Incivility
Bormann, Marike; Ziegele, Marc

Digital
Communication
Research.de

Abstract: Incivility is considered a significant challenge for democratic discourse and has been the subject of many studies in a variety of contexts. Although political incivility has a long research tradition, and scholarly attention toward the phenomenon has increased with the advance of social media, there is academic controversy regarding the concept and normative implications of incivility in political contexts. This chapter provides an overview of different incivility approaches in the extant literature, discusses key challenges in incivility research, and outlines normative implications. Further, we suggest future directions for incivility research and argue why an integrative, multidimensional concept of incivility offers great potential for incivility research in the field of political (online) communication.

Marike Bormann & Marc Ziegele

Incivility

1   Incivility in political communication—an established yet elusive concept

Incivility has been studied in a variety of contexts, ranging from workplace environments (e.g., Schilpzand et al., 2016) to political contexts (e.g., Jamieson, 2000; Papacharissi, 2004). For this chapter, we focus on incivility in political communication. Incivility in public political discourse is a recurring subject of concern across different countries. Recently, various speakers have feared a decline or even a "crisis of civility" (Boatright et al., 2019). Polls have shown that 68% of Americans think that incivility in political communication is a major social issue. Moreover, most Americans have reported personal encounters with incivility (Weber Shandwick, 2020). Surveys among German online users reveal a similar picture, with 73% of users reporting that they have already been exposed to uncivil or hateful comments (LfM, 2020). Even the German federal president urgently called for more "reason and civility" (Steinmeier, 2019) in online discussions.

Political incivility, similar to the general phenomenon of incivility, has been the subject of many studies in a variety of contexts. These include, for example, incivility in political news articles, political campaigns, and advertising, and in political debates in Congress, television, and radio talk shows or interviews. Studies in this field usually analyze uncivil portrayals of politicians or incivility

in the interactions between political elites, such as politicians, journalists, and experts (e.g., Ben-Porath, 2010; Jamieson, 2000; Mutz & Reeves, 2005). Besides incivility among political elites, scholars have become increasingly interested in studying incivility in online discussions among ordinary citizens on social media platforms or on the websites of traditional news media. Online incivility research has yielded significant output, including findings on the causes, determinants, and patterns of incivility (e.g., Coe et al., 2014; Rossini, 2020), the perceptions of incivility (e.g., Stryker et al., 2016), the effects of incivility (e.g., Rösner et al., 2016), and interventions against incivility (e.g., Kalch & Naab, 2017; Ziegele, Jost et al., 2018).

Although political incivility has a long research tradition and academic attention to the phenomenon has increased with the advance of the Internet, there is academic controversy regarding the concept, theory, operationalization, and normative implications of incivility in political contexts. In the following section, we first provide an overview of different approaches to the phenomenon of political incivility in the extant literature and argue for an integrative, multidimensional concept. We then discuss the challenges of different approaches and outline the normative implications of incivility. Lastly, we argue why an integrative approach offers great potential for incivility research in the field of political (online) communication.

2   Concepts of political incivility

Incivility is a broad phenomenon that encompasses a wide spectrum of communication in offline and online contexts. Owing to its Latin word stem *civis* (citizen) and *civitas* (citizenship), which historically refer to the civic role and the order of the polity (Simpson, 1960), the concept of incivility and much research on incivility explicitly focus on the political sphere and public political communication.

Incivility has a long tradition of research, but scholars are still having trouble finding an agreed-upon conceptual definition and operationalization. Herbst (2010) noted that the decision of where to draw the line between civility and incivility lies "very much in the eye of the beholder" (p. 3). Similarly, Coe and colleagues (2014) stated that "incivility is a notoriously difficult term to define, because what strikes one person as uncivil might strike another person as perfectly appropriate" (p. 660).

Benson (2011) pointed out that civility and incivility "are always situational and contestable" (p. 22). Hence, defining incivility is challenging, and a variety of approaches to the phenomenon can be found. Nevertheless, most definitions—at least implicitly—share the notion that *incivility is a violation of norms.* The majority of scholars approach incivility as a violation of *respect norms*, *democratic norms*, or *politeness norms.* These studies usually refer to normative theories of democracy or politeness theories. Additionally, recent studies have conceptualized incivility as a violation of *multiple norms.* Although these different perspectives are not always entirely clear-cut, it is helpful to briefly outline them in the following sections before proposing a new approach that integrates the different perspectives.

