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ABSTRACT

A CONSTRUCT ANALYSIS OF CIVILITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Ashlyn M. Patterson
University of Guelph, 2016

Advisor: Dr. M. Gloria González-Morales

Interpersonal relationships in the workplace are often described as an important part of an employee’s experience at work (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; McNeese-Smith, 1999). Coworkers can be sources of support, validation, and respect or they can be rude, stressful, and frustrating. On the negative side, research on workplace incivility has grown over the last 15 years and suggests rude behaviour at work is harmful to employees and the organization. On the positive side, research on workplace civility is sparse. The main purpose for the dissertation is to explore what workplace civility is and how is it similar and/or different from other similar constructs.

Given that the study of workplace civility arose out of research on workplace incivility, is it important to understand the relationship between these two constructs. Chapter 1 of the dissertation reviewed current research in both areas highlighting important gaps in the workplace civility literature. In Chapter 2, I describe a study in which I used a qualitative approach to better understand the similarities and differences between civil and uncivil behaviours. Findings suggest civil behaviours are positive active displays of respect while uncivil behaviours are negative active displays of rudeness. Thus, civility is not simply a lack of incivility.

The goal of Chapter 3 was to extend the findings of Chapter 2 and test the empirical relationships between incivility and civility, using a measure of civility norms. Chapter 3 also empirically compared civility to organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB) and respect; thus, starting to form the nomological network. Findings support the distinction between incivility, civility, OCBs, and respect.
In order to expand the nomological network further, in Chapter 4 I identify constructs within the network (i.e., perceived coworker support, OCB, respect, prosocial organizational behaviour, and interpersonal justice) and proposes a framework to better understand the theoretical and methodological similarities and differences between constructs.

Lastly, Chapter 5 includes an empirical exploration of the relationships between civility and the full nomological network using a two-wave panel study. I compared the antecedents of enacted civility, incivility, OCBs, and prosocial organizational behaviours and found different antecedents were more important for different constructs. Next, I compared the relative influence of experienced civility, incivility, civility norms, respect, perceived coworker support, and interpersonal justice on predicting organizational outcomes to determine when civility is a more or less important predictor. Findings suggest civility is a unique construct, however, it is most similar to the constructs of perceived coworker support and respect. Implications for theory, practice, and future research are discussed.
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A CONSTRUCT ANALYSIS OF CIVILITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Prelude

Historically, the concept of “civility” comes from the ideas of citizenship, civilization and the city. The civilized people are those who are fit to live in cities, while the uncivilized represent a savage society. A savage society is characterized by rude and barbarous behaviour; in contrast, a civil society is characterized by good manners, politeness, and etiquette. The idea of civility is important because it allows people to live in close quarters with one another and provides an underlying basis for cooperation, collectivism, and community (Peck, 2002).

The definition of civility, however, has changed over time. Rather than a sole focus on manners and politeness, the current understanding of civility goes beyond that to include communication that “recognizes and adapts to the autonomy and individuality of other persons” (Sypher, 2004, p.258). One reason for this change is that civility evolves through a process of learned behaviour; thus, as expectations of appropriate behaviours change so does the conceptualization of civility. The current understanding of civility views it as an active sacrifice (of talk time, work time, down time etc.) that is made in order to listen to, comfort, encourage, and motivate others to feel and do their best (Sypher, 2004). Thus, these are behaviours that go above and beyond simply “good manners”. However, these conceptualizations haven’t been taken into account by organizational scholars who, initially were interested in workplace incivility, and currently have changed their focus to the positive counterpart of this subtle and ambiguous deviant behaviour.

Within the academic management and organizational literature the interest in workplace civility has largely come in response to the growing body of research on workplace incivility. Andersson and Pearson’s (1999) seminal paper on the incivility spiral marked the beginning of
workplace incivility research and the topic has continued to gain momentum. Although Andersson and Pearson (1999) touch on the idea of civility in their article, they do not expand on it. The focus was on incivility, defined as, “low intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p.457). Only recently have researchers started to focus on the importance of civility. Interestingly, the emergence of the study of workplace civility among incivility researchers may be related to the need to talk about civility to organizations and potential participants when hoping to study incivility or to design interventions to reduce incivility.

Andersson and Pearson (1999) originally defined civility in their paper as, “behavior involving politeness and regard for others in the workplace, within workplace norms for respect” (p.454). A year later in their paper on assessing workplace incivility, Pearson, Andersson and Porath (2000) defined civility as “behavior that helps to preserve the norms for mutual respect at work; it comprises behaviors that are fundamental to positively connecting with another, building relationships and empathizing” (p.125). More recently, McGonagle and colleagues (2014) defined civility as, “behaviors characterized by a show of concern and regard for others” (p.438). What all these definitions have in common is that civility a) helps build/maintain positive relationships with others and b) involves a set of observable behaviours and c) comes from organizational scholars initially and originally interested in incivility, not civility.

Given that civility is defined as a set of behaviours, it should be measured in terms of the frequency at which one experiences or enacts civil behaviours. The majority of research on civility, however, has been conducted at the group-level and focused on broader perceptions of civil norms. In 2007, Meterko and colleagues created the Veteran’s Health Administration (VHA) Civility Scale, which measures employee perceptions of civility, cooperation, diversity
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acceptance, and conflict resolution within their workgroup, from their immediate supervisor, and from the organization in general. Although the items are varied, they tend have high reliability and to group together as a single factor (Hernandez, Luthanen, Ramsel & Osatuke, 2015; Leiter, Laschinger, Day & Gilin-Oore, 2011). The VHA scale has been used to test the effectiveness of a group-level intervention called Civility, Respect, and Engagement in the Workforce (CREW).

The VHA scale has been criticized for going beyond the boundaries of civility to include items about teamwork, acceptance of diversity and organizational tolerance of discrimination (Walsh, Magley, Reeves, Davies-Schrils, Marmet & Gallus, 2012). In 2012, Walsh and colleagues developed the Civility Norms Questionnaire-Brief (CNQ-B), a four-item scale measuring whether civil behaviours are normative and whether uncivil behaviours are corrected when they occur. Originally, Walsh and colleagues (2012) reported a single factor structure for their scale. More recently, however, Walsh and Clark (2015) re-examined the factor structure of the CNQ-B and tested a two-factor solution. They found the data supported a two-factor structure with one factor focused on incivility (i.e., discouraging incivility) and one focused on civility (i.e., encouraging civility). The scale was intended to identify and target workgroups that could benefit from interventions to enhance civility (Walsh et al., 2012).

Both the VHA scale and the CNQ-B are designed to assess perceptions/norms of civility at the group-level. Neither scale includes specific civil behaviours that convey concern for or regard for others or that are fundamental to building relationships and empathizing. Thus, the majority of the current research gets away from the original focus of civility as behaviours and reflect a mismatch between operational definition and measurement. One potential reason for this is that the concept of civility primarily arose from the sociological perspective of a civil society (Peck, 2002). Moreover, the CREW intervention was designed to improve civility in a
workgroup; thus, the intervention happened at the group-level and the VHA scale was created in response to that. Moving forward it is important to further distinguish between civil behaviours and civility norms, and determine how civil behaviours can be assessed.

Given that the study of civility is linked to the study of incivility it is important to assess these two constructs in a comparable way. Currently, incivility is commonly measured using Cortina and colleague’s (2001) Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS) which assesses the frequency at which employees experience specific uncivil behaviours over a given period of time (e.g., a month, a year). Examples of scale items are: ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie, put you down or was condescending to you, and made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you. It is clear these behaviours measure the individual-level experience of incivility. As a result, the majority of research on incivility has occurred at the individual-level assessing predictors and outcomes of uncivil behaviour. This level disparity, (i.e., group-level civility vs. individual-level incivility) needs to be addressed: in order to better understand how these two constructs are related to one another, the conceptualization and measurement of civility and incivility should be carried out on the same level of analysis.

