

4-30-2017

# The Effect of Co-worker Closeness on Teasing Perceptions, Behavioural Intentions and Trust in the Workplace

Jessica Bitel  
*King's University College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/psychK\\_uht](https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/psychK_uht)



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Bitel, Jessica, "The Effect of Co-worker Closeness on Teasing Perceptions, Behavioural Intentions and Trust in the Workplace" (2017).  
*Undergraduate Honors Theses*. 66.  
[https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/psychK\\_uht/66](https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/psychK_uht/66)

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact [tadam@uwo.ca](mailto:tadam@uwo.ca), [wlsadmin@uwo.ca](mailto:wlsadmin@uwo.ca).

The Effect of Co-worker Closeness on Teasing Perceptions, Behavioural Intentions and Trust in  
the Workplace

By

Jessica Bitel

Honors Thesis

Department of Psychology

King's University College at Western University London, Ontario, Canada

April 2017

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Glen Gorman

Research Collaborator: Dr. Irene Cheung

### Abstract

Teasing is considered to be an ambiguous form of social interaction. Targets may not always recognize teasers' intentions, and in turn, perceive teases more negatively. However, individuals who have a close relationship with a teaser may be more likely to perceive teases more positively. The present study consisted of 50 undergraduate students who were randomly assigned to either think about a close or non-close co-worker. Participants recalled and described previous teasing instances from a fellow co-worker and indicated their perceptions of the teases, their intentions to engage with and their trust towards that co-worker. Results show no significant differences between closeness conditions in perceptions of teasing, future engagement and trust. However, how close participants felt to their co-worker, perceptions of teasing, future engagement and trust were all significantly correlated in the expected direction. Implications of the findings are discussed.

*This work is in dedication to my family and fiancé who have stuck by my side through all the stress and tears. I couldn't have done it without you all.*

The Effect of Co-worker Closeness on Teasing Perceptions, Behavioural Intentions and Trust in  
the Workplace

Teasing is a multifaceted phenomenon. It is a form of social interaction that many individuals use in their day-to-day interactions with others. Teasing often contains “negative characteristics” (Albert, 1992, p. 161), but it also contains situational cues, such as smiling or laughing that may suggest that teasing is more lighthearted and positive. These negative and positive elements are both central components to teasing. Although teasing can be ambiguous in different social contexts with different people, teasing can serve a variety of functions in social interactions. For instance, reducing social tensions, increasing social bonds and re-establishing social norms (Keltner, Young, Heerey, Oemig & Monarach, 1998; Keltner, Capps, Kring, Young & Heerey, 2001). In organizations, such as the workplace environment, teasing can help motivate staff, increase productivity, reduce stress and inaugurate cohesiveness in workgroups (Keltner et al., 1998). Furthermore, staff motivation, group cohesion, stress reduction and work productivity have been shown to be influenced by social factors, such as humour in the workplace (Romero & Cruthirds, 2006). Therefore, it is important to understand teasing in the workplace given the implication teasing has for various interpersonal and work outcomes, such as employee cohesion and work productivity.

The present study examined perceptions of teasing in the workplace. More specifically, we examined whether employees’ felt closeness towards a co-worker affects their perceptions of teasing, as well as their trust and future engagement with that fellow co-worker. We expected that those who feel closer to their fellow co-worker will perceive teases more positively, and be more likely to trust and engage with their fellow co-worker in the future, than those who feel less close to their fellow co-worker.

## Teasing

Teasing is a form of social interaction that is often perceived as ambiguous (Alberts, 1992; Campos, Keltner, Beck, Gonzaga & John, 2007; Dynel, 2008; Georgesen, Harris, Milich & Young, 1999; Gorman & Jordan, 2015; Keltner et al., 1998, 2001; Kowalski, 2004; Kruger, Gordan & Kuban, 2006; Lampert & Ervin-Tipp, 2005). The ambiguity in teasing can be a result of a tease being portrayed as either literal or non-literal (Alberts, 1992). Targets may interpret teasing remarks more harmfully than intended because the content is harsh or touches on a sensitive topic. For instance, imagine that Sally is playing a game of pick-up hockey against her friend Andrew. As the game goes on, both parties become more competitive, and their body language becomes more aggressive compared to the beginning of the game. Their friend Larry yells out “Last point wins the game!” In that moment, Andrew scores against Sally and goes up to her face, and with a grin, says, “IN YOUR FACE... just kidding...!” In this example, the tease may be portrayed as less humorous to Sally compared to Andrew.

In spite of this, teasing remarks can also be playful and make light of a situation. Going back to our hockey example, if the scenario ended with Andrew missing his last shot and Sally putting her arm around him and saying “Hey, nice shot, haha,” Andrew may perceive this tease as lighthearted. The difference between these two examples can be explained by situational cues. For example, in these scenarios the situational cues are Andrew saying “just kidding” or Sally putting her arm around Andrew and laughing after she says “Hey, nice shot.” The difference is very minimal, but is a very powerful suggestion as to why someone may perceive a tease more positively or negatively. These situational cues can also help preserve either Sally or Andrew’s feelings and their friendship when they use more playful situational cues, such as smiling or wrapping an arm around the other person when making an unkind comment.

Likewise, teasers' intentions can contribute to the degree of ambiguity in teasing (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001). Targets of teasing may "never be completely certain of the teaser's motives" (Kowalski, 2004, p. 332) which suggests that there may be a discrepancy between how teasers and targets perceive the intentions of a tease. For example, Sally observes that Andrew is very upset because his favourite hockey team the San Jose Sharks lost and are out of the Stanley Cup finals. She tries to make him laugh by saying, "The Sharks suck, don't worry about it – it happens every year," accompanied by a laugh. Sally's intentions are purely good, she wants to make Andrew feel better about the situation, however Andrew thinks Sally is being rude to him and perceives her tease as negative. Because Sally's motives are unclear to Andrew, Andrew can perceive the tease more negatively. This misunderstanding can have negative implications in relationships (Kowalski, 2004; Conoley et al., 2007; Alberts, Kellar-Guenther & Corman, 1996).

