ABSTRACT. Incivility at work has the potential to impact both individual (e.g., psychological health) and organizational outcomes (e.g., job performance and turnover). In line with Affective Events Theory, the current study proposed a moderated mediation model wherein employee job satisfaction would mediate the relation between cyber incivility and job performance, and trait positive affect would buffer the negative impact of cyber incivility on performance. Two-hundred twenty participants completed measures of cyber incivility, job satisfaction, job performance, positive affect, negative affect, and quantitative workload. Hierarchical regression analyses revealed that cyber incivility was negatively related to job satisfaction ($\beta = -.19, p = .006$), as well as job performance ($\beta = -.14, p = .037$), while controlling for negative affect. Additionally, results of mediation analyses indicated that job satisfaction served as a mediator of the cyber incivility-job performance relationship because employees who experienced cyber incivility reported lower job satisfaction, which was linked with lower job performance (indirect effect = -.020, 95% CIs = -.041, -.009; Sobel $z = -2.36, p = .02$). Trait positive affect moderated the relationship between cyber incivility and job performance such that the performance of those individuals with higher positive affect was not as negatively impacted by the cyber incivility as individuals with lower positive affect ($b = .08, p = .044$). The results are discussed in terms of their implications for the wired 21st century world of work.

Incivility in the workplace is a widespread phenomenon that can impact employees and organizations. According to Anderson and Pearson (1999), incivility is “low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others” (p. 457). Evidence has suggested that most of the workforce experiences this phenomenon, as Cortina, Magley, Williams, and Langout (2001) reported that nearly 75% of their sample experienced some type of incivility within the previous 5-year period. Such a widespread phenomenon has the potential to harm both individuals and organizations. For example, exposure to incivility has been linked with decreased physical and psychological health, lower job satisfaction, and increased work withdrawal, as well as increased absenteeism, greater intentions to quit, and actual turnover (Cortina et al., 2001; Johnson & Indvik, 2001; Porath & Pearson, 2012).

According to Affective Events Theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), stressful workplace events such as incivility are theorized to impact employees’ job attitudes, which can subsequently influence job performance. Previous research has supported this theoretical model, finding that incivility was linked with emotional reactions and subsequent changes in job satisfaction and withdrawal behaviors (Bunk & Magley, 2013). Additionally, Lim and Tai (2014) found that incivility...
led to increased psychological distress, which was subsequently linked with lower job performance. However, although much of the existing research has looked at incivility in a face-to-face context, the 21st century working world is one characterized by frequent online communications (Madden & Jones, 2008; Purcell & Rainie, 2014). The experience of cyber incivility, or rude and discourteous treatment that occurs via information and communication technologies (Giumetti, McKibben, Hatfield, Schroeder, & Kowalski, 2012) is also widespread. A study of financial employees from Singapore found that 91% of the sample experienced cyber incivility in the last year (Lim & Teo, 2009). Preliminary evidence has also suggested that cyber incivility is linked with negative outcomes for employees, as a study of U.S. workers found that daily cyber incivility was associated with greater levels of distress at the end of the workday as well as the next morning (Park, Fritz, & Jex, 2015).

Beyond this initial research, however, less is known about the mechanisms through which cyber incivility may be linked to decreased performance and for whom cyber incivility may be more impactful. Therefore, the purpose of the current study was first to examine the main effect of cyber incivility on job satisfaction and job performance, and then to examine the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relation between cyber incivility and job performance. Additionally, the current study examined the moderating role of positive affect (PA) to understand the role of individual differences in this relationship (see proposed model in Figure 1).

Technology Use at Work
Internet use in the workplace is nearly ubiquitous. A 2014 survey of employed adults in the United States found that nearly all workers (96%) use a laptop, desktop, tablet, or smartphone (Harter, Agrawal, & Sorensen, 2014). In addition, another 2014 survey of U.S. workers found that 61% say that e-mail is very important to doing their job (Purcell & Rainie, 2014), and a recent study found that as many as 83% of workers in the sample used the Internet to communicate with coworkers, and 70% used it to communicate with supervisors once or twice per day (Giumetti et al., 2012). Communication via online media such as e-mail, text messaging, or chat has several unique qualities compared to face-to-face communication, which may make both the perception of mistreatment as well as the likelihood of engaging in mistreatment greater than communication in a face-to-face context.