As Cronbach and Meehl (1955) state, “learning more about a theoretical construct is a matter of elaborating the nomological network in which it occurs, or of increasing the definiteness of the components” (p.290). Thus, understanding the relationship between workplace civility and other similar constructs is important in advancing our theoretical conceptualization of civility. Given that current civility research branched out from the incivility research, it is largely influenced and determined by the deviance literature perspective and has not been fully understood within the context of other positive organizational behaviour research (e.g., organizational citizenship behaviours, respect, perceived coworker support). Work needs to
be done to assess how civility is similar/different from the proposed constructs in research areas different from organizational deviance, in order to determine the construct validity of workplace civility.

In sum, the emergence of civility from the incivility literature over the last decade has led to a body of research that is fragmented, involves different measurement tools and levels, and lacks a strong case for the construct validity of civility. Research continues to be published on workplace civility without having a clear and common understanding of what “workplace civility” is and what it is not. Given this context, it is important to stop and evaluate what has been done and what can be done to create a common conceptual framework around this topic. On the practical side, the interest in civility is also growing (and will likely continue to grow) and therefore both scholars and practitioners should further develop their work within a much-needed common framework.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Within the academic literature the interest in workplace civility has largely come in response to the growing body of research on workplace incivility. Andersson and Pearson’s (1999) seminal paper on the incivility spiral marked the beginning of workplace incivility research and the topic has continued to gain momentum. In order to provide a thorough overview of civility it is important to first review key research on workplace incivility.

Workplace Incivility: A Review of the Literature

Antecedents of Incivility. Many organizations are struggling with workplace incivility. Workplace trends such as increased work demands, low job security, and constant change are leaving employees feeling overworked and overburdened (Sypher, 2004). Dealing with these work demands can lead to job stress, which is linked to increased engagement in incivility (Roberts, Scherer & Bowyer, 2011; Blau & Andersson, 2005).

Perceived unfairness can also be a strong motivator for employees to engage in uncivil behaviour as a form of revenge or retaliation. Research findings suggest the more organizational injustice employees perceive, the more likely they are to engage in counterproductive work behaviours (e.g., incivility; Baron, Neuman & Geddes, 1999; Blau & Andersson, 2005; Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001).

It has been proposed that negative emotions are the pathway through which job stress and perceived injustice lead to engagement in incivility. Using a sample of non-students and working students, Fox, Spector and Miles (2001) found the negative relationship between perceived organizational justice and engagement in counterproductive workplace behaviours (CWBs) was mediated by the employee’s negative emotions. Building off of their empirical research, Spector
and Fox (2002) proposed an emotion-centred model of voluntary work behaviour. It states that the interpretation of environmental factors (e.g., role conflict, interpersonal conflict, organizational constraints) leads to negative emotions, which leads to engagement in counterproductive workplace behaviours (including incivility).

**Outcomes of Incivility.** The experience of workplace incivility has many negative implications. Individuals who are the target of incivility report lost work time resulting in reduced performance (Pearson, 1999; Pearson & Porath, 2005). In a series of experimental studies, Porath and Erez (2007, 2009) found that even the act of witnessing incivility can lead to reduced performance. They proposed that a) feelings of negative affect and/or b) disruptions in cognition as a result of witnessing incivility may be the mechanisms through which incivility affects performance.

The experience of incivility may lead people to become more uncivil themselves. The incivility spiral theory postulates that uncivil behaviours can be exchanged over time with the potential to escalate into more intense forms of conflict (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). From an empirical perspective, Bruk-Lee and Spector (2006) studied 133 dyads and found the experience of coworker conflict was significantly related to engagement in interpersonally-directed CWBs. More recently, Francis and colleagues (2015) found that compared to those who received a neutral email, those who received an uncivil email were more likely to respond with reciprocated incivility (in email form), especially during times of high workload.

Employees may also intentionally and unintentionally disengage from the workplace as a result of incivility. Especially when incivility comes from a supervisor, it can result in employees who are less committed to the organization and report higher turnover intentions (Herscovis, 2011; Cortina, Magley, Williams & Langhout, 2001). Employees may also unintentionally
disengage because they are experiencing high levels of burnout. In a sample of health-care workers Leiter, Nicholson, Patterson and Laschinger (2012) found experienced incivility was related to higher levels of exhaustion and cynicism (two components of burnout). Feelings of exhaustion can overwhelm employees and reduce their available emotional resources and cynicism can increase feelings of psychological distance from the workplace (Leiter et al., 2012).

Incivility Summary. As presented above, there are clear negative implications for those who witness incivility or are the target of incivility. More broadly, an uncivil work environment can reduce the effectiveness of a team due to reduced cooperation and collaboration among team members. In sum, the cost of wasted time at work, reduced productivity, and replacing employees who leave the organization can place a significant burden on any organization.

As workplaces become more informal, the norms of appropriate behaviour become less concrete; this creates more opportunities for uncivil behaviour to occur because employees have a more difficult time discerning acceptable from unacceptable behaviour (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). It is important to study incivility in order to understand how bad behaviour affects employees, managers, and organizations. It is equally important, however, to study civility because a positive workplace not only lacks negative behaviour (i.e., incivility) but, as it will be explained below, it also actively promotes positive behaviour (i.e., civility). Within organizations, civility is essential for positive interpersonal relationships and effective collaborations between coworkers. The majority of previous research in this area has focused on incivility; thus, the current research aims to shed light on workplace civility with Chapter 2 of my dissertation specifically exploring the proposed relationship between civility and incivility. Before describing the second chapter, I will present the current state of the art in the field of workplace civility.
Workplace Civility: Current State

Andersson and Pearson (1999) defined civility as “behavior involving politeness and regard for others in the workplace, within workplace norms for respect” (p.454). It has been defined by other researchers as “behaviors characterized by a show of concern and regard for others” (McGonagle, Walsh, Kath & Morrow, 2014, p.438) or “behavior that helps to preserve the norms for mutual respect at work; it comprises behaviors that are fundamental to positively connecting with another, building relationships and empathizing” (Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000, p.125). Although research focusing on incivility typically discusses the role of civility, it is often not measured empirically. Within the existing civility research there are two main areas of research: civility interventions and civility norms.

Civility Interventions. In 2007, Meterko and colleagues created the Veteran’s Health Administration (VHA) Civility Scale. A few years later, Osatuke and colleagues (2009) used it to assess levels of civility before and after the implementation of an intervention called Civility, Respect, and Engagement in the Workforce (CREW). The intervention, aimed at hospital workgroups, involves weekly discussions led by a facilitator and supported by an educational tool kit. During the intervention, the trained facilitator supports the workgroup to identify their strengths and weaknesses related to civility. The proposed mechanism of change during CREW is simply that the organization and teams “commit to giving time, attention, and support to having regular (weekly) workgroup-level conversations about civility” (Osatuke et al., 2009, p.387). Similar to client-centred counselling, the main driver of change in the intervention is the client’s motivation to change themselves and their own behaviour (Osatuke et al., 2009).

CREW is designed such that groups are able to tailor the intervention to their specific needs; thus, increasing their motivation to change. As a result, the specific discussions around
civility vary greatly between groups; however, overall themes are consistent (e.g., creating clear communication, establishing ground rules for civility; Leiter, et al., 2011; Osatuke et al., 2009). The effectiveness of the intervention was tested and researchers found a significant increase in civility scores between pre-and post-intervention (8-month gap) for the intervention sites but not the comparison sites (Osatuke et al., 2009).

