EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF MANAGERIAL CIVILITY: DEVELOPMENT

AND VALIDATION OF A MEASUREMENT SCALE

Except where reference is made to the work of others, the work described in this dissertation is my own or was done in collaboration with my advisory committee. This dissertation does not include proprietary or classified information.

_____
Robert Mitchell Crocker

Certificate of Approval:

_____	_____
Achilles A. Armenakis Pursell Professor Management	Stanley G. Harris, Chair Everett Professor Management
_____	_____
Hubert S. Feild Torchmark Professor Management	Stephen L. McFarland Acting Dean Graduate School

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF MANAGERIAL CIVILITY: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A MEASUREMENT SCALE

Robert Mitchell Crocker

A Dissertation

Submitted to

the Graduate Faculty of

Auburn University

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn University
August 8, 2005

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF MANAGERIAL CIVILITY: DEVELOPMENT

AND VALIDATION OF A MEASUREMENT SCALE

Robert Mitchell Crocker

_____
Signature of Author

_____
Date of Graduation

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF MANAGERIAL CIVILITY: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A MEASUREMENT SCALE

Robert Mitchell Crocker

Doctor of Philosophy, August 8, 2005
(M.B.A., University of South Alabama, 1995)
(B.S., University of South Alabama, 1993)

106 Typed Pages

Directed by Stanley G. Harris

The impact of managerial incivility in the workplace has received theoretical attention but, due to the absence of a reliable measure, the empirical study of the construct has remained under-explored. Following a framework suggested by Hinkin (1998), I developed and validated a measure of employee perceptions of managerial incivility. Three independent samples were employed at various stages in the scale development process.

In the first stage, after a careful review of the literature, I determined that an inductive approach to item generation was warranted to be certain of content validity. A convenience sample of working college students was used to generate work-related

critical incidents of managerial exchanges in which the subordinate (student) perceived the manager's behavior to represent a rude or uncivil act. From these critical incidents, 116 identifiable behaviors were extracted. The 50 most often mentioned items were selected for inclusion in a data collection instrument.

In the second stage, another convenience sample of working college students was recruited, and the instrument developed in stage one was administered to them. Using exploratory factor analysis, the data yielded a four-factor solution, representing the perceptions of managerial incivility construct. Each factor demonstrated desirable internal consistency and reliability.

In the third stage, the supervised staff of a local hospital was enlisted to participate in the administration of an instrument designed to collect information on the managerial incivility factors and work-related outcomes. Using the data collected in this stage, I examined the convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity of the measure by exploring its relationships with relevant criteria such as perceptions of interactional justice, turnover intentions, withdrawal behaviors, performance appraisal, and negative affect.

I found sufficient support for convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity for the four-factor measure of managerial incivility. The results of this study provide a means to extend the research and to gauge the actual impact of managerial incivility, as well as provide developmental feedback to managers.

Style Manual: *Publication Manual of the American Psychological* (5th ed.). (2001). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Computer Software: Microsoft Word 2000, SPSS 10.1.0, and EQS 5.7b.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

> When a manager fails to value one person, that failure is nearly always perceived by the workers immediately around that person. Workers know when the boss is ignoring, riding, downgrading, or otherwise devaluing a coworker. It is very difficult for a manager to fail to value one person without the behavior being perceived as a failure to value the whole. Employees who are not valued know they are not being valued. And they don't let such expressions and behavior on the part of managers go unnoticed. They either react instinctively or respond consciously. Either way, the company suffers (Alderson & McDonnell, 1994, pp. 178-179).

The concept of civility refers to norms of polite social intercourse marked by benevolence (*Webster's Universal College Dictionary*, 1997). Engaging in normatively unacceptable behaviors is often referred to as "being uncivil" or "incivility," with both terms referring to rude and impolite behaviors. Understanding civility is complicated by the variance in norms of behavior from culture to culture and variation in individual reactions to specific behaviors even within a culture: what is acceptable to one person may be unacceptable to another. Furthermore, an individual may consider a behavior acceptable today, but tomorrow, under different circumstances, may view it as unacceptable. In addition, individuals react to uncivil behavior even when they are not

the target, such as the case in which an employee observes an uncivil exchange between a coworker and supervisor.

Buckingham and Coffman (1999) summarized the meta-analytic findings from over 100,000 employees surveyed from a broad range of more than 2,500 business units and concluded that if people have a bad manager, they are likely to look for another job. In recent years, several authors have focused on negative managerial behaviors to help explain the relationships between managerial practices and various employee outcomes.

Ashforth used the term “petty tyrant” to describe managers who use “their power and authority oppressively, capriciously, and perhaps vindictively” (1997, p. 126). Similarly, Tepper (2000) developed a measure of “abusive supervision” that focused on persistent managerial demonstrations of antagonistic verbal and nonverbal behaviors. In another study, Quine (2001) used "workplace bullying" to describe supervisor/subordinate relationships in which the subordinate was exposed to methodical humiliation by the supervisor. While the study of these extreme negative managerial behaviors contributes greatly to our understanding of manager-employee relations, a void still remains. Specifically, little research has examined managerial incivility, which encompasses the range of managerial behaviors lying between acceptable managerial behaviors and these extreme examples of overt managerial abuse. Previous research has clearly established the negative consequences of severe forms of deviant managerial behaviors such as abusive supervision and bullying. However, work by Baron and Neuman (1996) indicated that a majority of negative behavior in organizations is of a more subtle form, specifically, incivility.

Recently, Andersson and Pearson (1999) proposed a theoretical framework for understanding and studying incivility in the workplace. They presented a model showing how modest acts of incivility on the part of one party can generate reciprocal incivility that ultimately can spiral into worsening forms of deviant workplace behaviors. Despite Andersson and Pearson's contribution, a major impediment to incivility research remains. Specifically, a reliable, validated measure of managerial incivility has yet to be developed. Taking Andersson and Pearson's theory and resulting propositions as a starting point, this research focused on developing and validating such a measure of managerial civility using the framework for scale development proposed by Hinkin (1998).

Literature Review

Typology of Workplace Deviance

To delineate the behavioral domain where managerial incivility resides, it was helpful to look at the entire realm of deviant workplace behavior. Robinson and Bennett (1995) defined employee deviance as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well being of an organization, its members, or both. Their study of deviant workplace behaviors identified four forms of deviance: property, production, personal aggression, and political. Each of the four forms of deviance can be defined by its location along two dimensions: minor versus serious deviance and interpersonal versus organizational deviance.

Organizational deviance. Property and production deviance are both forms of organizational deviance, with property deviance being the more serious, and often illegal, form. Property deviance refers to employee behaviors that target tangible organizational

property or assets (e.g. sabotaging equipment, theft of company property, and lying about hours worked). Property deviance is generally considered to be a reaction to feelings of injustice and inequitable treatment (e.g., DeMore, Fisher & Baron, 1988; Greenberg & Scott, 1996; Hollinger & Clark, 1983). Production deviance involves behaviors intended to thwart production such as leaving early, taking excessive breaks, intentionally slowing work, and wasting resources. Because they focus on the organization rather than individuals, property and production deviance are not considered forms of incivility.

Personal aggression. Robinson and Bennett's (1995) personal aggression and political deviance quadrants are interpersonal in nature, with personal aggression being the more serious. Many personal aggression behaviors are clear violations of legal boundaries (e.g., sexual harassment and theft of personal property) while others reflect other overt actions that are not violations of law such as some forms of overt workplace bullying (cf., Lyons, Tivey, & Ball, 1995; Quine, 2001). Personal aggression is clearly consistent with recent constructs describing overt negative managerial behavior including abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000) and bullying (Quine, 2001).

Tepper (2000) characterized abusive supervision as a routine pattern of intentional and repetitive hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, falling short of physical assault, that are grossly unacceptable by society. Tepper's abusive supervision measure is shown in Table 1. Research has clearly shown that abusive supervision encourages turnover and harms employee attitudes and health (e.g., Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 1998; Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994; Richman, Flaherty, Rospenda, & Christensen, 1992; Sheehan, Sheehan, White, Leibowitz, & Baldwin, 1990; Tepper, 2000).

Table 1.

Tepper's Abusive Supervision Scale (Tepper, 2000)

1. Ridicules me
2. Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid
3. Gives me the silent treatment
4. Puts me down in front of others
5. Invades my privacy
6. Reminds me of my past mistakes and failures
7. Doesn't give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort
8. Blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment
9. Breaks promises he/she makes
10. Expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason
11. Makes negative comments about me to others
12. Is rude to me
13. Does not allow me to interact with my coworkers
14. Tells me I'm incompetent
15. Lies to me

Note. The items were prefaced with the statement, "My boss…," and respondents used a five-point response scale with answers ranging from "I cannot remember him/her ever using this behavior with me," to "He/she uses this behavior very often with me."

Workplace bullying has been characterized as "systematic stigmatizing attacks from a fellow worker… encroaching upon one's civil rights" (Quine, 2001, p. 74). Rayner and Hoel (1997) suggested five categories of bullying behaviors: (a) threat to professional status (e.g., belittling opinion, public professional humiliation, accusation of lack of effort); (b) threat to personal standing (e.g., gossiping about you, name-calling, insults, teasing); (c) isolation (e.g., preventing access to opportunities, withholding of information); (d) overwork (e.g., undue pressure to perform, impossible deadlines, unnecessary disruptions); and (e) destabilization (e.g., failure to give proper credit, meaningless assignment, removal of responsibility, shifting of goals, repeated reminders of past mistakes, setting up to fail). The items used to measure bullying are shown in Table 2. Quine (2001), in a study of nurses, found that the bully was more likely to be a senior manager or line manager (59%) and found that nurses who had been bullied reported significantly lower levels of job satisfaction and significantly higher levels of anxiety, depression, and propensity to leave than those not having similar encounters.

Political deviance. Political deviance refers to minor and interpersonally harmful behavior and social interaction that puts other individuals at a personal or political disadvantage. Politically deviant behaviors include supervisor actions that violate interpersonal sensitivity as defined by interactional justice theory (Bies & Moag, 1986) (e.g., gossiping about an employee, showing favoritism, and blaming an employee for the supervisor's own mistakes). Of the four dimensions of workplace deviance identified by Robinson and Bennett (1995), this quadrant appears more consistent with the concept of workplace incivility.

Table 2.

Quine's Measure of Workplace Bullying (Quine, 2001)

1. Persistent attempts to belittle or undermine your work.
2. Persistent unjustified criticism and monitoring of your work.
3. Persistent attempts to humiliate you in front of colleagues.
4. Intimidatory use of discipline/competence procedures.
5. Undermining your personal integrity.
6. Destructive innuendo and sarcasm.
7. Verbal and non-verbal threats.
8. Making inappropriate jokes about you.
9. Persistent teasing.
10. Physical violence.
11. Violence to property.
12. Withholding necessary information from you.
13. Freezing out/ignoring/excluding.
14. Unreasonable refusal of applications for leave, training, or promotion.
15. Undue pressure to produce work.
16. Setting of impossible deadlines.
17. Shifting goalposts without telling you.
18. Constant undervaluing your efforts.
19. Persistent attempts to demoralize you.
20. Removal of areas of responsibility without consultation.

Table 2 *(continued)*.

Note. Respondents were asked to indicate by "yes" or "no" whether they had been persistently subjected to any of these behaviors in the workplace in the last 12 months.

Ashforth's (1987) petty tyranny construct seems to span both the personal aggression and political deviance domains. Ashforth's six-dimension measure of petty tyranny scale is shown in Table 3. At least three of the six dimensions appear to be consistent with political deviance. For example, arbitrariness and self-aggrandizement (e.g., "makes boasts, brags, or 'shows off'"), lack of consideration (e.g., "is friendly and approachable" reversed), and discouraging initiative (e.g., "expresses appreciation when a subordinate does a good job" reversed) seem to be good examples of disadvantaging social interaction. Ashforth (1997) found that the effect of petty tyranny on subordinates included frustration, stress, reactance, helplessness, and work alienation. Constructs similar to Ashforth's idea of the petty tyrant include authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Altemeyer, 1988), "bureaupathic" individual (Thompson, 1961), abrasive personality (Levinson, 1978), and dictator (Rubin, 1987).

Workplace Incivility

Civility is an act or expression of courtesy or politeness. Carter (1998) suggested that civility is the moral basis necessary for human interaction, and that civility begins with an attitude of respect for others. Furthermore, as human interactions increase in complexity and frequency, the need for civility becomes greater (Carter, 1998; Chen & Eastman, 1997). Burkett (1990) argued that managers lead by example through respectable conduct and good mannerisms. Alderson and McDonnell (1994) stated that effective managers treat employees with love, dignity, and respect. In short, civility means treating others with dignity and respect (Lauer, 2002).

Table 3.