2.1   Incivility as a violation of respect norms

Studies analyzing incivility as a *violation of (deliberative) respect norms* usually refer to normative theories of democracy, mostly deliberation theory. Deliberation theory sketches a public sphere accessible to everyone in which citizens debate matters of public interest in a reciprocal, rational, and respectful manner (Gastil, 2008; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Habermas, 1996). Within this framework, civility is understood as mutual respect between discussants. Thus, studies have often defined incivility as *disrespectful behavior in public discussions* toward other participants, the forum, or specific topics (e.g., Anderson et al., 2014; Coe et al., 2014; Gervais, 2014, 2015; Sobieraj & Berry, 2011). It is important to note that such disrespectful behavior differs from mere disagreement. Disagreement, if voiced respectfully, is an inevitable characteristic of discussions with political opponents and is beneficial for deliberation (Herbst, 2010; Stromer-Galley, 2007). From this perspective, only disagreement (or negativity) combined with disrespect constitutes incivility (e.g., Hwang et al., 2018). Despite partly overlapping definitions, studies analyzing incivility as a violation of respect norms vary regarding their operationalizations of incivility. These operationalizations range from *name-calling*, *emotional displays*, and *ideologically extremizing language* (Sobieraj & Berry, 2011) to *lying* (Coe et al., 2014) and the *use of conspiracy theories* (Gervais, 2014).

2.2   Incivility as a violation of liberal democratic norms

Many scholars have also approached incivility as a *violation of liberal democratic norms* (e.g., Kalch & Naab, 2017; Oz et al., 2018; Papacharissi, 2004; Rowe, 2015). These studies often refer to Papacharissi's (2004) distinction between impoliteness and incivility. According to Papacharissi (2004), many earlier concepts of incivility have, in fact, measured impoliteness, which is "etiquette-related" and something that is not undesirable per se, as "adherence to etiquette [...] frequently restricts conversation" (p. 260), especially in political discussions. The author argued that incivility goes further than impoliteness, threatens democratic norms, and has negative implications for democracy. Consequently, impoliteness and incivility are operationalized differently, with the latter focusing on *threats to democracy*, *threats to individual rights*, and *antagonistic stereotypes*, such as *racism* or *sexism* (Papacharissi, 2004). This approach has since been used by various researchers. Rossini (2020), for example, similarly argued that violations of politeness norms cannot be equated with violations of democratic norms, and that only violations of the latter would be detrimental to democracy. Violations of democratic norms in Rossini's operationalization include discriminatory expressions and threats to individual liberty rights or denial of political participation. Contrary to Papacharissi (2004), however, Rossini defined violations of interpersonal politeness or respect norms as *incivility*, and norm violations that pose a threat to democracy as *intolerance*. Here, we clearly observe some inconsistencies in contemporary concepts of incivility. The resulting challenges will be discussed in more detail below.

2.3   Incivility as a violation of interpersonal politeness norms

Similar to Rossini (2020), various studies have analyzed incivility as a violation of *interpersonal politeness norms* (e.g., Ben-Porath, 2010; Chen & Lu, 2017; Chen & Ng, 2017; Mutz, 2007, 2015; Mutz & Reeves, 2005). These studies draw on politeness theories that deal with the rules of interpersonal interaction in public spaces, such as *social norm approaches* (Fraser, 1990) or *face theory* (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Goffman, 1959). Social norm approaches often follow a Western understanding of etiquette; within this understanding, incivility is usually defined as a

violation of the social norms of politeness for a given culture (e.g., Ben-Porath, 2010; Mutz, 2007; Mutz & Reeves, 2005). Against the backdrop of face theory, researchers have also conceptualized incivility as a threat to people's positive face, which is the socially desired and constructed public identity that people act out during a communication process (e.g., Chen & Lu, 2017; Chen & Ng, 2017). According to these approaches, incivility manifests, among others, in *insults*, *name-calling*, *yelling* (or using capital letters to indicate yelling in online communication), *interruption*, *profanity*, and *vulgarity* (Ben-Porath, 2010; Chen & Lu, 2017; Chen & Ng, 2017; Mutz, 2007; Mutz & Reeves, 2005).

2.4   Incivility as a violation of multiple norms

Contemporary theorizing about incivility has shifted to a constructionist perspective, suggesting that incivility is "multifaceted, individual, and context specific" (Wang & Silva, 2018, p. 73). Consequently, current research often approaches incivility as *perceived violations of multiple norms.* Muddiman (2017), for example, derived from the perceptions of participants in two experiments a two-dimensional model of perceived incivility. In this model, "personal-level incivility" includes violations of interpersonal politeness norms, and "public-level incivility" includes violations of deliberative norms, such as *ideological extremity* and *lack of comity.* Chen (2017) also approached incivility as a perceptual continuum, with impoliteness being on the mild end and hate speech being on the harmful end of the continuum. In their extensive survey, Stryker et al. (2016) found that besides violations of politeness and democratic norms, participants perceived *deception* as a third dimension of incivility. This dimension includes *lies* as well as *misleading* and *exaggerating claims*, which can be considered violations of honesty norms.