Leiter, Laschinger, Day and Gilin-Oore (2011) replicated the CREW intervention in a set of Canadian hospitals. They also expanded their research questions to include a broader range of variables, such as: civility, incivility, burnout, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and trust. Forty-one units participated in the study (8 were intervention units and 33 were control units) and completed surveys before and after the 6-month intervention period. A significant Time by Intervention interaction indicated the intervention units showed greater improvements over time in civility, respect, trust, job satisfaction, and commitment compared to the control units. Moreover, the intervention units showed significantly greater decreases in turnover intentions, supervisor incivility, absences, and burnout over time compared to the control units. In this study, both civility increased and incivility decreased in intervention units; however, civility had only moderate correlations with incivility (supervisor incivility $r = -.35$; coworker incivility $r = -.49$)

A follow-up study conducted one-year later showed improvements in civility and reductions in supervisor incivility continued to grow in intervention groups while work attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction) maintained their gains in the post-intervention assessment (Leiter, Day, Gilin-Oore & Laschinger, 2012). Again, correlations between civility and supervisor incivility ($r = -.35$) and coworker incivility ($r = -.50$) were moderate in size suggesting both shared and unique variance between these constructs.
Gedro and Wang (2013) conducted their own case study involving their experiences implementing a civility training program at a college in the United States. The half-day training program included educating employees about the language and framework of civility, bullying and related terms, discussing how uncivil behaviours can be conceptualized subjectively and individually, and applying their new knowledge through incivility case studies. The authors concluded that as a result of this training, employees were better able to communicate their concerns with appropriate language and initial training feedback suggested positive experiences with the degree of learning and relevance of the program (Gedro & Wang, 2013). It is important to note, however, that training effectiveness was never empirically tested so it is unclear how civil and/or uncivil behaviour may have changed as a result of the training.

In sum, it appears civility can be improved through appropriate training and these changes can be maintained over time. Focusing on individual motivation to change (i.e., client-centred approach) and group discussions of normative behaviour is an effective model to promote civility. It is still unclear, however, what specifically about the training makes it effective and whether or not a shorter and less time/cost intensive intervention (than CREW) could produce similar positive results.

**Civility Norms.** The second area of civility research focuses more explicitly on understanding norms of civility. Walsh and colleagues (2012) developed the Civility Norms Questionnaire-Brief (CNQ-B), a four-item scale measuring a) whether civil behaviours are normative and b) whether uncivil behaviours are corrected when they occur. In their scale validation process they found positive civility norms had moderate size correlations with increased job satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, affective commitment, and civility (as measured by the VHA scale; Walsh et al., 2012). More positive civil norms were
also related to less coworker incivility, customer incivility, and intentions to quit (Walsh et al., 2012).

Originally, Walsh and colleagues (2012) reported a single factor structure for their scale. More recently, however, Walsh and Clark (2015) re-examined the factor structure of the CNQ-B and tested a two-factor solution. Using a sample of graduate students who worked full-time in teams (outside of the university), they found the data supported a two-factor structure when it was measured at both the individual-level and team-level. Although independent, the two factors (encouraging civility and discouraging incivility) had strong latent variable correlations ($r = .68$ at individual level, $r = .61$ at team level). In addition, they also found higher between-team variability and within-team agreement on the “encouraging civility” subscale than the “discouraging incivility” subscale, suggesting what really sets teams apart is how much they encourage civility among team members (Walsh & Clark, 2015). It is possible that most teams have an understanding that incivility shouldn’t be tolerated; however, not all teams are able to harness the positive power of civility.

McGonagle, Walsh, Kath and Morrow (2014) also approached civility from a norms perspective while incorporating the ideas of safety climate and safety behaviours. The authors’ conceptualization of civility norms came directly from the work of Walsh and colleagues (2012) and the CNQ-B was used as the measurement tool. They theorized that the presence of civility norms within a workgroup encourages respectful behaviours, promotes helping, and creates an overall positive workplace (McGonagle et al., 2014). Employees perceive these civil norms as an indication that the organization and their coworkers care about them and in exchange employees are more likely to follow appropriate safety guidelines.
Using two samples of full-time employees, McGonagle and colleagues (2014) found consistent links between positive civility norms and more positive perceptions of management and coworker safety climate (i.e., that management and coworkers value safety). In turn, this led to decreased work-safety tension, which reduced unsafe behaviour and on-the-job injuries (McGonagle et al., 2014). Thus, civility norms may be a way through which organizations show employees they value them, leading employees to reciprocate in positive ways (e.g., engagement in safety behaviours).

In contrast to McGonagle and colleagues’ (2014) focus on civility norms as a predictor of employee behaviour, Hernandez, Luthanen, Ramsel and Osatuke (2015) explored how civility climates were an outcome of leader behaviour. They found that supervisors who were more self-aware showed a weaker relationship between their levels of burnout and civility climates (using the VHA Civility Scale) such that the leaders were able to monitor their own behaviour in order to maintain high levels of civility and psychological safety within the group they supervised (Hernandez et al., 2015). It is important that leaders are aware of their own capabilities and monitor their own behaviours in order to promote civility within their group.

In sum, civility norms are important predictors of employee satisfaction, commitment, uncivil behaviour and safety behaviours. Moreover, leaders play an important role in the development and maintenance of civility norms. Further exploring the antecedents of civility norms would be beneficial to understand these norms are developed and shared among employees. Additionally, given the large variability among teams in terms of how much they encourage civility it appears that this is a promising area for future research to focus on, rather than simply studying how teams discourage incivility.
Why and How is Civility Beneficial

Beyond the study of interventions and norms, a recent article by Porath and colleagues (2015) used Social Network Analysis to explore the individual-level benefits of civility in two separate studies. Their novel approach and core focus on civility is worth explaining in detail. In Study 1, the authors’ use of Social Network Analysis constrained the measurement of civility such that it had to be a dichotomized variable. As a result, employees were asked to rate their fellow coworkers based on the extent to which that person was considered civil. More specifically, participants were asked, “To what extent is this person civil? For example does this person treat you with respect, treat you with dignity, treat you in a polite manner and is pleasant to you”. Responses were then dichotomized resulting in some employees who were characterized as civil and some who were not. Within this conceptualization, civility is measured more as a stable characteristic of an employee rather than a set of behaviours or norms.

The focus of Porath et al.’s (2015) research is on the benefits of being perceived as a civil colleague. Results showed employees who perceived a coworker to be civil were more likely to seek out advice from that coworker as well as see that coworker as a leader (Porath et al., 2015). One reason for this is that civility conveys respect and sets the foundation for positive relationships; thus, employees are more likely to seek advice from those whom they feel will respect them and are likely to help them (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). Moreover, respect can be conveyed through characteristics such as humbly asking question, listening, and respectfulness; all of these are characteristics of good leaders (Porath & Pearson, 2012).

Their study also reported the more people who found a coworker to be civil, the higher the performance of that coworker (as measured by supervisory ratings). The relationship between civility and performance is partially mediated by being sought out for advice (due to increased
instrumental resources) and being perceived as a leader (due to increased informal organizational networks).

In their second study, the authors had university students read various vignettes in which they manipulated a target employee’s behaviour (civil, neutral, or uncivil). The civil vignettes were created based on examples of civility from Cortina et al., (2001), Forni (2002) and Porath (2011) and included behaviours such as: kindly offering you a suggestion, acknowledging and thanking you for your work, and asking what you thought of a proposal. They found those in the “civil” condition perceived the target employee as more competent, warmer, and possessing more leadership qualities than those in the “uncivil” or “neutral” conditions. In addition, those in the “civil” condition reported more likelihood of seeking advice from the target employee than those in the other two conditions. Mediation analyses indicate being sought for advice and being perceived as a leader were the mechanisms through which perceptions of competence and warmth influenced performance ratings.

In sum, it is beneficial to be perceived as a civil person because it is associated with other positive perceptions (e.g., warmth, competence). In addition, those who are perceived as civil have more people seeking them out for advice and are more likely to be perceived as a leader. All of these positive benefits of civility are associated with increased performance for the civil employee. Although their approach was novel, the authors also recognized that civility might be more nuanced than was captured in their study. They suggested future research should explore specific verbal and non-verbal behaviours that communicate respect and civility; this recommendation is in line with the goals of the current proposal.

Summary of the Civility Literature. The body of literature on workplace civility is limited but has grown significantly in the last few years. Previous intervention work suggests
Civil behaviours can be increased within teams through focused discussion and employee motivation to change. Research also suggests promoting civility and discouraging incivility are important in driving employee attitudes and behaviours. Lastly, it is beneficial, and not seen as weak, to be perceived as a “civil colleague”.

**Gaps in the Current Research**

Given the relative infancy of the study of workplace civility it has resulted in a fragmented and narrow body of research. There are several gaps in the current state of the art that need to be addressed before moving forward, including: lack of good measurement tools, lack of a multi-level perspective and lack of an established nomological network. These three issues reflect the main problem in relation to the study of civility: the lack of a theoretical framework and conceptualization. In the following section each gap will be addressed in more detail.

