Binyamin Cooper

Curriculum Vitae

Department of Management
Warrington College of Business
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611-7165
352-392-6147 (Office)
352-745-9534 (Cell)
E-mail: binyamin.cooper@warrington.ufl.edu
Website: binyamincooper.com

Education

2020	(Expected) Ph.D. in Business Administration, University of Florida Dissertation: *Organizational First Aid: Exploring Workplace Remedies to Buffer Rudeness' Negative Outcomes* Amir Erez, PhD (Chair)
2014	M.A. in Social-Organizational Psychology, Bar-Ilan University, Israel Thesis: *Unethical Leadership: Validating a New Construct* Yair Berson, PhD (Chair)
2011	B.A. in Psychology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

Research Interests

Rudeness, Cognition, Resilience, Negotiation

Academic Positions

2015-Present	PhD student, Instructor, Research and Teaching Assistant University of Florida

Refereed Journal Articles (Revision Requested)

Cooper, B., Giordano, C. R., Erez, A., Foulk, T. A., Reed, H., & Berg, K. (2019). Anchored to a Sinking Ship: How Rudeness Can Lead to Errors in Critical Decision-Making. Revise and Resubmit, *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Cooper, B., Pounds, T., Halevy, N., & Erez, A. (2019). Incivility Divides and Hurts: Exposure to Brief Incidental Rudeness Boosts Intergroup Discrimination. Revise and Resubmit, *Nature: Human Behavior*.

Refereed Journal Articles (Under Review)

Erez, A., Bamberger, P., Foulk, T., **Cooper, B.**, Riskin, A., Schilpzand, P., & Vashdi, D. When Sticks in a Bundle are Breakable: Effects of Rudeness on Team Coordinative Processes and Performance. Manuscript Under Review, *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Manuscripts in Preparation (Data Collection Completed)

Cooper, B., De Pater, I., Foulk, T. A., & Erez, A. The Cycle of Incivility: How Incivility Begets Incivility. Manuscript in preparation for submission to *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Cooper, B., Berson, Y., Erez, A., & Woolum, A. (2019). The Silencing Effect of Incivility: an Investigation of Voice Suppression as a Mediator in the Spiral of Incivility. Manuscript in preparation for submission to *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Gale, J., **Cooper, B.,** Erez, A., & Brownlee, A. The Worriers that Could: How Neurotic Problem-solvers better respond to Rudeness. Manuscript in preparation for submission to *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Erez, A., **Cooper, B.**, & Porath, C. Overconfident and Rude: The Impact of Overconfidence on Subsequent Rude Behavior. Manuscript in preparation for submission to *Academy of Management Journal.*

Foulk, T., Erez, A., & **Cooper, B.** Rudeness on the Brain: Why Rudeness is So Pervasive, and How One Rude Event can have Long Lasting Effects. Manuscript in preparation for submission to *Academy of Management Journal.*

Research in Progress (Data in collection)

Cooper, B., Erez, A., Gale, J., Mathews, C., & Green, J. Counteracting the Toxic Impact of Disruptive & Intimidating Behaviors on Nursing Staff. Data Collection in progress.

Cooper, B., Bamberger, P., Jingqiu, C., Erez, A., & Ackerman, R. Exploring the Implications of Workplace Injuries in Real-Time: A Longitudinal Field Study. Data collection in progress.

Cooper, B., Erez, A., Katz, Y., Gale, J., Guelmman, M., Escheto, L., & Zoidis, P. The Impact of Exposure to Rudeness on Technical Dexterity. Data collection in progress.

Riskin, A., Bamberger, P., Erez, A., **Cooper, B.,** Riskin-Guez, K., Riskin, Y., Sela, R., Ackerman, R. Ziv, A., Pessach-Gelblum, L., & Bamberger, E. The Consequences of Medical Hubris: Exploring the Outcomes of Medical Team Overconfidence. Data collection in progress.

Refereed Journal Articles (Published) – Non-Management

Riskin, A., Bamberger, P., Erez, A., Riskin-Guez, K., Riskin, Y., Sela, R., Foulk, T., **Cooper, B.**, Ziv, A., Pessach-Gelblum, L., & Bamberger, E. (2019). Expressions of Gratitude and Medical Team Performance. ***Pediatrics***.

In Media: Reuters, metro.us, channelnewsasia

Riskin, A., Bamberger, P., Erez, A., Foulk, T. A., **Cooper, B.**, Peterfreund, I., Sheps, J., Wilhelm-Kafil, M., Riskin, Y., Riskin-Guez, K., & Bamberger, E. (2019). Incivility and Patient Safety: A Longitudinal Study of Rudeness, Protocol Compliance and Adverse Events. ***The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety***.

In Media: AHRQ PSNet

Chaired Conference Sessions

Schilpzand, P., & **Cooper, B.** (Chairs). *Workplace Incivility: New Frontiers and Research Directions*. Symposium at the 77th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (2017), Atlanta, GA.

Berson, Y., & **Cooper, B.** (Chairs). *New Directions in Ethics-Focused Leadership Research: Behaviors, Transmitters, and Qualifiers*. Symposium at the 75th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (2015), Vancouver, B.C.

Refereed and Invited Conference Presentations

Cooper, B., Pounds, T., Halevy, N., & Erez, A. (2019, August). Incivility Divides and Hurts: Exposure to Brief Incidental Rudeness Boosts Intergroup Discrimination. Presented at the 79th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Boston, MA.

Avesar, M., Erez, A., Essakow, J., Young, C., **Cooper, B.**, Klein, M., Akan, D., Chang, T., & Rake, A. (2019, February). The Effect of Rudeness on Challenging Diagnostic Error: A Randomized Controlled Simulation Trial. Presented at the 48th Annual Congress of the Society of Critical Care Medicine (SCCM), San Diego, CA.

Cooper, B., De Pater, I., Foulk, T., & Erez, A. (2018, August). The Lose-Lose Scenario: Negative Consequences of Instigated Incivility. Presented at the 78th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

Riskin, A., Erez, A., Riskin-Guez, K., Sela, R., Riskin, Y., Foulk, T., **Cooper, B.**, Ziv, A., Pessach-Gelblum, L., & Bamberger, P. (2018, May). Expressions of gratitude and NICU teams' performance. Presented at the Pediatric Academic Societies Meeting (PAS), Toronto, Canada.

Cooper, B., Pounds, T., Halevy, N., & Erez, A. (2018, January). An Organizational House of Cards: How Witnessing Rudeness Undermines Intergroup Cooperation. Presented at the 4th Annual Meeting of the Israel Organizational Behavior Conference, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

Cooper, B., Pounds, T., Halevy, N., & Erez, A. (2017, August). Does Experiencing Rudeness Trigger Outgroup Hate? The Role of Rudeness as an Accelerator of Intergroup Conflict. Presented at the 77th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Atlanta, GA.

Pounds, T., **Cooper, B.**, & Erez, E. (2017, April). Inducing Out-Group Hate: Rudeness and Intergroup Conflict. Presented at the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Cooper, B., Berson, Y., & Erez, A. (2016, August). Not All Rude Behaviors are Alike: The Effects of Perspective Taking on the Rudeness-Aggression Link. Presented at the 76th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.

Cooper, B. (2016, January). *Analyzing the nature of Shard Team Leadership: Shifting along Faultlines.* Paper presented at the Teams Research Incubator, Atlanta, GA.

