting that the neutral leaders were also perceived as moderately dominant.

While the higher levels of dominance did not affect incivility outcomes as they pertain to leader behaviour, this could have interfered with detecting a possible interaction with leader gender as well as overshadowed any effects which could have been caused by the organizational stability manipulation. Research supports the notion that female leaders experience a dominance penalty (Rudman et al., 2012), however, Role Congruity Theory also posits that women who are perceived as *generally* agentic (cold), are also viewed negatively (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Therefore, as both the dominant and neutral leaders were perceived as cold, this might explain the lack of significant difference in perceptions of incivility based on leader gender and specifically, in terms of the interaction between leader gender and leader behaviour. In the future, it would be prudent to remove certain more agentic cues embedded in the current vignette. The challenge when creating the vignettes was limiting warmth in the neutral condition

without increasing agency. In the future, it may be beneficial to add a few subtle warmth cues to ensure a more notable difference between dominance ratings for both conditions, but not so much as to create moderate to high perceptions of warmth. Alternatively, when evaluating the relationship between leader gender, leader behaviour and organizational stability, both warmth and dominance could be manipulated to assess their interactive effects.

Future Research

Based on the highlighted research presented throughout this paper, there is evidence suggesting the relationships of interest in the current study are worth pursuing in future studies. I have provided several methodology changes throughout the discussion. In this section, I provide recommendations for future studies beyond methodological issues.

The first recommendation for future research is driven by an issue faced when designing the current study, that of finding certain validated measures. More specifically, both measures of direct incivility chosen for the present research were not extensively validated, but they were the only ones currently available[5]. Bhatt's measure of direct incivility (2017) was used in a previous student's master's thesis and Porath and Pearson developed their 2012 measure to use in their study as an outcome variable. Both scales were developed by selecting adjectives or phrases used in Andersson and Pearson's

[5]Carmona-Cobo and colleagues (2019) also developed a measure based on Andersson and Pearson's (1999) description of incivility, but their measure was not publicly available nor was it validated.

(1999) definition of incivility. While this is a great approach, a more thoroughly validated measure for direct incivility is needed, should research involving perceptions of incivility continue.

In a similar vein, there exists a lack of choice of validated measures for organizational uncertainty, which assess individuals' views of an organization's standing. Existing research either focuses on feelings of uncertainty as they pertain to more narrow aspects of the workplace or the individual's role, such as tasks or demands, (e.g., Clampitt et al., 2000; Cullen et al., 2014) or uses uncertainty measures which are heavily rooted in finance details, such as percent decrease in revenue or stocks (e.g., Agle et al., 2006). These latter measures might prove challenging as they require a specific knowledge base from participants. Additionally, similar to the current study, some researchers created their own measures tailored to fit their manipulation of organizational uncertainty (e.g., Bruckmuiller & Branscombe, 2010). That said, the measure created for the present study did show similar patterns to the closely related and validated job insecurity measure (Probst, 2003) which may indicate its potential as a candidate for future validation.

Beyond the need for validated measures relevant to the relationships under assessment, the influence of industry is another factor that requires greater attention. Previous research suggests that women are more likely to experience incivility in a male-dominated field (Cortina et al., 2013). Moreover, Carmona-Cobo and colleagues (2019) found that in a male-dominated industry (i.e., engineering) participants had higher ratings for perceived incivility when performed by a female (vs. male) leader. The authors stated,

that as women are underrepresented in male-dominated fields, and as per Role-Congruity Theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002), this may have led to a perception of a mismatch between their job roles and their gender stereotypes. Subsequently, adding uncivil behaviour to this scenario is believed to exacerbate the perceived "mismatch" and the negative perceptions which accompany it (Carmona-Cobo et al., 2019). That said, drawing on the literature examining incivility in male-dominated industries, it is possible that replicating the current study using a male-dominated industry could lead to significant findings.

Finally, research in the realm of incivility has received a lot of attention but there is a need for more focus in the area of leader-related factors which can influence job insecurity. Specifically, some studies have examined leader characteristics and leader behaviours as correlates or outcomes of job insecurity (e.g., Probst et al, 2016; Wang et al., 2019), yet there is a lack of research that investigates leader-related constructs (i.e., leader characteristics and leader behaviours) as antecedents of job insecurity. The findings from the present study suggest that leader dominance increases feelings of job insecurity. Thus, it would be of interest to focus on this relationship and explore if similar findings would be present with other leader behaviours (e.g., social isolation, undermining, favouritism, or cynicism). This line of research could be very valuable, especially so in practice, as job insecurity has been linked to several undesirable employee actions such as counter-productive work behaviour, productivity, and turnover (Baillien & De Witte, 2009).

