

WORKPLACE INCIVILITY: SCALE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION¹

İŞYERİ NEZAKETSİZLİĞİ: BİR ÖLÇEK GELİŞTİRME ÇALIŞMASI

Melda Keçeci² - Tülay Turgut³

Geliş Tarihi: 20.06.2017

Kabul Tarihi: 12.02.2018

Abstract: The main purpose of this study is to explain the concept of workplace incivility, which is an underestimated subject in Turkey but a popular one in the international literature and to develop a Turkish incivility scale. Workplace incivility does not intend to harm others but it harms workplace norms and puts a peaceful workplace environment into danger. For this reason, it is an important topic for the business world. In this study, Coworker Incivility Scale and Supervisor Incivility Scale were developed seperately because workplace incivility has two different sources, coworkers and supervisor.

Key words: Workplace incivility, supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, scale development, low intensity deviant behavior

İşyeri Nezaketsizliği: Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması

Özet: Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, Türkiye’de hak ettiği önemi bulmamış bir konu olan işyeri nezaketsizliğini açıklamak ve Türk kültürü için bir nezaketsizlik ölçeği geliştirmektir. İşyerlerinde karşılaşılan nezaketsiz davranışlar, karşı tarafa zarar vermeyi amaçlamasa da işyeri normlarına ve huzurlu bir çalışma ortamının yaratılmasına zarar vermektedir. Bu nedenle de iş dünyası için önem arz etmektedir. Bu çalışmada, işyerinde nezaketsizlik büyük oranda iş arkadaşlarından veya yöneticilerden geldiği için, iş arkadaşı ve yönetici nezaketsizliği olarak iki farklı ölçek geliştirilmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: İş yeri nezaketsizliği, yönetici nezaketsizliği, iş arkadaşı nezaketsizliği, ölçek geliştirme, az yoğunluktaki zararlı davranışlar

INTRODUCTION

The main factor making workplace incivility very crucial in today’s work life is the so-called “incivility spiral” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Uncivil acts of one employee may create a snowball effect and can influence the whole organization because the targets of incivility can easily transform into instigators. When the targets feel the unjust treatment, they feel the need to balance and act uncivilly. If these acts are limited to uncivil acts like ignoring, interrupting or criticizing publicly, they would disturb the climate but they can be tolerated. However, this spiral movement may cause more aggressive actions like rude remarks, maligning insult or even threat of physical attack.

¹ This article is based on a doctoral dissertation.

² Graduate, Marmara University, Department of Business Administration, Sub-department of Organizational Behavior, Istanbul/Turkey, keçeci.melda@gmail.com

³ Associate Professor, Marmara University, Department of Business Administration, Sub-department of Organizational Behavior, tturgut@marmara.edu.tr

One may believe that incivility is a very mild form of counterproductive workplace behavior and these small acts of incivility would not change the performance of the organizations. The research shows the opposite. Porath and Pearson (2013) reported that managers of Fortune 100 companies spend 13% of their time on fallout from the incidences of incivility and 98% of employees in the United States have experienced workplace incivility at least once in their work life moreover half of them experience workplace incivility on a weekly basis.

Aside from all of these negative work outcomes of being the victim of workplace incivility, the witnesses also experience similar outcomes. Although, there are few studies on the witnesses of workplace incivility, even the limited research shows that witnessing uncivil behaviors has negative organizational outcomes like being less helpful, exhibiting less organizational citizenship behaviors and engaging in more dysfunctional behaviors (Pearson & Porath, 2005; Porath & Erez, 2007; Porath & Pearson, 2010). Studies on workplace incivility have increased recently, however there are very few studies in Turkey (Kanten, 2014; Taştan, 2014). The aim of this research is to investigate the concept of incivility in the Turkish culture and the Turkish organizations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Andersson and Pearson (1999, p. 457), workplace incivility means “low intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect”. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others’. When this definition is taken into consideration, workplace incivility can be explained as impolite behaviors and disregard for others in the workplace.

Workplace incivility includes verbal abuse and nonverbal behaviors such as glaring, ignoring, or excluding colleagues (Lim, Cortina, & Magely, 2008). Other examples are eye rolling, checking e-mail during meetings, or showing little interest in another’s opinion (Porath & Pearson, 2010), answering the phone with a “yeah,” neglecting to say thank you or please, using voice mail to screen calls, leaving a half cup of coffee behind to avoid having to brew the next pot, standing uninvited but impatiently over the desk of someone engaged in a telephone conversation, dropping trash on the floor and leaving it for the maintenance crew to clean up, and talking loudly on the phone about personal matters (Martin, 1996).