Teaching Experience

University of Florida

MAN 3401 **Human Resource Management** (Instructor, Fall 2018)
Teacher Rating 4.60/5; *Department avg.* 4.26/5

MAN 3240 **Organizations: Structure and Behavior** (Instructor, Fall 2017)
Teacher Rating 4.62/5; *Department avg.* 4.33/5

Teaching Assistant Roles

MAN 5245 **Organizational Behavior**
Graduate level class, Spring 2020
Lecturer: Alex Settles, PhD

SWARM 2019 **Summer Workshops in Advanced Research Methods** (SWARM)
Ph.D. and Junior Faculty workshop, June 2019
Lecturer: Mo Wang, PhD, Topic: Mplus
Teaching Assistant Rating 5/5

MAN 7108 **Seminar on Research Methods**
Ph.D. seminar, Fall 2018
Lecturer: Mo Wang, PhD

MAN 5245/6 **Organizational Behavior**
Graduate level class, Fall 2015 through Spring 2020
Lecturer: Amir Erez, PhD

Invited Lectures

MAN 3240 **Organizations: Structure and Behavior** (Spring 2019)
Topic: Negotiation

MAN 3240 **Organizations: Structure and Behavior** (Fall 2018)
Topic: Negotiation

MAN 5246 **Organizational Behavior** (MBA class, Summer 2018)
Lecturer: Ariane Froidevaux , PhD
Topic: Negotiation

MAN 3240 **Organizations: Structure and Behavior** (Spring 2018)
Topic: Negotiation

Psychology - I/O Club **Gators Applied** (Undergraduate Student Club, Fall, 2017)
Topic: Pursuing an Academic Career

Bar-Ilan University

60-209-01 **Introduction to Social Psychology**
Teaching Assistant, Undergraduate course (Fall 2012 through Spring 2015)
Lecturer: Yair Berson, PhD

Award, Honors & Grants

- Winner, *Best Poster in Medical Education* category and *Best Poster in All Categories*, Saban Research Institute 24th Annual Poster Session for Training, Education, Career Planning, & Development (TECPAD; 2019), Children's Hospital Los Angeles (CHLA), CA
- 2019 Behavioral Data Collection Support Funds ($2,000), Warrington College of Business, University of Florida
- Ph.D. Outstanding Teaching Award, Warrington College of Business (Fall 2018)
- Nominated for the Best Symposium Award by the OB division, 75th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (2015), Vancouver, B.C.

Professional Service

Ad Hoc Reviewer, Academy of Management Annual Meeting (2017-present)

University Service

Research pool coordinator, Department of Management, University of Florida (2016-present)
Lab manager, Department of Management, University of Florida (2015-present)

Professional Experience

2013-15 Organizational Consultant,
Tmurot TPS,
Petah Tikva, Israel

Research Statement
Binyamin Cooper

My research explores the cognitive processes by which minor yet influential contextual factors such as incivility and rudeness affect behavior of individuals and groups in organizations. More specifically, my research to-date has focused on two primary areas. First, I examine the impact of workplace rudeness on diverse professional and interpersonal outcomes. Second, I am developing research that explores resilience in the face of rudeness and potential interventions to reduce the impact of rude behavior in the workplace. Below I list a few ongoing projects within my current body of work to illustrate these two research areas.

1. Manifestations and Impact of Workplace Incivility

In the last two decades, workplace incivility has emerged as a focal topic in the organization behavior literature. Whether experienced, witnessed, or even instigated, the extant literature has demonstrated that those involved with an uncivil event are likely to experience, exhibit and report many negative impacts. It has been estimated that 98 percent of workers experience incivility, with 50 percent experiencing such conduct at least weekly, with a monetary cost estimated at $14,000 per employee annually due to project delays and cognitive distraction from work.

A. **Rudeness' role in promoting intergroup conflict.** A common finding in the psychology of intergroup relations is that observable intergroup discrimination is predominately caused by "in-group love" (i.e., positive sentiments toward in-group members) more than by "out-group hate" (i.e., animosity toward out-group members). Our (*Cooper, Pounds, Halevy, & Erez*, R&R at Nature: Human Behavior) findings reveal that exposure to incidental rudeness functions as a tipping point that pushes individuals to withhold help from out-group members as well as actively harm them. Our experiments provide evidence for the coevolution of interpersonal incivility and hostility toward out-groups in everyday life and points to rudeness as an important, yet overlooked, source of polarization and conflict between groups.
B. **Rudeness on team collaborative processes.** A vast body of literature shows that when teams encounter major internal or external threat, team members band together to face the threat. In a series of four studies aimed at extending theories of the social-cognitive implications of rudeness to the team level, we (*Erez, Bamberger, Foulk, Cooper, Riskin, Schilpzand, & Vashdi*, Under review at Journal of Applied Psychology) show that minor social threats such as rudeness have the opposite effect – they devastate team collaborative processes and outcomes. Specifically, we demonstrate that rudeness often has implicit and even unconscious implications for the coordinative processes underlying effective teamwork, and thus can have severe and even life-threatening implications (e.g., in a surgical setting) on team members and those they serve.

2. Interventions to Reduce the Known Impact of Rude Behavior in the Workplace

Although a substantial body of work has explored how rudeness affects attitudes and behaviors, little is known regarding what kinds of remedies can be offered. In fact, it seems that only a handful of studies have explored what solutions can be offered to organizations to combat the negative outcomes that follow exposure to such behaviors, with most requiring substantial resources to deploy effectively, and usually from a preemptive approach. My research in this area focuses on designing and testing easily deployable interventions that can both preemptively

and reactively protect employees from adverse workplace behaviors.

A. **Anchoring bias.** Rudeness is commonly experienced at work and is known to negatively impact critical decision-making in multiple setting (e.g., medical diagnosis). However, the processes by which rudeness causes these cognitive errors is unclear. We (*Cooper, Giordano, Erez, Foulk, Reed & Berg*, R&R at Journal of Applied Psychology) sought to explore the impact of rudeness on one of the major cognitive errors, namely anchoring, and test interventions that might mitigate its consequences. Across multiple studies we found that those exposed to rude events exhibit an anchoring bias, compared to those exposed to a neutral interaction. Additionally, we designed and tested multiple interventions which were able to negate the negative impact caused by rudeness and eliminate the anchoring effect.
B. **Promoting employee voice in the face of supervisor rudeness.** The "Spiral of Incivility" suggests that small rude incidents tend to escalate to aggressive and violent behaviors. In our paper (*Cooper, Berson, Erez & Woolum*, manuscript in preparation for submission to the Journal of Applied Psychology) we offer a theoretical model suggesting that voice suppression could enhance, and voice expression could prevent the "spiral of incivility" in which small uncivil incidents escalate to overt aggression and violence. Altogether, our study demonstrates that uncivil behavior from a supervisor can negatively affect individuals' voice but also that interventions aimed at enhancing voice expression can inoculate individuals from the harmful effects of incivility, reducing the likelihood of further aggressive acts towards others.
C. **Organizational First Aid: Exploring Workplace Remedies to Buffer Rudeness' Negative Outcomes.** While a wealth of studies has expanded our understanding regarding the negative outcomes of workplace rudeness, researchers and practitioners have not provided systematic and consistent "remedies" that may ameliorate rudeness' negative impact. Building on this pressing need, my dissertation research combines the literatures on coping strategies and cognitive resources, exploring the degree to which individuals can be made to resist and even counter the negative outcomes of exposure to rude events. My suggested interventions are aimed at, on one hand, increasing the coping resources available to the target of rudeness, and on the other hand, blocking the ruminative process that drains the coping resources of the target of the rude event. From the resource approach, I am adapting interventions aimed at increasing individuals' self-competency, while from the process approach, I focus on changing the rumination process from dysfunctional (i.e., abstract rumination) to functional rumination (i.e., concrete rumination).