Conclusion

In summary, although the current study did not find evidence to support an interaction between leader gender, leader behaviour and organizational stability as they pertain to perceptions of incivility, it did provide evidence to suggest that dominant leaders are perceived as more uncivil than neutral leaders. Further, the present findings provide useful evidence regarding other outcomes of dominant leader behaviours such as job insecurity, organizational uncertainty, and reduced perceptions of warmth. Indeed, evidence suggests that job insecurity and organizational uncertainty can be influenced not only by changes in the organization itself, but also by a leader's behaviour, specifically dominance.

Additionally, the overview of the limitations present in the current study as well as the recommended changes in methodology offer several ideas for future studies in this area. There remains progress to be made as it pertains to research investigating factors that influence perceptions of incivility (e.g., personal characteristics or organizational factors). Such research is of high value as incivility is prevalent in our society today (Bambi et al., 2018; Porath & Pearson, 2010; 2013). Thus, the greater the advancements that can be made to improve our understanding of its antecedents and contributing constructs, the better the interventions that can be created to minimize the impact of incivility.

References

Agle, B. R., Nagarajan, N. J., Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Srinivasan, D. (2006). Does CEO charisma matter? An empirical analysis of the relationships among organizational performance, environmental uncertainty, and top management team perceptions of CEO charisma. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(1), 161-174. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.20785800

Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best practice recommendations for designing and implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, *17*(4), 351-371. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114547952

Albrecht, T. L., & Hall, B. (1991). Relational and content differences between elites and outsiders in innovation networks. *Communications Monographs, 58*(3), 273-288. http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1991.tb00243.x

Allen, J., Jimmieson, N. L., Bordia, P., & Irmer, B. E. (2007). Uncertainty during organizational change: Managing perceptions through communication. *Journal of Change Management, 7*(2), 187-210. http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.1080/14697010701563379

Allen, M. T., Myers, C. E., & Servatius, R. J. (2016). Uncertainty of trial timing enhances acquisition of conditioned eyeblinks in anxiety vulnerable individuals. *Behavioural Brain Research, 304*(1), 86-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2016.02.007

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiralling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 452-471. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202131

Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, cause, and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, *32*(4), 803-829. https://doi.org/10.5465/256569

Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, *47*(7), 755-778. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679404700701

Ateş, C., Kaymaz, Ö., Kale, H. E., & Tekindal, M. A. (2019). Comparison of test statistics of nonnormal and unbalanced samples for multivariate analysis of variance in terms of type-I error rates. *Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine*, *2019*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/2173638

Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2009). Why is organizational change related to workplace bullying? Role conflict and job insecurity as mediators. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, *30*(3), 348-371. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X09336557

Bambi, S., Foà, C., De Felippis, C., Lucchini, A., Guazzini, A., & Rasero, L. (2018). Workplace incivility, lateral violence and bullying among nurses. A review about their prevalence and related factors. *Acta Biomed*, *89*(6-S), 51–79. https://doi.org/10.23750/abm.v89i6-S.7461

Barnett, V., & Lewis, T. (1984). *Outliers in statistical data.* Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Applied Probability and Statistics.

Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, *22*(3), 161-173. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:3<161::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-Q

Bazerman, M. H., & Neale, M. A. (1986). Heuristics in negotiation: Limitations to effective dispute resolution. In H. R. Arkes & K. R. Hammond (Eds), *Judgment and decision making: An interdisciplinary reader* (pp. 311-321). Cambridge University Press.

Bhatt, A. (2017). *Examining the effects of humanization and racial identity on judgments of incivility and justice*, [Unpublished master's thesis]. Saint Mary's University.

Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Hjelt-Bäck, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, *20*(3), 173-184. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1994)20:3<173::AID-AB2480200304>3.0.CO;2-D

Bordia, P., Hunt, E., Paulsen, N., Tourish, D., & DiFonzo, N. (2004). Uncertainty during organizational change: Is it all about control? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 13*(3), 345-365. doi: 10.1080/13594320444000128

Brashers, D. E. (2001). Communication and uncertainty management. *Journal of Communication, 51*(3), 477-497. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2001.tb02892.x

Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological Science, 19*(3), 268-275. https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1467-9280.2008.02079.x

Bruckmüller, S., & Branscombe, N. R. (2010). The glass cliff: When and why women are selected as leaders in crisis contexts. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *49*(3), 433-451. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466609X466594

Bryan, A. D., Webster, G. D., & Mahaffrey, A. L. (2011). The big, the rich, and the powerful: Physical, financial, and social dimensions of dominance in mating and

attraction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*(3), 365–382. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167210395604

Cameron, K., Kim, M., & Whetten, D. (1987). Organizational effects of decline and turbulence. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 32*(2), 222-240. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393127

Carmona-Cobo, I., Lopez-Zafra, E., & Garrosa, E. (2019). Observers' reactions to workplace incivility in the masculine domain: How does role congruency explain gender bias in future workers? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 60*(6), 628-636. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12576

Casey, M. K., Miller, V. D., & Johnson, J. R. (1997). Survivors' information seeking following a reduction in workforce. *Communication Research, 24*(6), 755-781. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F009365029702400600 7

Cheng, Y., Chen, C. W., Chen, C. J., & Chiang, T. L. (2005). Job insecurity and its association with health among employees in the Taiwanese general population. *Social Science & Medicine*, *61*(1), 41-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.11.039

Cheng, G. H. L., & Chan, D. K. S. (2008). Who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology*, *57*(2), 272-303. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00312.x

Clampitt, P. G., Williams, M. L., & Korenak, A. (2000). *Managing organizational uncertainty: Conceptualization and measurement.*

Clark, C. M. (2008). Student voices on faculty incivility in nursing education: A conceptual model. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 29*(5), 284-289. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00312.x

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386-400. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.386.

Conway, M., Di Fazio, R., & Mayman, S. (1999). Judging others' emotions as a function of the others' status. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 291-305. https://doi.org/10.2307/2695865

Copeland, C. L., Driskell, J. E., & Salas, E. (1995). Gender and reactions to dominance. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *10*(4), 53.

Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2009). Patterns and profiles of response to incivility in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*(3), 272-288. http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.1037/a0014934

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management, 39*(6), 1579-1605. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311418835

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. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64

Costrich, N., Feinstein, J., Kidder, L., Marecek, J., & Pascale, L. (1975). When stereotypes hurt: Three studies of penalties for sex-role reversals. *Journal of*

Experimental Social Psychology, 11(6), 520-530. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(75)90003-7

Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*, 61-149. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(07)00002-0

Cullen, K. L., Edwards, B. D., Casper, W. C., & Gue, K. R. (2014). Employees' adaptability and perceptions of change-related uncertainty: Implications for perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *29*(2), 269-280. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9312-y

Cuyper, N. D., Bernhard-Oettel, C., Berntson, E., Witte, H. D., & Alarco, B. (2008). Employability and employees' well-being: Mediation by job insecurity. *Applied Psychology*, *57*(3), 488-509. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00332.x

Deaux, K., & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 788–827). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Diekman, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(10), 1171–1188. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167200262001

DiFonzo, N., & Bordia, P. (2002). Corporate rumor activity, belief and accuracy. *Public Relations Review, 28*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(02)00107-8

Eagly, A. H. (1987). Reporting sex differences. *American Psychologist, 42*(7), 756-757. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.42.7.755

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573-598. http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekman, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes, & H. M. Trautner (Eds), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123-174). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Ejelöv, E., & Luke, T. J. (2020). "Rarely safe to assume": Evaluating the use and interpretation of manipulation checks in experimental social psychology. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *87, 103-937.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2019.103937

Ekman, P. (1984). Expression and the nature of emotion. In R. Scherer & P. Eckman (Eds), *Approaches to emotion*, (pp. *3*19-344). Hillsdale.

Farley, S. D. (2008). Attaining status at the expense of likeability: Pilfering power through conversational interruption. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *32*(4), 241-260. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-008-0054-x

Farley, S. D., Ashcraft, A. M., Stasson, M. F., & Nusbaum, R. L. (2010). Nonverbal reactions to conversational interruption: A test of complementarity theory and the status/gender parallel. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *34*(4), 193-206. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-010-0091-0

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Fung, T. K., Griffin, R. J., & Dunwoody, S. (2018). Testing links among uncertainty, affect, and attitude toward a health behavior. *Science Communication, 40*(1), 33-62. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1075547017748947

Gabriel, A. S., Butts, M. M., Yuan, Z., & Rosen, R. L. (2018). Further understanding incivility in the workplace: The effects of gender, agency, and communion. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(4), 362-382. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000289

Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organizations*. SAGE.