It is safe to say that teasing can consist of both positive and negative intentions, which encompasses both hostility and playfulness. Teasing may be commonly used to hurt and humiliate individuals, but it may also be used to flirt, resolve conflict, reduce social distance and strengthen social bonds (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001). Researchers have proposed various definitions of teasing ranging from teasing being purely aggressive to teasing as being both hostile and good-natured. One of the most widely used definitions in the current teasing literature was put forth by Keltner and his colleagues (1998, 2001). They conceptualize teasing as a behaviour that is intentional, but a lighthearted provocation (e.g., incitement, annoyance and taunting) directed at another person. They further state for an interaction to be recognized as a tease, the tease should refer to something that is relevant to the person being teased, and that the tease should use playful off-record markers to inform the recipient that they are "just kidding". These off-record markers are essential aspects of the definition because they can influence the

level of hostility or playfulness in a tease. Off-record markers can be both verbal cues, such as “I’m just kidding!” and non-verbal cues, such as smiling, winking or nudging. These off-record markers allow a target of the tease to know how literal or non-literal the teaser is being with them. Teasers who use fewer off-record markers tend to send the message that their tease is more hostile and is meant to hurt or humiliate the other person (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001). Likewise, teasers who use a lot of off-record markers can convey their teases to be taken less seriously (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001).

### **Differences Between Teasing, Bullying and Humour**

Since teasing consists of both hostile and playful characteristics, it can be easily conflated with both bullying and humour. Even though there are overlapping components between teasing and bullying, as well as teasing and humour, not all forms of teasing are bullying or humour, and vice versa (Keltner et al., 2001; Mills & Carwile, 2009). By its nature, bullying is an act that uses repeated verbal and physical hostility of a more powerful individual over a less powerful individual (Olweus, 1997). Bullies tend to use dominant components such as their size, authority and power to frighten or inflict harm onto their targets (Mills & Carwile, 2009). Bullies are also likely to use multiple tools to help themselves reinforce dominance over a target, with teasing being one of those tools.

Although bullies may opt to use teasing as a strategy to intimidate others, other individuals may use teasing as a way to preserve and enhance interpersonal relationships (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001). Teasing allows individuals who are in relationships to say what they are feeling without being too straightforward about it. An illustration of this is when Sally sees her friend Andrew having a new hairstyle – ‘the man bun’ – but it does not flatter him. She may indirectly tell Andrew by saying, “Are you growing a nest on your head?” This message will



inform Andrew that he should change his hairstyle. Teasing helps Sally protect her relationship with Andrew by telling him the truth, but in a much more playful way.

Teasing and humour on the other hand, are harder to differentiate from one another because humour is a component of teasing (Mills & Carwile, 2009; Gorman & Jordan, 2015; Keltner et al., 2001; Conoley et al., 2007; Dynel, 2008; Pawluk, 1989; Alberts, 1992). By definition humour is a “verbal and nonverbal display that indicates that the content is not to be taken in a serious way” (Mills & Carwile, 2009, p. 284). Like humour, teasing also involves the display of indicators like off-record markers to inform the recipient of the tease that the teaser is “just kidding” (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001). Nevertheless, many forms of humour consist of different elements that do not resemble teasing, such as “role playing” (Keltner et al., 2001, p.232), “playing tricks” (Tragesser & Lippman, 2005, p. 256) and telling comical stories (Keltner et al., 2001; Pawluk, 1989). Therefore, humour does have an integrative aspect to teasing, which allows teasing remarks to be more playful (Mills & Carwile, 2009).

### **Face Threat Analysis of Teasing**

According to Goffman (1967), who developed the concept of ‘face’, which occurs when people engage in social interactions. He describes face as a level of self-image that people contain in another person’s eyes. When people are interacting with each other, they know that other individuals do not want their self-image being threatened because of their own desires for protecting their own self-image. Some forms of interactions have the potential for face-threatening risks, such as gossiping, arguing and telling the truth, specifically threatening an individual’s positive and negative face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Individuals who engage socially can reduce these threats by avoiding the face-threatening action or by lowering the threat of the action (Keltner et al., 1998). A person who engages in a face-threatening act can reduce

the threat by using off-record markers, implying the action should not be taken seriously (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

So how does face-threat analysis relate to teasing? Teasing can be considered a face-threatening social interaction due to the hostility aspect of teasing, but also teasers' comments on something of relevance to the target. Teases that are more hostile and relevant to the target can increase the risk of threatening the recipient's face. Recalling the example of Sally and Andrew playing pick-up hockey, after Andrew scores his goal he says to Sally's face and says, "IN YOUR FACE!.. just kidding...". Even though, Andrew is teasing Sally and is using an off-record marker, "just kidding" to indicate the comment is not to be taken seriously, it still has the potential to hurt Sally's feelings and humiliate her in front of her friends. Teasing involves the use of off-record markers, such as saying, "just kidding" to inform the recipient of the tease that the teaser is not being serious. Likewise, individuals who attempt to avoid face-threat use similar tactics, such as off-record markers, to inform the recipient that the behaviour is not to be taken seriously.

How does face-threat analysis explain the effects of closeness on people's perceptions of teasing? Teasers may be less concerned with the target's face in relationships that are not well-established, such as those involving strangers or individuals who they are less familiar with. Therefore, teasers will be less inclined to use face-threatening reduction tactics, such as off-record markers. However, people who are in close relationships are more likely to use teasing accompanied by face-threatening reduction tactics (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001). People who are in close relationships are more conscious and concerned about maintaining the other person's face – meaning that they do not want to hurt the other person's self-image (Goffman, 1967; Keltner et

al., 1998, 2001). This is why individuals' closeness to one another can be a factor that influences their awareness of others' self-image or face.

### **The Relationship Between the Teaser and Target**

Teasing occurs in many different types of relationships, in families, friends, intimate partners, and even strangers. The motives why people use teasing can range on a wide spectrum as well. Beck et al. (2007) created a questionnaire asking college students what their motives are behind their teases. They found that college students mainly use teasing for fun, and to cheer up and bond with another person. This can imply that teasing is a versatile tool whereby people use teasing in a relationship for different reasons.