First, individuals may be more likely to perceive communications sent via the Internet as uncivil because of the lack of instant feedback and reduced nonverbal cues (Byron, 2008). When individuals send an e-mail, they may not receive a response for hours, days, or in some cases, ever. The individuals may be left wondering if the message was delivered or if they are being ignored. Also, messages sent via online means lack the rich nonverbal cues that face-to-face communication includes. For example, if an individual is having a face-to-face conversation and something being said is upsetting, the message sender may perceive changes in the recipient’s body language such as arms crossing, a frown, or eyebrows raising, and may decide to change the direction of the conversation. Additionally, face-to-face conversations have the benefit of other important nonverbal cues including emotional expressions, tone of voice, and gaze direction. In an online message, these cues are missing, which may heighten the possibility of miscommunication.

Additionally, a phenomenon known as the online disinhibition effect may make uncivil behaviors more likely (Suler, 2004). This effect occurs because normal constraints on individual behavior are less salient in an online context, making people feel less restrained and more likely to express themselves freely. For example, individuals may feel that they can more easily express their disapproval over a new company policy via e-mail by clicking “reply all” to share derogatory remarks about the policy makers, something that they would be less likely to do in a face-to-face meeting with the entire company. As technology use becomes more prevalent in the workplace, interpersonal mistreatment may also become more likely (Weatherbee & Kelloway,
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The current study utilized AET to understand how cyber incivility (a stressful workplace event) can impact employee attitudes and performance (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). According to AET, negative workplace encounters such as cyber incivility can lead to negative job attitudes. These negative attitudes may impact work performance because they signal that something at work is wrong, and they lead individuals to spend copious amounts of resources thinking about the situation, thus distracting their efforts from work (Porath & Erez, 2007).

Previous research has used AET as a theoretical model to understand how incivility in the workplace impacts individuals. For example, the study by Porath and Erez (2007) found that rudeness was associated with higher levels of negative affect (NA), which in turn was linked to reduced task performance. Additionally, Bunk and Magley (2013) found a mediating role for job satisfaction in the relation between incivility and work withdrawal. Therefore, in the current study, we predicted that cyber incivility would be associated with decreases in job satisfaction and job performance, and that job satisfaction would serve as a mediator of the relation between cyber incivility and performance. We develop these hypotheses further below.

Incivility and Job Attitudes

Incivility has been linked with decreases in several different job attitudes including organizational commitment, job satisfaction (Smith, Andrusyszyn, & Laschinger, 2010), and perceived organizational support (Miner, Settles, Pratt-Hyatt, & Brady, 2012). Further, when incivility is removed from a working environment, employees tend to show more positive work attitudes. For example, researchers found that a workplace civility intervention was able to both decrease instances of incivility and increase employee job attitudes including trust, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and professional efficacy (Leiter, Laschinger, Day, & Oore, 2011), and these improvements were sustained 1 year later (Leiter, Day, Oore, & Laschinger, 2012).

Clearly, much research has demonstrated a link between face-to-face incivility and job attitudes. However, considerably less research has focused on the relation between cyber incivility and job attitudes. One exception to this is a study by Lim and Teo (2009) that examined cyber incivility among a sample of financial services employees in Singapore. The researchers found that cyber incivility was negatively related to both organizational commitment and job satisfaction. However, no studies to date have examined the link between cyber incivility and job attitudes in a U.S.-based sample. Therefore, we proposed for our first hypothesis that cyber incivility would be negatively related to job satisfaction.

Incivility and Job Performance

Previous research has found a link between incivility and job performance. Sliter, Jex, Wolford, and McInerney (2010) examined predictors of customer service performance and found that customer incivility was linked with decreased performance. In other words, when employees were faced with an uncivil customer and they faked a positive emotional state, their sales performance decreased. Cortina et al. (2001) also linked experiences of incivility with increased levels of work withdrawal, suggesting that those employees who experience rude or discourteous behavior may be more likely to disregard specific tasks that are part of their role, and therefore suffer a decrease in their job performance. Recent research has also linked cyber incivility with task performance. According to a study by Giumetti et al. (2013), participants who experienced cyber incivility from a supervisor performed more poorly on a series of math tasks as compared to experiencing supervisor support. Based on this existing research, we proposed our second hypothesis, that cyber incivility would be negatively related to job performance.