2.5   Toward an integrative concept of political incivility

In our own research, we propose a new concept of political incivility that incorporates previous concepts into an integrative framework, while following a bottom-up approach from the perspective of communication participants (Bormann et al., 2021). Based on theories on cooperation, communication, and

norms (e.g., Grice, 1975; Lindenberg, 2015; Tomasello, 2008, 2009), we suggest five communication norms that individuals can disapprove of violating. The five communication norms build on the central aspects of communication, namely, the substantial aspect (content; information), the formal aspect (mode), the temporal aspect (process), the social aspect (actors; relation), and the spatial aspect (context; Bormann et al., 2021; Lasswell, 1948; Schaff, 1962). Violations of the five norms potentially constitute incivility. The *information norm* refers to the substance of the information provided in a discussion. It can be violated when, for example, participants lie, spread conspiracy theories, or communicate misleading, irrelevant information. The *modality norm* concerns the formal aspect of communication and can be violated when participants communicate ambiguously, for example, by using sarcasm. The *process norm* refers to the interconnectedness of contributions and can be violated when, for example, participants deviate from the topic of the discussion or refuse to be responsive. The *relation norm* expresses the expectation of participants to be respectful and polite; it can be violated when, for example, participants use name-calling, insults, or vulgarity. Lastly, the *political context norm* encompasses the normative expectations of participants in political discussions to consider essential liberal democratic principles in their contributions. This norm can be violated when, for example, participants threaten the rights of other individuals, question the democratic constitution, or incite violence against democratic governments or minority groups. In our concept, incivility occurs when participants disapprove of an act of communication as severely violating one or several of these five communication norms.

In summary, it becomes clear that political incivility is a multi-faceted and complex phenomenon. A common denominator of the existing concepts that we can identify is that incivility refers to violations of norms. Depending on the research tradition, these norms include deliberative norms of mutual respect, liberal-democratic norms, or norms derived from politeness research. We also proposed an attempt toward an integrative concept of incivility in political communication. This concept describes incivility as a perceived violation of one or several of five basic communication norms, namely, the information norm, the modality norm, the process norm, the relation norm, and the political context norm. In the following sections, we discuss the challenges and perspectives related to these different approaches to political incivility.

3   Challenges of research on political incivility

3.1   Challenges related to inconsistent definitions and measures

A major challenge in research on political incivility is related to the difficulty of comparing the findings of different studies. Content analyses of online discussions, for example, have reported varying shares of incivility in user comments, ranging from 3% to more than 50% (e.g., Rowe, 2015; Santana, 2014). Some of these variations are clearly due to the fact that studies have analyzed different platforms and topics, among others. Yet, the *operationalizations of incivility* also vary significantly from study to study; thus, different phenomena are studied under the same term. Coe et al. (2014), for example, found that 22% of the user comments posted on a newspaper's website contained incivility, which the authors operationalized as name-calling, vulgarity, aspersion, pejoratives, or lying accusations. Rowe (2015) operationalized these norm violations as impoliteness and found that 32% of the comments posted on a newspaper's Facebook site and 35% of the comments posted on the newspaper's website were impolite. Incivility in terms of the assignment of stereotypes and threats to democracy or individual's rights was only visible in 3% of the Facebook comments and in 6% of the website comments (Rowe, 2015). Similarly, Santana (2014) compared incivility in anonymous and non-anonymous news website comments. Applying a broad operationalization of incivility as personal attacks, threats, vulgarities, abusive, foul, or hateful language, assignment of stereotypes, epithets, ethnic slurs, and racist or bigoted speech, Santana found that up to 53% of the comments were uncivil.

What renders these diverging findings particularly problematic is that they suggest different normative and practical implications for governing online discussion spaces. While policymakers or journalists may conclude that incivility is not a pressing issue based on studies that report low shares of incivility, research that has reported otherwise may justify calls for strong interventions. Future research should thus invest in reaching agreed-upon standardized operationalizations of incivility to increase the comparability of findings and to provide more reliable assessments of the development of incivility over time.