Teasing can have various implications on relationships. As previously mentioned, people can use teasing in order to bond with other people (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001). It is a way to communicate to friends or a romantic partner that you are ready for the next level of intimacy. Teasing can be a mechanism to strengthen social bonds in relationships (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001). There have been a few studies that have indicated that teasing can have the ability to increase affiliation in wide-ranging relationships. For example, Keltner et al. (1998) observed how teasing could increase affiliation, specifically among fraternity members and romantic partners. In the first study, fraternity members were asked to tease each other by making up nicknames about one another and telling embarrassing stories explaining why they have those nicknames. The results showed that fraternity members who tease each other actually had stronger affiliation between one another compared to those fraternity members who did not tease each other (Keltner et al., 1998). In the second study, they asked romantic partners to do a similar task, however in this instance, they observed how teasing occurred in a conflict dialogue. They found that romantic partners using teasing in prosocial ways created an increase in positive

outcomes and reduced the negative outcomes in their relationships, which in turn, increased affiliation (Keltner et al., 1998)

Even though teasing can have positive outcomes in interpersonal relationships, teasing may not always be perceived in the most positive way, due to the fact that targets may be unaware of the teaser's intentions. In a study conducted by Kruger, Gordan and Kuban (2006), participants were asked to recall times when they were either the teaser or were teased by another person in their life. Participants were required to evaluate those teases that they described regarding their perceived valence to the tease, perceived intentions behind the tease and perceived importance of those intentions. The findings demonstrated that teasers interpreted their teasing intentions differently than targets of the tease. This suggests that even though teasers may have good intentions regarding their teases, the teasing intentions are less important and less clear to the targets, leading to more negative interpretations of the tease.

Relationship factors may also moderate targets' perceptions of a tease. On a rare occasion people may find themselves teasing someone they are not familiar with, such as a stranger on the street or a classmate they do not often talk to (Keltner, 1998). In these instances, teasing can be perceived as harsh and intended to hurt a person's feelings because there is no sense of relationship (Mills & Carwile, 2009). On the contrary, people may rather tease those they have already established a close social bond with. Individuals in close relationships who tease each other may find more pleasure in teasing one another because they have more knowledge about the other person and are able to reciprocate with teases (Kowalski, 2004). It is suggested that recipients of teases may be biased and predisposed to the teaser's teasing remark because they have many shared experiences and an established a level of intimacy (Alberts, 1992, Jones,

Newman & Bautista, 2005). Recipients may justify teaser's behaviours and interpret teases more favourably because they have a significant bond with each other.

Individuals who have close social bonds with each other may be more likely to deliver teases more positively, and as such, targets will perceive teases more positively as well (Keltner et al., 1998, 2001; Gorman & Jordan, 2015; Tragesser & Lippman, 2005). Gorman & Jordan (2015) showed how relationship closeness affects people's perceptions of teasing. The results of their study suggest that recipients of teases are more likely to perceive teases more positively because they are in a close relationship with the teaser. In one study, they manipulated participants' level of closeness by having them recall the most important person that they interact with or the least important person they interact with. Participants were asked to recall specific teasing instances when they were the teaser and the target of the tease. The findings showed that participants, who were in close relationships, were more likely to perceive teases more positively compared to people who are in non-close relationships. In a subsequent study, the researchers manipulated participants' feelings of closeness to a stranger and then had the stranger ostensibly tease the participants. Participants who were made to feel close to the stranger rated the tease more positively than those who were not made to feel close to the stranger. Thus, these findings suggest that the role of closeness is indeed a determinant in the way people perceive teases.

### **The Present Research**

Previous research has shown that teases tend to be perceived more positively when there is a level of closeness and familiarity between the teaser and target (Gorman & Jordan, 2015; Keltner et al., 1998, 2001). However, there has been a lack of research examining teasing specifically in the workplace, especially on co-worker closeness. Therefore, it is important to examine the effects of teasing in the workplace because teasing can be used as a tool to help

organizations motivate their staff, increase productivity, reduce stress and build cohesiveness (Keltner et al., 1998). The purpose of this study is to extend past research to examine the causal relationship between closeness and perceptions of teasing in the workplace. Rather than just looking at a broad spectrum of close and non-close relationships as in Gorman & Jordan (2015), we examined a specific type of interpersonal relationship, co-worker relationships, to enhance the understanding of closeness and teasing in the workplace. Likewise, by specifically looking at co-worker closeness, workplace researchers and employers could use the results to better understand and improve workplace interactions.

In the present study, participants were randomly assigned to either think about a close or non-close co-worker. Participants were required to recall previous teasing instances by the fellow co-worker and rate the overall positivity of the tease and their co-worker's intentions. In addition, participants were asked to indicate how much they trust their fellow co-worker and how likely they want to engage with their fellow co-worker again in the future. We hypothesized that participants will perceive teases more positively when they have a close relationship with their fellow co-worker compared to a non-close fellow co-worker. It was also hypothesized that co-workers who are close, and perceive the teases more positively, are more likely to trust their co-worker compared to co-workers who are not close. Lastly, we hypothesized that co-workers who are close, and perceive the teases more positively are more likely to want to engage with their co-worker in the future compared to co-workers who are not close.

## **Methods**

### **Participants**

Participants for this current study consisted of 63 undergraduate students from the Psychology 1000 class at King's University College in London, Ontario (females = 34, males = 16). The study consisted of 44 students in the age range of 18-24, 3 students in the age range of

25-34, 1 student in the age range of 35-44 and 2 students in the age range of 45-54. To be eligible for the study, students were required to be currently employed. Students were recruited online through King's SONA system. In turn for their participation, they received up to 2.5% course credit once they completed the study and a brief assignment related to the study.