Job Satisfaction as a Mediator

With AET, one possible mechanism for the reduced job performance that victims of cyber incivility may experience may be through a reduction in job satisfaction (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). That is, individuals who experience cyber incivility may become dissatisfied with their jobs, causing them to withdraw effort, and therefore their performance decreases. Previous research has supported this mediational model linking uncivil workplace behaviors with decreases in job satisfaction and subsequent decreases in job performance. For example, Porath and Erez (2007) examined...
rudeness and task performance among college students and found that individuals who experienced rudeness during the experiment performed worse on the anagram tasks, and this was mediated by disruptions to cognitive processing. Additionally, in a study by Lim, Cortina, and Magley (2008), the researchers found that, among a sample of U.S. federal circuit court employees, participants who experienced personal incivility tended to report lower levels of satisfaction with their work, which in turn was related to turnover intentions. Therefore, we proposed our third hypothesis, that job satisfaction would mediate the relationship between cyber incivility and performance.

The Role of Positive Affect
Previous research has identified several variables that may buffer the negative impact of stress on strain outcomes. One such moderator is PA, or the tendency to experience positive mood states (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). A study by Vander Elst, Bosman, De Cuypers, Stouten, and De Witte (2013) found that PA buffered the relationship between job insecurity and psychological distress. Other studies have also found a buffering role for positive emotions in stressor-strain relationships at work (Grote, Bledsoe, Larkin, Lemay, & Brown, 2007; Riolli & Savicki, 2003; Thomas, Britt, Odle-Dusseau, & Bliese, 2011). In each of these studies, those individuals who experienced higher levels of PA tended to be less susceptible to the negative outcomes of the stressor. In the current study, we predicted that PA would protect employees from the deleterious impact of cyber incivility on job satisfaction and job performance (see Figure 1). Therefore, our fourth hypothesis was that the indirect effect of cyber incivility on both (a) job satisfaction and (b) job performance would be moderated by PA such that the negative cyber incivility-outcomes relationship would be stronger for those individuals low in PA as compared to those individuals high in PA.

Method
Participants and Procedure
The Clemson University institutional review board reviewed and approved the current study. Participants were recruited via an e-mail invitation that provided a link to the online survey, and they completed it electronically through SurveyMonkey®, an online survey platform. All participants first completed an informed consent form to acknowledge their agreement to participate. Partial course credit was offered to the undergraduate student sample, whereas no incentives were offered to the other samples. Participants were under no time limit while taking the survey, and the mean time to complete the survey was 11 min (SD = 8.2 min). We set the survey data collection options so that only one submission would be accepted per computer to control for potential double submission of surveys. Two-hundred twenty participants completed the survey.

The mean age of the sample was 31.05 years (SDage = 12.40 years), and there were 80 men (37%) and 127 women (58%). In terms of racial/ethnic background, most participants were White (n = 171, 82.93%), and the next most common racial groups were Black (n = 17, 8.29%), Asian or Pacific Islander (n = 10, 4.88%), or “other” (n = 7, 3.41%). Participants were gathered from four different samples: business professionals contacted through an alumni database (n = 39, 17.7% of the sample), professional psychologists contacted through an association listserv (n = 84, 38.2% of the sample), current MBA students in an executive MBA program (n = 6, 3% of the sample), and undergraduate students from a large southeastern university (n = 91, 41.4% of the sample). All participants were at least working part-time in the United States at the time of the survey. Participants worked an average of 33.87 hours per week (SD = 18.78) and had an average of 4.29 years of experience (SD = 5.75). Participants were employed in numerous industries including education (28.29%), health care (12.68%), professional services (8.90%), retail trade (6.80%), food service (6.30%), and manufacturing (4.90%). In terms of Internet use at work, 60% of the sample (n = 151) communicated at least once or twice per week with their coworkers via the Internet. Fifty-three percent of the sample reported using the Internet at least once or twice per week to communicate with supervisors (n = 147), and 50% of the sample reported using it this often to communicate with customers (n = 130).

Measures
Job performance. Perceived job performance was measured with one question pertaining to overall job performance. The specific question was, “In the past six months, do you think that your job performance has been . . . ” and response options were on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (significantly below normal) to 5 (significantly above normal). This question was answered based on a self-assessment from the past 6 months.
Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured with three questions that were similar to the general satisfaction measure from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1974). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with three statements using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The items are “Overall, I feel satisfied with my job,” “I feel happy with my job for the most part,” and “I think that my job generally pleases me.” Together, the three items demonstrated good internal reliability ($\alpha = .96$), so a composite was created by taking the mean of the three items.