The most significant part of the definition of workplace incivility is the notion of “ambiguity”. The interpretation of the target defines whether a behavior is incivility or not. The behavior can be easily presumed as instigator’s ignorance or misunderstanding/sensitivity of the target (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

If anyone has doubts about whether workplace incivility deserves to be concerned, the research suggests that workplace incivility may act as a precursor to other forms of workplace violence (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Incivility has been recognized as being “one of the most pervasive forms of antisocial behavior in the workplace” (Cortina, 2008, p.56). Managers of Fortune 100 companies reported that 13% of their time is spent on fallout from the incidences of incivility which means approximately 7 work weeks each year (Porath & Pearson, 2013). The concept of “Incivility Spiral” is based on the fact that “tit-for-tat” exchange of uncivil actions may lead to other forms of aggressive behavior (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). This concept can be explained briefly as following; worker A may act uncivilly to worker B and worker B as uncivilly to worker

A as a part of reciprocation. While these reciprocities continue, the behaviors become harsher and in the end, it may lead to workplace aggression.

The study of Nicholson and Griffin (2015) demonstrates the negative effect of workplace incivility on wellbeing, afterwork recovery experiences (psychological detachment and relaxation) and next-morning recovery level is also apparent. On days when participants experienced incivility, they feel lower situational wellbeing, lower detachment and less recovered the next morning.

Antecedents of Workplace Incivility

Personality

Although there is no single personality profile of those that are likely to engage in deviant behaviors (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998), there are some major personality characteristics that are related to incivility. Negative affect and neuroticism are important traits for the instigator as well as the target. Since individuals high in negative affectivity and neuroticism tend to focus more on negatives (Siomkos, Rao & Narayanan, 2001), they may see workplace as oppressive or unrewarding and when they transfer their negativity to others this results in incivility (Vardi & Weitz, 2004).

The most unique feature of incivility is the concept of *ambiguous intent to harm*. The target cannot be sure whether the instigator is intentionally or accidentally uncivil. This feature makes incivility a matter of perception. According to Affective Events Theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), negative affect (NA) affects one's mood in interpreting events. People who are high in NA react more harshly to negative events than the people low in NA.

Emotional stability is characterized with level-headedness, appropriate emotional reactions, and calmness. In the opposite side of emotional stability lies neuroticism, which refers to anxiety, hostility, and impulsiveness (Barrick & Mount, 1991). People who are high in neuroticism tend to interpret even mild negative events as incivility because even positive events may invoke negative emotions in them (Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995). In other words, worrying, nervousness, insecurity, and self-pity are the basic characteristics of neuroticism and someone high in neuroticism may see incivility in the events that others see innocuousness. This negative relationship between emotional stability and the perception of incivility was also supported by the study of Sliter, Withrow and Jex (2015).

Agreeableness is characterized with courteousness, flexibility, trust, cooperativeness, softheartedness, good-nature, and tolerance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). People, who are low in agreeableness, tend to be argumentative, mistrustful, and skeptical that might cause them to see incivility although it does not exist (Milam et al., 2009). Moreover, because they experience lower levels of positive affect, are usually uncooperative, stubborn and rude, they may provoke incivility and attract uncivil behaviors unintentionally. When people low in agreeableness, behave confrontational and argumentative all the time; their coworkers would react uncivilly (McCrae & Costa, 1987; Sliter et al, 2015).

Extraversion is characterized with sociability, gregariousness, assertiveness, and activity (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Since extraverts experience more positive affect (PA) than the introverts, they also experience the mood states of joyfulness and confidence more often. Moreover, they tend to interpret neutral events as pleasant incidents (Watson & Clark, 1992). Milam and colleagues (2009) showed that there is a negative relationship between extraversion and perceived workplace incivility. The reason is that, even if an extravert is the target of incivility, s/he may not perceive it as incivility because s/he is less likely to notice small breaches of social contracts. However, this relationship was not apparent in the study of Sliter and colleagues (2015). They explain this unexpected result, as people who are high in Positive Affect (PA) may be sensitive to incivility because they have higher standards for how people should treat each other.

Passion for Work

Passion for work is defined as a strong inclination toward an activity that people like, they find important, is self-defining, and in which they invest time and energy. Scholars emphasize a dualistic model of passion for work: obsessive passion and harmonious passion (Forest et al., 2012). Some people feel passion for work because it is fun and developmental while others believe that it fosters the admiration of coworkers or their self-esteem is based upon their performance (Mageau, Carpentier & Deci, 2011). It is easy to understand that if one loves his/her job with obsessive passion; s/he would act uncivil when his/her status is jeopardized (Porath, Overbeck, & Pearson, 2008). The research by Birkeland and Nerstad (2015) showed that obsessive passion for work is positively related to incivility instigation.

Status

Supervisors are usually the main source of incivility and it is the least likely to experience incivility from subordinates. Because of the power difference, subordinates are reluctant to reciprocate (Lim & Lee, 2011; Porath & Pearson, 2012). At the same time, since employees pay more attention to the behaviors of their superiors, they are more sensitive to their potentially uncivil behaviors.

Being in a subordinate position may increase the possibility of facing uncivil behavior from supervisors because workplace incivility may function as a means of asserting power (Cortina et al., 2001). Research also supports this argument. Keashly, Trott, and MacLean (1994) reported that while 57.8% of their research participants identify instigators of abuse as supervisors, only 37.7% as coworkers. In their study, Lim and Lee (2011) investigated the main source of incivility and the results showed that respondents reported more incidents of incivility from supervisors, followed by coworkers and subordinates. In other words, employees are more likely to be mistreated by the ones possessing higher status at work.