**Measurement Issues**

There are currently two measures of civility that have been used in past research: the VHA Civility Scale and the Civility Norms Questionnaire – Brief (CNQ-B). Meterko and colleagues (2007) created the VHA Civility Scale, focusing on behaviours that go above and beyond a lack of incivility. For example, the VHA scale includes items such as “people treat each other with respect in my work group” and “a spirit of cooperation and teamwork exists in my work group”. Although the VHA scale asks about specific behaviours, they are often in relation to the group rather than one individual. For example, items are phrased in relation to how employees in a workgroup treat each other, rather than how employees in a workgroup treat you specifically. Thus, the VHA scale taps into individual perceptions regarding group norms of respect.
One major issue with this scale is that it references the workgroup, immediate supervisor, and organization in relation to different survey items. This is problematic because it is combining perceptions from many different levels; which may contradict one another. Moreover, the items likely go beyond what “civility” really is, to include issues around anti-discrimination and acceptance of diversity.

In contrast, Walsh and colleagues (2012) created the CNQ-B, which consists of items such as, “rude behaviour is not accepted by your coworkers” and “respectful treatment is the norm in your unit/work group”. Scale items imply that incivility is not accepted and general respectful treatment is the norm. The scale was designed to assess workgroup climate for civility and was originally validated at the individual-level (i.e., individual work environment perceptions; Walsh et al., 2012) then later examined at the team-level (Walsh & Clark, 2015). The scale showed adequate reliability as well as strong incremental validity in predicting incivility experiences above and beyond the predictive ability of the VHA Civility Scale and interactional justice (Walsh et al., 2012). In the development of this scale a positive frame (civility) was chosen over a negative frame (incivility) because it was expected to elicit increased ease of use for practitioners and researchers but not because of a theoretical conceptualization.

Although both measures use the term “civility”, they are tapping into different ideas about what civility is, making it difficult to compare research using these two measures. The VHA scale includes behaviours that go above and beyond the definition of civility and uses multiple points of reference (i.e., workgroup, supervisor, organization). In contrast, as described earlier, the CNQ-B involves two factors of workgroup norms related to both incivility and civility (discouraging incivility and promoting civility). As Walsh and colleagues (2012) report, the VHA Civility Scale and the CNQ-B are only moderately correlated ($r = .48$). The apparent
discrepancy is problematic because how researchers conceptualize civility drives how they theorize, measure, and make conclusions about their research. In the following section I will further describe the problem of levels of analysis that these issues highlight.

**Level of Analysis Issues**

Organizations are naturally multilevel systems (e.g., individual, teams, organization). Articulating the level of analysis and measurement of phenomena is important because it drives the types of research questions that can be addressed and how constructs may relate to one another. Constructs at higher-levels (e.g., climate, norms) can have important contextual effects on how individuals choose to behave, perform, and interact with one another day-to-day in a top-down process (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). In contrast, behaviours of individual employees can converge over time and manifest as group or team phenomena in a bottom-up process (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000).

The current civility scales capture group-level civility norms (CNQ-B) and general perceptions of civility, fairness and tolerance (VHA scale). Given that civil and uncivil behaviours are heavily influenced by group norms, a group-level measurement of civility is important because norms are a group-level phenomenon (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). Moreover, having a clear understanding of these norms is critical because they strongly influence individual behaviour (Hackman, 1992). It is also important, however, to consider the specific role of individual behaviours because they act as the basis for descriptive norm formation (Thibault & Kelley, 1959). Taken together, individual behaviours and group norms influence one another in a cyclical manner; thus, a clear distinction arises between the individual-level phenomenon of civil behaviours and the group-level phenomenon of civility norms. Although studying civility norms is important, it is also important to consider the role of civil behaviours because currently civility
is defined in terms of behaviours, which reflect concern and regard for others. Moreover, understanding civil behaviours is important when exploring the formation of group norms and how individual civil behaviour can change on a daily basis affecting individual-level outcomes (e.g., affect, productivity, job stress etc.).

More specifically, civil behaviours involve specific behaviours individuals can engage in that convey politeness and concern for others within workplace norms for respect. Civil behaviours are best understood and measured at the individual-level because every employee can engage in (or experience) different levels of specific civil behaviours. In contrast, civility norms are more broadly, “employee perceptions of norms supporting respectful treatment among workgroup members” (Walsh et al., 2012, p.409). Civil norms refer to perceptions of the group; however, can be measured at either the individual-level (i.e., individual perceptions of group norms) or at the group-level (i.e., aggregated individual perceptions of group norms).

Given the close relationship between civility and incivility it is imperative that the study and measurement of both phenomena are comparable. Cortina and colleague’s (2001) Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS) and more recently Leiter, Day and Laschinger’s (2013) Straightforward Incivility Scale both measure the frequency at which employees experience specific uncivil behaviours over a given period of time. Both the WIS and the Straightforward Incivility Scale capture individual experiences of incivility, and as a result, the majority of research on incivility has occurred at the individual-level assessing predictors and outcomes of uncivil behaviour.

In sum, the group-level phenomena of both discouraging incivility and encouraging civility (which appear to be distinct but related factors) are measured using the CNQ-B. The VHA Civility Scale also has items that reflect more general group-level perceptions of behaviours and norms rather than the frequency of individual behaviours. Incivility is commonly
measured as behaviours at the individual level using the WIS. A clear gap in the literature and measure is the inexistence of individual-level civil behaviours; thus, in the present dissertation I aim to conceptualize and explore the role of individual-level civil behaviours in the workplace.

**Nomological Network Issues**

Workplace civility, as an academic construct, emerged out of the incivility literature but it is still unclear how incivility and civility relate to one another. For example, is civility simply a lack of incivility or is it something more? At the group-level, research by Walsh and Clark (2015) found support for the distinction between civility norms and incivility norms. Leiter and colleagues (2011) have also found support for the distinction between civil norms and uncivil behaviours. It is still unclear, however, how civility and incivility relate at the behavioural level.

A lack of research evidence also exists regarding how civility is both theoretically and empirically related to other similar constructs in its nomological network. Understanding the relationship between civility and other similar constructs is important in advancing our theoretical conceptualization of civility. Constructs within my proposed nomological network include: organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB; Organ, 1988; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983), prosocial organizational behaviour (POB; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; McNeely & Meglino, 1994), perceived coworker support (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986; Ladd & Henry, 2000), respect (Spears, Elemers, Doosje & Branscombe, 2006), and interpersonal justice (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001).

**Theoretical Issues**

The above issues of measurement, levels of analyses, and nomological network comparisons coalesce to a core theoretical issue present in the civility literature: there is no good theory or framework for understanding this phenomenon. Not only is theory important for the
definition of the construct of civility, but also theory is needed to guide future research questions, such as how do individual civil behaviours turn into civil norms? How is civility related to incivility? How are civil behaviours related to OCBs? Moving forward, it is important to understand civility within a framework that is able to answer these and other questions.

**Summary and Description of Next Chapters**

In order to conceptualize and explore the role of individual-level civil behaviours, the next chapters involve an exploratory examination of how the construct of civility differs from incivility and other similar constructs and will consist of both theoretical and empirical contributions. Theoretically, a review of the literature will speculate on how/why similar constructs relate to one another based on their definition, antecedents, outcomes. A framework will be created that identifies how constructs within the proposed nomological network relate to one another methodologically. Empirically, the antecedents and outcomes of civility and other related constructs will be examined in order to determine how civility may be unique from other similar constructs. The aim of this dissertation is to provide a comprehensive framework through which civility can be understood in relation to other constructs within the realm of positive organizational behaviours.
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CHAPTER 2
THE CONCEPTUAL RELATIONSHIP OF CIVIL AND UNCIVIL BEHAVIOURS

To review, incivility is defined as “low intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p.457). In contrast, civility is defined as “behavior that helps to preserve the norms for mutual respect at work; it comprises behaviors that are fundamental to positively connecting with another, building relationships and empathizing” (Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000, p.125). It is possible that civility is merely a lack of incivility and vice versa, or civility is a related but unique construct.