Ashforth's Petty Tyrant Scale (Ashforth, 1997)

1. Uses authority or position for personal gain.
2. Administers organizational policies unfairly.
3. 'Plays favorites' among subordinates.
4. Relies upon authority or position to get work done.
5. Makes boasts, brags, or "shows off."
6. Treats subordinates in a condescending or patronizing manner.
7. Suggests that subordinates should feel grateful to him or her.
8. Makes subordinates feel that s/he is doing the subordinate a favor when the supervisor is only doing his or her job.
9. Makes subordinates follow rules that s/he breaks him or herself.
10. Delegates work that s/he does not want to do.
11. Makes up arbitrary rules.
12. Fulfills his or her promises (R).
13. Pulls rank on subordinates.
14. "Guards his or her turf" against others outside the department.
15. Claims the credit for good work done by others.
16. Blames others for his or her mistakes.
17. Yells at subordinates.
18. Loses his or her temper.
19. Criticizes subordinates about personal matters.
20. Is unfair to subordinates as a group.

Table 3 *(continued)*.

21. Exaggerates the size of subordinates' error and weaknesses.
22. "Rides" subordinates who make mistakes.
23. Criticizes subordinates in front of others.
24. Belittles or embarrasses subordinates.
25. Is friendly and approachable (R).
26. Goes out of his or her way to help a subordinate (R).
27. Makes every effort to get to know subordinates (R).
28. Makes those under him or her feel at ease when talking to him or her (R).
29. Treats subordinates as individuals (R).
30. Looks out for the personal welfare of group members (R).
31. Treats all group members as his or her equals (R).
32. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group (R).
33. My supervisor is often displeased with my work for no apparent reason.
34. I am frequently reprimanded by my supervisor without knowing why.
35. My supervisor is often critical of my work even when I perform well.
36. My supervisor frequently holds me accountable for things I have no control over.
37. Encourages subordinates to participate in important decisions (R).
38. Expresses appreciation when a subordinate does a good job (R).
39. Encourages initiative in the group members (R).
40. Encourages people to speak up when they disagree with a decision (R).
41. Trusts members to exercise good judgment (R).

Table 3 *(continued)*.

42. Trains subordinates to take on more authority (R).
43. Forces acceptance of his or her point of view.
44. Insist on one solution.
45. Demands to get his or her way.
46. Will not take no for an answer.
47. Imposes his or her solution.

Note. Respondents were asked to read each statement and think about how often their manager performed that action. Responses ranged from "very seldom" to "very often." (R) indicates the item was reverse scored.

Messages of dignity and respect are sent through managerial behaviors that let employees know that they are valuable and appreciated. Managers convey these messages through communication by saying "please" and "thank you" to employees, calling people by their names, telling people they are appreciated, telling people they did a good job, and listening to employees (Alderson & McDonnell, 1994). Managers convey these messages through actions by lending a helping hand, being polite and courteous, recognizing contributions and achievements, treating people fairly, and giving employees opportunities for growth and responsibility (Alderson & McDonnell, 1994). Managers that treat their subordinates with dignity and respect create energy and enthusiasm among their employees (Alderson & McDonnell, 1994).

In contrast to civility, workplace incivility has been characterized as rudeness, insensitivity toward others as reflected in demeaning language or gestures, verbal abuse, and other low intensity forms of mistreatment at work (Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000). Workplace incivility manifests itself in the work environment through a wide assortment of behaviors such as rude remarks, verbal attacks, wrongful blame, preferential treatment, and unfavorable work assignments (Carter, 1998; Marks, 1996; Neuman & Baron, 1997). Workplace incivility is generally verbal, passive, indirect and subtle as opposed to physical, active, direct, and overt (Baron & Neuman, 1996). According to Andersson and Pearson (1999), "Workplace incivility is low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect" (p. 457).

Unfortunately, no general measure of managerial incivility currently exists. Andersson and Pearson (1999) argued that a measure of incivility capturing lesser forms

of mistreatment, such as rude comments and thoughtless acts, is needed to advance the understanding of the phenomenon. The various descriptions and definitions of incivility in the literature offer a great deal of clues as to the behaviors that constitute incivility and that must be assessed in a valid measure. While "rude" and "discourteous" are the most frequently mentioned key words used to describe uncivil behaviors (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000; Neuman & Baron, 1997), these same authors used negative gestures, thoughtless acts, invasions of privacy, demeaning language, impatience, obnoxiousness, and slinging innuendo to exemplify behaviors that should be included in a measure of incivility. In addition, Ashforth's (1997) petty tyrant, Quine's (2001) bullying, Tepper's (2000) abusive supervision, and Scott's (1965) personal values scales also offer insights useful in capturing managerial incivility. The main goal of this research was to develop and validate a reliable measure that focused exclusively on managerial incivility.

Hypothesized Correlates of Managerial Incivility

An important test of any measure will be its predictive validity in that it may prove to be useful for scientific purposes such as hypothesis testing (DeVellis, 1991). Current incivility theorists (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000; Neuman & Baron, 1997), made it clear that managerial incivility is expected to relate to important employee and organizational outcomes. According to Pearson et al. (2000), the organizational costs of workplace incivility are substantially high. Furthermore, these costs may be hidden in the form of loss of individual production and high turnover. Also, existing measures of deviant managerial behavior focused on extremes, such that organizations may not fully comprehend the magnitude of the lesser

forms of mistreatment. A measure of the more subtle managerial incivilities should prove to be a useful diagnostic tool for identifying managerial deficiencies and for developing corrective action plans to fend off the incivility spiral.

Interactional Injustice

According to Andersson and Pearson's (1999) incivility spiral, perceptions of interactional injustice play an integral role in determining how an individual responds to an uncivil behavior. Folger (1993) proposed that reactions to perceived mistreatment at work hinge in part on the inappropriateness of the conduct by a supervisor. Mikula, Petrik, and Tanzer (1990), in a study designed to gather information about daily events that people consider unjust, reported that a considerable proportion of perceived injustices referred to the manner in which people were treated interpersonally during interactions and encounters. Individuals experience interactional injustice when organizational representatives fail to treat them with respect, honesty, propriety, and sensitivity to their personal needs (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Past studies have measured perceptions of interactional justice with questions that pertain to communications or other actions that are disrespectful, derogatory, deceptive, and invasive of others' privacy, including questions assessing the extent to which employees perceive themselves to have been treated in the workplace with dignity and respect, kindness, politeness, honesty, and consideration (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). The measure of interactional injustice is included in this study because it appears to broach the content addressed by incivility, yet fails to commit totally to measuring the incivility construct. Five of the six interactional justice items limit the perceived fairness of work-related exchanges between managers and their subordinates to

the personal level, not allowing for perceptions that might be developed by employee observations of exchanges between the supervisor and other employees. None-the-less, a strong correlation between employee perceptions of managerial incivility and interactional justice is expected, yet the two measures will estimate different constructs. Therefore:

Hypothesis 1a: Employee perceptions of interactional injustice will positively correlate with their perceptions of managerial incivility.

Hypothesis 1b: The measure of managerial incivility will be discriminately different from the measure of interactional justice.

Turnover Intentions

Extreme deviant managerial behavior has been clearly shown to positively correlate with the turnover intentions of subordinates. Turnover intentions are an important precursor of the individual turnover process, and represent the extent to which an individual thinks about quitting his or her job (Mobley, 1977). Fishbein (1967) posited that behavioral intention is the primary antecedent to actual behavior, and empirical research indicates that turnover intentions are an important predictor of actual turnover (Kraut, 1975; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Prestholdt, Lane, & Mathews, 1987; Steel & Ovalle, 1984; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Conditions of employment are particularly important correlates of turnover intentions. Throughout Andersson and Pearson's (1999) incivility spiral model, "departure" is a frequently suggested potential reaction. The subtle nature of perceived incivility is expected to create a less than desirable work condition, and while the effect is not expected to be as large as harsher

forms of deviant managerial behavior, the resulting impact on turnover intentions is expected to be measurable and significant.

Hypothesis 2: Employee perceptions of managerial incivility will positively correlate with their turnover intentions.

Withdrawal Behaviors

Employees can withdraw from an organization or manager in ways other than turnover. Withdrawal behaviors have been defined as a reduction in the employee's socio-psychological attraction to, or interest in, the work of the organization (Bluedorn, 1982). Hanisch and Hulin (1990, 1991) suggested that lateness, absence, and turnover are actually part of a larger dimension called work withdrawal which also includes such phenomena as social loafing, shirking one's responsibilities and duties, long lunch breaks, and excessive socializing with colleagues during the work day. Interestingly, withdrawal behaviors such as arriving late and taking extended breaks are a form of deviant behavior themselves (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) and may be ways that employees reciprocate managerial incivility.

Hypothesis 3: Employee perceptions of managerial incivility will positively correlate with their withdrawal behaviors.

Performance

A number of social influences have been demonstrated to influence organizational measures of employee performance (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Davis and Dickinson (1987) examined the influence of individual-level variables on performance appraisal and found that variables such as leader trust, leader support, leader interaction, and leader facilitation accounted for systematic variance in performance ratings. Leader-member

exchange theory (Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2000) suggests that employees reciprocate "in-group" treatment from their supervisor. Likewise, incivility is likely to be reciprocated, perhaps by lessened job performance. In addition, it is also highly possible that managerial incivility is more likely to be foisted on lower performing employees. Hence:

Hypothesis 4: Employee perceptions of managerial incivility will negatively correlate with their performance as judged by their supervisors.

Negative Affectivity and Reactions to Incivility

Several theoretical models suggested that personality traits are important for predicting responses to perceived unfairness (e.g., Brockner, 1988; Folger & Skarlicki, 1998; O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996). Studies (e.g., Burbach, 2004; Hoge & Bussing, 2004; Shelley & Pakenham, 2004) demonstrated how personality traits often moderate the effect of one variable on another. A better understanding of the impact of personality traits on perceptions of managerial incivility could prove valuable in future research.

The personality trait of negative affectivity (NA) reflects the predisposition to view the world in negative terms, leading to self-recrimination, distress, and dissatisfaction (Watson & Clark, 1984). NA increases individual vulnerability to stimuli that generate negative emotions (Larsen & Katelaar, 1991). High NA persons reported greater exposure and negative reactivity to interpersonal conflicts than did low NA persons (Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995). High NA persons were less likely to try to control their work environments (Judge, 1993), opting instead for indirect coping strategies such as covert retaliation (Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999). The predisposition to negativism

and the heightened sensitivity to stimuli that induce negative emotions suggest that high NA individuals may more readily interpret managerial behaviors as being uncivil.

Hypothesis 5: Employees' negative affect will positively correlate with their perceptions of incivility.

Research Overview

The purpose of this study was to develop and validate a measure of incivility. The research design generally followed the scale development and validation framework provided by Hinkin (1998). The first stage of the scale development process included the generation of a set of items that are conceptually consistent with the theoretical domain of incivility. Hinken allowed for item generation through inductive (literature) or deductive (sampling) approaches. Although a substantial portion of literature was considered, the deductive method was the primary method employed in item generation due to the perceived void in the specific domain of managerial incivility.

In the second stage, the items generated in the first stage were included in a questionnaire along with other measures that were believed, based on theory, to correlate with, or be independent of, the incivility construct being developed. Data collected in this stage were analyzed using exploratory factor analysis to discern the underlying statistical structure of the items. The objective was to group items into discrete content domains. Items that did not clearly fit the emerging factors were eliminated. Exploratory factor analysis was repeated until a clear factor structure emerged for the incivility construct and the resulting factors possessed internal consistency and reliability.

Using a new set of data, the third stage in the measure design process employed confirmatory factor analysis to assess the quality of the incivility factor structure by

statistically testing the significance of the model and the item loadings on the factors. Other variables were also assessed during this stage to provide a test of convergent and discriminant validity. Criterion-related validity was established via correlation analysis and hierarchical regression.

My effort to develop and test a measure of managerial incivility was built around three separate studies utilizing three independent samples. Study one was a qualitative effort to generate potential items by asking employees to describe their managers' uncivil actions. Study two was a quantitative effort to reduce the list of items and establish a reliable scale through exploratory factor analysis. Study three was designed to test the convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity properties of the final scale. Because the results of one study provided the input for the next, a chapter describing the method and results for each study is provided.

II. STUDY ONE: QUALITATIVE ITEM GENERATION

Following Hinkin's (1998) framework, study one covered the first step in the scale development process—item generation. Defining the managerial incivility construct began by reviewing relevant literature and gaining a clear understanding of the construct domain. While previous studies (e.g., Ashforth, 1987; Quine, 2001; Tepper, 2000) have provided measures of abusive managerial behaviors, and other studies (e.g., Mikula, et al, 1990; Scott, 1965) have demonstrated generic responses to unjust and/or unacceptable behavior, none of these studies specifically address the subtle managerial behaviors described by others (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Neuman & Baron, 1997; Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000). Hinkin (1998) suggested a deductive approach to item generation when the theoretical foundation provides enough information to generate an initial set of items and an inductive approach to item generation when conducting exploratory research and when attempting to identify an abstract construct. Considering the apparent gap between the managerial behaviors described by Ashforth (1997), Tepper (2000), and Quine (2001) and the call for a reliable measure of incivility by Andersson & Pearson (1999), an inductive approach to item generation seemed a reasonable and responsible means to verify that the items correctly reflected the domain of interest. Additionally, DeVellis (1991) suggested that it is better to be over-inclusive and redundant at this stage of the scale development process.