In sum, my general interest in the effects of rudeness on the behavior of individuals and groups in organizations has produced multiple projects that enhance understanding and attempt to offer solutions in the hope of improving employees' subsequent well-being and performance. I look forward to discussing my research and collaborating with faculty members and graduate students at the Carnegie Mellon University and am excited about further developing these areas further.

Incivility Divides and Hurts:

Exposure to Brief Incidental Rudeness Boosts Intergroup Discrimination

Binyamin Cooper*
University of Florida

Troy Pounds
University of Central Florida

Nir Halevy
Stanford University

Amir Erez
University of Florida

Abstract

Observers of everyday rudeness often become the carriers of its harmful consequences. However, little is known about the epidemiology of rudeness—that is, whom do observers of rudeness typically hurt. We propose that simply witnessing rudeness fuels both passive and active harm to out-groups. Three experiments demonstrate that brief exposure to everyday rudeness reinforces social divides, elucidating the differentiation between "us" and "them". We find that observers of rudeness are less likely to help outgroup members and more likely to derogate and directly harm out-group members. This causal evidence explains the coevolution of interpersonal incivility and hostility toward out-groups in society, and identifies rudeness as an important, yet overlooked, source of polarization and intergroup conflict.

Rudeness, a pervasive form of interpersonal incivility, is on the rise. Everyday manifestations of rudeness, such as social rejection and verbal insults, are omnipresent in politics, across work organizations, in our communities, and on social media[1]. Research suggests that even mild (i.e., low-intensity) manifestations of rudeness exert powerful effects[2]. For example, exposure to rudeness at work has been linked to depression[3], stress[4,5], and diminished cognitive and behavioral performance[6-10].

Importantly, rudeness' harmful consequences are not limited to its direct targets. Rather, individuals who witness rude behavior toward others also show negative symptoms[11,12]. For instance, exposure to rudeness has been shown to inhibit helpful behavior not only toward the perpetrators of rude behavior, but also toward uninvolved third parties[13]. Further, exposure to rudeness in one context, such as in the workplace, has been shown to promote mistreatment of others in a different context—at home[14]. Thus, rudeness tends to be "contagious": Its effects ripple to additional victims beyond the immediate target of the rude behavior[11].

Although previous research has made important strides by demonstrating that exposure to rudeness harms its direct targets, its witnesses, as well as uninvolved third parties, systematic research on the question "To whom rudeness' effects spread?" is notably missing. We know that witnesses of rudeness become the carriers of its harmful consequences, but whom do witnesses of rudeness typically hurt? Nearly all of the existing research on rudeness has used nonspecific targets in exploring rudeness' harmful downstream consequences. Therefore, little is known about the epidemiology of rudeness—that is, how its harmful consequences are distributed in defined populations.

Here we illuminate the epidemiology of rudeness by exploring the idea that witnesses of rudeness are particularly likely to harm out-group targets. Thus, we propose, and empirically

demonstrate, that the natural human tendency to divide the social realm into "us" and "them"[15,16] facilitates people's tendency to choose out-group members as the targets for rudeness' downstream consequences. Put differently, exposure to rudeness exacerbates intergroup bias, leading witnesses of rudeness to harm out-group members both passively and actively. We explored this proposition in three experiments.

Results

Experiments 1a and 1b used an online simulation with employed adults from across the US to examine the extent to which witnessing rudeness increases passive (1a, N=150) and active (1b, N=150) harm to out-group members. Both experiments used a two-condition (rudeness vs. control), between-participant design. Participants played the role of an employee of a bookstore chain. They learned that they were employed in a particular store ("B"), and were randomly assigned to view videos in which employees of another store in the chain ("A") treated others (a customer and a coworker) either rudely or politely. Participants subsequently made choices in an incentivized decision-making task in which they allocated resources to themselves, in-group members (other participants assigned to the role of coworkers in store "B") and out-group members (other participants assigned to the role of coworkers in a third store in the same chain, "C"). This decision making task had real monetary consequences for the study participants.

Experiment 1a focused on passive harm to out-group members. Participants' task was to decide in a nested social dilemma game[17] how much of their resources to allocate to themselves, to fellow in-group members, and to out-group members. Withholding resources from out-group members served as our measure of passive harm. Experiment 1b focused on active harm to out-group members. Participants' task was to decide in an intergroup social dilemma game[18] how

much of their resources to allocate to themselves, how much to allocate to in-group members, and how much resources to take away from out-group members. Taking resources away from out-group members served as our measure of active harm.

	Proportion of Total Endowment					
	Helping out-group members			Harming out-group members		
	B	*SE*	Exp(B)	B	*SE*	Exp(B)
Intercept	.39	.09	1.48**	-.51	.15	.60**
Rudeness condition	-.32	.15	.72*	.39	.20	1.48*

Table 1. Proportion of resources participants invested in the third option in the intergroup decision making task in Experiments 1a (helping out-group members; $N_{control}$=79. N_{rude}=71) and 1b (harming out-group members; $N_{control}$=71, N_{rude}=79); Condition was coded as control = 0 rude = 1; *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Table 1 reports the proportion of resources participants invested in helping out-group members (Experiment 1a) or in harming out-group members (Experiment 1b), as a function of experimental rudeness condition., a Poisson regression analysis (our dependent variable was a count measure with a Poisson-like distribution) revealed that participants exposed to the rudeness video helped out-group members significantly less (B=-.32, odds ratio=.72, p=.030), and harmed out-group members significantly more (B=.39, odds ratio=1.48, p=.046), than participants exposed to the control video, in Experiments 1a and 1b respectively. These findings provide initial evidence for a causal effect of witnessing rudeness on passive as well as active harm to out-group members. Importantly, witnesses of rude behaviors in Experiments 1a and 1b mistreated out-group members more than participants in the control condition despite the fact

that neither the perpetrator nor the target of the rude behavior were associated with either of the two groups defined by the study. Notably, exposure to rudeness did not have an effect on the proportion of resources allocated to oneself or to fellow in-group members. Thus, exposure to incidental rudeness increased intergroup discrimination rather than selfishness.

Experiment 2 used an online field study with another set of employed adults from across the US, to examine whether witnessing rudeness increases the tendency to divide the social realm into "us" and "them". We randomly assigned 201 participants to a rudeness or a control condition in a between-participant design. Each participant completed three surveys during one single workday – a morning survey at 7am, an afternoon survey at 12pm, and an evening survey at 6pm. Participants indicated in the morning survey the work unit in their organization to which they belonged, as well as another unit in their organization with which they were not affiliated. These two units served as the in-group and out-group, respectively, throughout the three daily surveys.

The morning survey exposed each participant to a brief video depending on their randomly assigned condition (i.e., either rude or control). The afternoon survey assessed intergroup bias[19]. The evening survey evaluated participants' behavioral intentions to engage in helping behaviors[20], as well as hostile behaviors[21] towards members of the out-group. Finally, to replicate the results of our previous experiments, the evening survey included an adapted resource-based measure of intergroup discrimination via Multiple Alternative Matrices[22], in which participants indicated their preferences for allocating valuable resources between members of both groups.

	Intergroup bias		Intergroup helping		Hostility toward outgroup		Outgroup Resources	
	B	*SE*	B	*SE*	B	*SE*	B	*SE*
Intercept	.73**	.08	4.68**	.11	1.33**	.07	3.06**	.13
Rudeness condition	.49**	.15	.07	.21	.08	.11	.29	.22
Intergroup bias			-.35**	.10	.36**	.10	-.27**	.09

Table 2. Results of path analysis, Experiment 2. *$p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; $N_{total} = 201$ ($N_{control}$=103, $N_{rudeness}$=98); Condition was coded as control = 0 rude = 1; Unstandardized coefficients are reported. Predictor was grand mean centered.