Understanding the relationship between incivility and civility is important because they are two clearly related phenomena. Currently, both incivility and civility are defined in terms of their behaviours (i.e., incivility involves negative behaviours, civility involves positive behaviours). The issue arises in the measurement of these constructs. More specifically, incivility is measured in terms of uncivil behaviours; however, civility is measured in terms of civil norms. Thus, there is a discrepancy between the definition and measurement of civility. As a result, previous research has been unable to compare incivility and civility based on the similarities/differences in specific behaviours.

At the group-level, it appears that discouraging incivility and encouraging civility (the two dimensions of the CNQ-B) are related but independent factors (Walsh & Clark, 2015). Leiter and colleagues (2011) found moderate size correlations between civility and supervisor incivility \((r = -.35)\) and coworker incivility \((r = -.49)\), and their follow-up research yielded similar relationships between civility with supervisor incivility \((r = -.35)\) and coworker incivility \((r = -.50;\) Leiter, Day, Gilin-Oore & Laschinger, 2012). It is important to note, however, that in Leiter
et al.’s (2011, 2012) research incivility was measured using individual-level behavioural frequency (WIS) and civility was measured using agreement about group-level perceptions of behaviours and norms (VHA civility scale). Thus, initial work supports the distinction between incivility and civility; however, the measurement of the two constructs is not entirely comparable (i.e., incivility is assessed in “frequencies” of individual experience and civility is assessed in generalized “agreement” with items referring to group-level perceptions).

Given issues with current available measurement tools and levels of analysis it is difficult to accurately and quantitatively examine the relationship between incivility and civility at the same level. As a result, I will explore how these two concepts may be theoretically related.

**Insights from Positive Psychology**

Drawing on theory from the positive psychology literature can help disentangle the relationship between civility and incivility. For example, Seligman (2002) argues that the positive is not simply the absence of the negative and that a neutral point exists that divides them. As Pawelski (2016) describes, “getting rid of the negative does not automatically bring the positive…[and] the presence of the positive does not automatically do away with the negative” (p.14). Thus, both positive and negative phenomena need to be examined in relation to one another (not in the absence of one another).

As an example, Pawelski (2013) explained that happiness and unhappiness are subcontrary opposites such that it is possible to be both happy and unhappy. Thus, happiness is not the same thing as the absence of unhappiness. Keyes (2007) had a similar point in arguing “the absence of mental illness is not the presence of mental health” (p.95). In relation to civility, it may be possible to experience and/or enact both civility and incivility within a short period of time and that civility is not just the absence of incivility.
Diener and Biswas-Diener (2008) argued that subjective wellbeing involves the presence of high positive affect, low negative affect, and high life satisfaction. Building on this idea, a positive work environment may involve both a lack of incivility and the presence of civility; thus, it is likely the two constructs are related but unique.

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviours Vs. Counterproductive Work Behaviours**

Drawing on the research regarding the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) and counterproductive work behaviours (CWBs) can also provide insight into how civility and incivility may be related. Previous research on OCBs and CWBs conceptualized these two behaviours as opposites. For example, someone who engages in many OCBs will engage in few CWBs, implying individuals have a tendency to be either harmful or helpful people. In this conceptualization, personality is a stronger determinant of behaviour than the environment. (Spector, Bauer & Fox, 2010). Given that all people can exhibit manifestations of different personality traits depending on the environment they are in (Fleeson, 2004) it is unlikely that we can simply categorize people as either helpful or harmful.

It is possible, however, that the relationship between OCBs and CWBs has been inflated due to measurement artifacts. In a meta-analysis, Dalal (2005) explored the relationship between OCBs and CWBs and potential moderators of the relationship. He found larger negative correlations between OCBs and CWBs for supervisor-ratings compared to self-ratings and for agreement ratings rather than frequency ratings. Spector, Bauer and Fox (2010) replicated these findings using an experimental methodology. An explanation for this is that supervisors are influenced by a halo effect resulting in inflated positive relationships between OCB dimensions and negative relationships between OCBs and CWBs. Moreover, agreement ratings tend to focus more on whether or not an individual is likely to engage in a behaviour and not necessarily
whether the behaviour occurred (Dalal, 2005). Thus, it is recommended that agreement scales should be used primarily for the assessment of feelings rather than behaviours (Fowler, 1995). When measured correctly OCBs and CWBs are likely unrelated (Spector et al., 2010).

The OCB/CWB relationship is relevant in the incivility/civility discussion because it highlights that the relationship between OCBs and CWBs is often inflated due to measurement issues. It also emphasizes the importance of using frequency scales (rather than agreement scales) in order to assess relationships between constructs more accurately. It is likely that incivility and civility are related; however, the size of the relationship may vary depending on how the constructs are measured.

Currently, incivility is measured in terms of behaviours but civility is not. In order to determine how incivility and civility are related it is important to determine how much overlap exists between uncivil and civil individual behaviours. For example, do civil behaviours largely consist of not engaging in incivility? Do civil behaviours go above and beyond a “neutral” point to be actively promoting positive and respectful norms? The following research question is aimed to investigate these questions: Are civil and uncivil behaviours related to one another? In order to answer this research question, the current study consists of a thematic analysis of qualitative data. The data and research findings were presented in poster format at the Canadian Psychological Association annual conference in June 2015.

Method

Participants. The sample consisted of 111 participants who completed an online survey through Qualtrics. Of those 111, 88 participants (79%) provided responses to open-ended questions regarding civil and uncivil behaviours in their workplace. Forty-five were male (51%), the average age was 47 years, and 78% of the sample was Caucasian. Ninety-eight percent of
participants worked full-time and the average job tenure was 10.24 years. Participants also worked in a variety of sectors, the most common ones being: science and education (16%), processing and manufacturing supply (15%), and health and social service (10%).

Materials and procedure. Participants were asked open-ended questions in regards to their experiences with incivility and civility in the workplace. First, participants were presented with the following definition, “civil behaviours are defined as behaviours characterized by a show of concern and regard for others”. Participants were then asked to list examples of civil behaviours. In order to contrast examples of civil behaviours to uncivil behaviours, participants were also asked, “what are some examples of uncivil/rude behaviour?” Lastly, in order to better understand the extent to which participants viewed the relationship between uncivil and civil behaviours, they were asked, “do you think civility and incivility can co-exist in the same workplace? Why?”

In order to reduce effects of order, the survey was counterbalanced. More specifically, participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: half the participants were asked about behavioural examples of civility first (then incivility) and vice versa. At the end of the survey, participants were asked to fill out demographics information.

Overview of data analysis. Thematic analysis was used to identify themes in response to three research questions: a) what are examples of uncivil/rude behaviours, b) what are examples of civil behaviours and c) do you think civility and incivility can co-exist in the same workplace. Thematic analysis is a method for analyzing qualitative data that involves identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data (Braun & Clark, 2006). Due to its flexibility and theoretical freedom, thematic analysis was chosen as the most appropriate means to analyze the data.
According to Braun and Clarke (2006), the first step in a thematic analysis is to familiarize yourself with the data, including reading the data numerous times and making initial notes. Step two involves generating initial codes, or basic pieces of the data, that can be analyzed further. Steps three and four involve searching for themes (and reviewing these themes) to ensure they make sense and represent the data as a whole. Step five, involves further refining the themes by giving them names or definitions. Lastly, a report is produced which includes impactful examples of each theme.

In order to identify the most common behaviours identified by participants as “civil” and “uncivil”, examples of behaviours were analyzed and clustered around common themes. Each theme captures a patterned response within the data set and is meaningful in relation to the research question (Braun & Clark, 2006). The unit of measurement in this study was the independent thought rather than the participant; thus, although only 88 participants provided qualitative data, 166 independent thoughts were coded for civility and 140 independent thoughts were coded for incivility. In order to obtain meaningful categories, two researchers with previous knowledge of incivility immersed themselves in the data through a process of individual coding and consensus building.

In order to identify themes related to the question of co-existence of incivility and civility each answer was coded for whether it reflected a) the two constructs could co-exist, b) the two constructs could not co-exist or c) did not know. Two researchers performed the coding independently. Once the independent coding was completed, they worked together to find the emerging themes around the answers to the “reasons why” question.

