

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary Table S1. *Respondent characteristics and remedial voice comparison*

Gender			Age		
Gender	Percent (%)		Descriptives	Percent (%)	
	Remedial Voice (whistleblowing voice)	Other (Non- whistleblowing voice)		Remedial Voice (whistleblowing voice)	Other (Non- whistleblowing voice)
Female	63.80	42.50	Mean	34.38	34.54
Male	34.00	55.70	SD	8.40	8.96
Other gender identity	2.10	1.80			

Organizational Position			Industry		
Organizational Position	Percent (%)		Industry	Percent (%)	
	Remedial Voice (whistleblowing voice)	Other (Non- whistleblowing voice)		Remedial Voice (whistleblowing voice)	Other (Non- whistleblowing voice)
Executive level position	4.30	3.10	Information Technology	17.00	14.00
Upper-level management position	10.60	9.20	Telecommunications	2.10	2.60
Mid-level management position	27.70	23.20	Retail	10.60	6.10
First level supervisory position	12.80	15.40	Legal/Law enforcement	2.10	2.60
Non-managerial position	44.70	48.70	Construction	8.50	1.80
Missing data		0.40	Transportation		2.60
			Banking		0.90
			Healthcare	10.60	8.80
			Real Estate		2.20
			Hospitality/Food service	6.40	3.50
			Professional Services	14.90	19.30
			Government	4.30	7.00
			Nonprofit	4.30	2.20
			Beauty/Fashion	2.10	2.20
			Education	8.50	12.30
			Automotive	2.10	0.40
			Manufacturing	6.40	8.80
			Tourism		0.90
			Arts, Culture, & Entertainment		1.80

Supplementary Table S2. *Standardized factor loadings for the hypothesized six-factor measurement model*

Construct	Item	Standardized Loading
Trait anger	Tr_anger1	0.43
	Tr_anger2	0.49
	Tr_anger3	0.64
	Tr_anger4	0.51
	Tr_anger5	0.67
	Tr_anger6	0.78
	Tr_anger7	0.80
Trait self-control	Tr_scontrol1	0.64
	Tr_scontrol2	0.69
	Tr_scontrol3	0.59
	Tr_scontrol4	0.54
	Tr_scontrol5	0.52
	Tr_scontrol6	0.49
	Tr_scontrol7	0.64
	Tr_scontrol8	0.47
	Tr_scontrol9	0.60
	Tr_scontrol10	0.64
	Tr_scontrol11	0.48
	Tr_scontrol12	0.71
	Tr_scontrol13	0.63
Trait negative affectivity	Negaff1	0.80
	Negaff2	0.78
	Negaff3	0.69
	Negaff4	0.76
	Negaff5	0.49
	Negaff6	0.71
	Negaff7	0.69
	Negaff8	0.76
	Negaff9	0.66
	Negaff10	0.74
Rumination	Ruminate1	0.86
	Ruminate2	0.89
	Ruminate3	0.92
	Ruminate4	0.67
	Ruminate5	0.85
	Ruminate6	0.89
Perpetrator power	Perppower1	0.93

Enacted workplace incivility	Perppower2	0.93
	Perppower3	0.95
	Perppower4	0.75
	Perppower5	0.83
	Perppower6	0.65
	En_incivil1	0.45
	En_incivil2	0.50
	En_incivil3	0.80
	En_incivil4	0.76
	En_incivil5	0.59
	En_incivil6	0.78
	En_incivil7	0.79
	En_incivil8	0.74
	En_incivil9	0.65
	En_incivil10	0.69
	En_incivil11	0.85
	En_incivil12	0.73

Note. All standardized factor loadings are statistically significant ($p < .001$). Targets' enacted workplace interpersonal deviance was measured using the Cortina et al. (2013) 12-item Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS).

Supplementary Table S3. *Construct Reliability and Convergent Validity*

Construct	Cronbach's α	Composite Reliability (ω)	AVE
Trait anger	0.81	0.81	0.40
Trait self-control	0.88	0.86	0.35
Trait negative affectivity	0.91	0.90	0.52
Rumination	0.94	0.94	0.71
Perpetrator power	0.94	0.94	0.73
Enacted workplace incivility	0.92	0.89	0.46

Note. CR = composite reliability; AVE = average variance extracted. CR values exceed .70, supporting reliability. AVE values are acceptable given strong CR. Targets' enacted workplace interpersonal deviance was measured using the Cortina et al. (2013) 12-item Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS).

Supplementary Table S4. *Discriminant validity (latent correlations)*

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Trait anger	—					
2. Trait self-control	-0.52					
3. Trait negative affectivity	0.53	-0.64				
4. Rumination	0.27	-0.27	0.41			
5. Perpetrator power	0.15	-0.18	0.15	0.32		
6. Enacted workplace incivility	0.30	-0.31	0.22	0.28	0.26	—

Note. All correlations were below 1.00. Targets' enacted workplace interpersonal deviance was measured using the Cortina et al. (2013) 12-item Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS).

Supplementary Table S5. *Assessment of Common Method Bias Using the UMLV / ULMF Approach*

Model	χ^2	df	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf
Baseline Measurement Model	2400.50	1356	—	—
UMLV (Method Factor) Model	2467.96	1309	67.46	47

Note. $\Delta\chi^2$ reflects comparison with baseline model.

REFERENCES

- Cortina, L., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E.A., Huerta, M., and Magley, V.J. (2013), "Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: evidence and impact", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 39 No. 6, 1579-1605.