Exposure to the rude video increased intergroup bias relative to exposure to the control video (B=.49, p=.001; Table 2). This increased bias, in turn, negatively predicted helping to outgroup members (B=-.35, p<.001) and allocation of resources to outgroup members (B=-.27, p=.001), and positively predicted hostile behaviors directed toward outgroup members (B=.36, p<.001). Finally, we found that intergroup bias (as reported in the afternoon survey) mediated the effect of the experimental exposure to rudeness (in the morning survey) on intergroup helping (95% CI [-.333, -.012]), hostility toward outgroup members (95% CI [.007, .347]), and allocating resources to out-group members (95% CI [-.251, -.014]), assessed in the evening survey.

These results demonstrate that exposure to rudeness, even when one is not the direct target of the rude act, increases polarization of the social sphere into "us" vs. "them." The finding that intergroup discrimination mediated the effect of exposure to rudeness on passive and active harm to out-group members illuminates the mechanism underlying the effects observed in Experiments 1a and 1b.

Discussion

The last two decades witnessed a substantial increase in incivility in the US. For example, one-fourth of employees polled in the US in 1998 said they were treated rudely once or more a week; by 2013 that proportion had nearly doubled[23]. Approximately 50% of customers report seeing service-providers mistreat customers[24] and many studies show that customers often behave rudely toward service-providers[24-28]. A staggering proportion of teenagers – 70.6%, have reported witnessing uncivil events daily in American schools[29]. At the same time that incivility seems to be spreading in the US, there seems to be also a substantial increase in polarization and hostility between groups in society. Political extremism is on the rise among Democrats and Republicans alike, with little exchange of ideas and cooperation across the political divide[30]. Hostility against out-groups such as immigrants and Muslims, has become a major point of contention in local as well as national and international politics[31]. One indicator of such hostility is the substantial increase in organized hate groups, from 457 in 1999 to 954 at the end of 2017[32].

The current research suggests that the parallel increases in incivility and hostility against out-groups are not independent trends. Specifically, our findings show that witnessing minor incidents of rudeness fuels bias against out-groups, which in turn, increases the tendency to harm out-group members. What is especially alarming about these findings is that rudeness in our studies was a mild, discrete, and one-shot hostile behavior that was not targeted at the participants (rather, participants just witnessed it). Yet, witnessing rudeness caused participants to exhibit hostility towards outgroups. The effect of observing brief rudeness in the morning lasted throughout the day in our field study.

Conclusions

A common finding in the psychology of intergroup relations is that intergroup discrimination is caused by "in-group love" (i.e., positive sentiments toward in-group members) more than by "out-group hate" i.e., animosity toward out-group members[15,33-35]. Our findings reveal that exposure to incidental rudeness functions as a tipping point that pushes individuals to withhold help from out-group members as well as actively harm them. The causal evidence our experiments provide for the coevolution of interpersonal incivility and hostility toward out-groups in everyday life points to rudeness as an important, yet overlooked, source of polarization and conflict in society. It also provides a clear path toward a potential (though partial) solution: Curbing interpersonal incivility as a means to reduce intergroup discrimination and hostility.

Methods

To test our central hypothesis that witnesses of rude acts are both less likely to help outgroup members, as well as more likely to actively harm them, we first conducted two experiments (Experiments 1a and 1b). In these studies, participants were randomly assigned to either a control or "rude" condition. Participants were told that the Experiment was designed to explore the role of emotions in conflict and cooperation.

Experiment 1a

Participants. We recruited 150 participants from a dedicated participant pool maintained by a large Western university (M_{age}=22.74, *SD*=3.59; 62% female; 40% White, 31.3% Asian or Asian-American, 10% Hispanic/Latino, 6% Black/African-American, and 12.7% "other"). The vast majority of participants were students (54.7% graduate, 44.7% undergraduate), and one

person identified herself as an alumni of the university. Individuals volunteered to participate in an online study involving a group decision making task and received $5 for their participation. They could also earn additional money based on their own and others' decisions in the study as explained below.

Design. We employed a 2 (rudeness vs. control) condition between-subject experimental design. The online survey software randomly assigned the participants to one of the two conditions. Following the consent form, participants learned that the study was designed to explore the role of emotions in conflict and cooperation, and that the study will involve a workplace simulation during which they will assume the role of Leslie Wilder (a gender neutral name), a member of a team of employees at a local bookstore Called "Birch." Participants learned that their usual tasks in the bookstore involve interacting with customers and other employees via phone, e-mails, and face-to-face interactions. They learned that their store belongs to a chain consisting of multiple bookstores, and that occasionally they will be sent to assist in another store in the chain by the name of "Ash" (for example, when there are special store-specific promotional events). To make the simulation more realistic participants viewed several images of the store itself, their supervisor, and other employees in the store.

Procedure. As the simulation started, participants read: "It is the morning and soon after arriving at "Birch" your manager informs you that the "Ash" store has a 'return to school' sale, and they need your assistance. You get into your car and drive to the other store. The manager of the other store asks you to assist with restocking the shelves." The participants then observed two videos, the first depicting an interaction among "Ash" employees and the second depicting an interaction

between “Ash” employee and a customer. These interactions served as the manipulation of rudeness in this experiment (described below).

Following the observed videos, the simulation text informed participants they finished helping at “Ash” and headed back to “Birch.” They then responded to a work-related email, which served to further reinforce the simulation context, after which they engaged in the main task of the experiment – a resource allocation decision making task that served as our dependent variable. Participants read that they had just received an email from their supervisor, which indicated an upcoming quarterly chain-wide promotional event starting the following week. The email stated that they and two other employees from “Birch” are asked to work up to ten extra hours of overtime next week (two hours each weekday). The supervisor further noted that he remembers that the participants’ family would be visiting next week, but that the store could really use their help. Specifically, the supervisor said that “the choice on how to spend your time is yours, but the store could use your help.” This served as the context for the resource allocation decision making task that followed. Finally, the participants made the decision, completed a manipulation check, and general demographic information before being thanked and debriefed.

Rudeness Manipulation. Immediately after the participants learned they arrived at the second store in the chain (“Ash”) they viewed two videos. The first video displayed two employees, and the second video depicted an interaction between a third employee and a customer. In the Control condition, the first video showed an interaction between two employees in which one of them is asking the other for help with a new shipment and the other positively responds to the request. In the Rudeness condition, the video showed one employee asking the other’s assistance

in locating a specific book. The other employee gave very abrupt answers in an annoyed and rude tone (i.e., "Just look under R, for religion. It's not hard! Do you need me to spell it for you? It's back there somewhere"). The second video in the control condition displayed a neutral interaction between an employee and a customer asking for a price for a book that was not marked. In the rude condition the video showed a similar scenario in which a customer asking an employee for a price of the book. However, here the exchange was confrontational and the employee was discourteous and condescending to the customer.

To determine whether our experimental manipulations created the intended conditions for the experiment, we conducted a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the rudeness manipulation as the independent variable. As a manipulation check, at the end of the session participants were asked to recall the videotaped interaction they observed while at "Ash", and rate their agreement with a six-item manipulation check previously used by Foulk, Woolum and Erez[11]. Example items were "Ash employees treat each other and customers in a polite manner (reverse-coded)," and "Ash employees insult customers and each other" (where 1=*Strongly Disagree* and 7=*Strongly Agree*; α=.98). The results indicated that the rudeness manipulation significantly influenced participants' agreement with the aggregated scale (M_{rudeness}= 5.80, SD_{rudeness}= .75; M_{control}= 1.62, SD_{control}= .80; $F(1, 148) = 1086.56$, $p < .001$). Thus, results confirmed the effectiveness of the manipulation.