Method

The first phase in the creation of the incivility measure involved generating a sufficient number of items to adequately capture the construct domain.

Participants

Students in three upper-level management classes at a mid-sized southern university were invited to participate in an item generation process in exchange for class credit. The requirement for participation was that the respondent had to have been employed for the previous six-month period or could recruit a respondent that met this criterion. Many students recruited a parent to complete the survey. Of the 112 students enrolled in the classes, 101 (90.2%) useable surveys were returned. Respondents' average age was 30.5 years (*SD* = 10.90) with an average work experience of 11.5 years (*SD* = 8.89). Females comprised 56% of all respondents. The racial composition was 77% White, 20% Black, and 2% Hispanic. Respondents represented a variety of work backgrounds with office and administrative support (24%) and sales and sales-related (20%) representing the two largest occupational groups. No other occupational area was represented by more than 9% of the sample.

Procedure

The purpose of this sample was to generate items representing the construct domain of managerial incivility. Using an anonymous open-ended questionnaire (see Appendix A), participants were given a brief explanation regarding the purpose of this study. Participants were asked to focus on "rude or incivil supervisory behavior" and then to describe critical incidents with their supervisors that represented these types of behaviors. Space was available to report as many as five critical incidents, and

respondents were encouraged to use the back of the form or attach additional pages if necessary. Respondents on average reported 4.49 incivility examples, and generated a total of 466 separate critical incidents.

Analysis

The author and two graduate assistants reviewed each critical incident with the objective of identifying critical words and/or phrases that described a discrete managerial behavior. Since many critical incidents listed multiple behaviors, a discrete managerial behavior represented one and only one action. For example, a critical incident that reported "My boss cursed and gave me the finger," would elicit two discrete behaviors; one being "cursing" and the second being "obscene gesture."

The first step was to classify a behavior as either representative of managerial incivility or not representative of managerial incivility. For example, one respondent wrote, "My past supervisor was the nicest person I had ever worked for," which offered no contribution to rude or uncivil behavior. Another respondent wrote, "My boss ignores my complaints about…" which was considered to be representative of managerial incivility. Very few cases, four in total, could not be immediately classified as representative of managerial incivility or not. In the few cases that did not easily distinguish themselves, the decision rule was to consider the item as representative of managerial incivility, and let subsequent analysis decide the fate of that particular item. For example, one respondent wrote, "My supervisor lacks management skills," which could imply several things, but could not be directly linked to managerial incivility. This particular case was initially included but later removed due to lack of mentioning by other respondents and lack of clear implications for managerial incivility.

Some critical incidents resulted in multiple discrete behaviors. Consider the following critical incident as reported by one participant: "My supervisor yelled at me in front of several other employees about a minor detail which could have waited until a better time." From this critical incident we retrieved two distinct examples of managerial uncivil behavior: yelling and criticizing in front of others. As often as possible, the exact word or phrase used by the respondent was recorded, such as was the case with the word "yelled" in the previous example. When the respondents' implication was clear, but not expressly worded, then the implication was recorded. Referring again to the previous example, the respondent never mentioned being criticized by the supervisor, but the reference to "being yelled at" over "a minor detail" was sufficient to convince the reviewers that the implication was justified.

After all critical incident cases were reviewed and discrete behaviors recorded, these behaviors were grouped by the author, as appropriate, into discrete incivility themes such as "yelling, arrogance, self-control, and name calling." A thesaurus was used to guide grouping, and terms, such as self-control, were employed as themes for a common set of behaviors. Twelve themes emerged and within each of the 12 themes, the descriptions that were synonymous were merged into a single item. For example, behaviors such as "yelling, hollering, and screaming" along with the phrase "with a load voice" were condensed into the item "yelling." "Lost self control" was the theme used to capture behaviors such as "flew off the handle," "exploded," or "lost his cool." Attempts to reduce incidents into items led to unanimous agreement among the three reviewers on 418 of the 453 (92%) items. The remaining items were discarded because they were

mentioned too infrequently, might be considered illegal, and were representative of extreme deviant behaviors (e.g., endangering, physical abuse, and sexual harassment).

Some of the final items were worded consistent with incivility (e.g., yelling) while others were positively worded consistent with civility (e.g., "respects me," "self-control," and "is supportive"). This positive wording convention was used for themes that were easier to verbalize and comprehend when phrased from the civility perspective. Incivility on these themes would be reflected by disagreement or reverse scoring of agreement.

Results

A total of 453 individual instances of discrete managerial incivility-relevant behaviors were recovered from the 466 critical incidents reported by respondents. The condensed list, which was the result of combining like words and phrases, contained 116 different items depicting discrete managerial behaviors (see Appendix B). Items were sorted in descending order of frequency with which the respondents mentioned them. Frequency was computed by the number of times different individuals cited an item, such that a respondent may have cited one behavior five times, but it would only count as one occurrence.

Many of the terms and phrases generated to describe the managerial actions were consistent with items found in the literature. For example, the terms public criticism, public humiliation, public confrontation, and public discipline were among the more frequent themes found in the critical incidents and these terms are consistent with Tepper's (2000) "puts me down in front of others" item, Quine's (2001) "attempts to humiliate me in front of colleagues" item, and Ashforth's (1997) "criticizes subordinates

in front of others" item. Several terms and phrases (e.g., gestures, body language, and tone of voice) represented managerial behaviors not overtly expressed in the literature but were mentioned with moderate frequency in the critical incidents and held some similarity to other items (e.g. inappropriate joking and sarcasm).

To develop a manageable set of items, the list of items was reduced according to the frequency that each was reported. To develop a common set of behaviors, it is reasonable to accept frequency of occurrence as a deciding factor in further item reduction, inferring that frequency is a reasonable indicator of relevance to the content of interest (DeVellis, 1991). The most frequently mentioned 50 fifty items (see Table 4) were retained and became the root of the survey items used for exploratory factor analysis.

Table 4.

Fifty Most Frequently Mentioned Incivility Items

Yells or hollers (18)	Treats me like a mature adult (6)
Wrongfully blames (17)	Respects me (6)
Puts me down (15)	Jokes inappropriately (6)
Keeps me informed (14)	Is concerned with work/life balance (6)
Is sensitive to my needs (14)	Gossips (6)
Displays favoritism (14)	Calls me names (6)
Publicly criticizes me (12)	Assigns schedules fairly (6)
Applies fair standards (12)	Admits mistakes (6)
Abuses his/her authority (12)	Uses inappropriate gestures (5)
Follows work rules consistently (10)	Respects my privacy (5)
Delays or withholds rewards (10)	Is moody (5)
Publicly humiliates me (9)	Is arrogant (5)
Shows concern for me (8)	Has a temper (5)
Listens to me (8)	Appreciates my effort (5)
Interrupts me (8)	Treats me equitably (4)
Realistic expectations (8)	Treats me like I don't know anything (4)
Considers alternative views (8)	Thinks they are better than everyone (4)
Talks down to me (7)	Takes credit for others' work (4)
Ignores me (7)	Publicly confronts subordinates (4)
Curses and swears at me (7)	Jumps to conclusions (4)
Watches me closely (6)	Is supportive (4)

Table 4 *(continued)*.

Is manipulative (4)	Lies (3)
Is available when needed (4)	Is sarcastic (3)
Gives good workers unfair workloads (4)	Is pushy (3)
Tries to scare or intimidate people (3)	Has self-control (3)

Note. Number in parentheses is frequency each item occurred.

III. STUDY TWO: QUANTITATIVE SCALE DEVELOPMENT

The 50 most frequent managerial incivility behaviors identified in study one reflected the general construct of managerial incivility as perceived by a diverse group of respondents and are the starting point for study two. Study two covers steps two and three of Hinkin's (1998) recommended scale development process: administering a questionnaire based on the surviving content valid items and refining the measure through exploratory factor analysis.

Method

Participants

Using a sampling method similar to study one, a different set of 128 students in three upper-level management classes at a mid-sized southern university were invited to participate, in exchange for extra credit, by completing a questionnaire (see Appendix C) that contained the 50 items retained from study one. The requirement for participation was that the respondent had to have been employed, full- or part-time, for the previous three-month period or could recruit a respondent that met this criterion. Of the 128 surveys distributed, 104 (81.3%) useable surveys were returned. Eighty-seven students completed the questionnaire themselves, and 17 recruited someone else to complete it. The respondents' average age was 22.1 years (SD = 2.23). The average tenure at their place of employment was 1.9 years (SD = 1.64) and average time working for their current supervisor was 1.4 years (SD = 1.21). Females comprised 56% of all respondents.

The racial composition was 83.5% White, 7.8% Hispanic, 5.8% Asian, 1% Black, and 1% Native American. Although a convenience sample was employed here, it was believed that this method would represent a diverse set of supervised work environments. The subject-to-items ratio was slightly greater than 2:1, which in factor analysis has been shown to produce large factors with clarity (Kline, 1994).

Procedure

The questionnaire contained the 50 items resulting from study one. Nineteen of the items were positively worded or civil behaviors, following the labeling convention used in study one. The remaining 31 items were negatively worded or uncivil behaviors. The 19 civil items were reverse scored. All items were prefaced with the statement "My immediate supervisor…" An item example was "criticizes me in front of others." Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Disagree Strongly to (6) Strongly Agree. Demographic data, including age, gender, marital status, family composition, race/nationality, length of service with company, and length of time with current supervisor, were also collected.

Analysis

Exploratory factor analyses using principal axis extraction with varimax (Kaiser 1958) rotation were used to examine the dimensionality of the 50 items and guide item removal and scale refinement. This is the most common orthogonal rotation method (DeVellis, 1991).

Results

Exploratory factor analysis produced a relatively simple factor structure for the 50 items that, according to Kline (1994), should be both easy to interpret and replicate.

Principal components analysis identified seven factors with eigen values greater than 1.0. In this seven-factor solution, 18 items demonstrated significant cross loadings (greater than 0.4) on multiple factors. These items were removed, and another iteration of exploratory factor analysis was conducted. The results of this iteration showed a four-factor solution with seven items demonstrating major cross loadings on other factors. These seven items were removed, and a third iteration was conducted. The third iteration produced a four-factor solution with no items demonstrating cross loading on another factor at a level greater than 0.4. These four scales were examined for harmony among the items within each factor. Three additional items were removed because they loaded less than 0.6 (Kline, 1994) on their particular factor and appeared to diverge from the other items within their specific factor: two items were removed from factor one and one item from factor two. After removing these items, a fourth iteration produced a four-factor solution with one item demonstrating cross loading on another factor at a level greater than 0.4. This item was removed. The remaining 21 items were subjected again to exploratory factor analysis and the resulting four-factor solution contained no substantial cross-loadings. The final factor analysis results showing the items' loadings on each of their principal factors are shown in Table 5. All final loadings for the four factors are provided in Appendix D.

Each factor was given a label based on the items comprising it, and those items were averaged together to form scales and their scale reliabilities examined. The most commonly accepted measure of reliability is Cronbach's alpha (Price & Mueller, 1986). For exploratory measures, a coefficient alpha greater than 0.7 indicates strong item covariance (Nunnally, 1978) and suggests that the sampling domain has been

Table 5.

Incivility Factor Structure

	Loading	M	SD
Factor 1: General Contemptuousness (*Alpha* = 0.93)			
Thinks they are better than everyone else.	.76	2.44	1.71
Jumps to conclusions before getting all the facts.	.75	2.71	1.56
Is sarcastic.	.73	3.03	1.64
Is moody.	.72	3.44	1.69
Has self-control. [R]	.72	2.28	1.11
Interrupts me when I am talking.	.67	2.62	1.46
Is arrogant.	.67	2.48	1.61
Is manipulative.	.66	2.27	1.35
Factor 2: Person-Focused Insensitivity (*Alpha* = 0.91)			
Has realistic expectations of what I can accomplish. [R]	.83	2.09	1.12
Appreciates my effort. [R]	.83	2.04	0.99
Listens to me. [R]	.78	2.14	0.99
Is concerned about helping me balance my work and non-work life. [R]	.73	2.46	1.40
Is sensitive to my needs and concerns. [R]	.71	2.39	1.29
Considers alternative views when making decisions. [R]	.68	2.45	1.28
Factor 3: General Inappropriate Communication (*Alpha* = 0.85)			
Jokes inappropriately.	.85	2.39	1.48
Uses inappropriate gestures.	.82	1.95	1.32

Table 5 *(continued)*.

Calls me names.	.66	1.94	1.27
Publicly confronts subordinates.	.60	2.48	1.43
Factor 4: Person-Focused Verbal Abuse (*Alpha* = 0.85)			
Yells or hollers when talking to me.	.84	1.74	1.15
Puts me down.	.74	1.79	1.17
Publicly humiliates me.	.64	1.66	1.04

Note. N = 104.