Gender

Pearson and Porath (2005) stated that when they started their research, they thought characteristically vulnerable people would be more likely to be the targets of incivility: a newcomer to the organization, someone young or female. However, they found out that gender and age have minimal effect on being the target of incivility. Although men are more likely to be instigators, they are also just as likely to be targets of incivility as women.

Workplace Climate and Leader

Cortina (2008) has noted that “leaders set the tone for the entire organization, and employees look to them for cues about what constitutes acceptable conduct” (p.62). Managers establish clear norms and by correcting or punishing offenders, they make the norms durable. They set examples by their behaviors and reactions to incivility. In order to eliminate incivility, they should be proactive and show that uncivil behaviors would not be tolerated. Otherwise, the workplace would be informal and lack of clear norms makes room for incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

The study of Harold and Holtz (2015) is very significant in explaining the role of leaders on work incivility. They claim that managers displaying a passive leadership style are less likely to define and clarify the expected behaviors for their employees, they usually have the “whatever” mentality and they do not take proactive steps when needed. In addition to this, they may simply ignore the uncivil behaviors because they are ambiguous and low intense.

Stress and Technology

Although workplace is characterized with formal and respectful behaviors, many scholars have found out that these behaviors are changing due to increased employee diversity, changes in management, downsizing, budget cuts, autocratic work environment, increased workloads and lack of communication (Baron & Neuman, 1996; Chen & Eastman, 1997). Organizational stress may occur when downsizing leads to overwork for the remaining employees or financial difficulties leads to pay freezes, and eventually this stress may lead to increased incivility (Baron & Neuman, 1998; Johnson, 2001). Baron and Neuman (1996) found that the greater the perceived changes, the greater the reported frequency of workplace aggression. In the research of Pearson, Andersson and Porath (2000), participants reported that improved technologies, such as voice mail, e-mail, and teleconferencing have changed the atmosphere of the workplace, and because of the workload they have no time to be nice and polite to others. Using increased number of part-time and temporary workers cause weaker connections to the organization and in return it contributes to workplace incivility. It is also cited in the study that in flat organizations, employees feel less pressure to obey the norms of business behaviors.

Outcomes of Workplace Incivility

Incivility has been recognized as being one of the most pervasive forms of antisocial behavior in the workplace (Cortina, 2008). Being the target of workplace incivility evokes negative emotions like anger, fear and sadness (Porath & Pearson, 2005). Targets that experience stronger perceived impact of incivility are more likely to experience greater anger, fear and sadness. Anger may show itself as direct or indirect aggression; fear as covert and displaced negative behavior like indirect aggression, displacement, absenteeism, and exit; and sadness as withdrawal and absenteeism. Targets of lower status that experienced greater fear are the most likely to be absent and to exit. Status is important for sadness as well while targets of lower status that experience greater sadness are the most likely to be absent and to exist.

Supporting such arguments, there are other studies showing that uncivil work place experiences are associated with negative work outcomes like reduced job satisfaction and increased job withdrawal, negative mood, cognitive distraction, and fear, employee psychological and physical health (Barling, 1996; Barling, Rogers, & Kelloway, 2001; Cortina et al., 2001; Harold & Holtz, 2015; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Lim et al., 2008; Miler, Settles, and Pratt-Hyatt, 2012).

Experiencing incivility is associated with lower energy levels, higher levels of negative affect, lower levels of positive affect, lower task performance, and lower task engagement (Giumetti & Hatfield, 2013). Pearson and colleagues (Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000; Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001) found that targets of incivility often experienced negative reactions at work and many eventually quit their jobs. Cortina and colleagues (2001, 2002) also showed direct links between incivility and lower job satisfaction. Moreover, a number of studies have found that dissatisfaction with the job predicts various job withdrawal behaviors, including turnover and retirement (e.g., Hanisch & Hulin, 1990; 1991). When employees want to restore justice because they feel a threat to their identity, incivility may reach to the tipping point and move to a different phase: desire for revenge, a form of antisocial behavior in retaliation (Aquino and Douglas, 2003).

Lim, Cortina and Magley (2008) suggested that experience with personal incivility has a direct negative impact on job satisfaction, which in turn affects turnover intentions and mental health, which in turn affects physical health. Porath and Pearson (2013) found that 66% of the incivility targets experience reduced job performance, 79% reduced levels of commitment, 38% intentionally decreased the quality of their work, and 48% intentionally reduced their work effort.

Employees, who experience incivility at work, usually feel like being treated unfairly and in return they experience less satisfaction with their supervisors and coworkers (Lim & Lee, 2011). However, although employees experience less incivility from their coworkers, it is more effective on lower levels of perceived fairness and increased depression. This may mean that since coworkers have the same status, they become more concerned. Moreover, this study showed that dissatisfaction is directly associated with the relevant instigator, which means supervisor incivility is negatively related to supervisor satisfaction and coworker incivility is negatively related to coworker satisfaction.