Measures

Intergroup Decision Making Task. Following the email from their supervisor, the participants decided how to allocate their time the next week (i.e., the 10 hours of overtime their supervisor

asked them to put in next week). Participants learned that their decision would impact not only themselves but also coworkers in their store (Birch) and employees of Cassia - another store in the chain. The simulation text explained to participants that their decision would be combined with the decisions of five other participants taking part in this study, who would face the same set of options: Two of these participants would be randomly assigned to play the role of other "Birch" employees (i.e., same store as the participant) and three others would be randomly assigned to be employees in a third store in the same chain ("Cassia"). We chose a third store to ensure a separation from the source of the rude incident that occurred at the "Ash" store, and the participants' subsequent decision-making about outgroup members (i.e., employees in the "Cassia" store).

To make the intergroup decision making task consequential, we informed participants that their choices in the decision making task would have monetary consequences for them and for other participants. Specifically, we informed participants that, at the end of the study, we would randomly choose four 6-person decision-making units (each consisting of three Birch employees and three Cassia employees), and pay their members based on their respective resource allocation decisions (i.e., how they chose to allocate their time). The first two options in the decision making task were to keep some or all of their time for themselves, or contribute the time to help team effort at their store. Specifically, participants learned that: (a) each hour that any employee decides to keep for themselves (e.g., to spend with their family in the following week) would pay $2 to that individual and would not impact their coworkers at the same store or the employees of the other store in any way; (b) each hour that any employee decides to contribute to their ingroup—the store in which they work—would pay $1 to each ingroup member including themselves (i.e., a gain of

$3 to the employees in their store) and would not impact the employees of the other store in any way. This option captures effort put into increasing their store's (Birch) sales, which benefits the three team members from their store. Note that if all team members choose to allocate all their hours to help at Birch, each member would receive $30, in comparison to $20 if they each allocate their time to spending time with their family. This is not the most profitable option because participants we to allocate all the hours to themselves, and the other team members allocate the hours to "Birch", they could potentially make $40. In contrast, if participants were to allocate all their hours to "Birch" but the other team members allocate it to time with their family, each participant would only make $10. Thus, the structure of the social dilemma within each group (store) takes the form of an n-person prisoner's dilemma.

The third option in Experiment 1a captured passive harm to out-group members: It allowed participants to invest some or all of the extra 10 hours on increasing the overall chain sales numbers (e.g., by taking actions to attract new clients to either 'Birch' or 'Cassia'). Specifically, participants learned that each hour that either Birch or Cassia employees spent on increasing the profit of either store would add 50¢ to each of the three team members from that store. In addition, it would add 50¢ to each of the three team members from the other store. Note that if all team members choose to allocate all their hours to helping both stores, each member would receive $30. The key difference between allocating help exclusively within one's group (sore) or across the two groups is whether one wishes their effort to also benefit outgroup members. Put differently, allocating hours of work to the third option essentially means distributing help or sharing resources (i.e., their time) equally with all participants. As a set, the three options available to participants in the passive harm condition create a payoff structure known as a Nested Social Dilemma[36].

Withholding contributions to this third option passively harms outgroup members by avoiding helping them.

Experiment 1b

Participants. We recruited 150 participants from a dedicated participant pool maintained by a large Western university (M_{age}=22.54, SD=3.75; 67.3% female; 43.3% White, 35.3% Asian or Asian-American, 8.7% Hispanic/Latino, 2.7% Black/African-American, and 10% "other"). The vast majority of participants were students (57.3% undergraduate, 38% graduate), and 7 individuals indicated they were either postdocs and staff or an alumni of the university. Individuals were invited and compensated identically to Experiment 1a.

Design. We employed the same 2 (rudeness vs. control) condition between-subject experimental design used in Experiment 1a. To determine whether our experimental manipulations again created the intended conditions for the experiment, we conducted a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). We utilized the same Foulk, Woolum and Erez[11] measure to assess rudeness (α=.98). The results indicated that the rudeness manipulation significantly influenced participants' agreement with the aggregated scale ($M_{rudeness}$= 5.65, $SD_{rudeness}$= .84; $M_{control}$= 1.65, $SD_{control}$= .68; $F(1, 148) = 1011.32$, $p < .001$). Thus, results confirmed the effectiveness of the manipulation.

Procedure. To capture individuals' propensity to actively harm outgroup members following exposure to a rude event, we modified only the third option of the Intergroup Decision Making Task. In Experiment 1b, the third option allowed participants to spend some or all of the extra 10 hours on increasing their store's (Birch) sales numbers *at the expense* of the other store (Cassia,

by taking actions to poach the other store's clients to shop at their store). Each hour invested on this option would add $1 to each of the three team members from the same store, and at the same time *subtract* $1 from each of the three team members from the other store. As a set, the three options available to participants in the active harm condition create a payoff structure known as the Intergroup Prisoner's Dilemma – Maximizing Difference Game[31]. As noted in previous work, choosing this third option allows participants to actively harm outgroup members as a means to benefit their own group.

Experiment 2

Participants. We recruited participants from a nation-wide online participant pool maintained by the same West-coast University. To secure our ideal sample of 200 complete responses, we deployed the three-part survey on three separate workdays. Of the 289 recruited participants, 89 participants completed at least the morning survey on day 1, 104 completed at least the morning survey on day 2, and 96 completed at least the morning survey on day 3. Only 205 participants completed all three parts of the experiment and thus included in the dataset. Prior to analysis, responses related to four participants were eliminated for the following reasons: (1) specified the same group as the in-group and out-group (2) noted that rudeness is part of the culture between the two groups, (3) was not able to view the videos that served as the intended experimental manipulation (see below), and (4) completed both versions of the morning surveys exposing him/herself to both experimental conditions. The final sample of 201 participants had an average age of 30 years (SD=16.68), and was 60.2% female (67.7% White, 19.4% Asian/Asian-American, 6.5% Black/African-American, 4.5% Hispanic, and 1.9% as "other"). All participants reported being employed on a fulltime basis at the time of the experiment.

Design and Procedure. We employed a 2 (rudeness vs. control) condition between-subject experimental design. The online survey software randomly assigned the participants to one of the two conditions in the morning survey. The experiment took place in three separate phases. First, participants completed a short survey at 7am that contained the informed consent, the specification of their work group and another group in their workplace with which they were not affiliated, demographic information measures, and video stimulus based on each participant's randomly assigned condition. Next, participants received a follow-up survey at 12pm on the same day, containing the measure for evaluating intergroup bias. Finally, the participants were sent a third survey at 6pm that same day with our dependent variables, and were debriefed. Participants who completed all three parts were paid $10.

Rudeness Manipulation. The manipulation consisted of two tasks: First, participants were presented with four sets of scrambled sentences consisting each of five words and were instructed to use the five words to create a grammatically correct four-word unscrambled sentence. This priming method was adapted by Woolum, et al. [37] to automatically activate rudeness based on the work of Bargh, et al. [38]. An example of a scrambled sentence in the rude condition was "him was rude she always", a correct assembling of which yielded the unscrambled sentence "she was always rude." Example of scrambled sentence in the control condition was "him was there she always" with a correct assembling of "she was always there."

Second, participants watched a video depicting employees interacting at work. They were told that following the video there would be asked to respond to two questions related to the content

they had just viewed. Each condition had 1 video, drawn from one of the two videos used for each of the rudeness conditions in Experiments 1a and 1b.