Gopalkrishnan, P. (2011). *Workplace incivility and employee strain reactions: The moderating effects of perceived organizational support and job insecurity* [Unpublished masters thesis]. Bowling Green State University.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (2001). Anxiety, uncertainty, and perceived effectiveness of communication across relationships and cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25*(1), 55-71. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(00)00042-0

Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male tasks?: The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 81-92. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.81

Hershcovis, M. S. (2011). "Incivility, social undermining, bullying… oh my!": A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(3), 499-519. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.689

Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). *Destructive conflict and bullying at work*. Manchester: Manchester School of Management, UMIST.

Holsti, O. R. (1971). Crisis, stress and decision-making. *International Social Science Journal*, *23*(1), 53-67.

Huang, Y., & Yang, C. (2020). A metacognitive approach to reconsidering risk perceptions and uncertainty: Understand information seeking during COVID-19. *Science Communication, 42*(5), 616-642. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1075547020959818

Huang, G. H., Wellman, N., Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Wang, L. (2017). Deviance and exit: The organizational costs of job insecurity and moral disengagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000158

Jussim, L., Coleman, L. M., & Lerch, L. (1987). The nature of stereotypes: A comparison and integration of three theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*(3), 536-546.

Kinney, J. A. (1995). *Violence at work: How to make your company safer for employees & customers*. Prentice Hall Direct.

LaFrance, M. (1992). Gender and interruptions: Individual infraction or violation of the social order?. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *16*(4), 497-512. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1992.tb00271.x

le Cessie, S., Goeman, J. J., & Dekkers, O. M. (2020). Who is afraid of non-normal data? Choosing between parametric and non-parametric tests. *European Journal of Endocrinology*, *182*(2), E1-E3. https://doi.org/10.1530/EJE-19-0922

Lee, J., & Jensen, J. M. (2014). The effects of active constructive and passive corrective leadership on workplace incivility and the mediating role of fairness perceptions.

Group & Organization Management, 39(4), 416-443. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601114543182

Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 95-107. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95

Livingston, R. W., Rosette, A. S., & Washington, E. F. (2012). Can an agentic black woman get ahead? The impact of race and interpersonal dominance on perceptions of female leaders. *Psychological Science, 23*(4), 354-358. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611428079

Martin, R. J., & Hine, D. W. (2005). Development and validation of the uncivil workplace behavior questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(4), 477-490. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.477

Matthews, R. A., & Ritter, K.-J. (2015). A concise, content valid, gender invariant measure of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 21*(3), 352-365. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000017

Mavin, S., Grandy, G., & Williams, J. (2014). Experiences of women elite leaders doing gender: Intra-gender micro-violence between women. *British Journal of Management*, *25*, 439 – 455. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12057

Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(1), 123-136. http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.1037/0021-9010.84.1.123

McCord, M. A., Joseph, D. L., Dhanani, L. Y., & Beus, J. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of sex and race differences in perceived workplace mistreatment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(2), 137-163. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000250

McGregor, I., Zanna, M. P., Holmes, J. G., & Spencer, S. J. (2001). Compensatory conviction in the face of personal uncertainty: Going to extremes and being oneself. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 472-488. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.3.472

Mignerey, J. T., Rubin, R. B., & Gorden, W. I. (1995). Organizational entry: An investigation of newcomer communication behavior and uncertainty. *Communication Research, 22*(1), 54-85. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365095022001003

Miner, K. N., Diaz, I., Wooderson, R. L., McDonald, J. N., Smittick, A. L., & Lomeli, L. C. (2018). A workplace incivility roadmap: Identifying theoretical speedbumps and alternative routes for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *23*(3), 320-337. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000093

Morales, A. C., Amir, O., & Lee, L. (2017). Keeping it real in experimental research—Understanding when, where, and how to enhance realism and measure consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *44*(2), 465-476. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx048

Motro, D., Spoelma, T. M., & Ellis, A. P. (2021). Incivility and creativity in teams: Examining the role of perpetrator gender. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 106*(4), 560-581. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000757

Okimoto, T. G., & Brescoll, V. L. (2010). The price of power: Power seeking and

backlash against female politicians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*(7), 923-936. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210371949

O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review*, *21*(1), 225-253. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9602161571

Pacheco, T., Coulombe, S., Khalil, C., Meunier, S., Doucerain, M., Auger, E., & Cox, E. (2020). Job security and the promotion of workers' wellbeing in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic: A study with Canadian workers one to two weeks after the initiation of social distancing measures. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *10*(3), 58-76.