Diverging operationalizations of uncivil behavior are also problematic in experimental research (e.g., Chen & Ng, 2017; Gervais, 2015; Kalch & Naab, 2017; Rösner et al., 2016). Some studies on the effects of incivility, for example, have

operationalized incivility as a unidimensional construct or as a "monolith" (see Masullo in this collection). These studies mingle different types of uncivil behavior, such as name-calling, vulgarity, histrionics, and lies. Consequently, the distinct effects of the different types of incivility cannot be assessed (e.g., Gervais, 2015; Rösner et al., 2016). Yet, the few studies that have investigated people's perceptions of different types of incivility suggest that participants evaluate each type differently in terms of severity (e.g., Muddiman, 2017; Stryker et al., 2016), and that different types of incivility have varying effects on people's behavioral intentions (e.g., Kalch & Naab, 2017). Distinct forms of uncivil behavior should therefore not be viewed and investigated as unidimensional in future studies (see also Masullo in this collection for a similar appeal).

3.2   *Challenges related to the reliable measurement of incivility in content analyses*

As previously mentioned, many studies on political incivility have applied content analyses to investigate the patterns, determinants, and potential consequences of uncivil communication (e.g., Coe et al., 2014; Rowe, 2015; Ziegele, Jost et al., 2018). For these analyses, it is often challenging to achieve satisfactory levels of reliability and external validity for the measures that are used. Some manifestations of incivility, such as name-calling, can easily be recognized by all coders. However, when it comes to more subtle, culture-specific, or context-specific norm violations, such as implicit stereotypes, coders regularly struggle to detect these forms of incivility reliably. Similarly, it is difficult to detect norm violations in online discussions that perpetrators intentionally camouflage to circumvent algorithms and word filters, for example.

Ross et al. (2018) demonstrated that even among researchers who are familiar with incivility-related concepts, there is sometimes low agreement on what should be classified as civil and uncivil. Particularly for subtle norm violations, the coders' individual perceptions, knowledge, and experiences impact whether they classify a speech act as uncivil. Human speech is a rich and complex phenomenon, and so are the potential manifestations of political incivility. Although many studies provide clear coding instructions for various types of incivility, it is challenging or even impossible to consider all or even the most possible manifestations of these types in a coding scheme. Some researchers tackle this problem by coding

only incivility that is measurable on the level of words. This, however, reduces the validity of incivility measures. The problem is no less urgent in automated analyses of political incivility. Previous studies have already applied dictionary-based approaches (e.g., Muddiman & Stroud, 2017) and machine learning (e.g., Su et al., 2018) to study online incivility. Similar to manual content analyses, these methods work best for explicit forms of incivility that are clearly expressed through the use of specific words, such as offensive language or extreme forms of hate speech (e.g., Davidson et al., 2017). Automatically detecting subtle or ambiguous forms of incivility, such as covert racism or sarcasm, is far more challenging, and many automated measures suffer from high rates of misclassification (Stoll et al., 2020).

In understanding incivility as a perceptual construct and accepting that even the work of professional coders in content analyses will be, to some extent, affected by individual biases, we can think about alternative or complementary ways to classify incivility in content analyses. For example, each contribution in online discussions could be checked to determine whether it was visibly disapproved of by other participants. Disapproval here can be expressed, among others, through a sanctioning reply comment. If a comment has been visibly disapproved, coders can analyze it regarding the specific type(s) of norm violations (Bormann et al., 2021). Although this procedure will certainly work only for a small fraction of uncivil contributions, it would account for the fact that incivility is often a matter of the perceptions of the people involved in the respective communication.

3.3   Challenges related to the normative implications of incivility

Normative implications of incivility are controversial among scholars. This can be partly explained by the fact that studies have reported different consequences of incivility. Experimental research, for example, has found various negative effects of being exposed to uncivil content: incivility in political talk shows can reduce viewers' trust in politics and politicians (Mutz & Reeves, 2005). Uncivil online discussions have been found to increase readers' opinion polarization (Anderson et al., 2014), stimulate negative emotions and aggressive cognitions (Gervais, 2015; Rösner et al., 2016), and promote further incivility (Gervais, 2015; Ziegele, Weber et al., 2018). Moreover, uncivil comments can adversely affect the perceived quality of news articles (Prochazka et al., 2018) and increase prejudice

against social minorities (Hsueh et al., 2015). Beyond that, specific types of in-civility, also known as *hate speech* (e.g., Ziegele, Koehler & Weber, 2018; see also Frischlich and Sponholz in this collection), have raised strong concerns among researchers, since these types are often used to further marginalize certain groups. Uncivil attacks against women in online discussions, for example, often aim to silence and exclude them from political discourse (e.g., Chen et al., 2020). However, various studies have also reported beneficial outcomes of incivility; ex-posure to uncivil content can, for example, increase people's interest in politics (Brooks & Geer, 2007) and their intentions to participate politically (Borah, 2014; Chen, 2017; Chen & Lu, 2017).