Measures

Intergroup Bias. Intergroup bias was measured with the 8-item measure developed by Gaertner, et al. [19]. Each participant indicated the extent to which each statement was an appropriate descriptor for his or her group members, and the members of the other-group, using a scale ranging from 1 ("Not at all") to 7 ("Extremely well"). The items were presented separately, for each group. The 8 items were "dominant, likable, warm, honest, strong, cooperative, friendly, and autonomous". Finally, and according to Gaertner et al.'s recommendations, a composite evaluative index was created using the average of all 8 items, separately for each group. The bias score was then computed as the difference between the mean ingroup evaluation and the mean outgroup evaluation. The coefficient alpha for the 8-item scale was .88 for the ingroup, and .88 for the outgroup.

Outgroup Helping. We adapted the Van Dyne and LePine [20] scale to measure helping behaviors directed toward members of the out-group. In our version, participants replied to the items following the prompt "If I had the opportunity, I would" directed toward members of the other group. We utilized a scale ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 7 ("Strongly agree"). Example items included "Assist others in the other group with their work for the benefit of their group" and "Help others in the other group with their work responsibilities" (α=.95).

Hostility toward out-group members. We used 6 of the 7 item measure developed by Bennett and Robinson [21] to measure interpersonal deviance. We did not include the statement "Make an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work", as we reasoned that it mixes two different levels of intergroup relations -between work units (the current focus) and between broad social categories. As before, participants replied to the items following the prompt "If I had the opportunity, I would" directed toward members of the other group. We utilized a scale ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 7 ("Strongly agree"). Example items included "Play a mean prank on members of the other group at work" and "Publicly embarrass members of the other group at work"; α=.94).

Outgroup Resources. We used the seven Multiple Alternative Matrices measure developed by Bornstein, et al. [22] to evaluate preference for different resource allocation strategies for the ingroup and outgroup. Specifically, we asked participants to rate their preference for 7 different allocation options that gave different proportions of additional resources to the in-group and to the out-group. The first three options favored the ingroup, the fourth displayed as equal allocation of resources to both groups, and the last three options favored the outgroup. Participants indicated their preference for each of the options using a scale ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 7 ("Strongly agree"). Finally, we averaged the three preferences that were more favorable to the outgroup as our dependent measure. The coefficient alpha for the 3 items was .91.

Analysis. To test our hypothesized model, we specified a path model using Mplus version 8[39] utilizing a bootstrapping approach with 3000 iterations to test all hypotheses. The experimental manipulation was operationalized as a dummy-variable where the control condition was coded as 0 and the rudeness condition was coded as 1. Results of our path analysis are shown in Table 2.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study is available from the corresponding author upon request.

REFERENCES

1 Porath, C. L., Gerbasi, A. & Schorch, S. L. The effects of civility on advice, leadership, and performance. *J Appl Psychol* **100**, 1527-1541 (2015).

2 Andersson, L. M. & Pearson, C. M. Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review* **24**, 452-471 (1999).

3 Lim, S. & Lee, A. Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: Does family support help? *J Occup Health Psych* **16**, 95-111 (2011).

4 Adams, G. A. & Webster, J. R. Emotional regulation as a mediator between interpersonal mistreatment and distress. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* **22**, 697-710 (2013).

5 Lim, S. & Cortina, L. M. Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: the interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *J Appl Psychol* **90**, 483-496 (2005).

6 Rafaeli, A. *et al.* When customers exhibit verbal aggression, employees pay cognitive costs. *J Appl Psychol* **97**, 931-950 (2012).

7 Rosen, C. C., Koopman, J., Gabriel, A. S. & Johnson, R. E. Who strikes back? A daily investigation of when and why incivility begets incivility. *J Appl Psychol* **101**, 1620-1634 (2016).

8 Chen, Y. *et al.* Self-love's lost labor: A self-enhancement model of workplace incivility. *Academy of Management Journal* **56**, 1199-1219 (2013).

9 Riskin, A. *et al.* The impact of rudeness on medical team performance: A randomized trial. *Pediatrics* **136**, 487-495 (2015).

10 Riskin, A. *et al.* Rudeness and medical team performance. *Pediatrics* **139**, 1-11 (2017).

11 Foulk, T., Woolum, A. & Erez, A. Catching rudeness is like catching a cold: The contagion effects of low-intensity negative behaviors. *J Appl Psychol* **101**, 50-67 (2016).

12 Porath, C. L. & Erez, A. Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks. *Organ Behav Hum Dec* **109**, 29-44 (2009).

13 Porath, C. L. & Erez, A. Does rudeness really matter? The effects of rudeness on task performance and helpfulness. *Academy of Management Journal* **50**, 1181-1197 (2007).

14 Ferguson, M. You cannot leave it at the office: Spillover and crossover of coworker incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* **33**, 571-588 (2012).

15 Mummendey, A. & Otten, S. Positive–negative asymmetry in social discrimination. *European review of social psychology* **9**, 107-143 (1998).

16 Greenwald, A. G. & Banaji, M. R. Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological review* **102**, 4-27 (1995).

17 De Dreu, C. K. *et al.* The neuropeptide oxytocin regulates parochial altruism in intergroup conflict among humans. *Science* **328**, 1408-1411 (2010).

18 Halevy, N., Weisel, O. & Bornstein, G. "In-Group Love" and "Out-Group Hate" in Repeated Interaction Between Groups. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* **25**, 188-195 (2012).

19 Gaertner, S. L., Mann, J. A., Dovidio, J. F., Murrell, A. J. & Pomare, M. How does cooperation reduce intergroup bias? *J Pers Soc Psychol* **59**, 692-704 (1990).

20 Van Dyne, L. & LePine, J. A. Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management journal* **41**, 108-119 (1998).

21 Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *J Appl Psychol* **85**, 349-360 (2000).
22 Bornstein, G. *et al.* On the measurement of social orientations in the minimal group paradigm. *European Journal of Social Psychology* **13**, 321-350 (1983).
23 Porath, C. & Pearson, C. The price of incivility. *Harvard business review* **91**, 114-121 (2013).
24 Porath, C., MacInnis, D. & Folkes, V. Witnessing incivility among employees: Effects on consumer anger and negative inferences about companies. *Journal of Consumer Research* **37**, 292-303 (2010).
25 Boyd, C. Customer violence and employee health and safety. *Work, Employment and Society* **16**, 151-169 (2002).
26 Grandey, A. A., Dickter, D. N. & Sin, H. P. The customer is not always right: Customer aggression and emotion regulation of service employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior* **25**, 397-418 (2004).
27 Harris, L. C. & Reynolds, K. L. The consequences of dysfunctional customer behavior. *Journal of service research* **6**, 144-161 (2003).
28 Ringstad, R. Conflict in the workplace: Social workers as victims and perpetrators. *Social work* **50**, 305-313 (2005).
29 Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L. & O'Brennan, L. M. Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. *School psychology review* **36**, 361-382 (2007).
30 Center, P. R. The Partisan Divide on Political Values Grows Even Wider. (2017, October 5).
31 Kteily, N., Bruneau, E., Waytz, A. & Cotterill, S. The ascent of man: Theoretical and empirical evidence for blatant dehumanization. *J Pers Soc Psychol* **109**, 901-931 (2015).
32 Heim, J. *Hate groups in the U.S. remain on the rise, according to new study*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/hate-groups-in-the-us-remain-on-the-rise-according-to-new-study/2018/02/21/6d28cbe0-1695-11e8-8b08-027a6ccb38eb_story.html?utm_term=.650a0fc6ff2b> (2018, February 21).
33 Halevy, N., Bornstein, G. & Sagiv, L. "In-group love" and "out-group hate" as motives for individual participation in intergroup conflict: A new game paradigm. *Psychological science* **19**, 405-411 (2008).
34 Greenwald, A. G. & Pettigrew, T. F. With malice toward none and charity for some: Ingroup favoritism enables discrimination. *American Psychologist* **69**, 669-684 (2014).
35 Brewer, M. B. The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of social issues* **55**, 429-444 (1999).
36 Halevy, N., Chou, E. Y., Cohen, T. R. & Livingston, R. W. Status conferral in intergroup social dilemmas: behavioral antecedents and consequences of prestige and dominance. *J Pers Soc Psychol* **102**, 351-366 (2012).
37 Woolum, A., Foulk, T., Lanaj, K. & Erez, A. Rude color glasses: The contaminating effects of witnessed morning rudeness on perceptions and behaviors throughout the workday. *J Appl Psychol* **102**, 1658-1672 (2017).
38 Bargh, J. A., Chen, M. & Burrows, L. Automaticity of social behavior: Direct effects of trait construct and stereotype activation on action. *J Pers Soc Psychol* **71**, 230-244 (1996).