One of the most important things for incivility is the fact that even witnessing incivility has negative impacts on employees. Witnesses of incivility perform less well on complex and creative tasks. They are also less likely to be helpful, exhibit citizenship behaviors and more likely to engage in dysfunctional ideation (Pearson & Porath, 2005; Porath & Erez, 2007; Porath & Pearson, 2010).

THE NEED FOR A LOCAL INCIVILITY SCALE

Researchers working on workplace incivility mostly use Cortina et al.'s (2001) Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS). This uni-dimensional scale consists of seven items, and the respondents are asked to rate the frequency of the workplace incivility that they have faced during the preceding 5 years. Despite its high preference frequency by the researchers, using this scale has some disadvantages. First of all, its uni-dimensional structure does not let the researcher to differentiate the uncivil behaviors coming from the different elements of the organization. In other words, supervisor incivility and coworker incivility may have different behavioral forms. Another disadvantage is the fact that using this scale may put aside the cultural differences. WIS was developed and validated in the United States, which is a highly individualistic country.

However, using it in a more collectivist country like Turkey may not be appropriate to represent behaviors perceived as uncivil in a collectivist culture.

In the present study, a more comprehensive set of items, which also reflect the culture of the country, were developed in order to make a reliable and valid measure of workplace incivility. Contrary to the WIS, this instrument is aimed to split up supervisor incivility and coworker incivility. With the two sets of instruments, researcher would be able to distinguish the instigators of workplace incivility, and find more effective recommendations to overcome the negative effects of workplace incivility.

ITEM GENERATION AND SCALE DEVELOPMENT

In developing the Uncivil Workplace Behavior Questionnaire (UWBQ), the most important issue was to understand what incivility means for different people, and what are the examples of uncivil behaviors that are considered as incivility. For this purpose, an open-ended questionnaire was formed. In this form, participants were provided with a working definition of incivility, which is the definition of Turkish Language Association (TDK). Participants were asked to give examples of uncivil behaviors they face in the workplace. This open-ended questionnaire was sent by email to 65 working people in different ranks and industries. The participants were reached through snowball method. First of all, the open-ended questionnaire was sent to nine people and they were asked to send the questionnaire to at least five of their working friends. The open-ended questionnaire were sent in January 2016 and it took 3 weeks to finalize the questionnaire.

All of the participants are university graduates working in private sector. 49 of them responded and 196 uncivil workplace behavior examples were provided in total. The similar items were grouped, and irrelevant items were eliminated. 29 items were repeated more than twice and 59 items were irrelevant (e.g., Not replacing the empty toilette paper, always complaining, insisting the shuttle to leave early, using many abbreviations on emails, eating stinky food in the workplace, etc.) After elimination, 51 items were left.

The items of three workplace incivility questionnaires in the literature by Cortina et al. (2001), Martin and Hine (2005), and Taylor (2010) were compared to the items generated from answers given to an open-ended questionnaire. The similar items were grouped. If an item was mentioned both in the open-ended questionnaire and at least one of the three incivility scales, this item was directly accepted. 14 items were directly added to the main scale. After adding these 14 items, 37 items from the open-ended questionnaire were left. A group of organizational behavior experts were consulted in order to finalize the questionnaire. According to their consultation, the items were reviewed again and 21 of the items were eliminated. The reasons behind this elimination were irrelevance and similarity. Although some of these items were repeated more than once, they were still irrelevant (e.g., not holding the door for the person coming from behind, using common places recklessly, and exceeding the lunch cue). In addition to this, although some items were different, the inner meaning was very similar (e.g., answering the questions that are directed someone else and getting involved to every conversation although s/he is not addressed and s/he is not an expert). In the end, a questionnaire of 30 items is generated. There were 14 items that were similar in the open-ended questionnaire items and at least one of the incivility scales in the literature. Other 16 items were selected among the rest of the open-ended questionnaire items according to the number of repetition and relevance.

The next step was distinguishing supervisor incivility and coworker incivility. In order to make a more objective distinction, these 30 items were sent to 55 participants via internet. The participants were asked to decide the source of the uncivil behavior: supervisor, coworker, both supervisor and coworker, none of them. The survey link was sent to nine people first and they were asked to send the survey link to at least five people. All the participants are university graduates and working in private sector. The results were evaluated according to the majority of the answers. 50% was set as threshold. Majority of the participants decided that neither the supervisor nor the coworker would be the source of the four items. One of them mentioned only in the open-ended questionnaire (Does not say good morning, good afternoon, bon appetite, etc.) Other three items were mentioned both in the open ended questionnaire and the incivility scale by Martin and Hine (2005). 58% - 74% of the participants stated that these items belong neither to the supervisor nor the coworker. For this reason, the mentioned items were eliminated. 46% of the participants decided that one of the items belong to coworker incivility. Although it is below the threshold, the item was mentioned in the incivility scale of Martin and Hine (2005) and it was quite close to the majority threshold. For this reason, it was included.