Cyber incivility. For the measure of cyber incivility, participants were first given a list of possible behaviors that define the experience of incivility such as being condescending, making demeaning remarks, ignoring someone, doubting someone’s judgment, or spreading rumors (Cortina et al., 2001). Then, participants read a definition, “The following questions are about being the victim of cyber incivility at work. When we say cyber incivility, we mean incivility that takes place through e-mail, instant messaging, in a chat room, on a website, or through a text message sent to a cell phone.” After reading the definition, participants indicated how often they experienced cyber incivility through seven different media in the last 6 months by using a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (several times per day). The seven media through which participants might have experienced cyber incivility were through instant messaging, in a chat room, on a website, or through a text message sent to a cell phone. The final potential control variable that we included was trait NA. Previous research has suggested that NA may inflate the relationships between job stress and job strain (Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988) and therefore NA should be statistically controlled. In the current study, trait NA was also measured using 10 items from the PANAS (Watson et al., 1988), using the same response scale as noted above for PA. These items included irritable, distressed, and upset. The PANAS has been used in previous research to assess NA in relation to job stress (Spector, Fox, & Van Katwyk, 1999) and has demonstrated good reliability ($\alpha = .91$). In the current study, internal reliability was good for our measure of NA ($\alpha = .87$), so a scale composite was created by taking the mean of the 10 NA items.

PA. Trait PA was measured using the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988). There were 10 items for PA measured with a 5-point Likert-type response scale ranging from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely). Participants indicated to what extent they agreed with three statements using a 5-point Likert-type response scale ranging from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely). The items are “Overall, I feel satisfied with my job,” “I feel happy with my job for the most part,” and “I think that my job generally pleases me.” Together, the three items demonstrated good internal reliability ($\alpha = .96$), so a composite was created by taking the mean of the three items.
workload, NA, and job tenure with the key variables of the current study (cyber incivility, job satisfaction, and job performance). As noted in Table 1, only NA had a significant relationship with cyber incivility, job satisfaction, and job performance. Both job tenure and workload were unrelated to these variables. Therefore, we included NA as a control variable when testing the hypotheses for the current study. Additionally, we conducted a series of one-way ANOVAs to examine whether there were differences across the four samples (undergraduate students, MBA students, business alumni, and professional psychologists) in the primary variables for the current study (cyber incivility, NA, PA, job satisfaction, and job performance). Results indicated that there were no significant differences across samples in cyber incivility, NA, PA, and job satisfaction (all p’s > .05). However, there were significant differences in job performance among the four samples, F(3, 209) = 7.42, p < .001, η² = .10. Therefore, we included a variable representing the sample from which data originated (referred to as data source below) as an additional control variable in the analyses.

To test the first two hypotheses that cyber incivility would be related to job satisfaction and job performance, respectively, we conducted a series of hierarchical linear regression analyses (sometimes called sequential regression; see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013), with NA and data source entered in Model 1 as control variables, and cyber incivility entered in Model 2. The third hypothesis involved examination of a mediator, job satisfaction. Mediation hypotheses involve examination of an intervening mechanism that occurs between some stimulus and some response (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In this case, we predicted that the intervening mechanism would be job satisfaction that comes between the experience of cyber incivility and job performance. In other words, our analysis tried to answer the question of how cyber incivility would be related to decreased job performance, in this case, for individuals low in PA (MacKinnon & Luecken, 2008). To test this hypothesis, we again used hierarchical regression analyses and entered NA and data source in Model 1, cyber incivility and PA in Model 2. We then entered the interaction term in Model 3 and examined the change in R² from Model 2 to Model 3 as an indication of a significant interaction (Aiken & West, 1991).

Results

Descriptive statistics, intercorrelations, and scale reliabilities can be found in Table 1. Prior to testing the hypotheses of the current study, we first examined the prevalence rate of cyber incivility in the current sample and found that 61.40% reported never experiencing cyber incivility at work, and 38.60% of the sample reported experiencing cyber incivility through at least one medium less than once per month or more. Whereas this prevalence rate may seem low, it aligns with previous research on cyber incivility (e.g., Giummetti et al., 2012; Park, Fritz, & Jex, 2015).

The first hypothesis was supported because cyber incivility was significantly related to job satisfaction while controlling for NA and data source (β = -.19, p = .006; see Table 2). The second hypothesis was also supported because cyber incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Incivility</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cronbach’s alpha values are presented along the diagonal in italics. *Correlation is significant at p < 0.05.
was significantly related to job performance while controlling for NA and data source ($\beta = -.14, p = .037$; see Table 3).