Participants' age and sex did not affect any of the reported results and therefore, they are not discussed further. Thirteen participants were excluded from the final analyses; seven were excluded due to failure to come up with a teasing instance, four were excluded due to unreliable responses and two were excluded due to failure to meet pre-study requirements

### **Materials**

**Closeness manipulation.** Participants were randomly assigned to one of two closeness conditions, close or non-close. In the close condition, participants were asked to, "Please think of a co-worker who you interact with on a regular basis who you are closest to". In the non-close condition, participants were asked to, "Please think of a co-worker who you interact with on a regular basis but are NOT close to". In both conditions, participants were asked to provide that co-worker's initials and respond to all subsequent questions keeping this co-worker in mind.

### **Felt closeness questionnaire.**

*Pre-closeness.* Participants completed a 6-item felt closeness questionnaire created by Murray, Rose, Bellavia, Holmes and Kusche (2002), which is intended to assess initial levels of closeness prior to recalling and describing a tease. The felt closeness questionnaire consisted of a 7-point scale with responses ranging from 1 (Not at all true) to 7 (Completely true). Examples of the questions found are: "I feel closer to \_\_\_\_\_ than to any one else in my life"; "At times, I feel out of touch with \_\_\_\_\_"(reversed) (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .82$ ). This measure was used to assess the effectiveness of the closeness manipulation.

*Post-closeness.* Participants completed a 5-item felt closeness questionnaire created by Gorman (2008), which is intended to assess levels of closeness after recalling and describing tease. The questionnaire consisted of a 7-point scale with responses ranging from 1 (Extremely disagree) to 7 (Extremely Agree). Examples of the questions found are: “I felt very close to this co-worker”; “I felt distant from this co-worker” (reversed) (Cronbach’s  $\alpha = .90$ ).

**Perceptions of the tease.**

*Valence.* Participants completed a 9-item valence assessment developed by Kruger, Gordan & Kuban (2006), which is intended to assess how positive or negative participants perceived the tease. The valence assessment consisted of a 7-point scale with responses ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Extremely). Examples of the questions are: “How humorous would you say this tease was?”; “How mean would you say this tease was?” (reversed) (Cronbach’s  $\alpha = .92$ ).

*Intent.* Participants completed a 16-item intent assessment adapted from Gorman & Jordan (2015), which assesses how positive participants perceived the teaser’s intentions. The intent assessment consisted of a 7-point scale with responses ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). Examples of the questions are: “I felt that my co-worker’s message was positively intentioned”; “I felt that my co-worker’s message was competitive” (reversed) (Cronbach’s  $\alpha = .95$ ).

**Interaction ratings.** Participants completed a 14-item scale interaction rating scale created by Gorman (2007), which is intended to assess how participants perceived their overall interaction with the teaser. The interaction rating scale consisted of a 7-point scale with responses ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Extremely). Examples of the questions are: “How



positive was your interaction with your co-worker?"; How negative was your interaction with your co-worker?" (reversed) (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .95$ ).

**Behaviourial intention questionnaire.** Participants completed a 9-item behavioural intention questionnaire created for the purposes of this study, which is intended to assess participants' future engagement with their co-worker. The behavioural intention questionnaire consisted of a 7-point scale with responses ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). Examples of the questions are: "How likely would you meet with this co-worker outside of work?"; "How likely would you tell this co-worker about a problem you are having at work or outside of work?." (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .96$ )

**Trust inventory scale.** Participants completed a 10-item trust inventory scale developed by Dunn and Maurice (2005). This scale was intended to assess participants' perceptions of their fellow co-worker's trustworthiness. The trust inventory scale consisted of a 7-point scale with responses ranging from 1 (Not at all likely) to 7 (Very likely). Examples of the questions are: "If \_\_\_\_\_ promised to copy a presentation for me, s/he would follow through"; "If \_\_\_\_\_ and I decide to meet for coffee, I would be certain s/he would be there" (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .92$ ).

**Demographic Form.** Participants were asked their age, gender, employment information and co-worker information. Examples of questions for employment information are: "Are you currently employed?"; "What is your current employment status?"; "How long have you been employed at your work?" Examples of question for co-worker information are: "How long have you known your co-worker for?"; "What relationship did this person have to you prior to being your co-worker?"

## **Procedure**

Participants were recruited online through King's SONA system, where they could find a website link that directed them to the online study through Qualtrics. Participants were told that the online study would take less than an hour to complete. They were given a letter of information and consent form to verify their willingness to participate in the online study. Once participants completed the consent form, two employment questions were asked (see Appendix A) and then they were randomly assigned by Qualtrics to complete either the close or non-close condition (see Appendix B). All participants were given a Pre-Close Felt Closeness Questionnaire (see Appendix C), provided with a definition of teasing, and were asked to recall and describe a teasing instance by their fellow co-worker (see Appendix D). As well, participants were asked to explain why they thought the instance they were thinking about was an example of a tease (see Appendix D). Then, participants completed a Post-Close Felt Closeness Questionnaire (see Appendix E), Perception of the Tease Assessment (see Appendix F, G, H), Behavioural Intentions Questionnaire (see Appendix I) and Trust Inventory Scale (see Appendix J). Finally, participants provided demographic information (e.g. age, gender, employment information), as well as information about their relationship with the co-worker they were thinking about throughout the study. The participant was then fully debriefed and thanked for their participation.

## **Results**

### **Primary Analyses**

We first conducted a test of our manipulation using our manipulation check item, which assessed how close participants felt to their nominated co-worker, prior to having them recall a teasing instance. Levene's test of homogeneity of variance indicated unequal variances ( $F =$

8.91,  $p = .004$ ) between experimental groups, therefore the Welch-Satterthwaite approximation was used to determine differences between the conditions. The independent sample  $t$ -test confirmed that participants reported feeling closer to their co-worker in the close condition ( $M = 3.21$ ,  $SD = 0.93$ ) than in the non-close condition ( $M = 2.50$ ,  $SD = 0.93$ ),  $t(38.4) = -2.11$ ,  $p = .042$ . Next we tested participants' level of closeness to their fellow co-worker following the recall of the tease event, and found no difference between the close ( $M = 4.00$ ,  $SD = 1.73$ ) and the non-close condition ( $M = 3.80$ ,  $SD = 1.60$ ),  $t(48) = -.442$ ,  $p = .661$ .