At the end of this step, Supervisor Incivility Scale (SIS) and Coworker Incivility Scale (CIS) were generated. Supervisor Incivility Scale (SIS) consists of 22 items; 12 items (e.g. Criticizes in front of other for no reason) are only mentioned in the open-ended questionnaire and 10 items (e.g. Does not accept his/her mistakes and does not apologize) are also mentioned in other incivility scales. Coworker Incivility Scale (CIS) consists of 15 items; eight items (e.g. Continues to use his/her mobile and notebook during the meetings) are only mentioned in the open-ended questionnaire and seven items (e.g. Uses others' belongings without permission) are also mentioned in other incivility scales. At the end of every step, an expert group consisting of three organizational psychologists evaluated the processes.

Pilot Study

In order to determine the reliability and the validity of the scales, a pilot study was conducted. The validity of the scales were tested through calculation of correlation coefficients with job satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction and coworker satisfaction based on the evidence of significant relationship between incivility and those concepts in the literature. The link of the survey was sent to nine people first and they were asked to send it at least five others. Participants were e-mailed a short invitation letter and the link of the online questionnaire. 41 of them responded, and reliability and correlation analyses were conducted based on this data. The participants were all working in the private sector. 88% of the participants were female and 12% of were male. All participants were at least university graduates while 5% (2 of them) had master's degree as well. In terms of their geographic distribution, the majority reported that they were working in Istanbul (82.9%) but employees from other cities of Turkey like İzmir (2.4%), Amasya (2.4%), Ankara (2.4%), Antalya (2.4%), Çanakkale (2.4%), Gaziantep (2.4%) and Yalova (2.4%) also took part in the study. The youngest participant was 22 years old, the oldest one was 35 years old, and the mean age was 27.29. The minimum tenure of the participants was one year, the maximum tenure was 13 years, and the mean tenure was 5.04 years. 34.14% of the participants had female supervisors while the rest of them had male supervisors. As mentioned in the below table, the reliability results of all scales are above the acceptable value .70 (Table 1). Pearson correlation analysis revealed that the strength of correlations of

supervisor and coworker incivility with job, supervisor and coworker satisfaction ranges from weak to moderate and in the expected direction (correlations range from .14 to .61).

Table 1: Descriptives of Pilot Study

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Supervisor Incivility	41	2.73	.967	.94
Coworker Incivility	41	2.87	.885	.91
Job Satisfaction	39	3.85	.895	.82
Supervisor Satisfaction	41	3.71	1.307	.95
Coworker Satisfaction	41	4.80	.574	.78

The Main Study

The sample was composed of 200 participants for the coworker incivility study and 196 participants for supervisor incivility study. The data was collected by a research company with nearly 2 million research database in Istanbul since the number of the sampling was high and their qualifications were very specific. All data was collected by trained and experienced research assistants via telephone. All telephone interviews were recorded and all the answers were coded during the conversations. The company was briefed to collect two different data set; one for investigating coworker incivility and one for supervisor incivility. They were asked to find a sampling balanced in gender, at least university graduates, working as white-collars in retail. The analyses were conducted and presented separately for coworker incivility and supervisor incivility. The demographics of both data sets are also presented separately.

Tablo 2: Demographic Information

		Coworker Incivility	Supervisor Incivility
Gender (%)			
	Female	110 (55%)	105 (53.6%)
	Male	90 (45%)	91 (46.4%)
Age			
	M	35.67	36.21
	SD	6.21	6.83
	Minimum	23	22
	Maximum	55	61
Tenure			
	M	13.15	13.42
	SD	7.1	7.70
	Minimum	1	1
	Maximum	35	43
Education level (%)			
	High school	1(5%)	2 (1%)
	University	165 (82.5%)	154 (78.6%)
	Post graduate	34 (17%)	40 (20.4%)

Gender of supervisor(%)

Female	54 (27%)	56 (28.6%)
Male	146 (73%)	140 (71.4%)

Factor Structure and Reliability of the Scales

Factor analysis was run for coworker and supervisor incivility scales separately. The factor analyses are carried out using principal components analysis with varimax rotation. The coefficient was suppressed for the absolute value lower than .40 and the items loading under .40 were not included in the analysis.

Coworker Incivility Scale

In this scale, only one item loaded under .40 (no.12. Answers the questions that are directed to others and does not let the addressed person to answer). Two more items were removed (no.2. Takes others' belongings without permission and no.4. Does not look in the eye during a conversation) because they were loaded under two factors at the same time.

After elimination of three items, 12 items were loaded into two factors as shown in Table 3. The first factor is named as "Malicious Interruption" and the second factor is named as 'Ignorant Interruption'. The first factor is composed of items like interruption, depreciation, gossiping, speaking loudly, etc. In the incidences of incivility, the intention is not always clear; however, all these items are intentional acts of incivility and the intention is suppressing others and aggrandizing himself/herself. The second factor is composed of items like ignoring others, being late, not taking others seriously, not bringing the borrowed items back, etc. These acts of incivility can be excused as being very busy, disoriented or tired. There is no apparent intention of being uncivil; the instigator is just ignorant of others. These two factors account for 50.02% of the variance in Coworker Incivility. The scale fulfills the necessary conditions in terms of KMO scores (higher than .50 and close to 1.), anti-image correlations (higher than .50) and Bartlett's test of sphericity (significant at .05 level). The reliability scores are .79 for Malicious Interruption and .79 for Ignorant Interruption.