The third hypothesis examined the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between cyber incivility and job performance. Results indicated that the indirect effect of job satisfaction was significant ($ab = -.020$, BC 95% CIs = -.041, -.009; Sobel $z = -2.36$, $p = .02$) while controlling for NA and data source. These results indicated that the third hypothesis was supported.

To test our moderated mediation models, the fourth hypothesis, we began by examining the interactive effect of cyber incivility and PA on job satisfaction. Results indicated that the model did not add significant incremental variance ($p = .59$). The second moderated mediation model involved examining the interactive effect of cyber incivility and PA on job performance. Results indicated that the model explained significant incremental variance ($\Delta R^2 = .020$, $p = .026$) over the main effects, NA, and data source, and the interaction term was significant ($\beta = .145, p = .026$). A simple slopes analysis revealed that the results were in the expected direction (Aiken & West, 1991). When employees were low in PA (one $SD$ below the $M$), cyber incivility was significantly related to job performance ($t = -2.85, p = .005$). However, when employees were high in PA (one $SD$ above the $M$), cyber incivility was not significantly related to performance ($t = 0.56, p = .577$). We plotted the interaction to help with interpretation (see Figure 2). Finally, we followed recommendations of Hayes (2013) to examine the conditional indirect effects at 1 standard deviation above and below the mean of PA. When employees were low in PA, the mediated model was significant (indirect effect = -.03, SE = .01, CIs = -.07, -.01). However, when employees were high in PA, the mediated model was not significant (indirect effect = -.01, SE = .01, CIs = -.05, .01). Together, these results suggested that individuals who are high in PA are less likely to be affected by cyber incivility and less likely to report lower levels of job satisfaction or job performance. Thus, partial support was found for the fourth hypothesis because the first part was not supported (i.e., PA did not moderate the relationship between cyber incivility and job satisfaction), but the second part was supported (i.e., PA moderated the relationship between cyber incivility and job performance).

**Discussion**

Incivility has the ability to negatively impact individuals in the workplace. Whereas much of the previous research on incivility has focused on its face-to-face form, the current study extended this research by focusing on so called cyber incivility, which is incivility experienced through electronic means such as e-mail, text messages, or instant messaging. By utilizing the AET model, the current study examined...
how cyber incivility can be identified as a stressful event in the workplace and subsequently impact a person’s job satisfaction and performance level. The results indicated that, when experiencing cyber incivility in the workplace, individuals tend to report lower levels of job satisfaction and also report lower job performance levels. These findings supported previous research linking face-to-face incivility to job attitudes (Miner-Rubino & Reed, 2010) and job performance (Sliter et al., 2010).

Additionally, the findings from the current study indicated that job satisfaction served as a mediator of the relationship between cyber incivility and job performance. This suggests that employees who are treated poorly at work through such acts as cyber incivility may report lower levels of job satisfaction, which in turn may be related to lower levels of job performance. However, PA served as a buffer to the negative effects of cyber incivility on job performance. Specifically, individuals who were high in PA did not report reduced job performance following cyber incivility as compared to those individuals who were low in PA. These results help to show how (through job satisfaction) and for whom (those low in PA) that cyber incivility may be linked with reduced job performance. Lastly, we did not find support for PA as a moderator of the link between cyber incivility and job satisfaction. This suggests that the relationship between cyber incivility and job satisfaction does not depend on a person’s typical levels of positive emotions.

Practical Implications
The results of the current study have important implications for the 21st century world of work. To try to reduce the incidence of cyber incivility, supervisors and managers might consider implementing online communication training sessions or interventions to guide individuals to act in appropriate ways online. Such training sessions have been effective for reducing the incidence of face-to-face incivility (Leiter et al., 2012), and also reducing the negative outcomes associated with incivility, so there may be a high likelihood of success in an online context as well. It is important to note, however, that the current study examined perceived experiences of incivility, rather than objective instances of incivility experienced from others, so it may be the case that supervisors or coworkers are not purposely trying to treat them poorly. Along these lines, then, other forms of training may also be helpful such as training employees to be more forgiving, understanding, or giving others the benefit of the doubt. Additionally, organizations may consider carefully monitoring employee job attitudes. If employees begin to report lower levels of job satisfaction, managers may want to intervene to learn about the root of the dissatisfaction to help ward off a decline in job performance.