[R] indicates item is reverse scored.

adequately captured (Churchill, 1979). Factor one, which was labeled "general contemptuousness," consisted of eight indicants and had a coefficient alpha reliability of .93. Factor two was labeled "person-focused insensitivity" and had a coefficient alpha reliability of .91. Factor three, labeled "general inappropriate communication," had a coefficient alpha reliability of .85. Finally, factor four, labeled "person-focused verbal abuse," had a coefficient alpha reliability of .85.

As expected, the four incivility scales were correlated. Scale means, standard deviations and correlations are shown in Table 6.

The measure of employee perceptions of managerial incivility that emerged from these analyses reflects incivility as a multi-faceted construct. Given the complex nature of human interactions, the wide variety of situations and circumstances in which these interactions take place, and the variability in which individual perceptions interpret these exchanges, this four-factor solution captured a range of managerial behaviors that are believed to be adequately representative of all managerial behaviors as they relate to the supervisor/subordinate relationship, and as such, capable of measuring employee perceptions of managerial incivility.

General contemptuousness. The eight-item scale, "General Contemptuousness," measured the facet of managerial incivility that registers the employees' perception of the managers' attitude. For example, the item "My boss is arrogant" captured the employees' sense that the boss thinks he or she is superior to the subordinate as learned from any number of work-related exchanges. These exchanges could include direct exchanges between the boss and the employee or observations made by the employee of exchanges between the boss and other employees. As a whole, these items reflected the portion of

Table 6.

Scale means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations

Factor	M	SD	1	2	3	4
1. General Contemptuousness	2.7	1.3	--			
2. Person-Focused Insensitivity	2.4	1.1	.65*	--		
3. General Inappropriate Communication	2.2	1.0	.65*	.51*	--	
4. Person-Focused Verbal Abuse	2.2	1.3	.67*	.59*	.53*	--

Notes. N = 104.

* $p < 0.01$, two-tailed.

the incivility construct that dealt with what employees perceive as unacceptable personal traits that permeate the manager-subordinate exchange.

Person-focused insensitivity. The second facet, a six-item measure labeled "Person-Focused Insensitivity" revealed subordinate expectations for being valued. Incivility was experienced when these expectations are violated. This measure captured the employees' need for recognition (e.g., appreciates my effort) at work-related endeavors, as well as acknowledgement of their intellectual contributions (e.g., considers alternative views) and life outside the job (e.g., balance of work and non-work). Unlike the first factor, this factor was almost completely based on direct exchange between the manager and subordinate. The item "considers alternative views" could be perceived from a vicarious experience, but each of the other items in this factor were indicative of personal experiences.

General inappropriate communications. The third factor, "General Inappropriate Communications," captured exchanges that reflected public communications. Inappropriate joking, gestures and name-calling hinted at scenes where the manager used verbal and/or non-verbal cues to demean subordinates. Publicly confronting subordinates was an item that directly inferred that this type of communication is demeaning and unacceptable behavior as perceived by employees.

Person-focused verbal abuse. The fourth factor, labeled "Person-Focused Verbal Abuse," was consistent with managerial communication abuse but differed in that it measured the employees' direct experience of humiliation and disrespect during communications with the boss.

Comparisons with Other Measures of Deviant Managerial Behavior

Whereas the goal of this study was to develop and validate a general measure of managerial incivility, it is important to compare the results at this point to measures used by others, specifically those used by Ashford (1994), Quine (2001), and Tepper (2000). Of the 21 items generated in this study, six are similar to petty tyrant items, four are similar to bullying items, one is found in both petty tyrant and bullying, and one is common to the abusive supervision, petty tyrant, and bullying measures. Considering work-related exchange between supervisor and subordinate was the focus of this and the other three measures, this phenomenon of item overlap was not unexpected.

The great differentiator between my four-factor incivility measure and these other measures was its singular focus on milder forms of deviance. In particular, Ashford's (1994) Petty Tyrant Scale and Quine's (2001) Workplace Bullying Scale both included items that capture deviant behaviors far beyond the low level of deviance suggested by incivility. As a result, those measures are confounded by not differentiating severity. For example, it is difficult to equate how uncivil behaviors equal "physical violence," which is an item found in Quine's (2001) bullying scale. By focusing exclusively on less severe forms of deviance, and building the scale from the reported examples of incivility given by a diverse group of respondents, the incivility measure developed here offers a valid tool for the assessment of minor forms of managerial deviance.

IV. STUDY THREE: CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS AND HYPOTHESIS TESTING

The goals of study three were to accomplish steps four and five of Hinkin's (1998) framework for scale development. Step four calls for confirmatory factor analysis to verify that the initial scales developed in step three have acceptable construct validity and internal consistency. Step five of Hinkin's (1998) framework calls for determinations of convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity.

Method

The four employee perceptions of managerial incivility scales developed in study two were the primary components of a questionnaire (see Appendix E) that was administered to a third independent sample. The purpose of this phase of the scale development process was to demonstrate scale validity using structural equation modeling techniques and to test the hypothesized relationships.

Participants

Employees of an East Texas Hospital were invited to participate in this research study and were offered a chance to win one of two $50 gift certificates for their participation. The requirement for inviting participants was that the employee worked under direct supervision in a department that employed five or more employees. All employees meeting these criteria (n = 387) were invited to participate in this study.

To insure confidentiality, the Human Resources Department of the hospital coded and addressed the questionnaires and kept a record linking employees to their survey. Participants received their questionnaire through the mail and were provided postage paid return envelopes for returning the completed questionnaire. In addition to completing the questionnaire, participation also required agreeing to allow the hospital to release confidential personal information regarding performance appraisals. The Human Resources Director of the hospital sent reminders via e-mail to potential participants at two weeks and four weeks after the initial mailing.

Of the 387 surveys mailed, 118 useable surveys were returned for a response rate of 30.5%. The respondents' average age was 34.7 years (*SD* = 11.83). The average tenure at the hospital was 6.1 years (*SD* = 6.00), and the average time working for their current supervisor was 2.8 (*SD* = 2.98). Females comprised 75.4% of all respondents. The racial composition was 81.4% White, 11.0% Black, 4.2% Hispanic, 0.8% Native American, 0.8% Asian, and 1.7% other. According to job classification, 59.3% of respondents were nurses, 10.2% were nurse aides, 8.5% were clerks, 7.6% were technicians, 5.0% were housekeeping, 2.5% were therapy, and 6.9% did not respond to this question. Test for non-response bias, based on organizational data for job classification, showed that nurses were more likely to respond (59% of the respondents versus 35% of the sample population), X^2 (1, N = 118) = 15.68, $p < .01$. Younger employees were also more likely than older employees to respond (age = 34.7 for respondents versus 41.2 for the sample population), $t(503) = 5.7$, $p < .01$.

Measures

Managerial incivility. The survey instrument included a modification of the 21-

item Employee Perceptions of Managerial Incivility Scale developed in study two. As a condition of hospital participation in the survey, all items had to be written from a positive point of view. Specifically, all items directly addressing incivility had to be rewritten to reflect civility. Incivility was reflected in disagreement with the new wording. The seven items from the original version of the scale that were worded positively (civil) were not altered. Table 7 shows how the original items from study two were rewritten for study three.

The incivility construct lends itself to either a positive (civility) or negative (incivility) wording format when used with Likert scale ratings ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. All items were prefaced with the phrase "My Immediate Supervisor…" and respondents answered each statement on a six-point Likert scale by circling the choice corresponding to their level of agreement with the item. Response options ranged from (1) Disagree Strongly to (6) Strongly Agree. Strong disagreement, or low scores, indicated higher levels of perceived managerial incivility. All items were reverse scored.

Benson and Hocever (1985), in a study that examined the effect of item phrasing on the validity of Likert-type attitude scales, reported that subjects had difficulty expressing agreement by disagreeing with negatively worded items. Schriesheim and Hill (1981) examined the effects of item wording on the accuracy of responses to a standard leader behavior questionnaire and found that a positive wording format yielded more accurate responses than did negatively worded or mixed, both positive and negative, wording formats. Thus, this rewriting of the items to reflect civility as required by the research site may have also led to a more accurate measurement approach.

Table 7.

Changes in Wording

Original Stems in Study Two	Changes for Study Three
Thinks they are better than everyone else.	Is unpretentious
Jumps to conclusions before getting all the facts.	Gets all the facts before making a decision.
Is sarcastic.	Avoids being sarcastic.
Has self-control.	*
Is moody.	Is not moody
Interrupts me when I am talking.	Lets me finish my point when I am talking.
Is manipulative.	Avoids manipulating others for his/her own gain.
Is arrogant.	Is humble.
Has realistic expectations of what I can accomplish.	*
Appreciates my effort.	*
Listens to me.	*
Is concerned about helping me balance my work and non-work life.	*
Is sensitive to my needs and concerns.	*
Considers alternative views when making decisions.	*

Table 7 *(continued)*.

Jokes inappropriately.	Avoids inappropriate joking.
Uses inappropriate gestures.	Avoids the use of inappropriate gestures.
Calls me names.	Addresses me appropriately.
Publicly confronts subordinates.	Privately speaks with subordinates about problems and concerns.
Yells or hollers when talking to me.	Uses a reasonable and appropriate tone when talking to me.
Puts me down.	Makes me feel important.
Publicly humiliates me.	Is careful not to embarrass me.

Note. * indicates wording was not changed

Interactional justice. Interactional justice was assessed using Moorman's (1991) six-item interactional justice scale. Coefficient alpha for this scale was .95. This measure was recorded on a six-point Likert scale with responses ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (6) Strongly Agree and includes:

1. My supervisor considers my viewpoint.
2. My supervisor is able to suppress personal biases.
3. My supervisor provides me with timely feedback about a decision and its implications.
4. My supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.
5. My supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee.
6. My supervisor deals with me in a truthful manner.

Turnover intentions. Turnover intentions were self-assessed by employees using the three-item measure developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, Jr., and Klesh, (1983) (*alpha* = .83) as a part of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. Studies by Shaw (1999) and Shore, Thornton, III, and Newton (1989) used this measure and reported reliabilities of .83 and .84, respectively, for this scale. Coefficient alpha in the present study was .92. The items in this scale were rated on a six-point Likert scale with responses ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (6) Strongly Agree and include:

1. I will actively look for a new job in the next year.
2. I often think about quitting.
3. I will probably look for a new job in the next year.

Withdrawal behaviors. A four-item measure developed by Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkle, Lynch, and Rhoades (2001) (reported *alpha* = .85) for use by supervisors to

assess employee withdrawal behaviors, was adapted for use as an employee self-report measure in this study. This measure, along with two items from Robinson and Bennett's (1995) typology of production deviances were used as a self-report measure of withdrawal behavior. These production deviance items were reverse scored. This resulting measure is best characterized as capturing work avoidance behaviors excluding quitting or being absent. The scale had a coefficient alpha of .74 in the present study. Items in this measure were rated on a six-point Likert scale with responses ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (6) Strongly Agree and include:

1. I return to my workstation as soon as my break is over.
2. I begin work on time.
3. I give advance notice when I cannot come to work.
4. My attendance at work is above the norm.
5. I take too many breaks. (R)
6. I am often late to work or often leave early. (R)

Performance appraisal. The codes from returned questionnaires were submitted to the hospital and in turn the hospital reported the latest performance evaluation for the respondent assigned to that code. Performance appraisal was reported in terms of A, B, C, and D where A was indicative of the highest level of performance. The performance scores were recorded numerically with A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, and D = 1. Descriptive statistics for the performance scores showed an average of 2.73 (*SD* = 0.675) and dispersion of 9.3% A's, 57.6% B's, 29.7% C's, and 3.4% D's.

Negative affect. Trait negative affect was assessed using the 10-item PANAS scale (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The PANAS scale has been used in numerous

studies with alpha reliabilities ranging from .87 (Mano & Oliver, 1993) to .95 (Johnson & Johnson, 2000). This scale asks respondents to rate each word, based on how often they feel this way in general, on a numeric scale from (1) never to (6) always. Words in this scale include scared, afraid, upset, distressed, jittery, nervous, ashamed, guilty, irritable, and hostile. Coefficient alpha in this study was found to be .82.

Control variables. Data relating to four demographic variables were collected as possible control variables. Length of service with current supervisor (*tenure with supervisor*) and length of time with the company (*organizational tenure*) might have a potential effect on employee perceptions of managerial incivility since time-related considerations have been suggested to relate to job satisfaction (Bedeian, Ferris, & Kacmar, 1992), turnover intentions (Werbel & Bedeian, 1989), and the development of disparaging attitudes toward work situations and social interactions (Crank, Culbertson, Poole, & Regoli, 1987; Ulmer, 1992: p. 423). Similarly, based on prior research, it was thought that time-related considerations might be related to job satisfaction (Bedeian, Ferris, & Kacmar, 1992) and turnover intentions (Werbel & Bedeian, 1989). Age was also included as time-related measure. Gender was included as a study variable based on speculation that men may have more disparaging attitudes toward work situations and social interactions than women (Kanter & Mirvis, 1989: p. 156). Tenure with supervisor, organizational tenure, and age was assessed with open-ended questions (e.g., "How long have you worked with your current supervisor?"). Gender was coded male = 0 and female = 1.