Table 3: Factor Structure and Reliability of Coworker Incivility Scale

Items	Loading	Variance Exp. (%)	Cr. Alpha
Factor 1: Malicious Interruption		25.64%	.79
Depreciates others	.82		
Interfere others' field of expertise even if s/he is not an expert	.66		
Speaks loudly on the phone or face-to-face	.63		
Interrupts others speeches	.62		
Gossips	.60		
Continues to work on the computer during a conversation	.43		
Factor 2: Ignorant Interruption		24.38%	.79

Does not take any responsibility in team work	.79		
Does not bring borrowed items back	.78		
When s/he sees you in the corridor, ignores you and does not say "hi"	.59		
Does not listen to others and does not take what they say into consideration	.57		
Continues to use his/her computer and mobile during meetings	.52		
Comes late to the meetings	.51		
Total explained	50.02%		
KMO Measure of sampling adequacy: .878	Bartlett's	773.418	
Sd: 66	p value	.000	

Reliability value of Coworker Incivility is .86 while the mean value of coworker incivility is 2.34, mean value of Malicious Interruption is 2.58 and Ignorant Interruption is 2.11.

Supervisor Incivility Scale

In this scale, five items were removed (no.6. Continues to use his/her mobile and computer during business meetings, no. 19. Does not inform participants while planning or canceling a meeting, or makes short notice briefing, no.17. Does not return calls and emails or returns late, no.5. Comes late to meetings and no.11. Answers the questions that are directed to others and does not let the addressed person to answer) because they were loaded two factors at the same time, and one item was removed (no.3. When s/he sees you in the corridor, ignores you and does not say "Hi") because it was the only item in the factor.

After elimination of six items, 16 items were loaded into three factors as shown in Table 26. These three factors account for 56.6% of the variance in Supervisor Incivility. The scale fulfills the necessary conditions in terms of KMO scores (higher than .50 and close to 1.), anti-image correlations (higher than .50) and Bartlett's test of sphericity (significant at .05 level). The reliability scores are .91 for F1, .61 for F2 and .50 for F3. The reliability scores of F2 and F3 are below the threshold of .70, however, F2 is composed of 3 items and in social sciences, .60 reliability is acceptable in case of low number of items. For this reason, F2 will be included in further analyses while F3 will not.

Like the coworker incivility scale, the first factor is named as "Malicious Interruption" and the second factor is named as 'Ignorant Interruption". The first factor is mostly composed of intentional acts of incivility like ordering, depreciating, scolding, and interfering. The second factor is mostly composed of unintentional acts of incivility like continuing work or not looking in the eye. These acts of incivility can be excused as being very busy, disoriented or tired and there may be no apparent intention of being uncivil.

Table 4: Factor Structure and Reliability of Supervisor Incivility Scale

Items	Loading	Variance Exp. (%)	Cr. Alpha
-------	---------	-------------------	-----------

Factor 1: Malicious Interruption	34.2%	.91
Says requests as an order	.76	
	.75	
Constantly calls and harasses to make his job done		
Depreciates others	.75	
Does not take others options seriously	.73	
Interferes others' field of expertise even if s/he is not an expert	.71	
	.67	
Criticizes in front of others for no apparent reason		
Interrupts others speeches	.66	
Asks for last minute jobs or changes	.66	
Speaks loudly on the phone or face-to-face	.61	
Scolds others	.60	
Takes a decision that needs to be taken collectively, alone	.57	
Factor 2: Ignorant Interruption	12.43%	.61
Does not look in the eye during a conversation	.78	
Continues to use his/her computer and mobile during meetings	.76	
Does not recognize well done jobs	.56	
Factor 3:	9.97%	.50
Does not care about special days of his/her subordinates (Does not say "Happy birth day" or "Get well soon")	.87	
Does not apologize	.50	
Total explained	56.6%	
KMO Measure of sampling adequacy: .92	Bartlett's:	1265,573
Sd: 120	p value:	.000

Reliability value of Supervisor Incivility is .90 while the mean value of supervisor incivility is 2.21, mean value of Malicious Interruption is 2.19 and Ignorant Interruption is 2.26.

In order to determine the convergent validity of the supervisor and coworker incivility scales, the correlations with job, supervisor and coworker satisfaction were taken into consideration. As can be seen from Table 5 and Table 6, supervisor incivility correlates moderately with job and supervisor satisfaction. Similarly, coworker incivility correlates moderately with job and coworker satisfaction. These results support the convergent validity of the scales.