Park, Y., & Haun, V. C. (2018). The long arm of email incivility: Transmitted stress to the partner and partner work withdrawal. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 39*(10), 1268-1282. http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.1002/job.2289

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, *29*(2), 123-137.

Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for "nice"? Think again. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 19*(1), 7-18. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2005.15841946

Perlow, R., & Latham, L. L. (1993). Relationship of client abuse with locus of control and gender: A longitudinal study in mental retardation facilities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(5), 831. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.5.831

Politis, C. (2017). *Women's experience of incivility in professional occupations: The roles of gender representation and occupational commitment* [Unpublished masters thesis]. Western University. https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/4952

Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2010). The cost of bad behavior. *Organizational Dynamics, 39*(1), 64-71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2009.10.006

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*, E326-E357. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.01020.x

Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2013, January-February). The price of incivility. *Harvard Business Review*, 115-121. https://hbr.org/2009/04/how-toxic-colleagues-corrode-performance

Porath, C. L., Overbeck, J. R., & Pearson, C. M. (2008). Picking up the gauntlet: How individuals respond to status challenges. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(7), 1945-1980. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00375.x

Probst, T. M. (2003). Development and validation of the Job Security Index and the Job Security Satisfaction Scale: A classical test theory and IRT approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*(4), 451-467. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317903322591587

Probst, T. M., Jiang, L., & Graso, M. (2016). Leader-member exchange: Moderating the health and safety outcomes of job insecurity. *Journal of Safety Research*, *56*, 47-56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2015.11.003

Prochazka, J., Vaculik, M., & Smutny, P. (2014). *Dominance as a moderator in the relationship between leader's warmth and effectiveness* [Conference presentation]. European Conference on Management Leadership and Governance.

Prolific. (2014). *Prolific.* (Version 5.21). Oxford, UK. https://www.prolific.co

Qualtrics. (2005). *Qualtrics.* (Version 5.21). Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA. https://www.qualtrics.com

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(2), 555-572. https://doi.org/10.5465/256693

Rodell, J. B., & Colquitt, J. A. (2009). Looking ahead in times of uncertainty: The role of anticipatory justice in an organizational change context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 989–1002. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015351

Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(3), 629-645. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.629

Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counter stereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(2), 157-176. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.157

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: The hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle

managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(5), 1004-1010. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.1004

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 743-762. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00239

Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(1), 165-179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.008

Schaller, M., Park, J. H., & Mueller, A. (2003). Fear of the dark: Interactive effects of beliefs about danger and ambient darkness on ethnic stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(5), 637-649. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167203029005008

Schaumberg, R. L., & Flynn, F. J. (2017). Self-reliance: A gender perspective on its relationship to communality and leadership evaluations. *Academy of Management Journal, 60*(5), 1859-1881. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0018

Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*, S57-S88. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1976

Schweiger, D. M., & Denisi, A. S. (1991). Communication with employees following a merger: A longitudinal field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*(1), 110-135. https://doi.org/10.5465/256304

Silla, I., De Cuyper, N., Gracia, F. J., Peiro, J. M., & De Witte, H. (2009). Job insecurity and well-being: Moderation by employability. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *10*(6), 739-751. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-008-9119-0

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32*(1), 29–39. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076857

Standfier, R. L. (2004). *Business-to-business electronic commerce relationships: The impact of B2B structure and other relational antecedents upon conflict and perceived success* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation] University of Missouri-Columbia.

Statistics Canada. (2020). Table 14-10-0335-01: Labour force characteristics by industry, annual. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1410033501

Staw, B. M., Sandelands, L. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1981). Threat rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*(4), 501-524. http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.2307/2392337

Størseth, F. (2006). Changes at work and employee reactions: Organizational elements, job insecurity, and short-term stress as predictors for employee health and safety. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *47*(6), 541-550. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2006.00548.x

Tarraf, R. C. (2012). *Taking a closer look at workplace incivility: Dimensionality and source effects* [Unpublished masters thesis]. Western University.