Analysis

Two different sets of analyses were conducted for study three. First, tests were conducted to examine the reliability and validity of the Employee Perceptions of Managerial Incivility Scale (EPMI). Confirmatory factor analysis using EQS Version 5.7b was used to test whether the structure of the 21-item instrument was consistent with the four incivility factors derived from the exploratory factor analysis in study two. Another confirmatory factor model was used that included the interactional justice items along with the EPMI scale for the sole purpose of demonstrating discriminant validity between the EPMI factors and interactional justice (Hypothesis 1b). Hypothesis 1a, that incivility would negatively correlate with interactional justice, was examined using correlation analysis. The remaining study hypotheses (2-5) were examined using correlation analyses and hierarchical regression where demographic variables (age, gender, tenure with supervisor, and organizational tenure) were included as controls in step 1.

Results

Reliability and Validity of the Employee Perceptions of Managerial Incivility Scale

I evaluated the fit of the observed data to the model using the EQS 5.7b structural equation modeling (SEM) program (Bentler, 1985). I modeled employee perceptions of managerial incivility as four latent first-order constructs, corresponding to an eight-item general contemptuousness factor, a six-item person-focused insensivity factor, a four-item general inappropriate communication factor, and a three-item person-focused verbal abuse factor. The four latent variables were allowed to covary. An advantage of SEM is

that it can model the relations between latent constructs as error-free indices reflecting the variance shared by multiple-item indicators of the latent constructs (Bentler, 1985).

A raw data file was used as input to separately estimate the effects of the individual indicators used to measure each latent construct (i.e., measurement model). The covariance between any two constructs measures the extent that a change in one construct is associated with a change in another construct. Because the distributions of several of the study's latent constructs were asymmetrical (normalized Mardia's coefficient of kurtosis = 33.99; Mardia, 1970), I used maximum likelihood (ML) estimation and requested robust statistics appropriate for analyses of non-normal data. As with other estimators, ML is based on minimizing the discrepancy between the observed covariance matrix for a set of measured variables and the covariance matrix implied by a theoretically specified structure (model) (Bentler, 1985). I assessed model fit, the extent to which an observed covariance matrix is similar with an implied covariance matrix, using various goodness-of-fit criteria.

Measurement model. In fitting the measurement model, the EQS program converged with no estimation problems. To assess the measurement model's overall goodness-of-fit, I used the Satorra-Bentler (1994) scaled (mean-adjusted) chi-square test because it is recommended for non-normal multivariate data. The observed chi-square value indicated a relatively poor model fit, S-B$_{X}^{2}$ (183, N = 118) = 216.18, $p < .05$, thus, indicating a significant difference between the observed covariance matrix and the covariance matrix implied by the parameters estimated in the specified model. Because S-B$_{X}^{2}$, as a measure of overall fit, is sensitive to sample size relative to more specialized

indices (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003), I also examined four of these more specialized goodness-of-fit statistics.

First, I computed Boruch and Wolins's (1970) adjusted chi-square ratio (X^2/df). It was selected because it is sensitive to model parsimony. Schmitt and Bedeian (1982), among others, have considered a 5:1 ratio or less to be an acceptable fit. The X^2/df for the observed data was 1.86:1, suggesting a good fit. Next, I examined Bentler's (1990) comparative fit index (CFI) and the Bentler-Bonett (1980) non-normed fit index (NNFI), as they are known to be robust to sampling characteristics and relatively invariant to sample size. The CFI and NNFI generally take on values between 0 and 1.0, with values exceeding .90 suggesting adequate fit of observed data to a specified model. The CFI and NNFI indices for the observed data are .92 and .93, respectively. Finally, I examined the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) because it adjusts for both sample size and degrees of freedom. The RMSEA is a measure of the discrepancy between a model-implied covariance matrix and a covariance matrix based on observed data, with an adjustment for degrees of freedom (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). RMSEA values less than .08 are considered desirable, indicating a reasonable error of approximation. The RMSEA for the observed data is .086, with a 90% confidence interval of .07 to .10. Overall, these measures suggested a reasonably acceptable fit of the specified measurement model to the observed data. Attempts at improving model fit through case deletion and/or variable removal yielded little, if any, significant improvement in fit indices.

Item reliability and convergent validity. After examining the measurement model, I examined the item reliability and convergent validity of the individual latent

constructs through estimates of composite reliability (Raykov, 1997) and variance extracted (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), to further determine how well the specified measurement model fit the observed data. These estimates (see Table 8) are based on standardized parameter estimates from the specified measurement model. All composite coefficient alpha reliabilities were above the widely accepted .70 cut-off, with narrow confidence intervals (Raykov, 2002). The variance-extracted statistic estimates the proportion of variance explained by a construct as compared to the variance due to random error and serves as an estimate of the convergent validity of a latent construct's indicator variables. The general contemptuousness, person-focused insensitivity, general inappropriate communication, and person-focused verbal abuse scales all had variance extracted estimates above .50, indicating good internal consistency and construct-captured variance larger than variance due to measurement error (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). It should be noted that the variance extracted statistic is a more conservative estimate than is composite reliability (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Moreover, none of the items had loadings less than .40, a threshold commonly used in factor analysis (Hulland, 1999).

Support for the convergent validity of the four latent constructs was offered by the individual item-to-construct loadings (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). These can be interpreted as a correlation (ranging from -1.0 to +1.0) between an indicator and the variance shared by other indicators of the same latent construct. In the present case, the item-to-construct loadings ranged from .73 to .89 (the average standardized loading was .83), and *t*-values ranged from 6.26 to 15.36 ($p < .05$), indicating that each of the indicators loaded onto its intended construct. Standard errors for the parameter estimates

Table 8

Measurement Properties for Study Constructs

Constructs and Indicators	Standardized Loading	Composite Reliability (ρ_Y)	Variance Extracted Estimate
General Contemptuousness		0.95	0.72
Item 1	0.80		
Item 2	0.77		
Item 3	0.86		
Item 4	0.88		
Item 5	0.89		
Item 6	0.84		
Item 7	0.88		
Item 8	0.87		
Person-Focused Insensivity		0.93	0.69
Item 1	0.83		
Item 2	0.75		
Item 3	0.89		
Item 4	0.80		
Item 5	0.85		
Item 6	0.85		
General Inappropriate Communication		0.85	0.59
Item 1	0.76		
Item 2	0.79		
Item 3	0.73		
Item 4	0.80		
Person-Focused Verbal Abuse		0.89	0.72
Item 1	0.80		
Item 2	0.89		
Item 3	0.87		

ranged from .09 to .13. The average value of the absolute standardized residuals (i.e., the difference between the actual and predicted scores) was .04, which reflected a fairly good fit to the data. The frequency distribution of these standardized residuals was symmetric and centered on zero, with 92% of the residual values falling between -0.1 and 0.1, and the remaining 8% between –0.2 and 0.2. These values indicated that the specified measurement model described the observed data well.

Discriminant validity. To assess the discriminant validity of the individual latent constructs, I calculated confidence intervals around the maximum likelihood estimate for the correlation (Φ) between each pair of constructs (i.e., Φ ± 2 standard errors). None of the confidence intervals contained a value of 1, providing some evidence that the four constructs are distinct (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Next, I compared a series of one-factor measurement models combining two of the employee perceptions of managerial incivility factors to a two-factor measurement model with the same two factors entered as separate factors. I made comparisons for every two-factor combination for a total of six comparisons. Using a sequential chi-square difference test, the two factor model was a significantly better fit to the observed data than the one-factor model for all comparisons: X^2_{diff} ($df_{\text{diff}} = 1$, $N = 118$) = ranged from 14 to 169, $p < .05$, thereby offering further support for the discriminant (and convergent) validity of the four constructs.

Despite the preceding evidence that the four incivility subscales can be considered separately, the subscales were highly correlated ($r = .7$ to $.81$, $p < .01$). This suggested that the four subscales could also be combined to form a global incivility index. The reliability estimate for the resulting 21-item global incivility index was .97. In further

analyses, it was decided to test the hypotheses against the four incivility subscales and the global index.

Hypotheses Testing

The third part of Hinkin's (1998) sixth step calls for establishing criterion-related validity. Evidence of criterion-related validity is provided when the new measures demonstrate significant relationships with existing variables that can be hypothesized to be related within a nomological network (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). Variable means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for all study variables are presented in Table 9.

Hypothesis 1: Interactional justice. Hypothesis 1 addresses concerns that the *Interactional Justice* scale may be indistinct from a scale measuring incivility. Specifically, hypothesis 1 proposed that (a) incivility will be negatively correlated with interactional justice but (b) will be distinctly different measures. Consistent with Hypothesis 1a, the global incivility index and the four subscales were negatively correlated with interactional justice (r = -.7 to -.87, $p < .01$).

To test hypothesis 1b, the six-item interactional justice measure was added to the measurement model to evaluate discriminant validity between interactional justice and the four incivility factors. The overall model fit was analyzed using the same procedures described previously. The observed chi-square value indicated a poor model fit, S-B$_{X^2}$ (314, N = 118) = 396.13, $p < .01$. The X^2/df for the observed data was 1.99:1 and the CFI and NNFI indices for this model were .89 and .90, respectively. The RMSEA was .09 with a 90% confidence interval ranging from .08 to 1.0. Overall, this model fit the data less acceptably than did the previous model, but still managed to rate acceptable fit for two of the five fit indices.

Again, I calculated confidence intervals around the maximum likelihood estimate for the correlation (Φ) between the each incivility factor and the interactional justice constructs (i.e., Φ ± 2 standard errors). None of the confidence intervals contained a value of 1, providing some evidence that the five constructs were distinct (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Next, I compared a series of one-factor measurement models combining each incivility factor with the interactional justice construct to a two-factor measurement model with the same two factors entered as separate factors. I made comparisons for each combination, a total of four comparisons. Using a sequential chi-square difference test, the two factor model was a significantly better fit to the observed data than the one-factor model for each comparison: X^2_{diff} ($df_{\text{diff}} = 1$, $N = 118$) = ranged from 43 to 204, $p < .05$, thereby offering further support for the discriminant validity of the four constructs compared to interactional injustice and Hypothesis 1b.

Hypothesis 2: Turnover intentions. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, turnover intentions were positively correlated with the global incivility index ($r = .39$, $p < .01$) and the four incivility subscales ($r = .32$ to $.39$, $p < .01$). The hierarchical regression shown in Table 10 further supported the hypothesis. After controlling for the demographic variables, the four incivility subscales accounted for an additional 15.5% of variance in turnover intentions. The betas of the four incivility scales showed that three of the four subscales were in the hypothesized direction, however, none of the four betas was significant. This outcome, influenced by high intercorrelation among the subscales, was not unexpected.

Hypothesis 3: Withdrawal behaviors. As shown in Table 9 and contrary to Hypothesis 3, withdrawal behaviors were not correlated with managerial incivility. This finding was confirmed in the regression analysis shown in Table 10.

Hypothesis 4: Performance appraisals. In partial support of Hypothesis 4, performance appraisal scores were negatively correlated with the global incivility index (r = -.24, p < .01) two of the four subscales: general contemptuousness (r = -.27, p < .01) and person-focused verbal abuse (r = -.22, p < .01) (see Table 9). The hierarchical regression shown in Table 10 further supported the hypothesis. After controlling for the demographic variables, the four incivility subscales accounted for an additional 7.4% of variance in supervisor-appraised performance. The betas of the four incivility scales showed three of the four subscales were in the hypothesized direction and that none of the betas were significant.

Hypothesis 5: Negative affectivity. Hypothesis 5 was largely supported: negative affect was positively correlated with the global incivility index (r = .24, p < .01) and all of the subscales (r = .22 to .25, p < .01) except general inappropriate communications. The hierarchical regression shown in Table 10 further supported the hypothesis. After controlling for the demographic variables, the four incivility subscales collectively accounted for an additional 11.2% of variance in negative affectivity. High correlations among the four subscales are likely responsible for none of the individual factor betas demonstrating significance.

Table 9.