Table 5: The Correlation Coefficients Among Coworker Incivility and Satisfaction Types

N	Cow Incivility	Malicious Inter	Ignorant Inter.
---	----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Malicious Interruption	2.58	.91**		
Ignorant Interruption	2.11	.90**	.65**	
Coworker Satisfaction	4.98	-.36**	-.33**	-.33**
Job Satisfaction	4.58	-.21**	-.24**	-.14*

Table 6: The Correlation Coefficients Among Supervisor Incivility and Satisfaction Types

	N	Super. Incivility	Malic. Interr.	Ignor. Interr.
Malicious Interruption	2.19	.98**		
Ignorant Interruption	2.26	.69**	.52**	
Supervisor Satisfaction	4.67	-.61**	-.61**	-.37**
Job Satisfaction	4.70	-.55**	-.56**	-.32**

**Correlation is significant at .01 level (two-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at .05 level (two-tailed)

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, Coworker Incivility Scale (CIS) and Supervisor Incivility Scale (SIS) were analyzed twice in order to test the reliability scores. Both of them proved that the reliabilities are over .85 (In pilot study, CIS is .91, SIS is .94. In main study, CIS is .86 and SIS is .90). The content validity of the scale was tested by the views of experts and comparing the items with the most commonly used scales in the literature. Moreover, the support was obtained for the convergent validity of the scales based on the correlations with satisfaction types. It could be claimed that these new scales have the properties of reliability and validity, yet further research are needed with larger samples composed of different characteristics. For this reason, further researches on this topic would contribute to these scales as well.

One can argue that workplace incivility is a problem of the Western nations, since independence, personal distinctness, and individual gain more common in the West (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) and they can easily lead to uncivil behaviors in the workplace. Research shows that culture is important and collectivism influences incivility in a negative way. In other words, a higher level of collectivism is associated with a lower level of incivility (Liu, Chi, Friedman, & Tsai, 2009). Since people with a high level of collectivism are more attentive to others' needs than those with a low level of collectivism, they would less prone to behave uncivilly. By contrast, people with a low level of collectivism are less attentive to the concerns of other parties, and thus less likely to perceive a lower possibility of social sanctions for incivility when pursuing personal goals (Liu, Chi, Friedman, & Tsai, 2009). However, recent research investigated that it is also a problem of eastern cultures (Lim & Lee, 2011).

This study also supports that incivility is not the problem of West but the whole business world and it deserves to be investigated deeply. According to the analyses, the mean value of coworker incivility is 2.34 and the mean value of supervisor incivility is 2.21. For the pilot study, they are even higher (2.87 for CIS and 2.73 for SIS). The data of the pilot study was collected from friends or friends of friends. For this reason, they could have felt more secure and more sincere when

they were answering the questions on incivility. However, in the main study, the data was collected via phone by professionals, so the respondents might not feel very comfortable when they are answering some negative questions about their coworkers and supervisors which leads to lower mean scores. This is also an area needs further investigation. Turkey is now a much more individualistic country than 50 years ago, especially big cities like İstanbul, İzmir and Ankara. In order to understand the incivility level, this study could be repeated in different cities.

While workplace incivility tends to be characterized as a less intense form of harm, it is still a form of counterproductive work behavior and since it is difficult to be recognized and named, it is more common, the outcomes for organizations and individuals can be very serious. Most importantly, incivility can be the culture of the organization, which leads to unfriendly, rude, paranoid, cliquish and stressful work environment. It can reduce cooperation and mutual understanding, and increase feelings of isolation and alienation (Vickers, 2006).

The main responsible of preventing uncivil behaviors and an uncivil organizational culture is the leader. When the leader fails to intervene the uncivil behaviors, the incivility spiral may start. Another effect of the leader is that, when managers fail to intervene uncivil behaviors, other employees may infer that such behaviors are tolerated as Bandura (1965) highlighted in Social Learning Theory and they become careless in their own behaviors. Ultimately, this leadership style may foster an uncivil workplace climate. For this reason, the leaders and power holders most of whom underestimate low intensity deviant behaviors, needs to be informed about the outcomes of workplace incivility. Only after then, they could be alert for these behaviors and intervene to stop the incivility spiral.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 452-471.
- Aquino, K., & Douglas, S. (2003). Identity threat and antisocial behavior in organizations: The moderating effects of individual differences, aggressive modeling, and hierarchical status. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 90(1), 195-208.
- Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of models' reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 1(6), 589.
- Barling, J. (1996). Prediction, experience, and consequences of violence. In G. R. VandenBos & E. Q. Bulatao (Eds.), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions* (pp.29-49). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Barling, J., Rogers, G., & Kelloway, E. K. (2001). Behind closed doors: In-home workers' experience of sexual harassment and workplace violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 255-269.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 161-173.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1998). Workplace Aggression – The Iceberg Beneath the Tip of Workplace Violence: Evidence on its Forms, Frequency, and Targets. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 21, (4), 446-464.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.