39 Muthén, L. K. & Muthén, B. O. *Mplus User's Guide*. Eighth edn, (Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén, 2018).

Authors Notes and Further Correspondence

Mr. Cooper, Mr. Pounds, Professor Halevy and Professor Erez drafted the initial manuscript, and approved the initial manuscript submitted. All authors conceptualized and designed Studies 1a and 1b. Professor Halevy collected the data for Studies 1a and 1b. All authors also conceptualized and designed Study 2. Mr. Cooper and Professor Halevy collected the data for Study 2. All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work. All the authors have indicated they have no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose. All the authors have indicated they have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose. All data, code, and material used in the analysis are available upon request from the first author.

UF UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA

Warrington College of Business Administration
Department of Management

201 Stuzin Hall
PO Box 117165
Gainesville, FL 32611-7165
352-392-0163
352-392-6020 Fax
www. warrington.ufl.edu/mang

July 24, 2019

Dear search committee members:

I am writing this letter of recommendation on behalf of Binyamin Cooper, who has applied for your assistant professor position. I have known Benny since 2015, when he joined our Ph.D. program in Florida. I am the Chair of Benny's dissertation committee, we published together two papers, we have two papers in a revise and resubmit status and a paper under review and I am working with him on multiple other projects. Thus, I think I am in a good position to appraise his capabilities and potential. I have organized this letter into three broad areas: (a) an evaluation of Benny's research potential; (b) an assessment of Benny as a teacher; (c) an appraisal of Benny as a colleague.

As you can see from his CV, Benny has an excellent research record for a scholar at his stage. He has published two articles in medical journals – one of them a top medical journal (*Pediatrics*). He has a paper in a revise and resubmit stage at *Nature: Human Behavior*, one of the most prestigious journals in Science (Impact factor: 10.575), in which he is a first author. He has another paper in a revise and resubmit stage at the *Journal of Applied Psychology* and a paper under review at the *Academy of Management Journal*. Benny also has five other projects in advance stages; in all five projects data have been collected and analyzed and most of these papers consist of multiple studies (Field and Laboratory). Even if only half of his papers will be accepted for publication in top journals (and I believe all of them are highly promising) in a very short time Benny will have a tenure-able record at most research universities.

Often when I work with Ph.D. students I discover that although they may come up with good ideas they do not know how to operationalize them. Benny clearly does not have this problem, in all the projects that we worked on together he was a major contributor to the design of the study, often the driving force of the design, and the one who operationalized it and brought it into fruition. In fact, my other co-authors and I totally depend on his technical expertise when running our studies. He is the one who creates the materials whether it is the surveys, findings the scales, putting together the survey, and in experiments creating the experimental tools. Benny has amazing computer and programing skills, which help him create sophisticated and innovative designs. Of course computer skills without content knowledge would not be very helpful but Benny also has deep knowledge of the management and social/cognitive psychology fields. For example, in a recent study Benny designed a sophisticated program to test whether online participants engaged in helping behavior when they encounter a teammate in need. Participants were given a total of five minutes to solve 10 items from the Remote Associate Test with a new item presented every 30 seconds. To manipulate teammates "need for help," Benny created a dynamic pre-scripted graph approximating the other two (virtual) participants continuous performance on the task. A green color indicated

good progress, orange lower than average, and red much lower than average progress. As an experimental manipulation, the graph continually changed during the five-minute task and reflected overall good performance for one virtual participant but below average for the other, and twice during the task her performance was much lower than average (e.g., red). Participants were given the opportunity to assist the lagging teammate in completing her word puzzles by clicking a button with her name which allowed them to complete these puzzles themselves and thus assist her and the team. In this specific task we were interested in investigating how rudeness affects workload sharing within the team and designing this study required knowledge of the rudeness, teams, helping and, creativity literatures along with sophisticated programing skills. Benny created this task by himself with little input from the other members of the research team. Crating this easily employed task will likely help us not only with this specific study but with multiple future studies that could explore factors that affect within teams workload sharing.

The majority of studies Benny conducted in the last few years surrounded the topic of rudeness and how it influences medical teams' performance. For example, in a recent study (R&R JAP) we investigated how rudeness affects fixation error (i.e., anchoring) in diagnosis. This paper consisted of two studies. In the first study, 40 anesthesiology residents participated in a surgical simulation in which the residents were initially provided with information suggesting the patient may be suffering from anaphylactic shock, but were later provided with information inconsistent with this diagnosis but consistent with blood loss that could lead to death. Anesthesiology residents in the rudeness condition were 14.49 times more likely to be anchored to the first incorrect diagnosis than those in the control condition. We then replicated these results in a second study that consisted of an online simulation that Benny designed and built. In this simulation, 138 senior medical students had to diagnose a patient that showed initial signs of heart attack, however, the right diagnosis was acid reflux disease. Here again, exposure to rudeness caused medical students to be locked onto an erroneous first diagnosis. One cannot emphasize enough the important of these findings as medical errors are the third leading cause of death in the US. In building this simulation, Benny showed that he is not afraid to tackle completely unfamiliar areas of research and that he can quickly gain expertise in them. Indeed, in order to build this simulation Benny had to work closely with Dr. Chris Giordano a chief anesthesiologist at the UF medical school, and learn areas of complex diagnoses of symptoms and disease. Benny was not only involved in the front part of the study but was also the one who conducted the entire analyses. In fact, one of Benny's main strengths and the reason that he is able to conduct sophisticated and captivating studies is his level of methodological sophistication. Benny is a "Wiz" when it comes to analyzing data. In fact, along with our graduate students and faculty who consult with him regularly, researchers from other universities (i.e., Shaul Oreg from the Hebrew University and Cornell University, Yair Berson from Bar-Ilan University and New York University) often consult with Benny on how to analyze data using sophisticated methods such as Mplus.

Benny's dissertation is another good example of his line of research that has a significant potential to contribute to the management and psychology literatures and society in general. In the last two decades, numerous studies have shown the negative outcomes of workplace rudeness. Indeed, many of the projects that Benny has been involved in showed that rudeness can lead to medical errors (Riskin et al., 2019; Erez et al., JAP R&R; Avesar et al. in preparation), aggression and violence (Berson et al., under review), cycles of incivility and long lasting contagious effects

(Cooper et al., in preparation; Foulk et al, in preparation), and outgroup discrimination (Cooper et al., R&R). However, while there is accumulating evidence to suggest that rudeness can have myriad harmful effects on those who experience and/or witness it, researchers and practitioners have not provided systematic and consistent "remedies" that may ameliorate rudeness' negative impact. In his dissertation Benny proposes and test a model that explores the conditions under which individuals can be made to resist and even counter the negative outcomes of exposure to rude events. Specifically, Benny argues in his dissertation that engaging in certain self-enhancing exercises will allow individuals to positively cope with rudeness and its' downstream effects. He then goes on to test multiple ways by which individuals can increase their personal resources or engage in activities that counter the depletion of resources to combat the effects of rudeness. If successful, his dissertation could open the door to very practical remedies that may "inoculate" or "cure" individuals from the negative effects of rudeness. In short, Benny's research has the real potential to help reduce the effects of rudeness that takes a severe toll on people and society in multiple ways.