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among Study Variables

Variables		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Global Index of Managerial Incivility		---									
2 General Contemptuousness		.94**	---								
3 Person-Focused Insensitivity		.89**	.74**	---							
4 General Inappropriate Communications		.86**	.76**	.70**	---						
5 Person-Focused Verbal Abuse		.91**	.79**	.81**	.78**	---					
6 Interactional Justice		-.86**	-.78**	-.87**	-.70**	-.74**	---				
7 Turnover Intentions		.39**	.39**	.34**	.32**	.32**	-.36**	---			
8 Performance Appraisal		-.24**	-.27**	-.18	-.14	-.21*	.19*	-.05	---		
9 Withdrawal Behaviors		.00	-.02	.02	-.01	.05	.05	.04	.15	---	
10 Negative Affect		.24**	.25**	.24*	.14	.22*	-.19*	.19*	-.28**	-.03	---
	M	51.1	21.4	14.3	8.7	6.7	27.1	10.3	2.7	32.3	23.4
	SD	22.6	10.3	6.6	4.1	3.8	6.9	4.7	0.7	2.7	6.7

Notes. N = 118.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 10:

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis (N = 118)

	Dependent Variables							
	Turnover Intentions		Withdrawal Behaviors		Performance Appraisal		Negative Affect	
	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2	b	ΔR^2
Step 1 (controls):		.05		.08[t]		.07[t]		.04
Age	-.02		.20[t]		.03		-.19[t]	
Gender	-.12		.04		.11		.03	
Tenure with Supervisor	.14		-.13		-.24*		.06	
Organizational Tenure	-.18		.11		.18		-.06	
Step 2 (Incivility):		.16**		.00		.07[t]		.11*
General Contemptuousness	.23		.03		-.27		.09	
Person-focused Insensitivity	.19		-.10		-.02		.22	
General Inappropriate Communications	.02		-.06		.19		-.23	
Person-focused Verbal abuse	-.00		.10		-.15		.24	

Note. In Step 1, $R^2 = .05$ for Turnover Intentions, $R^2 = .08$ for Withdrawal Behaviors, $R^2 = .07$ for Performance Appraisal, and $R^2 = .04$ for Negative Affect.

[t] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

V. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to develop and validate a measure of incivility. Following the framework provided by Hinkin (1998), this research demonstrated convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity for the managerial incivility constructs developed. This is only a beginning. The impact of managerial incivility on employees has been theorized to have tremendous organizational consequences (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Yet, lacking empirical methodology to capture perceptions of incivility, the literature has been, to this point, largely theoretical. This research has established a new instrument with which the exploration of the impact of incivility might be more closely gauged.

Study Limitations

Sampling issues. While this study incorporated multiple samples in the scale development process, further testing with a diversity of independent samples will enhance the generalizability of this new measure (Stone, 1978). Convenience sampling dominated the first two studies in this research and the third sample was relatively homogenous, being dominated by nursing staff in particular. To further enhance the generalizability of this measure, a more diverse set of workers encompassing a greater variety of work environments should be utilized.

Another area that merits attention is the applicable area to which this measure can be applied. In other words, this study focused on the employees' perceptions of their

immediate supervisors, but is this measure also adaptable to peer-to-peer evaluations, or to client/server relationships? While measuring a wider variety of situational relationships could be deemed an admirable trait, as developed, this measure fills a very narrowly defined niche in the realm of workplace relationships, and deviations from this supervisor/subordinate relationship should be approached with caution.

Wording inconsistencies. A key assumption in this research was that the incivility/civility construct resides on opposite ends of a continuous measure. This is clearly an idea that can and should be tested. While conventional wisdom and intuition may convince us that these two constructs are merely polar opposites, empirical validation is warranted. In a similar vein, it would be useful to explore whether perceptions of incivility are determined by the intent of the perpetrator. In other words, research is needed to determine if incivility is simply the omission of civil behavior or if it also includes the commission of demeaning behavior. Additionally, this line of research should lead to the establishment of, or redefining of acceptable civil managerial behaviors so that management development can be targeted to equip organizational trainers with an instrument to guide them in maximizing the manager/subordinate relationship.

The fact that I had to change from negative wording to positive raises some concerns. In a study of optimism and pessimism, Mook, Kleijn, and van der Ploeg (1992) found that positively worded items loaded on one factor (labeled "presence of optimism") and negatively worded items loaded on a second factor (labeled "absence of pessimism"). These findings led them to reason that the absence of pessimism is not necessarily equivalent to the presence of optimism. Findings such as these indicate that

the civility/incivility assumption maintained in this study should be examined empirically. Furthermore, if the assumption holds that civility and incivility are inverse of each other, it may be easier and more palatable to collect data regarding incivility from the positive, or civil perspective.

Common method variance concerns. Although three different samples were used in this research, each analysis relied almost completely on data within the sample, except in Study three where the organization provided a measure of performance. Results contrary to expectations, such as the nonsignificant relationship between withdrawal behaviors and incivility may prove to exist if future research incorporates management rating of subordinate in this and other areas. To allay common method variance concerns, these regressions were rerun, adding negative affect in with the controls. With turnover intention as the dependent variable, the results were only slightly different, with the incivility subscales still accounting for a significant portion of the variation (13% with negative affect as a control versus 15%). With performance appraisal as the dependent variable, the change in explained variation dropped from 7.4% ($p = 0.57$) without negative affect in the controls to 4.2% ($p = .242$) with it in. Future research should address these design shortcomings as well as test against other organizational and individual level work outcomes.

The lack of support for the relationship between incivility and withdrawal behaviors was a curious result, considering that the literature seemed to point to a relationship. The most plausible explanation for this result is in the measure of withdrawal behaviors. The withdrawal behavior measure was intended for use as an

observational measure, such that a supervisor might rate employees according to the items in this measure. In this research, the withdrawal items were self-reported. In future research, it is recommended that withdrawal behaviors be tested as observed data and not as self-report data.

Key Contributions

Instrument. This research, driven by subject observations and input, produced a 21-item measure of incivility. The measure yielded 4 subscales that capture a richer and wider range of incivility behaviors. Also, this measure works as an index, which is consistent with the objective of developing a general measure of managerial incivility. This instrument targets the narrow void of minor managerial deviant behavior that lies somewhere between measures of acceptable managerial behavior and major managerial deviant behavior. Future research is needed to further evaluate this measure against other organizational and individual level work outcomes and to further understand the relations between the subscales.

Hinkin's (1998) sixth step in the scale development process calls for replication studies to confirm the psychometric properties of this new measure. Replication studies will aid in both the validation and refinement of the instrument. Amending this instrument to measure other settings, such as peer-to-peer, is also suggested to assess the flexibility of the instrument to apply to areas outside the narrow niche for which it was developed.

Practical use. This measure and subscales has merely scratched the surface in terms of organizational and individual work-related outcomes, yet has managed to

demonstrate significant relationships to important attitudes and performance. This begins to verify what incivility theorists have been suggesting for years, that minor forms of deviance do impact the work relationships. Researchers and practitioners can begin testing and exploring ideas on the importance of minor forms of deviance.

The favorable support for predictive validity of this new measure regarding turnover intentions and performance appraisal represents a small portion of the organizational outcomes that could be addressed. Future research streams should explore the impact of employee perceptions of managerial incivility on a variety of organizational outcomes. Lobel and Faught (1996) conceptualized four basic approaches to measuring organizational outcomes; three of these approaches appear to be suitable to testing against the new measure. A human cost approach (Konrad & Mangel, 2000; Kossek & Grace, 1990) focuses on the savings associated with reduced labor costs as indicated by absenteeism, turnover, and productivity that result from employer-support. The human-investment approach (Cohen, 1999) attempts to document the long-term financial benefits that are related to employer-support as indicated by recruitment, retention, morale, and productivity. The employee stakeholder approach (Litchfield, 1999; Mirvis, 1999) considers the different types of benefits that are gained by members of stakeholder groups as indicated by attitudes, reputation, commitment to company or project satisfaction. Demonstrating significant relationships between employee perceptions of managerial incivility and organizational outcomes such as these could prove beneficial to organizations as they seek to improve their competitive positions in an ever-increasing competitive marketplace.

The personality variable, negative affect, was included in this study to explore the possibility that perceptions of incivility may be correlated with attitudes and traits. Negative affect has been shown to relate to a variety of work-related outcomes and has been tested as a moderator against a measure of work satisfaction (Johnson & Johnson, 2001). While this study only examined correlations, future research may be more appropriately designed to test for the moderating or mediating effects on employee perceptions of managerial incivility against a variety of attitudinal and trait measures.

Conclusion. A close examination of the relationships between the incivility factors with each of the variables used in this study offers some answers, and raises some questions. Hopefully this measure spurs further research and application regarding concern for low-severity deviant behavior. Work relationships other than the manager/subordinate could also be explored using variations of this instrument. Relationships outside the work arena, such as teacher/student, could also prove to be fertile ground for applications of this instrument.

A final note on the incivility construct in general must touch on the fact, despite long being widely held that incivility plays an instrumental role in the work relationship, little empirical development of tangible incivility measures has heretofore been offered to the academic community. Most work to date has focused on more aggressive behaviors and intentional actions, with less focus on the less overt behaviors that this research has attempted to capture. This research has delivered a very specific measure of incivility that should prove to be a valuable tool in the organizational behavior researchers' toolbox.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E. Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Alderson, W. T., & McDonnell, N. A. (1994). *Theory R management: How to utilize value of the person leadership principles of love, dignity, and respect*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). *Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach*. Psychological Bulletin, 103, 411-423.

Anderson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999, July). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 452-471.

Ashforth, B. E. (1987). *Organizations and the petty tyrant: An exploratory study*. New Orleans, LA: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management.

Ashforth, B. E. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations, 47*(7), 755-778.

Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*(2), 126-140.

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.

Bedeian, A. G., Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A Tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 40*: 33-48.

Benson, J. & Hocevar, D. (1985). The impact of item phrasing on the validity of attitude scales for elementary school children. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 22*, 213-240.

Bentler, P. M. & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness-of-fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin, 88*, 588-606.

Bentler, P. M. (1985). *Theory and implementation of EQS: A structural equations program*. Los Angeles: BMDP Statistical Software.

Bentler, P. M.(1990). Comparative fit indices in structural fit indices in structural equation models. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*: 238-246.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations, 1,* 43-55.

Bluedorn, A. C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations, 35,* 135-153.

Bolger, N. & Zuckerman, A. (1995). A framework for studying personality in the stress process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 890-902.

Boruch, R. F., & Wolins, L. (1970). A procedure for estimation of trait, method, and error variance attributable to a measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*: 547-574.

Brockner, J. (1988). The effects of work layoffs on survivors: Research, theory, and practice. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (vol. 10, pp. 213-255). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Browne, M. B. & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit: 136-162. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Buckingham, M. & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, break all the rules*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Burbach, M. E. (2004). Testing the relationship between emotional intelligence and full-range leadership as moderated by cognitive style and self-concept. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section: Humanities & Social Science, 65*, 1020.

Burkett, L. (1990). *Business by the book: The complete guide of Biblical principles for business men and women*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

Cammann, C., Fichman, M. Jenkins, G. D., Jr. & Klesh, J. R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler, III, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices* (pp. 71-138). New York: Wiley.

Carter, S. L. (1998). *Civility: Manners, morals, and the etiquette of democracy*. New York: Basic Books.

Chen, C. C. & Eastman, W. (1997). Toward a civic culture for multicultural organizations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33,* 454-470.

Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research, 16*, 64-73.

Cohen, J. (1999). Measuring impact on the bottom line: Applying accounting measures to work/life initiatives. In Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (Ed.) *Metrics Manual: Ten Approaches to Measuring Work/Life Initiatives*. (pgs. 143-171). Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College Center for Work & Family.

Crank, J. P., Culbertson, R. G., Poole, E. D., & Regoli, R. M. (1987). The measurement of cynicism among police chiefs. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 15*: 37-48.

Cronbach, L. J. & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*, 281-302.

Davis, D. D., & Dickinson, T. (1987). *Organizational and contextual determinants of perceived utility of performance appraisals*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Psychological Association, New York.

DeMore, S. W., Fisher, J. D., & Baron, R. M. (1988). The equity-control model as a predictor of vandalism among college students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 18,* 80-91.

DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc..

Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C. & Pagon, M. (1998). *Social undermining and social support in the workplace*. San Diego: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management.

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkle, B., Lynch, P. D. & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 42-51.

Fishbein, M. (1967). *Readings in attitude theory and measurement*. New York: Wiley.

Folger, R. & Skarlicki, D. P. (1998). A popcorn model of workplace violence. In R. W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Nonviolent dysfunctional behaviors* (pp. 43-82). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Folger, R. (1993). Reactions to mistreatment at work. In J. K. Murnigham (Ed.), *Social psychology in organizations: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 161-183). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 28*: 39-50.

Greenberg, J. & Scott, K. S. (1996). Why do workers bite the hand that feeds them? Employee theft as a social exchange process. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research on organizational behavior* (Vol. 18, pp. 111-156). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Hanisch, K. A. & Hulin, C. L. (1990). Job attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An examination of retirement and other voluntary withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37,* 60-78.

Hanisch, K. A. & Hulin, C. L. (1991). General attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An examination of a causal model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39,* 110-128.

Hinken, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 104-121.

Hoge, T. & Bussing, A. (2004). The impact of sense of coherence and negative affectivity on the work stressor-strain relationship. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9*, 195-205.