- Birkeland, I.K. & Nerstad, C. (2016). Incivility is (not) the very essence of love: passion for work and incivility instigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21, 77-90.
- Brief, A. P., Butcher, A. H., & Roberson, L. (1995). Cookies, disposition, and job attitudes: The effects of positive mood-inducing events and negative affectivity on job satisfaction in a field experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 62(1), 55-62.
- Chen, C. C., & Eastman, W. (1997). Toward a civic culture for multicultural organizations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 33, 454-470.
- Cortina, L.M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management*, 56(4), 1199-1219.
- Cortina, L.M., Lonsway, K.A., Magley, V.J., Freeman, L.V., Collinsworth, L.L., Hunter, M., and Fitzgerald, L.F. (2002). What's gender got to do with it? Incivility in the federal courts. *Law and Social Inquiry*, 27(2), 235-270.
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 64-80.
- Forest, J., Mageau, G. A., Crevier-Braud, L., Bergeron, É., Dubreuil, P., & Lavigne, G. L. (2012). Harmonious passion as an explanation of the relation between signature strengths' use and well-being at work: Test of an intervention program. *Human Relations*, 65, 1233–1252.
- Giumetti, G. W. and Hatfield, A.L. (2013). What a rude e-mail! Examining the differential effects of incivility versus support on mood, energy, engagement, and performance in an online context. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 18(3), 297-309.
- Hanisch, K. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1991). General attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An evaluation of a causal model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39(1), 110-128.
- Harold, C. M. & Holtz, B. C. (2015). The effects of passive leadership on workplace incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36, 16-38.
- Johnson, P. R. (2001). Rudeness at Work: Impulse Over Restraint. *Public Personnel Management*, 30, (4), 457-466.
- Kanten, P. (2014). İşyeri Nezaketsizliğinin Sosyal Kaytarma Davranışı ve İşten Ayrılma Niyeti Üzerindeki Etkisinde Duygusal Tükenmenin Aracılık Rolü. *Aksaray Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 6(1), 11-26.
- Keashley, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 341-357.
- Lim, S., Cortina, L.M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 95-107.
- Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 483–496.
- Lim, S., & Lee, A. (2011). Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: does family support help? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16 (1), 95-111.
- Liu, W., Chi, S. S., Friedman, R., and Tsai, M. (2009). Explaining incivility in the workplace: The effects of personality and culture. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 2(2), 164-184.
- Mageau, G. A., Vallerand, R. J., Charest, J., Salvy, S.-J., Lacaille, N., Bouffard, T., & Koestner, R. (2009). On the development of harmonious and obsessive passion: The role of

- autonomy support, activity specialization, and identification with the activity. *Journal of Personality*, 77, 601–646.
- Martin, J. (1996). *Miss Manners rescues civilization*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Martin, R. J. & Hine, D. W. (2005). Development and validation of the uncivil workplace behavior questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 477.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Milam, A. C., Spitzmueller, C., & Penney, L. M. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 58-69.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81–90.
- Miler, K. N., Settles, I. H., and Pratt-Hyatt, J. S. (2012). Experiencing incivility in organizations: The buffering effects of emotional and organizational support. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(2), 340-372.
- Nicholson, T & Griffin, B. (2015). Here today but not gone tomorrow: Incivility affects after-work and next-day recovery. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(2), 218-225
- Pearson, C. M. & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for “nice”? Think again. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1) 7-18.
- Pearson, C., Andersson, L., & Porath, C. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(2). 123-137.
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). Workplace incivility. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 177–200). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., and Wegner, J.W. (2001). When workers flout convention: a study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations*, 54(11), 1387-1419.
- Porath, C. L. & Erez, A. (2007). Does rudeness really matter? The effects of rudeness on task performance and helpfulness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1181-1197.
- Porath, C. L., Overbeck, J. R., & Pearson, C. M. (2008). Picking up the gauntlet: How individuals respond to status challenges. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 1945–1980.
- Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for “nice”? Think again. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), 7-18.
- Porath, C. & Pearson, C. (2010). The cost of bad behavior. *Organizational Dynamics*, 39(1), 64-71.
- Porath, C. & Pearson, C. (2012). Emotional and behavioral responses to workplace incivility and the impact of hierarchical status. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42, 326-357.
- Porath, C., & Pearson, C. (2013). *The price of incivility*. *Harvard Business Review*, 91, 114–121, 146.
- Robinson, S. L., & Greenberg, J. (1998). Employees Behaving Badly. In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (vol. 5, pp. 1-30). New York: Wiley.
- Siomkos, G. J., Rao, S. S., & Narayanan, S. (2001). The Influence of Positive and Negative Affectivity on Attitude Change Toward Organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16, (1), 151-161.

- Sliter, M., Withrow, S. & Jex, S. M. (2015). It happened or you thought it happened? Examining the perception of workplace incivility based on personality characteristics. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 22(1), 24-45.
- Taştan, S. (2014). İşyeri Nezaketsizliğini Öngören Örgütsel ve Durumsal Önceller ile Çalışanların Davranışsal Sonuçları Arasındaki İlişkinin ve Sosyo - Psikolojik Kaynakların Rolünün İncelenmesi: Sağlık Kurumlarında Yapılan Bir Araştırma. *"İşGüç" Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi* 16(3), 60-75
- Taylor, S. G. (2010). *Cold looks and hot tempers: Individual-level effects of incivility in the workplace* (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in The EJ Ourso College of Business Administration Rucks Department of Management by Shannon G. Taylor BS, Bradley University).
- Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehavior in Organizations: Theory, Research and Management*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Vickers, M. H. (2006). Writing what's relevant: Workplace incivility in public administration-A wolf in sheep's clothing. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 28(1), 69-88.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1992). On traits and temperament: General and specific factors of emotional experience and their relation to the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 441-476.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* (Vol. 18, pp. 1-74). Oxford: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.