We then tested whether the closeness manipulation affected perceptions of tease valence. The results indicated no difference in the valence of teasing among those in the close condition ( $M = 4.20$ ,  $SD = 1.65$ ) compared to those in the non-close condition ( $M = 4.60$ ,  $SD = 1.51$ ),  $t(48) = .90$ ,  $p = .390$ . We also examined whether closeness influenced perceptions of tease intentions and found no difference in the teaser's intentions in the close condition ( $M = 3.64$ ,  $SD = 1.53$ ) compared to those in the non-close condition ( $M = 3.90$ ,  $SD = 1.22$ ),  $t(48) = .604$ ,  $p = .55$ . Next, we assessed the effects of closeness on interaction ratings and found no difference between the close condition ( $M = 3.74$ ,  $SD = 1.70$ ) compared to the non-close condition ( $M = 3.62$ ,  $SD = 1.50$ ),  $t(48) = -.270$ ,  $p = .800$ .

Additionally, we examined whether closeness affected behavioural intentions. The findings showed that there was no difference between the close condition ( $M = 4.43$ ,  $SD = 2.10$ ) and the non-close condition ( $M = 4.12$ ,  $SD = 1.90$ ),  $t(48) = -.535$ ,  $p = .600$ . As well, we tested whether closeness influenced trust. We found that no differences were observed between the close condition ( $M = 5.00$ ,  $SD = 1.50$ ) and the non-close condition ( $M = 5.02$ ,  $SD = 1.53$ ),  $t(48) = .123$ ,  $p = .903$ . Taken together, the findings indicate that our closeness manipulation was effective. However, after participants thought about a tease, differences in closeness between the

conditions were no longer observed and did not affect the dependent variables. The same analyses were conducted examining the effect of closeness on the dependent variables with levels of closeness prior to the tease included as a covariate. All analyses were non-significant,  $F$ s ranged from .30 to 3.36,  $p$ s ranged from .07 to .80.

### **Exploratory Analyses**

Although our manipulation seemed to be effective, we were surprised that there were no condition differences on any of the dependent variables, which was unexpected. We wanted to examine this more closely by looking at the correlations between our variables. Consistent with past research, analyses using the Pearson product-moment correlation indicated that closeness after recalling and describing a teasing instance was positively correlated to valence,  $r(50) = .74$ ,  $p < .001$ , intentions,  $r(50) = .75$ ,  $p < .001$ , interactions ratings,  $r(50) = .80$ ,  $p < .001$ , behavioural intentions,  $r(50) = .83$ ,  $p < .001$ , and trust,  $r(50) = .75$ ,  $p < .001$  (see Table 1). As such, the closer individuals felt to their co-worker after thinking about a tease, the more positively they rated the tease, the more well-intentioned they perceived the tease, the more they viewed the teasing interaction more positively, the more they were willing to interact with the teaser in the future, and the more they trusted the teaser.

In addition, because trust was not examined in previous teasing studies, and trust and closeness tend to be strongly related in the present study, we wanted to examine the effects of closeness on both perceptions of valence and intentions of the tease while holding trust constant. Results of a partial correlation analysis showed that the association between closeness and tease valence,  $r(50) = .36$ ,  $p = .01$ , and intent,  $r(50) = .39$ ,  $p = .005$ , remained significant even when controlling for trust.

Table 1

Correlations Between Closeness, Valence, Intentions, Interaction Ratings, Behavioural Intentions, and Trust

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Post Closeness	----					
2. Valence	0.74***	----				
3. Intentions	0.75***	0.88***	----			
4. Interaction Rating	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	----		
5. Behavioural Intentions	0.83***	0.75***	0.74***	0.83***	----	
6. Trust	0.75***	0.78***	0.78***	0.76***	0.90***	----

*Note.* Pearson's correlations indicated in table \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

### Discussion

The present study examined whether the closeness of a co-worker influenced individuals' perceptions of teasing, as well as their trust and future engagement with that fellow co-worker. We expected that those who feel closer to their co-worker will perceive teases more positively, and will be more likely to trust and engage with that co-worker in the future than those who feel less close to their co-worker. Causally, closeness did affect individuals' perceptions of teasing, future engagement and trust with their co-worker. However, our correlational findings showed that participants who felt closer to their co-worker were more likely to have positive perceptions of teases, more likely to want to engage with them in the future and more likely to trust them. Therefore, in the work context, teases from a closer co-worker are associated with more positive social outcomes.

Our primary analyses suggest that participants who felt close to their co-worker were not more likely to perceive the tease, the teaser's intentions and the interaction with the teaser more positively than participants who felt not close to their co-worker. As a result, felt closeness did not affect perceptions of teasing in the workplace, and as such, did not support hypothesis 1. Although our manipulation indicated that the closeness manipulation was effective, there are many possible reasons why our manipulation may not have yielded the anticipated results. First, our instructions to participants may have constrained the type of teasing events they generated. In the original studies conducted by Gorman and Jordan (2015), teasing was not defined for participants. Thus, it is possible that participants' understanding of teasing was different based on the level of closeness they experienced with the other person, causing them to generate different kinds of teasing events (e.g., I might think about more hostile teasing instances when thinking about someone less close and more prosocial teasing instances when thinking about

someone more close). Unlike the original studies, participants in the present study were instructed to specifically think about a prosocial tease. As a result, this may have removed the effects of our manipulation causing participants to think about similar events regardless of how close they were with the other person. Second, the original studies examined closeness in a different context. There may be certain qualities inherent in a co-worker relationship that are different from other kinds of relationships (e.g., dating partner, friend, family member), such as history and the choice to be in the relationship, which may mitigate the effects of closeness on teasing perceptions.