Hollinger, R. C. & Clark, J. P. (1983). *Theft by employees*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Hulland, J. (1999). Use of partial least squares (PLS) in strategic management research: A review of four recent studies. *Strategic Management Journal, 20*: 195-204.

Johnson, G. J. & Johnson, W. R. (2000). Perceived over-qualification, positive and negative affectivity, and satisfaction with work. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 15*(2), 167-184.

Judge, T. A. (1993). Does affective disposition moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and voluntary turnover? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 395-401.

Kaiser, H. F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 23*, 187-200.

Kanter, D. L. & Mirvis, P. H. (1989). *The cynical Americans: Living and working in an age of discontent and disillusion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Keashly, L., Trott, V. & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims, 9,* 341-357.

Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Konrad, A. M. & Mangel, R. (2000). The impact of work-life programs on firm productivity. *Strategic Management Journal, 21*, 1225.

Kossek, Ellen E. & Grace, Paulette. (1990). Taking a strategic view of employee child care assistance: A cost-benefit model. *Human Resource Planning,13*(3). 189-202.

Kraut, A. (1975). Predicting turnover of employees from measured job attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13,* 233-243.

Larsen, R. J., & Katelaar, T. (1991). Personality and susceptibility to positive and negative emotional states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61,* 132-140.

Lauer, C. S. (2002). The end of civility?. *Modern Healthcare, 32*(9), 29-31.

Levinson, H. (1978). The abrasive personality. *Harvard Business Review, 56*(3), 86-94.

Litchfield, L. (1999). Examining impact on supervisors and co-workers: Assessing the ripple effect. In Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (Ed.) *Metrics Manual: Ten Approaches to Measuring Work/Life Initiatives*. (pgs.199-226). Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College Center for Work & Family.

Lobel, S. & Faught, F. (1996), Four methods for proving the value of work/life initiatives, *Compensation and Benefits Review, 28* (6), 50-57.

Lyons, R. Tivey, H. & Ball, C. (1995). *Bullying at work: A guide for MSF representatives and members*. London: MSF.

Mano, H. & Oliver, R. L. (1993). Assessing the dimensionality and structure of the consumption experience: Evaluation, feeling, and satisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Research, 20*(3), 451-466.

Mardia, K. V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications. *Biometrika, 57*: 519-530.

Marks, J. (1996, April 22). The American uncivil wars. *U. S. News & World Report, ,* 66-72.

Mikula, G. Petrik, B. & Tanzer, N. (1990). What people regard as unjust: Types and structures of everyday experiences of injustice. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 20,* 133-149.

Mirvis, P. (1999). Measuring impact on external stakeholder relationships. In Pitt-Catsouphes, M. (Ed.) *Metrics Manual: Ten Approaches to Measuring Work/Life Initiatives*. (pgs. 227-249). Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College Center for Work & Family

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62,* 237-240.

Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O. & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63,* 408-414.

Mook, J., Kleijn, W. Chr. & Ploeg, H. M. van der. (1992). Positively and negatively worded items in a self-report measure of dispositional optimism. *Psychological Reports, 71*, 275-278.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 845-855.

Murphy, K. R. & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). Understanding performance appraisal. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

Neuman, J. H. & Baron, R. A. (1997). Aggression in the workplace. In R. A. Giacalone, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 37-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.) New York: McGaw-Hill.

O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W. & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review, 21,* 225-253.

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M. & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics, 29*(2), 123-137.

Prestholdt, P. H., Lane, I. M. & Mathews, R. C. (1987). Nurse turnover as a reasoned action: Development of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72,* 221-227.

Price, J. L. & Mueller, C. W. (19860. *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.

Quine, L. (2001). Workplace bullying in nurses. *Journal of Health Psychology, 6*(1), 73-84.

Raykov, T. (1997). Estimation of composite reliability for congeneric measures. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 21*: 173-184.

Raykov, T. (2002). Analytic estimation of standard error and confidence interval for scale reliability. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 37*: 89-103.

Raynor, C. & Hoel, H. (1997). A summary review of literature relating to workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 7,* 181-191.

Richman, J. A., Flaherty, J. A., Rospenda, K. M. & Christensen, M. L. (1992). Mental health consequences and correlates of reported medical student abuse. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 267,* 692-694.

Robinson, S. L. & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(2), 555-572.

Rubin, B. (1987). *Modern dictators: Third world coup makers, strongmen, and populist tyrants*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Satorra, A. & Bentler, P. M. (1994). Corrections to test statistics and standard errors in covariance structure analysis: 399-419. In A. von Eye & C. Clogg (Eds.), *Latent variables analysis: Applications for developmental research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H. & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online, 28*(2): 23-74. Retrieved February 3, 2005, from http://www.dgps.de/fachgruppen/methoden/mpr-online/issue20/

Schmitt, N. & Bedeian, A. G. (1982). A comparison of LISREL and two-stage least squares analysis of a hypothesized life-job satisfaction reciprocal relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*: 806-817.

Schriesheim, C. A. & Hill, K. D. (1981). Controlling acquiescence response bias by item reversals: The effect on questionnaire validity. *Education and Psychological Measurement, 41*, 1101-1114.

Scott, W. A. (1965). *Values and organizations: A study of fraternities and sororities*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Shaw, J. D. (1999). Job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The moderating role of positive affect. *Journal of Social Psychology, 139*(2), 242-244.

Sheehan, K. H., Sheehan, D. V., White, K. Leibowitz, A. & Baldwin, D. C. (1990). A pilot study of medical student abuse. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 263,* 533-537.

Shelley, M. & Pakenham, K. I. (2004). External health locus of control and general self-efficacy: Moderators of emotional distress among university students. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 56*, 191-199.

Shore, L. M., Thornton, G. C., III & Newton, L. A. (1989). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of behavioral intentions and employee behavior. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* 229-233.

Skarlicki, D. P. & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 434-443.

Skarlicki, D. P., Folger, R. & Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(1), 100-108.

Steel, R. P. & Ovalle, N. K. (1984). A review of meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69,* 673-686.

Stone, E. (1978). *Research methods in organizational behavior*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178-190.

Tett, R. P. & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analysis based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology, 46,* 259-293.

Thompson, V. A. (1961). *Modern organizations*. New York: Alfred A Knopf.

Uhl-Bien, M. & Maslyn, J. M. (2000). Examining the exchange in leader-member exchange (LMX): Identification of dyadic relational styles and their association with key attitudes and behaviors. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* 1-6. Retrieved January 11, 2005 from http://eparchiver.epnet.com/Pubs/aom/Main.asp.

Ulmer, J. T. (1992). Occupational socialization and cynicism toward prison administration. *Social Science Journal, 29*: 423-442.

Watson, D. & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin, 96,* 465-490.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A. & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of a brief measure of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 54*(6), 1063-1070.

Webster's Universal College Dictionary. (1997). New York: Gramercy Books, Inc.

Werbel, J. D. & Bedeian, A. G. (1989). Intended turnover as a function of age and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*: 275-281.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

I am working on a research project designed to gain a better understanding of **incivil, rude supervisory behavior** and would like your help. I am asking people with a variety of work experience for help in identifying the various forms that rude behavior takes. Your participation is voluntary and your responses are completely anonymous.

Please think about your current and past supervisors. Briefly describe five (5) things these supervisors did that made you feel like they were being rude or incivil. Please be as specific as possible. Use the back of this form if necessary.

1. _____
   _____
   _____
2. _____
   _____
   _____
3. _____
   _____
   _____
4. _____
   _____
   _____
5. _____
   _____
   _____

Please take a moment to complete the following demographic questions.

Age _____ Sex _____ Race _____

Years of Supervised Work Experience _____

Job Type (select one that best describes your current job)

- o Business/ Financial Operations
- o Community & Social Services
- o Education, Training, & Library
- o Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, & Media
- o Healthcare Practitioner & Technical
- o Healthcare Support
- o Protective Service
- o Food Preparation & Serving
- o Building/Grounds Cleaning & Maintenance
- o Personal Care & Service
- o Sales & Related
- o Office & Administrative Support
- o Farming, Fishing, & Forestry
- o Construction & Extraction
- o Installation, Maintenance, & Repair
- o Production
- o Transportation & Material Moving
- o Management

Contact Information: Robert M. Crocker
Stephen F. Austin State University
Department of Management, Marketing & International Business
Nacogdoches, Texas 75962
Phone: (936) 468-1673

APPENDIX B.

Critical Incidents Words and Phrase (Frequency Descending)

1. 18 yelling
2. 17 wrongful blame
3. 15 belittle
4. 14 not informing
5. 14 not doing job
6. 14 insensitive
7. 14 favoritism
8. 12 public criticism
9. 12 differential treatment
10. 12 abuse of position
11. 10 withholding reward
12. 10 double standard
13. 9 public humiliation
14. 8 unrealistic expectations
15. 8 not listening
16. 8 not considering alternatives
17. 8 lack of concern
18. 8 interrupting
19. 7 talk down
20. 7 ignoring
21. 7 cursing
22. 6 work/life
23. 6 schedule
24. 6 parental
25. 6 not admitting mistake
26. 6 name calling
27. 6 joking
28. 6 gossip
29. 6 disrespect
30. 6 closely watched
31. 5 temper
32. 5 no appreciation
33. 5 moody
34. 5 invasion of privacy
35. 5 gestures
36. 4 unavailable
37. 4 stealing credit
38. 4 public confrontation
39. 4 over-using good worker
40. 4 not supporting
41. 4 manipulative
42. 4 jumping to conclusion
43. 4 condescending
44. 3 public discipline
45. 3 lying
46. 3 lack of self-control
47. 3 intimidating
48. 3 incompetent
49. 3 failing to discipline
50. 3 critical
51. 3 breach of trust
52. 3 arrogance
53. 2 unfair treatment
54. 2 tone of voice
55. 2 telling not asking
56. 2 sarcastic
57. 2 rushing
58. 2 pushy
59. 2 not responding
60. 2 not helping
61. 2 not available
62. 2 lack of trust
63. 2 insulting
64. 2 disorganized
65. 2 changing rules
66. 2 changing mind
67. 2 body language
68. 2 air of superiority
69. asking employees to lie
70. back stabbing
71. breaking promises
72. changing assignments
73. chauvinism
74. comparison to others
75. demanding
76. discourteous
77. disobeying
78. emotional abuse
79. fault finding
80. forgetting days off

81. griping about policy
82. harassing
83. hypocrisy
84. impatient
85. insatiable
86. irrational
87. mental abuse
88. misuse of assets
89. negative
90. nepotism
91. no feedback
92. no follow up
93. no recognition
94. not an example
95. not involved
96. over-reacting
97. pessimistic
98. petty
99. picky
100. self-control
101. stubborn
102. teasing
103. unsocial
104. wasting resources
105. *6 racism*
106. *2 asking employee to break rules*
107. *2 sexual comments*
108. *breaking the law*
109. *endangering*
110. *physical abuse*
111. *sexual advances*
112. *sexual conduct*
113. *sexual harassment*
114. *unethical assignment*
115. *unequal opportunity*
116. *violence*

APPENDIX C.

General Instructions

This is not a test. Please answer the questions as honestly as you can. Do not compare your answers to others. If you make a mistake, erase or cross through your original answer.

Section 1. This section contains statements describing a variety of actions and behaviors that your immediate supervisor may or may not engage in. Using the scale provided, indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate response. Use the following scale to represent your level of agreement with each statement.

SA	=	**STRONGLY AGREE**
A	=	Agree
sa	=	Slightly agree
sd	=	Slightly disagree
D	=	Disagree
SD	=	**STRONGLY DISAGREE**

Please read each item carefully and circle the one answer that best matches your level of agreement with each statement.

My Immediate Supervisor…							
1.	yells or hollers when talking to me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
2.	wrongfully blames me when things go wrong.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
3.	puts me down.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
4.	displays favoritism in dealing with subordinates.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
5.	is sensitive to my needs and concerns.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
6.	keeps me informed.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
7.	abuses his/her authority.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
8.	treats me the same as my co-workers.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
9.	criticizes me in front of others.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

My Immediate Supervisor…							
10.	applies fair standards to all subordinates.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
11.	delays or withholds rewards due me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
12.	publicly humiliates me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
13.	interrupts me when I am talking.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
14.	shows concern for me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
15.	considers alternative views when making decisions.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
16.	listens to me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
17.	has realistic expectations of what I can accomplish.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
18.	curses and swears at me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
19.	ignores me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
20.	talks down to me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
21.	watches me closely looking for mistakes.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
22.	respects me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
23.	gossips about his/her subordinates.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
24.	jokes inappropriately.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
25.	calls me names.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
26.	admits when he/she has made a mistake.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
27.	treats me like a mature adult.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
28.	assigns schedules fairly.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
29.	is concerned about helping me balance my work and non-work life.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

My Immediate Supervisor…							
30.	uses inappropriate gestures.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
31.	respects my privacy.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
32.	is moody.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
33.	appreciates my effort.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
34.	has a temper.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
35.	treats me like I don't know anything.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
36.	jumps to conclusions before getting all the facts.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
37.	is manipulative.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
38.	is supportive.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
39.	takes advantage of good workers by giving them unfair workloads.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
40.	publicly confronts subordinates.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
41.	takes credit for others' work and successes.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
42.	is available when needed.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
43.	is arrogant.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
44.	follows work rules consistently.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
45.	tries to scare or intimidate people.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
46.	has self-control.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
47.	lies.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
48.	thinks they are better than everyone else.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
49.	is pushy.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

My Immediate Supervisor…						
50. is sarcastic.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

End Section 1.