The frequency at which each theme emerged was also investigated. Although this approach is less common in thematic analysis, it is often used in quantitative content analysis as
a means to indicate the relative importance of themes (White & March, 2006). In the current study, frequency counts were used as a way to quantify how large (or small) each theme was in the data.

Results and Discussion

Uncivil Behaviours

Table 1 indicates common themes that emerged from the data in regards to the most common “uncivil behaviours”. Uncivil behaviours are predominantly active (rather than passive) and self-focused (rather than other-focused). For example, talking loudly, taking advantage of others, belittling people, and interrupting others. A word cloud (see Figure 1) was generated in order to visually present the textual data. The most commonly used words when describing uncivil behaviour include: someone, talking, loud, swearing, others, and interrupting. Thus, it appears uncivil behaviours are described in relation to interpersonal interactions that have a negative tone.

The behaviours identified by participants are similar to items used in two workplace incivility scales. Leiter, Day, and Laschinger (2013) developed the Straightforward Incivility Scale, which asks participants the extent to which others have: ignored you, excluded you, spoke rudely to you, behaved rudely to you, and behaved without consideration for you. The most obvious overlap is between the first two survey items from the Straightforward Incivility Scale and the theme “Ignoring/Excluding others”. Additional themes that were present in the current data include using hurtful language and being loud (which could fall under the “spoke rudely to you” item). Within “behaved rudely to you” acts such as gossiping, belittling, and interrupting would be applicable. Lastly, “behaved without consideration for you” would involve more self-
centred behaviour or behaviour that lacked professionalism. Thus, the behaviours generated in the current study appear to map nicely onto the Straightforward Incivility Scale.

Themes of uncivil behaviour are also similar to behaviours used to measure incivility using Cortina and colleagues (2001) Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS). Items in the WIS include: put you down or was condescending to you, made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you, and ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie. Themes from the current data that overlap with these items include: belittling, gossiping, and ignoring/excluding others. Only one item from the WIS did not emerge as a theme in the current data set. More specifically, the item “doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility”. Given the large overlap with other items in the WIS and the Straightforward Incivility Scale it is evident the uncivil behaviours generated in the current study are representative of the current understanding and measurement of uncivil behaviors within academia.

It is important to note that only one theme identified has to do with behaviour that simply “lacks civility”. Samples of behaviours include, “not considering the effect of [your] actions on others” and “refusing to help a colleague”. Thus, many people view incivility as an active form a negative behaviour rather than the omission of positive behaviour.

**Civil Behaviours**

Table 2 indicates common themes that researchers drew from the data in regards to the most common “civil behaviours”. In general, civil behaviours are considered active (rather than passive) and are generally others-focused (rather than self-focused). For example, helping behaviours, small acts of kindness, pleasantries, actively caring for others, and promoting group cohesion all involve an active sacrifice of time, energy, etc. in order to accommodate others. A word cloud was created in order to present textual data such that the more frequent the word was
used, the larger it is displayed. As evident in Figure 2, some of the most common words in reference to civility were: others, someone, people, helping and respect. These findings identify civility as involving positive behaviour that is active and interpersonal in nature.

The idea that civility goes above and beyond simple good manners is consistent with Sypher’s (2004) definition of civility. There is also minor overlap between civility and other similar constructs. For example, active helping behaviours (e.g., “people take up the slack during busy periods”) align closely with OCBs while more passive caring behaviours (e.g., being kind, considerate of others feelings”) tap into more trait-like constructs such as conscientiousness or agreeableness. The majority of themes, however, are not adequately captured within other constructs.

Only one theme within “civil behaviour” reflects behaviour indicative of “lack of incivility” (e.g., “Not interrupting someone when they’re speaking”, “Allowing others in meetings to be heard without interruption”). It is important to note that although this behaviour could also fall under “respectful communication”, given the focus on contrasting uncivil and civil behaviour, any behaviours that referred to not engaging in specific uncivil behaviours were grouped together under this theme.

Thus, given that only 1 out of 10 themes that emerged was related to lack of incivility, it appears that civility is not reflected only by the absence of uncivil behaviors but by the existence of respectful, helping, caring, pleasant, professional and communal behaviours.

Co-existence of Civility and Incivility

When asked, “do you think civility and incivility can co-exist in the same workplace? Why?”, 69% participants said “yes, they can co-exist”, 28% said “no, they cannot co-exist”, and 2% were unsure. As summarized in Table 3, for those who believed civility and incivility can co-
exist many were split between thinking some people are just “uncivil” or “civil” people or everyone can be civil or uncivil depending on the situation. Lastly, others blamed the co-existence of civility and incivility on a weak organizational culture. Of the 28% of participants who did not think civility and incivility can co-exist in the same workplace, some believed incivility would simply overpower civility while others believed civility is essential and incivility cannot permeate a functioning workplace (see Table 4). Thus, it appears that some participants believed either civility or incivility will “win out” in the end because they are incompatible.

In sum, the majority of participants believed incivility and civility can co-exist in the same workplace. Moreover, the themes that emerged indicate that civility is more than the absence of incivility and includes caring, professional, pleasant and kind treatment at work. Finally, the findings from this study support the independent, yet related, nature of civil and uncivil behaviours.
Table 1

*Themes in relation to Uncivil Behaviours in the Workplace*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hurtful Language</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>Using language in a manner that hurts</td>
<td>“Insulting responses to questions or comments that are clearly not intended to be confrontational”; “Swearing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being loud</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>Acting or communicating at a high noise level</td>
<td>“Talking loudly when others are trying to work”; “Yelling at each other”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lacking Professionalism</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>Not engaging in professional behaviours at work</td>
<td>“Shutting a door in someone’s face”; “Not keeping one’s word”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-centred Behaviour</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>Engaging in acts that help yourself but hurt others</td>
<td>“Throwing others under the bus”; “Taking advantage of others”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interrupting Others</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>Interrupt others when they are speaking</td>
<td>“Interrupting someone when they’re speaking”; “Being abruptly cut off when making a point in a meeting”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Belittling</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>Making others feel inferior</td>
<td>“Making others feel stupid or inferior”; “Belittling co-workers in front of others”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ignoring/Excluding Others</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>Failing to take someone into account</td>
<td>“Excluding someone from a group activity”; “Ignoring someone who’s trying to talk to you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aggressive acts</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>Engaging in hostile or aggressive acts towards others</td>
<td>“Pushing someone out of the way to get to somewhere”; “Bullying”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lacking Civility</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>Failing to behave in a considerate way towards others</td>
<td>“Not considering the effect of actions on others”; “Refusing to help a colleague”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gossiping</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>Engaging in conversations about others who are not present</td>
<td>“Talking behind ones back”; “Gossiping about others behind their backs”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Themes in relation to Civil Behaviours in the Workplace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Helping Behaviour</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>Actively helping coworkers with work-related and non work-related problems</td>
<td>“People take up the slack during busy periods”; “Helping someone who has fallen stand back up”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respectful Communication</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>Communicating to all others in a respectful and polite manner</td>
<td>“People are polite in conversation to each other”; “common courtesy, even in rather intense meetings”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Caring for others (passive)</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>Being considerate of others in a passive manner</td>
<td>“Being kind, considerate of others feelings”; “Empathizing in general”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Respecting shared space</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>Respecting boundaries in relation to shared space</td>
<td>“Showing respect for other people’s property”; “Being quiet and maintaining own personal space”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Small acts of kindness</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>Non work-related acts of kindness towards others</td>
<td>“Holding doors open for others”; “Buying someone a coffee”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pleasantries</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>Engaging in small-talk and acknowledging the presence of others</td>
<td>“Saying please and thank you as appropriate”; “Greeting someone when you see/meet them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professionalism</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>Maintaining a high level of professional behaviour</td>
<td>“Showing up for work on-time and prepared”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Caring for others (active)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>Actively showing others you care about their wellbeing by</td>
<td>“Acknowledging others for their hard work”; “Listening to others being sure they are heard and issues addressed”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Communal behaviour</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>Actively promoting a sense of community</td>
<td>“People make every effort to make newcomers feel welcome”; “Everyone getting along with one another each pitching in to do their job”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lacking Incivility</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>Avoiding engaging in uncivil acts</td>
<td>“Not interrupting someone when they’re speaking”; “Allowing others in meetings to be heard without interruption”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Top reasons supporting the co-existence of civility and incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People are different</td>
<td>“Different people have different personalities and some are more abrasive than others”; “We all work with good people and rude, inconsiderate people”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone can be both uncivil and civil</td>
<td>“We are all human and have good points and bad points”; “Multiple people can have different attitudes on different days”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak organizational culture</td>
<td>“Weak management that doesn’t enforce a consistent culture”; “Sometimes it depends on the culture of the workplace”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Top reasons not supporting the co-existence of civility and incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incivility will overpower civility</td>
<td>“Uncivil people make it difficult for everyone else”; “Incivility can be corrosive to morale over the long term”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civility is essential</td>
<td>“Civility will weed out incivility”; “No, it has to be civil”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfathomable</td>
<td>“I can’t imagine how it would work”; “It never gels”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Word Cloud representing the most commonly used words to describe uncivil behaviours