Taken together, empirical studies analyzing the consequences of incivility ar-rive at different conclusions regarding whether incivility is a good or bad thing. Overall, however, the prevailing claim in public discourse is that incivility is un-desirable and needs to be eliminated (Chen et al., 2019). This claim is not only based on empirical findings but also on prescriptive theories. From a deliberation perspective, for example, incivility is mainly considered as undermining deliber-ative discourse, and from a politeness perspective, it is predominantly assessed as a negative threat to the constructed public self-image of individuals. These prescriptive theories, however, neglect an important argument: just as incivility itself can serve as a tool to silence minorities, calls for civility can also be used as silencing mechanisms (see also Litvinenko in this collection). As of today, vari-ous researchers have argued that democracy can endure heated discussions and that high demands for civil discourse can exclude certain social groups, such as educationally disadvantaged milieus (e.g., Bejan, 2017; Estlund, 2008; Garton Ash, 2016). Therefore, calls for "robust civility" (Garton Ash, 2016) or "mere civility" (Bejan, 2017) are being voiced—a civility that is robust and broad, tolerates dis-agreement, various language styles, and heated discussions.

In a similar vein, a large body of *critical studies* conceive of civility as a set of norms that a powerful elite establishes to suppress marginalized groups. From this perspective, calls for civility mainly serve as an instrument of the powerful to suppress the powerless and reinforce existing power relations and social inequal-ity (e.g., Baez & Ore, 2018; Lozano-Reich & Cloud, 2009; Stuckey & O'Rourke, 2014). According to these studies, the powerful can decide what is considered (un)civil, perform social control, and thus exclude minority voices from political discourse.

When conceptualizing calls for civility as a strategy to exclude and suppress certain groups, the positive implications of incivility emerge. For example, critical studies have acknowledged incivility as an instrument of the powerless to express their identity. From this perspective, incivility is a powerful means of differentiating an oppressor from an oppressed, and thus an out-group from an in-group (e.g., Jamieson et al., 2017). Violations of civility norms can then demonstrate self-assertion and belonging to a marginalized group (e.g., Lozano-Reich & Cloud, 2009; Stuckey & O'Rourke, 2014). Further, marginalized groups can use incivility to draw attention to their problems and fight for their rights. In fact, incivility has been described as the weapon of the powerless (Scott, 1985) and as a strategic instrument of marginalized groups to denounce injustice and seek change. Incivility is then seen as an act of dissent and democratic activism and has important mobilizing functions (Edyvane, 2020; Jamieson et al., 2017). Thus, protest, threats, insults, and several other uncivil expressions against social injustice can sometimes be considered legitimate, and some scholars even plead for an "uncivil tongue" (Lozano-Reich & Cloud, 2009). Other scholars, however, explicitly call for "responsible incivility" (Edyvane, 2020, p. 105). From this perspective, incivility is legitimate only when its positive democratic consequences outweigh the negative ones.

Overall, the normative implications of incivility depend on various factors. An across-the-board evaluation of incivility as something bad seems inappropriate because such an evaluation neglects the sometimes positive effects of incivility and the sometimes legitimate use of an "uncivil tongue" (Lozano-Reich & Cloud, 2009) to fight inequality and injustice. Researchers should, therefore, withstand the temptation to justify the relevance of their own research solely by referring to the destructive effects of incivility. Thereby, they can help to promote a more differentiated perspective on the phenomenon.

4 Towards new perspectives on incivility in political communication

Incivility is a multi-faceted, dynamic, and, partly, elusive phenomenon. What we can say with some confidence is that incivility is mostly situated in the fields of politics and political communication. Moreover, studies are relatively consistent in conceptualizing incivility as a violation of norms, although the specific norms that

incivility violate cover a broad range and include interpersonal politeness norms, deliberative respect norms, liberal democratic norms, and communication norms. Further, an increasing number of studies agree that incivility is a matter of perceptions and, as such, often a violation of multiple norms.

In this chapter, we have outlined various conceptual, methodological, and normative challenges that arise from a multitude of approaches toward incivility. From these challenges, we have derived some potential directions for future research on incivility. More specifically, we recommend developing more consistent operationalizations of incivility, rethinking the ways in which perceived incivility can be measured in content analyses, and broadening the view on when and why incivility is a "good" or "bad" thing.

Despite the challenges related to the concept of incivility, we should not disregard its benefits. Most importantly, by broadly focusing on *norm violations*, incivility resonates with other concepts that investigate specific deviant communicative behaviors, such as *flaming, offensive speech, and hate speech* (see Sponholz and Frischlich in this collection). Compared to other concepts of deviant communication, such as *toxicity* (see Risch in this collection), incivility is a strongly theory-based construct that has a long research tradition. Research has provided far-reaching insights into the causes, patterns, and consequences of incivility in offline and online contexts, and future studies can build on established experiences and measurements. Incivility is also tailored to the analysis of political communication among elites and citizens. At the same time, the concept is flexible enough to be applied to non-political contexts, such as the analysis of social interactions in the workplace.