Finally, workplace factors, such as a person's attitudes towards their workplace may be an explanation why there were no differences between the close and non-close conditions. The way a person views their work may impact the way they perceive teases, teaser's intentions and the overall interaction with the teaser. If the target of the tease takes their job more seriously than the teaser, the target may be less inclined to observe off-record cues (e.g., smiling, laughing) from the teaser and the pro-social content of the tease itself, regardless of how close they felt to the teaser. Similarly, if the target views their job as more stress-free and good-natured, they may be more inclined to see the off-record cues and pro-social content of the tease. Alberts, Kellar-Guenther and Corman (1996) suggest that individuals rely on off-record cues to determine how positive or negative the tease intent was. In their study, they found that participants who observed more off-record cues were more likely to perceive teases as more humorous and positive. Thus, if participants in the current study view their work environment more pro-social, they may perceive teases more positively because of the off-record markers presented during a tease, and based on previous research it suggests a tease is more playful.

Likewise, individuals in a close relationship with their co-worker showed no difference with those in a less close relationship with their co-worker in their willingness for future engagement and trust. Therefore, hypotheses 2 and 3 were not supported. A possible explanation for these findings is that due to the inherent nature of a work relationship, individuals may have no choice but to continue interacting with and trusting their fellow co-worker. Contrary to the findings from the present study, previous research has found that individuals who have a greater sense of affiliation with someone, the more likely they are to trust that person than someone who they are less close with (Keltner et al., 1998).

In the present study, we also tested whether there is a relationship between co-worker closeness, perceptions of teasing, behavioural intentions, and trust. We found that the closer participants felt to their co-worker after thinking about a tease, the more positively they rated the tease, the teaser's intentions, their interaction with the teaser. They were also more willing to engage with the teaser in the future and more likely to trust the teaser. Even though we did not find any significant effects in our analyses testing the causal effects of closeness, the correlational analyses show that there is a relationship between closeness and perceptions of teasing, behavioural intentions and trust, which are consistent with past research. For example, Keltner and colleagues (1998) examined how teasing might increase affiliation in relationships by correlating the pro-social content of teasing and participants' emotional responses to the tease. They found that the more pro-social the tease was, the more participants reported greater positive emotions and fewer negative emotions. Therefore, the more people perceive teases to be more pro-social, the more positive emotions they will have, and in turn, the more closely they will feel to the teaser, which may explain our findings.



The findings from the present study demonstrate that participants who felt closer to their co-worker perceived their co-worker's tease more positively, which suggests that these teases may be more pro-social in nature. However, we did not examine the specific content of the teases reported in the present study. Past research suggests that it may be important to examine the specific content of the teases. For example, Keltner and his colleagues (1998) categorized the different types of teases that related to different emotional responses and found that teases that were more hostile and show less off-record markers were perceived less positively, whereas teases that were less hostile and included more off-record markers were viewed more positively.

Overall, the primary findings showed that close and non-close relationships with a co-worker showed no difference in the way they perceived teasing, and in turn, showed no difference in their willingness to engage and trust their co-worker contrary to previous research (e.g., Gorman & Jordan, 2015; Keltner et al., 1998). One reason why we may not have observed causal effects of closeness may be due to factors that can prevent or enhance workplace relationships or individuals' perceptions of teasing. These factors may include individuals' attitudes towards work, how many hours worked or opportunity for interaction between an individual and their co-worker. Although we did not assess these factors in the present study, our findings showed that the closer individuals felt to their co-worker after thinking about a tease, the more positively they rated the tease, the more well-intended they perceived the tease, the more they viewed the teasing interaction more positively, the more they were willing to interact with the teaser in the future, and the more they trusted the teaser. Despite this, further research is needed to explain the additional factors that reflect these relationships.

**Limitations and Future Direction**

Like all research, the present study possesses some limitations. First, the sample size was reasonably small compared to the amount of variables that were used in this study, which may limit the power to detect an effect whether felt closeness causes individuals to perceive teasing more positively. Using first-year psychology students may be another limitation because the work experience of students may not be representative of employed individuals in general (e.g., full-time employees, older employees, employees working in different industries). Since the focus of the present study is on workplace interactions, students may be more likely to have limited working hours, and therefore, may not be exposed to many teasing interactions while working. Lastly, the study required participants to recall and describe past teasing instances. Having someone recall past events may unintentionally influence their responses due to recall bias (Gutek, 1978). If teases were delivered in a positive manner, the target may not remember the teases as much as if the teases were delivered in a negative manner (Strauss & Allen, 2006)

To address the limitations of the present study, future research should involve retesting the hypotheses of the current study using a larger sample size and a sample that is more representative of employed individuals more generally. Not only will this give us more power to detect any effects, it will also enable us to test how teasing occurs in contexts in which individuals spend significant amounts of time at work. Additionally, in order to have a better indication what additional factors may be contributing to the relationship that was found, future research should examine workplace attitudes. The extent to which individuals perceive their experiences in the workplace as positive or negative may have an effect on how they perceive teases from their co-worker. For example, if an employee views their workplace as more hostile and is being teased by a fellow co-worker, it may lead to negative work outcomes (e.g., increase

absenteeism, decrease job satisfaction, decrease workplace interaction). Finally, it would be interesting to test whether there are differences in perceptions of teasing between individuals being teased in a public versus a private setting. Not only will this help workplace researchers and employers to see if teases occur more in a group or private setting, but also whether the content of a tease might differ between the two settings. For instance, if teases occur more in a group setting and have more of a hostile component to the tease, this type of behaviour may feel more like an attack and may resemble similar elements to bullying.

### **Practical Implications and Conclusion**

Studying teasing in the workplace is essential for workplace researchers and employers because it helps them understand that there is much more to teasing than just teasing. The results of this study suggest that the closer someone feels with their co-worker, the more positively they perceive teasing instance, the more willing they are to engage with that person in the future and the more they trust that person. Therefore, teasing has important implications for relationship outcomes between employees, which can subsequently impact their work-related outcomes, such as employee cohesion, job satisfaction and commitment. Employers want their staff to be motivated to come to work, meet the organization's goals and needs, and work effectively with their fellow colleagues. Past research has shown that humour in the workplace can have a positive influence on staff motivation, group cohesion, stress reduction and work productivity (Romero & Cruthirds, 2006). For this reason, if teasing is fostered by employers as a form of pro-social behavior, it can help promote a number of positive work-related outcomes similar to those that are observed with the use of humour. Therefore, it is important to understand teasing in the workplace given the implications it has for various interpersonal and work outcomes.