Figure 2. Word Cloud representing the most commonly used words to describe civil behaviours
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CHAPTER 3

PRELIMINARY NOMOLOGICAL NETWORK AND INCREMENTAL VALIDITY

Understanding the relationship between civility and other similar constructs is important in advancing our theoretical conceptualization of civility. Previous research has measured civility at the group-level; thus, the current chapter will be focusing on empirical relationships between civility norms (as measured using the VHA Civility Scale) and other similar constructs. Given that the VHA measure of civility norms is currently being used in research (e.g., Leiter, Laschinger, Day & Gilin Oore, 2011), and is the most common way to measure civility, it is important to first understand the value of studying civility norms beyond similar constructs. The next step of understanding the role of civil behaviours in the workplace will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5. Although ideally we want to assess civil behaviours (rather than civil norms), using the existing measures of civility norms may provide preliminary insight into the relationships between civility and other constructs.

There are many potential constructs within the nomological network, the current chapter will focus on two specifically: respect and OCBs. The preliminary nomological network is limited in scope because of the exploratory nature of this chapter. Chapters 4 and 5 further develop and grow the nomological network.

Respect

Within the academic literature respect is conceptualized in many different ways, such as: an attitude (van Quaquebeke & Eckloff, 2010), a value we strive for (de Cremer & Mulder, 2007), a form of social power (Langdon, 2007), a set of social rules (Langdon, 2007), a perception of status within a group (Bartel, Wrzesniekski & Wiesenfeld, 2012; Fuller et al., 2006; Tyler & Blader, 2002), a perception of how everyone is treated in an organization.
(Ramarajan, Barsade & Burack, 2008), and an indicator of injustice (Miller, 2001). In addition, many researchers create/adapt their own self-report scale to measure respect resulting in a literature that lacks a consistent definition and form of measurement. In 2007, Langdon summarized the respect literature and indicated, “an overarching theory of respect and its complements…is absent from the literature” (p.470). The lack of consistency in this research area makes it difficult to generalize findings across studies and make any conclusions about the implications that respect/disrespect have on individuals, teams, and organizations.

Very broadly, respect represents the “worth accorded to one person by one or more others” (Spears, Ellemers, Doosje & Branscombe, 2006, p.179). The majority of the literature uses Social Identity Theory as a theoretical framework and draws heavily on the organizational justice literature (e.g., Bartel et al., 2012; Fuller et al., 2006; Tyler & Blader, 2002). More specifically, procedural injustice is viewed as an antecedent of respect (or a lack of respect). In turn, perceptions of disrespect have negative implications for an individual’s social identity, self-worth, and perceptions of status within a group (Grover, 2013; Rogers & Ashforth, 2014). As a result, disrespect is related to reduced organizational commitment, organizational identification, organization based self-esteem, and job satisfaction (Bartel et al., 2012; de Cremer & Tyler, 2005; van Quaquebeke & Eckloff, 2010). Disrespect is also associated with increased negative emotions (e.g., anger) and burnout, and reduced self-confidence and engagement (de Cremer & Tyler, 2005; Miller, 2001; Ramarajan et al. 2008). In sum, a lack of respect indicates to individual’s that their status/reputation/identity within a group may be jeopardized which results in withdrawal from the organization (e.g., reduced commitment) and negative implications for the individual (e.g., burnout, anger).
The emphasis on organization-focused outcomes may reflect the focus of the literature on respect as an indicator of relationship quality with the organization as a whole. For example, Bartel and colleagues (2012) suggest respect reflects the extent to which one is valued as a member of the organization (as communicated by members of the organization). Moreover, Ramarajan, Barsade and Burack (2008) identified respect as involving perceptions of how all others in an organization are treated (not just your own treatment). Fuller et al. (2006) suggested perceptions of respect may be heavily influenced by direct supervisor behaviour because supervisors are strong determinants of perceived organizational status. Thus, there is a clear link between respect and organization-based judgments.

**Respect and Civil Norms.** The academic construct of respect is often conceptualized as an indicator of relationship quality with the organization as a whole (Bartel, Wrzesniekski & Wiesenfeld, 2012). Aggregated perceptions of respect are measured and used to convey information about one’s own identity and self-esteem (Rogers & Ashforth, 2014). Other researchers have suggested respect can be conceptualized as a climate variable (Ramarajan, Barsade & Burack, 2008). The VHA measure of civility captures broad perceptions of civility at work coming from coworkers, supervisor, and the organization as a whole. In this way, broad civility norms are being captured. Given that both respect and civil norms are conceptualized as perceptions regarding quality of treatment emerging from various groups within the organization, I propose the following:

*Hypothesis 1: Employee perceptions of civility norms will be positively related to employee perceptions of respect.*
Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) proposed the idea of organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) as the day-to-day prosocial gestures of individuals at work (e.g., helping others who have been absent, helping with others’ heavy workloads, and volunteering for things that are not required). The behaviours go beyond formal role requirements and are considered a form of contextual performance that indirectly contributes to the maintenance of the organization’s social system (Organ, 1997).

There are a few different conceptualizations regarding the dimensionality of OCBs with two different viewpoints being the most common: the OCB-I/OCB-O model and the five dimensions model. Smith and colleagues (1983) had originally identified a two-factor structure involving altruism (involving helping a specific person) and generalized compliance (involving more impersonal behaviour). Later, these two factors were re-defined as OCB-I representing the interpersonal altruism dimension and OCB-O representing the organizational dimension and impersonal generalized compliance (Dalal, 2005). In a recent meta-analysis, Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff and Blume (2009) found a strong correlation between OCB-I and OCB-O and concluded there may be little support for the I vs. O distinction.

It is worthwhile noting, however, the distinction between interpersonally driven and organizationally driven behaviour mimics Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) categorization of deviant workplace behaviours. 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” (p.556). Using a sample of critical incidents and multidimensional scaling techniques, the authors found deviant behaviour could be categorized on two dimensions: minor vs. serious deviance and interpersonal vs. organizational
deviance. These two unrelated dimensions (intersecting at 90 degrees) created four quadrants of deviant behaviour. For example, one quadrant represents minor-organizational deviance (e.g., leaving early, wasting resources), while another quadrant represents minor-interpersonal deviance (e.g., gossiping, blaming co-workers). Thus, the distinction between engaging in different behaviours towards individuals or the organization is present in both the positive (e.g., OCB) and negative (e.g., deviance) literature.

In contrast, Organ (1988) identified five major dimensions of OCBs: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. In general, altruism and courtesy would fall within the realm of OCB-Is and conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship would fall within OCB-Os (Podsakoff et al., 2009). The five dimensions are sometimes studied as independent factors (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990); however, the dimensions are strongly related and are sometimes combined into one measure of OCB (Koys, 2001; Zellers, Tepper & Duffy, 2002). The strong relationships have also prompted some researchers to speculate that OCBs may actually be a latent construct that represents a general tendency to be cooperative in organizational settings (LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002).