Nevertheless, to exploit the full potential of the incivility concept, we advocate a broad view of the phenomenon that integrates different previous approaches. More specifically, we sketched a perceptual and multidimensional model of incivility (Bormann et al., 2021). This model is built on fundamental concepts of human cooperation and communication, and includes five communication norms (information, process, modality, relation, and political context) that are largely compatible with the multitude of the norm concepts suggested in previous incivility research. Within our integrative approach, we conceive of incivility as disapproved violations of one or several of these communication norms. This concept offers various benefits for future research. First, although our concept is broad enough to cover most norm violations that previous research has identified, it

does not conceive of incivility as a monolith. Rather, the model specifies different types of norm violations in a distinctive way by systematizing them along the five communication norms. Second, owing to its roots in the fundamental processes of communication and cooperation, the concept can be applied to a variety of contexts, ranging from offline political interactions between politicians to online discussions among citizens. Lastly, the concept is based on perceptions or, more specifically, on the disapproval of those involved in the respective communication. Consequently, our concept allows for a less prescriptive and more differentiated perspective regarding which potential norm violations can actually be considered uncivil in specific contexts.

Social norms have always been in flux and are constantly being renegotiated among citizens and elites. The Internet and the social web have accelerated this development, as currently demonstrated by debates around *political correctness* or canceling culture, to name only a few. In these debates, we observe that the perceptions of civility and incivility clash among different camps and that the perceived civil behavior of one's own camp is disapproved of as uncivil by members of the other camp. Further, various communication and behavior that societies have evaluated as civil back in history may be considered uncivil today. For example, denying women the right to publicly raise their voice on political issues and to participate politically was not considered uncivil a few decades ago but certainly would be today. Similarly, in many societies, the use of racial stereotypes was widely perceived as appropriate for a long time but would today be evaluated as an act of incivility. Since incivility is—and will likely always be—subject to individual perceptions and zeitgeists, future research would benefit from paying more attention to the contexts of uncivil communication, such as time, culture, situation, social groups, or issues, for example. With these arguments in mind, we argue that future incivility research should investigate more comprehensively the circumstances under which different individuals and social groups perceive specific norm violations as civil or uncivil and evaluate them as (democratically) legitimate or harmful. Our multidimensional concept offers a fruitful starting point for such research in that it distinguishes between distinct norm violations, considers individual perceptions and evaluations of communication participants, and is applicable to a wide variety of contexts.

Marike Bormann is a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Social Sciences at the University of Düsseldorf, Germany. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2879-2471

Marc Ziegele is Assistant Professor at the Department of Social Sciences at the University of Düsseldorf, Germany. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2710-0955

References

Anderson, A. A., Brossard, D., Scheufele, D. A., Xenos, M. A., & Ladwig, P. (2014). The "nasty effect:" Online incivility and risk perceptions of emerging technologies. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*(3), 373–387. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12009

Baez, K. L., & Ore, E. (2018). The moral imperative of race for rhetorical studies: on civility and walking-in-white in academe. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 15*(4), 331–336. https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2018.1533989

Bejan, T. (2017). *Mere civility: Disagreement and the limits of toleration.* Harvard University Press.

Ben-Porath, E. N. (2010). Interview effects: Theory and evidence for the impact of televised political interviews on viewer attitudes. *Communication Theory, 20*(3), 323–347. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01365.x

Benson, T. W. (2011). The rhetoric of civility: Power, authenticity, and democracy. *Journal of Contemporary Rhetoric, 1*(1), 22–30.

Borah, P. (2014). Does it matter where you read the news story? Interaction of incivility and news frames in the political blogosphere. *Communication Research, 41*(6), 809–827. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650212449353

Boatright, R., Shaffer, T., Sobieraj, S., & Young, D. G. (Eds.) (2019). *A crisis of civility? Political discourse and its discontents.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351051989

Bormann, M., Tranow, U., Vowe, G., & Ziegele, M. (2021). Incivility as a violation of communication norms: A typology based on normative expectations toward political communication. *Communication Theory.* https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtab018

Brooks, D.J., & Geer, J.G. (2007). Beyond negativity: The effects of incivility on the electorate. *American Journal of Political Science, 51*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00233.x

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness. Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge University Press.