As illustrated in previous research, teasing is considered to be an ambiguous social interaction (Alberts, 1992; Campos, Keltner, Beck, Gonzaga & John, 2007; Dynel, 2008; Georgesen, Harris, Milich & Young, 1999; Gorman & Jordan, 2015; Keltner et al., 1998, 2001; Kowalski, 2004; Kruger, Gordan & Kuban, 2006; Lampert & Ervin-Tipp, 2005). It has the potential to harm relationships (Kruger et al., 2006), but it also has the ability to strengthen relationships (Keltner, et al., 1998; 2001). The present study did not extend previous research findings to show that closeness with a co-worker affects perceptions of teasing within the workplace. Instead, this study provided some evidence that individuals who feel closer to their co-worker viewed teasing more positively, are more willing to engage with their co-worker in their future and more trusting in their coworker. Overall, future research observing teasing in the workplace will contribute to our understanding of workplace interactions and how it can help impact workplace outcomes.

## References

- Alberts, J. K. (1992). An inferential/strategic explanation for the social organization of teases. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 11*(3), 153-177.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1177/0261927X92113003>
- Alberts, J. K., Kellar-Guenther, Y., & Corman, S. R. (1996). That's not funny: Understanding recipients' responses to teasing. *Western Journal of Communication, 60*(4), 337-357.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1080/10570319609374553>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY. Retrieved from <https://www.lib.uwo.ca/cgi-bin/ezpauthn.cgi?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/617346647?accountid=15115>
- Campos, B., Keltner, D., Beck, J. M., Gonzaga, G. C., & John, O. P. (2007). Culture and teasing: The relational benefits of reduced desire for positive self-differentiation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(1), 3-16.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1177/014616720629378>
- Conoley, C. W., Hershberger, M., Gonzalez, L., Rinker, S., & Crowley, A. K. (2008). Responding to interpersonal teasing. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 7*(4), 27-41. doi: 10.1300/J135v07n04\_02
- Dunn, J. R., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2005). Feeling and believing: The influence of emotion on trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(5), 736-748.  
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.736>
- Dynel, M. (2008). No aggression, only teasing: The pragmatics of teasing and banter. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics, 4*(2), 241-261. doi: 10.2478/v10016-008-0001-7

- Georgeson, J. C., Harris, M. J., Milich, R., & Young, J. (1999). "Just teasing...": Personality effects on perceptions and life narratives of childhood teasing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*(10), 1254-1267.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1177/0146167299258007>
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behaviour*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Gorman, G., & Jordan, C. H. (2015). "I know you're kidding": Relationship closeness enhances positive perceptions of teasing. *Personal Relationships*, *22*(2), 173-187.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1111/pere.12071>
- Guterk, B. A. (1978). On the accuracy of retrospective attitudinal data. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *42*(3), 390-401. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/268462>
- Jones, D. C., Newman, J. B., & Bautista, S. (2005). A three-factor model of teasing: The influence of friendship, gender, and topic on expected emotional reactions to teasing during early adolescence. *Social Development*, *14*(3), 421-439.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2005.00309.x>
- Keltner, D., Capps, L., Kring, A. M., Young, R. C., & Heerey, E. A. (2001). Just teasing: A conceptual analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(2), 229-248.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1037/0033-2909.127.2.229>
- Keltner, D., Young, R. C., Heerey, E. A., Oemig, C., & Monarch, N. D. (1998). Teasing in hierarchical and intimate relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(5), 1231-1247. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1037/0022-3514.75.5.1231>

- Kowalski, R. M. (2004). Proneness to, perceptions of, and responses to teasing: The influence of both intrapersonal and interpersonal factors. *European Journal of Personality, 18*(4), 331-349. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1002/per.522>
- Kruger, J., Gordon, C. L., & Kuban, J. (2006). Intentions in teasing: When "just kidding" just isn't good enough. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(3), 412-425. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1037/0022-3514.90.3.412>
- Lampert, M. D., & Ervin-Tripp, S. (2006). Risky laughter: Teasing and self-directed joking among male and female friends. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(1), 51-72. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.004>
- Mills, C. B., & Carwile, A. M. (2009). The good, the bad, and the borderline: Separating teasing from bullying. *Communication Education, 58*(2), 276-301. <http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1080/03634520902783666>
- Murray, S. L., Rose, P., Bellavia, G. M., Holmes, J. G., & Kusche, A. G. (2002). When rejection stings: How self-esteem constrains relationship-enhancement processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(3), 556-573. <http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1037/0022-3514.83.3.556>
- Olweus, D. (1997). Bully/victim problems in school: Facts and intervention. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 12*(4), 495-510. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1007/BF03172807>
- Pawluk, C. J. (1989). Social construction of teasing. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 19*(2), 145-167. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1989.tb00142.x>

Romero, E. J., & Cruthirds, K. W. (2006). The use of humor in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(2), 58-69.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.5465/AMP.2006.20591005>

Strauss, G. P., & Allen, D. N. (2006). The experience of positive emotion is associated with the automatic processing of positive emotional words. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1(3), 150-159. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760600566016>

Tragesser, S. L., & Lippman, L. G. (2005). Teasing: For superiority or solidarity? *Journal of General Psychology*, 132(3), 255-266.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/10.3200/GENP.132.3.255-266>



**Appendix A**

First we would like to ask you about your current employment.