Torkelson, E., Holm, K., Backstrom, M., & Schad, E. (2016). Factors contributing to the perpetration of workplace incivility: The importance of organizational aspects and experiencing incivility from others. *Work & Stress, 30*(2), 115-131. http://dx.doi.org.library.smu.ca:2048/10.1080/02678373.2016.1175524

VandenBos, G. R., & Bulatao, E. Q. (1996). *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions*. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10215-000

van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (2002). Uncertainty management by means of fairness judgments. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 34*, 1-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(02)80003-X

van den Bos, K., Heuven, E., Burger, E., & Van Veldhuizen, M. F. (2006). Uncertainty management after reorganizations: The ameliorative effect of outcome fairness on job uncertainty. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale, 19*(1), 145-156 .

Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(2), 219-230. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.21

Walsh, B. M., Magley, V. J., Reeves, D. W., Davies-Schrils, K. A., Marmet, M. D., & Gallus, J. A. (2012). Assessing workgroup norms for civility: The development of the Civility Norms Questionnaire-Brief. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *27*(4), 407-420. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9251-4

Wang, H. J., Le Blanc, P., Demerouti, E., Lu, C. Q., & Jiang, L. (2019). A social identity

perspective on the association between leader-member exchange and job insecurity. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *28*(6), 800-809. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1653853

Welbourne, J. L., & Sariol, A. M. (2017). When does incivility lead to counterproductive work behavior? Roles of job involvement, task interdependence and gender. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(2), 194-206. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000029

Wiggins, J. S., Trapnell, P., & Pjillips, N. (1988). Psychometric and geometric characteristics of the revised interpersonal adjective scale (IAS-R). *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 23*(4), 517-530. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2304_8

Williams, M. J., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2016). The subtle suspension of backlash: A meta-analysis of penalties for women's implicit and explicit dominance behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 142*(2), 165-197. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/bul0000039

Yaşlıoğlu, M., Karagülle, A. Ö., & Baran, M. (2013). An empirical research on the relationship between job insecurity, job related stress and job satisfaction in logistics industry. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *99*, 332-338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.501

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. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/ocp0000215

Appendix

Vignette

Next, you will be presented with a description of a fictitious company, Inglis Insurance, as well as a hypothetical interaction between yourself and the district manager of your branch of the company. ***We ask that you please read through the description and interactions very thoroughly and imagine that you are truly an employee who works for Inglis Insurance who is experiencing the interaction as described.*** *In this mindset, we will ask you a series of questions.*

Please note that there will be a timer set on the next page to ensure that you have adequate time to fully read the vignette.

Organization Description

Blue is stable – Red is unstable.

Stable	Unstable
You are an employee at *Inglis Insurance*, a medium-sized local insurance company with multiple branches across the region. This is your 3rd year as an insurance broker for the company. ***Inglis Insurance is currently prospering***. In the past two years, ***another*** insurance company has moved into your area ***yet your company (Inglis Insurance) has thrived through the competition.*** There have been whispers ***that Inglis Insurance may expand its operations, including into neighbouring regions in a few years***. Today, you are meeting with your district manager for a one-on-one discussion, as are the rest of your colleagues. The goal of the meeting is to discuss the plan for an upcoming promotion designed to draw in new clientele. You have prepared for the meeting and have brainstormed a few ideas that you think would help the project.	You are an employee at *Inglis Insurance*, a medium-sized local insurance company with multiple branches across the region. This is your 3rd year as an insurance broker for the company. ***Inglis Insurance is currently struggling*****.** In the past two years, **a *large, nation-wide*** insurance company has moved into your area ***and the competition has negatively impacted Inglis Insurance*****.** There have been whispers ***of cutbacks at Inglis Insurance, including personnel, due to financial losses.*** Today, you are meeting with your district manager for a one-on-one discussion, as are the rest of your colleagues. The goal of the meeting is to discuss the plan for an upcoming promotion designed to draw in new clientele. You have prepared for the meeting and have brainstormed a few ideas that you think would help the project**.**

District Manager Description

Blue is neutral – Red is dominant – Green is gender.