Chen, G. M. (2017). *Online incivility and public debate: Nasty talk.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Chen, G. M., & Lu, S. (2017). Online political discourse: Exploring differences in effects of civil and uncivil disagreement in news website comments. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *61*(1), 108–125. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2016.1273922

Chen, G. M., & Ng, Y. M. M. (2017). Nasty online comments anger you more than me, but nice ones make me as happy as you. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *71*, 181–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.02.010

Chen, G. M., Muddiman, A., Wilner, T., Pariser, E., & Stroud, N. J. (2019). We should not get rid of incivility online. *Social Media and Society*, *5*(3), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119862641

Chen, G. M., Pain, P., Chen, V. Y., Mekelburg, M., Springer, N., & Troger, F. (2020). 'You really have to have a thick skin': A cross-cultural perspective on how online harassment influences female journalists. *Journalism*, *21*(7), 877–895. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884918768500

Coe, K., Kenski, K., & Rains, S. A. (2014). Online and uncivil? Patterns and determinants of incivility in newspaper website comments. *Journal of Communication*, *64*(4), 658–679. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12104

Davidson, T., Warmsley, D., Macy, M., & Weber, I. (2017). Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language. https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.04009

Edyvane, D. (2020). Incivility as dissent. *Political Studies, 68*(1), 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321719831983

Estlund, D. M. (2008). *Democratic authority: A philosophical framework.* Princeton University Press.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(2), 219–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N

Garton Ash, T. (2016). *Free speech: Ten principles for a connected world.* Yale University Press.

Gastil, J. (2008). *Political communication and deliberation.* Sage Publications.

Gervais, B. T. (2014). Following the news? Reception of uncivil partisan media and the use of incivility in political expression. *Political Communication*, *31*(4), 564–583. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2013.852640

Gervais, B. T. (2015). Incivility online: Affective and behavioral reactions to uncivil political posts in a web-based experiment. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics, 12*(2), 167–185. https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2014.997416

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* Doubleday.

Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D.F. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy.* MIT Press.

Herbst, S. (2010). *Rude democracy: Civility and incivility in American politics.* Temple University Press.

Hsueh, M., Yogeeswaran, K., & Malinen, S. (2015). "Leave your comment below": Can biased online comments influence our own prejudicial attitudes and behaviors? *Human Communication Research, 41*(4), 557–576. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12059

Hwang, H., Kim, Y., & Kim, Y. (2018). Influence of discussion incivility on deliberation: An examination of the mediating role of moral indignation. *Communication Research*, *45*(2), 213–240. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215616861

Jamieson, K. H. (2000). *Incivility and its discontents: Lessons learned from studying civility in the US House of Representatives.* Allyn and Bacon.

Jamieson, K. H., Volinsky, A., Weitz, I., & Kenski, K. (2017). The political uses and abuses of civility and incivility. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199793471.013.79_update_001

Kalch, A., & Naab, T. K. (2017). Replying, disliking, flagging: How users engage with uncivil and impolite comments on news sites. *SCM Studies in Communication and Media*, *6*(4), 395–419. https://doi.org/10.5771/2192-4007-2017-4-395

Lasswell, H. D. (1948). The structure and function of communication in society. In L. Bryson (Ed.), *The communication of ideas* (pp. 37–51). Harper and Brothers.

LfM – Landesanstalt für Medien NRW (2020). *Ergebnisbericht der forsa-Befragung zu Hate Speech 2020*. https://www.medienanstalt-nrw.de/fileadmin/user_upload/NeueWebsite_0120/Themen/Hass/forsa_LFMNRW_Hassrede2020_Ergebnisbericht.pdf

Lindenberg, S. (2015). Solidarity: Unpacking the social brain. In A. Laitinen & A.B. Pessi (Eds.), *Solidarity. Theory and practice* (pp. 30–54). Lexington Books.

Lozano-Reich, N. M., & Cloud, D. L. (2009). The uncivil tongue: Invitational rhetoric and the problem of inequality. *Western Journal of Communication, 73*(2), 220–226. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570310902856105

Muddiman, A. (2017). Personal and public levels of political incivility. *International Journal of Communication, 11*, 3182–3202.

Muddiman, A., & Stroud, N. J. (2017). News values, cognitive biases, and partisan incivility in comment sections. *Journal of Communication, 67*(4), 586–609. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12312

Mutz, D. C. (2007). Effects of "In-your-face" television discourse on perceptions of a legitimate opposition. *American Political Science Review, 101*, 621–635. https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305540707044X

Mutz, D. C. (2015). *In-your-face politics: The consequences of uncivil media*. Princeton University Press.