*Where are you currently employed?* \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix B**

Close Condition Instructions:

*Please think of a co-worker who you interact with on a regular basis who you are closest to.*

*Please write the initials of the co-worker here: \_\_\_\_\_*

Not-close Condition Instructions:

*Please think of a co-worker who you interact with on a regular basis but are NOT close with.*

*Please write the initials of the co-worker here: \_\_\_\_\_*

**Appendix C**

**Please describe how you feel about \_\_\_\_\_ using the scale below for each question.**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	not at all true		somewhat true	moderately true		very true	completely true
1.	I can tell _____ anything.....						_____
2.	_____ and I have a unique bond.....						_____
3.	I feel closer to _____ than to anyone else in my life.....						_____
4.	At times I feel out of touch with _____.....						_____
5.	I would choose to spend time with _____ over anyone else in my life						_____
6.	I feel extremely attached to _____.....						_____

### Appendix D

In this study, we are interested in examining teasing within the workplace. According to psychological research, teasing is a behaviour that is an intentional, but lighthearted provocation (e.g., incitement, annoyance, taunting) directed at another person. For something to be recognized as a tease, the tease should refer to something that is relevant to the person being teased. The teaser, the person who is teasing, tends to use playful markers, such as smiling, winking or nudging to inform the other person that they are “just kidding”. Teasers who use fewer playful markers can send the message that their tease is more hostile and is meant to hurt or humiliate the other person. Therefore, without the playful markers, the teases may be interpreted as bullying. For the purpose of this study, the main focus will be on playful teases, in which it is clear that the teaser is “just kidding”.

Now think of a time in which the co-worker you indicated above teased you in this way.

In the space below, describe the tease by your co-worker. Provide as much detail as you are comfortable with.

---

---

---

---

---

Based on the teasing definition above, what makes you believe your co-worker was teasing you?

---

---

---

---

---

**Appendix E**

Answer the following questions for how you felt right after the tease you previously described involving your co-worker.

Please use the scale provided below.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Agree		Neither agree nor disagree			Extremely Disagree	

I wanted to spend a lot of time with this co-worker I work with. \_\_\_\_\_

I felt very close to this co-worker. \_\_\_\_\_

I felt distant from this co-worker. \_\_\_\_\_

I couldn't be certain that my relationship with this co-worker would continue. \_\_\_\_\_

I wanted to spend less time with this co-worker. \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix F**

Thinking about the situation above, rate the following questions using the scale provided:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

1. How humorous would you say this tease was? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How mean would you say this tease was? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How light-hearted would you say this tease was? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How hurtful would you say this tease was? \_\_\_\_\_
5. How annoying would you say this tease was? \_\_\_\_\_
6. To what extent was the tease given with good intentions? \_\_\_\_\_
7. To what extent did the teaser intend to hurt your feelings with the tease? \_\_\_\_\_
8. To what extent do you think the teaser was “just kidding”? \_\_\_\_\_
9. At the time of the teasing, how important was it that you believed that the teaser was “just kidding”?

### Appendix G

Thinking specifically about what your co-worker said to you in their message. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely Disagree						Completely Agree

1. I felt that my co-worker's message was positively intentioned
2. I felt that my co-worker's message was competitive
3. I felt that my co-worker's goal in their message was to form a friendship or a bond with me
4. I felt that my co-worker was using their message to feel good about themselves
5. I felt that the intention behind my co-worker's message was to motivate me to do my best
6. In my co-worker's message, I felt that he or she had negative intentions towards me
7. I felt that my co-worker was using his or her message to make ME feel good about myself
8. I felt that the goal behind my co-worker's message was to express that he or she was doing the very best that he or she could
9. I felt that my co-worker was trying to be encouraging in his or her message
10. I felt that my co-worker's message was meant to show that he or she was enjoying our interaction
11. I felt that my co-worker was trying to be better than me in his or her message
12. I felt that my co-worker's message was expressing cooperation with me
13. I felt that the point of my co-worker's message was to show that he or she is trying to "beat" me
14. I felt that my co-worker's message was intended to make sure that I had fun
15. In my co-worker's message to me, I felt that he or she was having fun at my expense
16. I felt that my co-worker's message was intended to maintain "harmony" between us

**Appendix H**

We are interested in people's impressions of constrained or "snippets of" communication. Even when interpersonal communication is very short, we believe that people can still form impressions about the communication and the communication partner. Thinking about the brief interaction you had with your co-worker, please answer the following questions with regard to the INTERACTION. Even if you feel you don't have enough information, answer the best that you can.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not At All						Extremely

1. How positive was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How negative was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How comfortable was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How enjoyable was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
5. How fun was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
6. How boring was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
7. How frustrating was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
8. How productive was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
9. How pleasurable was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
10. How relaxed was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
11. How anxiety provoking was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
12. How humorous was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
13. How interesting was your interaction with your co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_
14. This is a calibration item, please select "5" on the scale below. \_\_\_\_\_



### Appendix I

Based on your co-worker that you have thought of throughout this survey, please answer the following questions as honest as possible.

How likely would you be to engage in the following situations with your fellow co-worker:

Meet with this co-worker outside of work?

Strongly agree			Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

Tell this co-worker about a problem you are having at work or outside of work?

Strongly disagree			Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

Take lunch breaks with this co-worker?

Strongly disagree			Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

Work with this co-worker again in the future?

Strongly disagree			Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

Recommend anyone to work with them?

Strongly disagree			Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

Sit with this co-worker during staff meetings?

Strongly disagree			Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

Buy a coffee or tea for this co-worker?

Strongly disagree			Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

Select this co-worker to be on your work team?

Strongly disagree			Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6 7

**Appendix J**

Continuing with your co-worker in mind, answer the following questions to the best of your abilities.

I would give \_\_\_\_\_ an important letter to mail after s/he mentions that s/he is stopping by the post office today.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7

If \_\_\_\_\_ promised to copy a presentation for me, s/he would follow through.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7

If \_\_\_\_\_ and I decided to meet for coffee, I would be certain s/he would be there.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7

I would expect \_\_\_\_\_ to tell me the truth if I asked him/her for feedback on an idea related to my job.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7

If \_\_\_\_\_ was late to a meeting, I would guess there was a good reason for the delay.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7

\_\_\_\_\_ would never intentionally misrepresent my point of view to others.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7

I would expect \_\_\_\_\_ to pay me back if I loaned him/her \$40.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7

If \_\_\_\_\_ laughed unexpectedly at something I did or said, I would know s/he was not being unkind.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7

If \_\_\_\_\_ gave me a compliment on my haircut I would believe s/he meant what was said.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7

If \_\_\_\_\_ borrowed something of value and returned it broken, s/he would offer to pay for the repairs.

Not at all Likely  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      Very Likely  
6                      7