Neutral	Dominant
Your district manager, **NAME,** is in charge of overseeing the five branches in your region including your branch. **She/He** is responsible for training, regional goals and ensuring operations adhere to company policy. **He/She** is a Caucasian, middle-aged **man/woman**	Your district manager, **NAME,** is in charge of overseeing the five branches in your region including your branch. **She/He** is responsible for training, regional goals and ensuring operations adhere to company policy. **He/She** is a Caucasian, middle-aged **man/woman**

who has been described as an experienced leader.	who has been described as an experienced ***and ambitious leader who has always been drawn to power.***

Note: Names are Mary Sullivan or Mark Sullivan

Interaction Description

Blue is neutral – Red is dominant.

Neutral	Dominant
You walk into a small room and sit in the chair directly across from the district manager**.** **She/he** begins to speak ***in a normal voice with a calm facial expression.***	You walk into a small room and sit in the chair directly across from the district manager**.** **She/he** begins to speak ***in a relatively loud voice and with a somewhat stern facial expression.***
NAME: "Hello, I am **NAME**, the district manager for this region. To begin, ***I would like to*** go over a few branch sales statistics and some small changes ***we will ask you*** to make moving forward, then ***we will discuss*** the upcoming promotional project."	**NAME***:* "Hello, I am **NAME**, the district manager for this region. To begin, ***I will*** go over a few branch sales statistics and some small changes ***you will have*** to make moving forward, then ***I will explain*** the upcoming promotional project."
He/She goes over updates for your branch and position and explains the small changes to your protocol**,** with pauses in **his/her** speech, giving you the opportunity to ask questions. After about 15-20 minutes, **he/she** indicates that **he/she** ***would like to move*** on to the promotional project discussion but ***pauses*** to ask you if you have any questions before doing so. ***You are ready to move forward,*** so **he/she** begins…	**He/She** goes over updates for your branch and position and explains the small changes to your protocol, with ***no*** pauses in **his/her** speech giving you ***no*** opportunity to ask questions. After about 15-20 minutes, **he/she** indicates that **he/she** ***is moving*** on to the promotional project discussion but ***does not pause*** to ask you if you have any questions before doing so. **He/She** begins…
NAME: "I am ***responsible for*** planning, organizing and executing the current promotional project. I ***would like*** this project to be a success and I know ***we*** can make that happen. For this promotion, I plan to introduce a new premium bundle, ***please try to upsell this whenever you can. I would also like you*** to offer a 10% discount for referrals."	**NAME**: "I am ***in charge of*** planning, organizing and executing the current promotional project. I ***am determined to ensure*** this project is a success and I know ***I*** can make that happen. For this promotion, I plan to introduce a new premium bundle ***which you need to upsell every single time. You need*** to also offer a 10% discount for referrals."
…**he/she** goes over more details of the promotion with you for about 10 minutes. **He/she** ***briefly pauses*** to see if you have any questions or concerns.	…**he/she** goes over more details of the promotion with you for about 10 minutes. **He/she** ***does not pause*** to see if you have any questions or concerns.

NAME: "These are the general plans for the promotion, you will also receive a document highlighting the details as a reference ***so we can do this well***. Do you have anything to add?"

YOU: Yes, I do, thank you. I thought that we could offer an increased discount if the referral also opts for our premium plan ***to encourage our customers to talk it up and spread the word, maybe 15%?***

NAME*: "**Thank you for your input**, **I will look at the numbers and see if it can work with our current plan**."*

…he/she then talks about a few other strategies **he/she** plans to implement. In closing, **he/she** ***says casually…***

NAME: "***Thank you for your time***, I think I have everything I need for today. Please send in the next employee when you leave. Have a nice day."

NAME: "These are the general plans for the promotion, you will also receive a document highlighting the details as a reference ***as I need to make sure you do this well.*** Do you have anything to add?"

YOU: Yes, I do, thank you. I thought that we could offer an increased discount if the referral also opts for our premium plan ---

* **He/She** ***cuts you off****

NAME*: "**Hold on, that reminds me of another component I intend to add to the promotion…".***

… he/she then talks about a few other strategies **he/she** plans to implement ***then immediately moves into closing comments.*** In closing, **he/she** ***says firmly…"***

NAME*:* "I think I have everything I need for today. Please send in the next employee when you leave. Have a nice day."