Mutz, D. C., & Reeves, B. (2005). The new videomalaise: Effects of televised incivility on political trust. *American Political Science Review, 99*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055405051452

Oz, M., Zheng, P., & Chen, G. M. (2018). Twitter versus Facebook: Comparing incivility, impoliteness, and deliberative attributes. *New Media & Society, 20*(9), 3400–3419. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817749516

Papacharissi, Z. (2004). Democracy online: civility, politeness, and the democratic potential of online political discussion groups. *New Media & Society, 6*(2), 259–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444804041444

Prochazka, F., Weber, P., & Schweiger, W. (2018). Effects of civility and reasoning in user comments on perceived journalistic quality. *Journalism Studies, 19*(1), 62–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2016.1161497

Rösner, L., Winter, S., & Krämer, N. C. (2016). Dangerous minds? Effects of uncivil online comments on aggressive cognitions, emotions, and behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior, 58*, 461–470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.022

Ross, B., Rist, M., Carbonell, G., Cabrera, B., Kurowsky, N., & Wojatzki, M. (2018). Measuring the reliability of hate speech annotations: The case of the European refugee crisis. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1701.08118.pdf

Rossini, P. (2020). Beyond incivility: Understanding patterns of uncivil and intolerant discourse in online political talk. *Communication Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650220921314

Rowe, I. (2015). Civility 2.0: A comparative analysis of incivility in online political discussion. *Information, Communication & Society*, *18*(2), 121–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.940365

Santana, A. D. (2014). Virtuous or vitriolic: The effect of anonymity on civility in online newspaper reader comment boards. *Journalism Practice, 8*(1), 18–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2013.813194

Schaff, A. (1962). *Introduction to semantics.* Pergamon Press.

Schilpzand, P., Pater, I. E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*(S1), 57–88. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1976

Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. Yale University Press.

Simpson, D. (1960). *Cassell's new Latin dictionary*. Funk and Wagnalls.

Sobieraj, S., & Berry, J. M. (2011). From incivility to outrage: Political discourse in blogs, talk radio, and cable news. *Political Communication, 28*(1), 19–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2010.542360

Steinmeier, F.-W. (2019, May 6-8). Eröffnung der re:publica 2019 [Keynote], Berlin, Germany. https://www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Reden/DE/Frank-Walter-Steinmeier/Reden/2019/05/190506-Eroeffnung-Republica.html

Stoll, A., Ziegele, M., & Quiring, O. (2020). Detecting impoliteness and incivility in online discussions: Classification approaches for German user comments. *Computational Communication Research, 2*(1), 109–134. https://doi.org/10.5117/CCR2020.1.005.KATH

Stromer-Galley, J. (2007). Measuring deliberation's content: A coding scheme. Journal of Public Deliberation, 3(1), Article 12. https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.50

Stryker, R., Conway, B. A., & Danielson, J. T. (2016). What is political incivility? *Communication Monographs, 83*(4), 535–556. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2016.1201207

Stuckey, M. E., & O'Rourke, S. P. (2014). Civility, democracy, and national politics. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs, 17*(4), 711–736.

Su, L. Y. F., Xenos, M. A., Rose, K. M., Wirz, C., Scheufele, D. A., & Brossard, D. (2018). Uncivil and personal? Comparing patterns of incivility in comments on the Facebook pages of news outlets. *New Media & Society, 20*(10), 3678–3699. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818757205

Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of human communication.* MIT Press.

Tomasello, M. (2009). *Why we cooperate*. MIT Press.

Wang, M. Y., & Silva, D. E. (2018). A slap or a jab: An experiment on viewing uncivil political discussions on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior, 81*, 73–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.11.041

Weber Shandwick (2020). Civility in America 2019: Solutions for tomorrow. https://www.webershandwick.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/CivilityInAmerica2019SolutionsforTomorrow.pdf

Ziegele, M., Jost, P. B., Bormann, M., & Heinbach, D. (2018). Journalistic counter-voices in comment sections: Patterns, determinants, and potential consequences of interactive moderation of uncivil user comments. *SCM Studies in Communication and Media, 7*(4), 525–554. https://doi.org/10.5771/2192-4007-2018-4-525

Ziegele, M., Koehler, C., & Weber, M. (2018). Socially destructive? Effects of negative and hateful user comments on readers' donation behavior toward refugees and homeless persons. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 62*(4), 636–653. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2018.1532430

Ziegele, M., Weber, M., Quiring, O., & Breiner, T. (2018). The dynamics of online news discussions: Effects of news articles and reader comments on users' involvement, willingness to participate, and the civility of their contributions. Information, *Communication & Society, 21*(10), 1419–1435. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1324505

Ziegele, M., Quiring, O., Esau, K., & Friess, D. (2020). Linking news value theory with online deliberation: How news factors and illustration factors in news articles affect the deliberative quality of user discussions in SNS' comment sections. *Communication Research, 47*(6), 860–890. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218797884