Turning to Benny's teaching, in Florida he has taught classes in human resource management, and organization behavior. His performance as an instructor in these courses has been outstanding with teaching evaluations of 4.60 and 4.62 (on a scale of 1 to 5). Indeed, last year he was nominated by his students and received the Ph.D. outstanding teaching award from the Warrington College of Business. Benny is more mature than most Ph.D. students and has an abundance of work experience. His practical knowledge and maturity proves invaluable in teaching his classes. In his teaching, Benny also exhibits a genuine interest and enthusiasm for the topic. For example, some of the comments on his teaching evaluation were: "He is very enthusiastic about the subject," I really like the real life examples and relations," "Incredibly knowledgeable about the subject" and "I felt like Benny expressed a genuine interest in the subject material, and his passion made me more eager to come to class prepared to learn." One of the clear signs of a very good teacher is the ability to simplify complex concepts and explain them in ways the students can comprehend. Indeed, his students clearly recognize and appreciate this ability: "He is interested in the material and makes it simple to understand, and shows how the concepts and theories can be applied to the real world of business," "Professor cares a lot about making sure students understand the material." One theme that repeatedly appears in his teaching evaluations is his care for his students and his willingness to help. His evaluations are peppered with expressions such "very helpful," "very approachable," "very friendly and nice," "willingness to help," "always prepare to help." In sum, Benny clearly possesses the requisite qualities of a great teacher, he is very organized, logical, and didactical. He is calm, collected, and patient when answering questions and he has a tremendous amount of knowledge of the management field. I have no doubt he is going to be an excellent teacher at your institution.

Finally, I would like to provide an evaluation of Benny as a person and as a potential colleague. I have no doubt that Benny is going to be wonderful colleague. He is smart, mature, and nice and is very well liked by the entire faculty and graduate students. Benny is also one the most helpful people I know. Not only is he always willing to help, he consistently offers others help. He is one of those rare individuals that when you ask them for help they make you feel that it is not a burden on them and that they are genuinely happy to help you. It is not surprising then that Benny is regularly asked by his Ph.D. students' colleagues to teach sections in their OB classes. Benny is

not only helpful to his peers but also to faculty. For example, recently, Mo Wang the chair of our department, asked Benny to help him teach the MPlus sections of his method class and then took Benny with him to Israel to help him teach a method workshop. In addition to being helpful, Benny is also a very good citizen for the department overall. For example, Benny managed the department lab for 4 years, worked closely with faculty to make sure the extra credit they give in the class is accurate and timely, and crated procedures to manage the lab. It is also not surprising that Benny is highly interested in investigating resilience. He overcame many adversities in his life and he has shown that he is a strong person that could also help others overcome difficulties. Finally, Benny is also highly energetic, motivated, reliable, and has a positive disposition but he is not afraid to speak up and to argue his point of view. I feel lucky to have had him as a student.

In sum, Benny has proven himself to be an excellent researcher, teacher, and colleague here at Florida. I strongly believe that any program will be lucky to have him. Thus, I highly recommend that you give him serious consideration. If you would like to further discuss Benny's candidacy, please contact me, preferably via email (ereza@ufl.edu).

Sincerely,

A. Erez

Amir Erez, Ph.D.
W.A. McGriff III Professor of Management

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

July 15, 2019

A letter of recommendation on behalf of Benny Cooper

Dear Committee Members,

It is my pleasure to recommend Benny Cooper for a faculty position in your department. I have known Benny since he joined the PhD program in Management at the University of Florida four years ago. I got to know Benny via two colleagues—Amir Erez and Yair Berson—who have collaborated with Benny in research and advised him during his undergraduate and graduate career. Benny and I have worked closely on a research project on rudeness in intergroup behavior that *Nature: Human Behavior* recently invited us to revise and resubmit. In addition, I serve on Benny's dissertation committee and have seen him present his research on multiple occasions (for example, in a symposium about incivility at AOM). As a result, I know Benny quite well and feel confident in my ability to accurately evaluate his merits. **Benny is a very promising young researcher** and a wonderful collaborator. He is truly passionate about his research, which focuses on questions related to the causes and consequences of, as well as remedies for, rudeness in organizations.

Benny is the complete package. Benny is a creative, thoughtful, and hard-working researcher; a remarkable teacher; and a wonderful colleague. As a researcher, Benny often builds on basic social science concepts and findings to offer novel answers to questions that individuals and organizations grapple with continuously. For example, his research on medical team performance in hospitals revealed how expressions of gratitude can increase information sharing in teams, and ultimately, performance in neonatal intensive care units (*Pediatrics*, 2019). As Benny's CV illustrates, he has established fruitful research collaborations with colleagues around

the country and the world, and these enable him to make progress on multiple projects simultaneously. Benny is currently the first author on five papers, and a coauthor on ten additional papers (including published papers, submitted papers, and work-in-progress). Consequently, **his pipeline is filled with papers that will undoubtedly be published in top-tier journals in coming years**.

Benny is an emerging expert on social interactions in the workplace, with a particular focus on pro-social and anti-social behaviors. His research projects explore how exposure to rudeness impacts pro-social behavior such as helping as well as anti-social behavior such as aggression. **Methodological versatility is always on display across Benny's multiple research projects**. Benny's research features compelling field studies alongside clever experimental paradigms that jointly provide high levels of ecological and internal validity. Importantly, Benny's research goes beyond demonstrating intriguing effects—such as how incivility perpetuates itself or how overconfidence fuels rude behavior. In addition to documenting robust effects, Benny's research uncovers the psychological processes that underlie the effects, thereby explaining when, why and how rudeness undermines cognitive processes, social interactions, and team performance.

Our joint research focuses on how brief exposure to incidental rudeness impacts individuals' intergroup behavior. Benny has masterfully led this project from inception to its current state (R&R from *Nature: Human Behavior*), demonstrating his conceptual, analytical, and statistical prowess during the process. Using online simulations, field experiments, and incentivized decisions in paradigms derived from behavioral economics, this research shows that observers of rudeness are significantly less likely to help out-group members and significantly more likely to harm out-group members than individuals who were not exposed to rudeness. This research project is unique in that it explains how a recurring daily experience for many employees (a micro-phenomenon) can have broad consequences for organizations and society at large (macro-consequences) by shaping patterns of intergroup discrimination in the workplace.

In addition to being a very promising young scholar, **Benny is also an outstanding teacher.** He has already won a teaching award at the University of Florida, and I am confident that students in

your department will similarly find him to be an exceptional instructor. His mastery of multiple literatures and his ability to connect basic research with current events bodes well not only for his future career as a researcher, but also for his success as a teacher in your institution. Thus, Benny has enormous potential not only as a scientist, but also as an educator. Last but definitely not least, **Benny is also a generous collaborator and colleague**, a potential community builder in your institution and a great addition to the faculty in your department.

In sum, Benny's qualities as a researcher, as a teacher, and as a person—his intellectual curiosity, work ethic, and deep commitment to research and teaching—bode well for a successful career in academia. I am confident that he will make an excellent addition to your faculty. Please feel free to email me if you have any questions about this letter.

Respectfully,

Halevy Nir

Nir Halevy
Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University
655 Knight Way
Stanford, CA 94305
nhalevy@stanford.edu