Section 2. This section contains statements regarding your job, behaviors, and attitudes. Using the scale provided, indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate response

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = Agree
sa = Slightly Agree
sd = Slightly Disagree
D = Disagree
SD = DISAGREE STRONGLY

51.	I will actively look for a new job in the next year.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
52.	I often think about quitting.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
53.	I will probably look for a new job in the next year.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
54.	I return to my workstation as soon as my break is over.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
55.	I begin work on time.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
56.	I give advance notice when I cannot come to work.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
57.	My attendance at work is above the norm.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
58.	I take too many breaks.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
59.	I am often late to work or often leave work early.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
60.	A job is what you make it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
61.	On most jobs, people can pretty much accomplish whatever they set out to accomplish.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
62.	If you know what you want out of a job, you can find a job that gives it to you.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
63.	If employees are unhappy with decisions made by their boss, they should do something about it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
64.	Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
65.	Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

66.	People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded for it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
67.	Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
68.	Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
69.	Making money is primarily a matter of good fortune.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
70.	In order to get a really good job you need to have family members or friends in high places.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
71.	Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
72.	When it comes to landing a really good job, who you know is more important than what you know.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
73.	To make a lot of money you have to know the right people.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
74.	It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
75.	The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who a make a little, is luck.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
76.	When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
77.	One of my problems is that I cannot get down to work when I should.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
78.	If I can't do the job the first time, I keep trying until I can.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
79.	When I set important goals for myself, I rarely achieve them.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
80.	I give up on things before completing them.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
81.	I avoid facing difficulties.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
82.	If something looks complicated, I will not even bother to try it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
83.	When I have something important to do, I stick to it until I finish it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
84.	When I decide to do something, I go right to work on it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

85.	When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
86.	When unexpected problems occur, I don't handle them very well.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
87.	I avoid trying to learn new things when they look too difficult for me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
88.	Failure just makes me try harder.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
89.	I feel insecure about my ability to do things.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
90.	I am a self-reliant person.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
91.	I give up easily.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
92.	I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that come up in life.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
93.	My supervisor considers my viewpoint.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
94.	My supervisor is able to suppress personal biases.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
95.	My supervisor provides me with timely feedback about a decision and its implications.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
96.	My supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
97.	My supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
98.	My supervisor deals with me in a truthful manner.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

This section contains a list of adjectives that describe a variety of emotions. Read each word and focus on how often you feel this way in general. Rate each word on the numeric scale, with 1 = You never feel this and 6 = you always feel this. Circle your response.

		Never					Always
99.	Scared	1	2	3	4	5	6
100.	Afraid	1	2	3	4	5	6
101.	Upset	1	2	3	4	5	6
102.	Distressed	1	2	3	4	5	6
103.	Jittery	1	2	3	4	5	6
104.	Nervous	1	2	3	4	5	6
105.	Ashamed	1	2	3	4	5	6
106.	Guilty	1	2	3	4	5	6
107.	Irritable	1	2	3	4	5	6
108.	Hostile	1	2	3	4	5	6

End Section 2.

Section 3. This final section contains items regarding your personal characteristics. This information will be used to group answers and for statistical purposes. The information will not be used to identify particular individuals.

Please read each item carefully and answer by writing in the information requested or checking the box ☑ that best describes you.

109. What is your age? _____ years

110. My gender is: ☐ Male ☐ Female

111. Are you: ☐ Married ☐ Single ☐ Divorced ☐ Other

112. Do you: ☐ Have no children. [Check all that apply]
☐ Have children at home.
☐ Have a blended family.
☐ Care for elderly parents.

113. How do you classify yourself? (If necessary you may check more than one box for this question.)
☐ European-American or Caucasian (White)
☐ African-American (Black)
☐ Asian-American
☐ Native American (American Indian)
☐ Hispanic American
☐ Other _____ (Please describe)

114. How long have you worked with this company? _____ years _____ months

115. How long have you worked with your current supervisor? _____ years _____ months

Please write any comments you have regarding this questionnaire or other issues on the back of this page.

If you are interested in a copy of the results from this study, include your name, mailing address, and e-mail address on an index card provided by the researchers.

Place the completed survey in the folder located on the desk in the front of the room.

Thank you for your participation

APPENDIX D.

Factor Structure

	Component			
Item	1	2	3	4
Thinks they are better than everyone else.	.763	.322	.163	.170
Jumps to conclusions before getting all the facts.	.750	.276	.170	.288
Is sarcastic.	.732	.155	.355	.022
Is moody.	.720	.171	.099	.223
Has self-control. [R]	.719	.236	.318	.202
Interrupts me when I am talking.	.666	.277	.176	.193
Is arrogant.	.665	.270	.334	.322
Is manipulative.	.664	.258	.342	.273
Has realistic expectations of what I can accomplish. [R]	.161	.834	.048	.202
Appreciates my effort. [R]	.320	.828	.148	.106
Listens to me. [R]	.390	.777	.178	.226
Is concerned about helping me balance my work and non-work life. [R]	.331	.727	.261	.075
Is sensitive to my needs and concerns. [R]	.108	.709	.306	.123
Considers alternative views when making decisions. [R]	.265	.677	.156	.338
Jokes inappropriately.	.262	.165	.850	.056
Uses inappropriate gestures.	.312	.136	.824	.151
Calls me names.	.204	.160	.661	.379
Publicly confronts subordinates.	.256	.213	.599	.294
Yells or hollers when talking to me.	.222	.161	.132	.836
Puts me down.	.328	.359	.154	.741
Publicly humiliates me.	.390	.253	.255	.637

APPENDIX E.

General Instructions

This is not a test. Please answer the questions as honestly as you can. Do not compare your answers to others. If you make a mistake, erase or cross through your original answer.

Section 1. This section contains statements describing a variety of actions and behaviors that your immediate supervisor may or may not engage in. Using the scale provided, indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate response. Use the following scale to represent your level of agreement with each statement.

SA	=	**STRONGLY AGREE**
A	=	Agree
sa	=	Slightly agree
sd	=	Slightly disagree
D	=	Disagree
SD	=	**STRONGLY DISAGREE**

Please read each item carefully and circle the one answer that best matches your level of agreement with each statement.

My Immediate Supervisor…							
1.	Uses a reasonable and appropriate tone when talking to me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
2.	Gets all the facts before deciding who is to blame when things go wrong.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
3.	Makes me feel important.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
4.	Treats subordinates impartially.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
5.	Is sensitive to my needs and concerns.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
6.	Keeps me informed.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
7.	Uses his/her authority appropriately.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
8.	Offers criticism or suggestions for improvement in private.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

My Immediate Supervisor…							
9.	Provides rewards due me as quickly as possible.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
10.	Is careful not to embarrass me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
11.	Lets me finish my point when I am talking.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
12.	Shows concern for me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
13.	Considers the opinions of his/her subordinates when making decisions.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
14.	Listens to me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
15.	Has a realistic expectation of what I can accomplish.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
16.	Uses appropriate language when talking with me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
17.	Pays attention to me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
18.	Talks to me like an equal.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
19.	Allows me to do my job without watching me too closely.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
20.	Avoids gossiping about his/her subordinates.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
21.	Avoids inappropriate joking.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
22.	Addresses me appropriately.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
23.	Admits when he/she has made a mistake.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
24.	Treats me like a mature adult.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
25.	Assigns schedules fairly.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
26.	Is concerned about helping me balance my work and non-work life.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
27.	Avoids the use of inappropriate gestures.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
28.	Respects my privacy.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

My Immediate Supervisor…							
29.	Is not moody.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
30.	Appreciates my effort.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
31.	Controls his/her temper.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
32.	Treats me like I know what I am doing.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
33.	Gets all the facts before making a decision.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
34.	Avoids manipulating others for his/her own gain.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
35.	Is supportive.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
36.	Assigns workloads fairly.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
37.	Privately speaks with subordinates about problems and concerns.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
38.	Gives credit where credit is due.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
39.	Is available when needed.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
40.	Is humble.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
41.	Follows work rules consistently.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
42.	Tries to avoid scaring or intimidating people.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
43.	Has self-control.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
44.	Tells the truth.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
45.	Is unpretentious.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
46.	Avoids being pushy.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
47.	Avoids being sarcastic.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
48.	My supervisor considers my viewpoint.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

49.	My supervisor is able to suppress personal biases.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
50.	My supervisor provides me with timely feedback about a decision and its implications.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
51.	My supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
52.	My supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
53.	My supervisor deals with me in a truthful manner.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

Section 2. This section contains statements regarding your job, behaviors, and attitudes. Using the scale provided, indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate response

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = Agree
sa = Slightly Agree
sd = Slightly Disagree
D = Disagree
SD = DISAGREE STRONGLY

54.	I will actively look for a new job in the next year.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
55.	I often think about quitting.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
56.	I will probably look for a new job in the next year.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
57.	I return to my workstation as soon as my break is over.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
58.	I begin work on time.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
59.	I give advance notice when I cannot come to work.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
60.	My attendance at work is above the norm.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
61.	I take too many breaks.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
62.	I am often late to work or often leave work early.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
63.	A job is what you make it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
64.	On most jobs, people can pretty much accomplish whatever they set out to accomplish.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
65.	If you know what you want out of a job, you can find a job that gives it to you.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
66.	If employees are unhappy with decisions made by their boss, they should do something about it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
67.	Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
68.	Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

69.	People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded for it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
70.	Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
71.	Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
72.	Making money is primarily a matter of good fortune.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
73.	In order to get a really good job you need to have family members or friends in high places.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
74.	Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
75.	When it comes to landing a really good job, whom you know is more important than what you know.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
76.	To make a lot of money you have to know the right people.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
77.	It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
78.	The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make a little, is luck.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
79.	When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
80.	One of my problems is that I cannot get down to work when I should.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
81.	If I can't do the job the first time, I keep trying until I can.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
82.	When I set important goals for myself, I rarely achieve them.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
83.	I give up on things before completing them.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
84.	I avoid facing difficulties.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
85.	If something looks complicated, I will not even bother to try it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
86.	When I have something important to do, I stick to it until I finish it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
87.	When I decide to do something, I go right to work on it.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

88.	When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
89.	When unexpected problems occur, I don't handle them very well.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
90.	I avoid trying to learn new things when they look too difficult for me.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
91.	Failure just makes me try harder.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
92.	I feel insecure about my ability to do things.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
93.	I am a self-reliant person.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
94.	I give up easily.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**
95.	I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that come up in life.	**SD**	D	sd	sa	A	**SA**

This section contains a list of adjectives that describe a variety of emotions. Read each word and focus on <u>how often</u> you feel this way <u>in general</u>. Rate each word on the numeric scale, with 1 = You never feel this and 6 = you always feel this. Circle your response.

		Never					Always
96.	Scared	1	2	3	4	5	6
97.	Afraid	1	2	3	4	5	6
98.	Upset	1	2	3	4	5	6
99.	Distressed	1	2	3	4	5	6
100.	Jittery	1	2	3	4	5	6
101.	Nervous	1	2	3	4	5	6
102.	Ashamed	1	2	3	4	5	6
103.	Guilty	1	2	3	4	5	6
104.	Irritable	1	2	3	4	5	6
105.	Hostile	1	2	3	4	5	6

END SECTION 2

Section 3. This final section contains items regarding your personal characteristics. This information will be used to group answers and for statistical purposes. The information will not be used to identify particular individuals.

Please read each item carefully and answer by writing in the information requested or checking the box ☑ that best describes you.

106. What is your age? _____ years

107. My gender is: ☐ Male ☐ Female

108. Are you: ☐ Married ☐ Single

109. How do you classify yourself?
☐ European-American or Caucasian (White) ☐ African-American (Black)
☐ Native American (American Indian) ☐ Asian American
☐ Hispanic American ☐ Other

_____

110. How long have you worked with this company? _____ years _____ months

111. How long have you worked with your current supervisor? _____ years _____ months

112. What is the gender of your supervisor? ☐ Male ☐ Female

113. Is your supervisor ☐ older, ☐ younger, ☐ or about the same age as you?

114. How would you classify your supervisor?
☐ European-American or Caucasian (White) ☐ African-American (Black)
☐ Native American (American Indian) ☐ Asian American
☐ Hispanic American ☐ Other

_____

Please write any comments you have regarding this questionnaire or other issues on the back of this page.

When this study is completed, copies of the results will be placed at the Human Resource desk and made available to study participants.

Thank you for your participation!