The results of the current study also suggested that personality plays a role in the stressor-strain process. More specifically, given that we found relationships between NA and cyber incivility, job satisfaction, and job performance, future researchers are encouraged to measure NA in their studies. The experience of cyber incivility may partially be a function of the personality of the e-mail recipient because individuals high in NA may be more sensitive to stressors in their environment or more likely to experience increased strain reactions as a result of stress in the workplace (Spector, Zapf, Chen, & Frese, 2000). More research is needed on the mechanisms associated with NA and job stressor-strain relationships.

From a practical standpoint, the results of the current study also suggested that individuals high in trait NA may be more likely to report lower levels of self-rated performance. Thus, managers may wish to take personality traits into consideration when reviewing self-rated employee performance, and be prepared to provide additional coaching to these individuals, helping them to see their strengths and areas for improvement. In addition, our findings indicated that individuals high in PA were less likely to report decreased job satisfaction and decreased performance. Therefore, organizations may wish to encourage positive emotional experiences at work (Fritz & Sonnentag, 2009).

Limitations and Future Research Directions
There are several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results of the current study. First, due to all variables being gathered via self-reported surveys, response bias may be a concern (McGrath, Mitchell, Kim, & Hough, 2010). In particular, participants might not have reported accurately on their current performance levels. Whereas much previous research has relied on self-report for measuring a person’s own performance (Kim & Glomb, 2014), supervisors or others in the workplace may be in a better position to observe and report on an employee’s levels of job performance. Therefore, future research should not focus entirely on self-reported measures and should instead include measures from coworkers, supervisors, and subordinates. Additionally, researchers...
should attempt to gather objective measures of performance. For example, test scores could be used with a student sample or sales numbers for salespersons. An additional limitation with the performance measure used in the current study was that participants were asked to judge their performance in comparison to normal. However, we did not define normal, and what is normal for one individual may not be the standard for the organization. Another limitation of the current study was that all data were gathered at a single time point and no variables were manipulated. Therefore, we cannot establish that cyber incivility caused changes in job satisfaction or performance, nor can we establish the temporal order of these variables. For example, it could be the case that poor performers are more likely to be victims of cyber incivility. Additionally, the design for the current study only provided weak evidence of true buffering. Future researchers should examine the cyber incivility phenomenon as well as a PA buffering hypothesis using longitudinal study designs or experimental manipulations.

Another possible limitation was that we were unable to control for certain personality traits that may be related to being targeted more often with cyber incivility. For example, previous research has indicated that individuals who are low in agreeableness report more occurrences of face-to-face incivility in the workplace than individuals who are high in agreeableness (Milam, Spitzmueller, & Penney, 2009). Therefore, future research should take into consideration the personality of the target employee and obtain other reports of cyber incivility. Additionally, the current study only examined one possible correlate of job performance and job satisfaction (cyber incivility), but these outcome variables may be influenced by additional workplace factors other than cyber incivility. For example, pay (Judge, Piccolo, Podsakoff, Shaw, & Rich, 2010), relationships with supervisors (Harris, Harris, & Brouer, 2009), job characteristics (Cheung & Tang, 2010), individual differences (Wu & Griffin, 2012), and growth opportunities (Ford & Wooldridge, 2012) may influence job satisfaction. In addition, the level of work-family conflict that an individuals experience may impact the amount of stress individuals might be under and their reported levels of satisfaction and performance (Odle-Dusseau, Britt, & Greene-Shortridge, 2012; Spector et al., 2007). Thus, future research is needed to look at other external factors that may influence a person’s job performance and job satisfaction at the same time as cyber incivility. One final limitation was that the working adults samples were not offered incentives for participation in this study. This might have reduced the number of responses, and previous research has indicated that even small incentives can improve survey response rates (Rose, Sidle, & Griffith, 2007). Therefore, future research should employ a small incentive with surveys sent to employee-based samples.

In conclusion, the current study provided additional support for AET as a theoretical model linking negative workplace events with job attitudes and job performance. Specifically, we found that cyber incivility was linked with lower levels of job satisfaction along with lower levels of self-rated job performance. In addition, we found evidence for a possible mechanism (job satisfaction) through which cyber incivility may be linked with job performance as well as an individual difference variable that helped us to understand for whom cyber incivility may be more impactful (individuals low in PA). Our study also provided additional information about the prevalence of cyber incivility among working adults because 38.60% of the sample indicated that they had experienced at least one form of cyber incivility at work in the past 6 months. Given the rapidly increasing use of communications technologies in today’s workplaces (Purcell & Rainie, 2014), we feel that additional research is warranted on this form of interpersonal mistreatment. Additionally, we encourage employees to be mindful of their electronic communications.
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