Of the five dimensions, there appears to be significant overlap between courtesy and civility. The OCB subscale “courtesy” is defined as, “discretionary behavior on the part of an individual aimed at preventing work-related problems with others from occurring” and includes behaviours such as being mindful of how your behaviour affects other people’s jobs and taking steps to try to prevent problems with other workers (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). Given that civility involves behaviours indicating concern and regard for others the specific relationship between civility and courtesy is worth exploring further. It is clear the dimensionality of OCBs is still debated within the literature; however, given that the five
dimension model is the most common and the particular interest in one of the those dimensions (i.e., courtesy) the current research will focus on that conceptualization.

**Antecedents of OCBs.** Historically, researchers have been interested in the idea that job satisfaction is related to performance; however, findings indicated that this is true only for contextual performance (Organ, 1997). A meta-analysis conducted by Dalal (2005) found a mean corrected correlation of 0.16 between job satisfaction and OCB; in comparison LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) found a population correlation of 0.24.

Research in this area has expanded to include other predictors of engagement in OCBs. Characteristics of the workplace environment such as task interdependence (Ehrhart & Nauman, 2004; Smith et al., 1983) and job autonomy (Van Dyne, Graham & Dienesch, 1994) are predictive of engagement in OCBs. In addition, perceptions of transformational leadership (Podsakoff et al., 1990), leader fairness (Farh et al., 1990), leader supportiveness (Smith et al., 1983), and a lack of abusive supervision (Zellars et al., 2002) are all significant predictors of OCB. More broadly, perceptions of organizational justice are also important in predicting engagement in OCBs (Dalal, 2005; Moorman, 1991; Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1996; Zellars et al., 2002).

From a theoretical perspective, the relationship between OCBs and their antecedents is often explained using Social Exchange Theory. More specifically, employees engage in OCBs based on conditions of social exchange (e.g., trust, support) with their organization (Zellers et al., 2002). Based on the norm of reciprocity, an employee and organization will exchange various resources in an ambiguous (and seemingly unrelated) manner. For example, an organization will provide status, information, and support to an employee and in turn that employee may engage in
OCBs such as helping others who are absent or attending functions that are not required but help the company image.

**OCB and Civil Norms.** Drawing on Rogers and Ashforth’s (2014) Model of the Internalization of Respect Cues, they suggest observable behaviours (e.g., OCBs, civility) influence perceptions of broader constructs (e.g., respect, norms). Thus, it is likely the presence of OCBs within an organization will influence the extent to which employees perceive their organization is a respectful, civil, and supportive place to work. Other behaviours (e.g., civil behaviours, prosocial behaviours, counterproductive work behaviours) will also influence norms of civility. Thus, I expect a positive correlation between enacted OCBs and civility norms at work.

*Hypothesis 2: Employee perceptions of civility norms will be positively related to employee engagement in OCBs.*

**Incremental Validity in the Prediction of Organizationally Relevant Outcomes**

Understanding how civility norms add value to the current body of literature is important. The criterion-related validity of a construct reflects how well a score on a specific test/survey can be used to infer an individual’s value on a given “criterion” measure (Bordens & Abbott, 2008). Using multiple constructs to predict criterion measures is useful if each construct is adding unique predictive ability. Incremental validity is the “gain in validity resulting from adding one or more new predictors to an existing selection system” (Sackett & Lievens, 2008, p.425). Given the proposed distinction between incivility, civility, OCBs, and respect I expect civility norms to be a unique predictor of other outcome variables including: affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and employee burnout. I will briefly explain the proposed effects of civility, OCB, respect, and incivility on each outcome variable drawing on previous research and theory.
Affective Organizational Commitment

Using Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component framework, organizational commitment can be broken down into three categories: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. The current chapter focuses specifically on affective commitment as an indicator of organizational commitment. Affective commitment refers to an “employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p.67).

Research suggests high levels of organizational commitment indicate a high-quality social exchange between an employee and the organization (Taylor, Bedeian & Kluemper, 2012). According to social exchange theory, high-quality relationships are those that “evolve over time into trusting, loyal, and mutual commitments” (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p.875). These relationships are built based on the exchange of resources. The nature by which resources are exchanged is guided by norms of how one is ought to behave (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Civility norms represent norms regarding politeness and respect at work. It is possible that civility norms represent the basis for which social exchange relationships can be built. For example, respectful and polite behaviour may lay the groundwork for other more time consuming or risky resources to be exchanged. In contrast, it is difficult to imagine building a high-quality social relationship when norms of respect, cooperation, and tolerance are absent. Thus, the presence of civility norms will be a predictor of outcomes of social exchange such as affective commitment.

Other Predictors. In their meta-analysis, Meyer, Stanley, Hershcovis and Topolnytsky (2002) found a moderate positive correlation between affective commitment and engagement in OCBs ($p = .32$). When employees are emotionally attached to their organization and engage in
behaviours that support their organization (OCBs), both indicate that a high-quality relationship exists between employees and the organization.

In regards to the respect-commitment relationship, Grover (2013) theorized that individuals who experience high amounts of respect will show strong commitment to their work. More specifically being respected drives a sense of belonging to a group/organization and that fosters a stronger sense of commitment. Empirically, in a sample of US employees, Tyler and Blader (2002) found individual perceptions of respect were a significant predictor of an individual’s intent to remain in the organization.

The relationship between incivility and commitment has also been explored in previous research. Using a sample of job incumbents, researchers have found experienced incivility was negatively associated with affective commitment ($p = -0.23$; Taylor et al., 2012). In a sample of registered nurses, Smith, Andrusyszyn, and Laschinger (2010) found experienced incivility from coworkers was an independent predictor of affective commitment. Although statistically significant, experienced incivility explained only 3.5% unique variance in affective commitment.

Given the shared relationships between civility norms, affective commitment, and social exchange relationships and small to moderate sized effects of OCB, respect, incivility and affective commitment, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3a: Civility norms will add unique variance to the prediction of employee affective organizational commitment above and beyond the effects of enacted incivility, experienced incivility, OCBs, and respect.

Job Satisfaction

A traditional variable in organizational behaviour research, job satisfaction is viewed as an attitude towards one’s job (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). The relationship between job
satisfaction and performance has been of interest to scholars for a long time. More specifically, researchers found that job satisfaction was positively associated with contextual performance (but not traditional task performance). Previous meta-analytic evidence suggests that the average corrected correlation between OCB and job satisfaction ranges from 0.12 to 0.23 (Dalal, 2005; LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Building off of the work done around job satisfaction and OCBs, a similar case can be made for the relationship between job satisfaction and civility. More specifically, the more employees feel satisfied with their job, the more they engage in OCBs/civility as a means of reciprocating the positive benefits they perceive. The nature of reciprocation is based on a social exchange rather than economic exchange with the organization (Moorman, 1991). Civility norms likely influence job satisfaction because the norms indicate whether or not employees are experiencing social exchange relationships with the organization. A lack of civil norms suggests a lack of respect, cooperation, and personal relationships; it is difficult to build social exchange relationships in this type of environment. Thus, the presence of civility norms will be a predictor of outcomes of social exchange such as job satisfaction.

**Other Predictors.** The relationship between job satisfaction and respect has not been explored in depth. Van Quaquebeke and Eckloff (2010) looked specifically at respectful leadership and found a strong positive relationship between perceived respectful leadership and job satisfaction ($r = .62$). It is unclear, however, how other conceptualizations of respect are related to job satisfaction.

Within the incivility literature, experienced incivility has been conceptualized as an antecedent to job dissatisfaction. In a sample of employees of a Midwestern municipality, Lim and colleagues (2008) found personal experiences of incivility (path coefficient = -.32) and
workgroup climate of incivility (path coefficient = -.33) were independent predictors of employee job satisfaction. Reio and Ghosh (2009) explored enacted incivility (rather than experienced incivility) and found the enactment of organizational incivility (i.e., came in late to work without permission) but not interpersonal incivility (i.e., cursed at someone at work) was a significant independent predictor of job satisfaction (above and beyond the effects of affect). The mixed findings and sole use of cross-sectional data make it difficult to identify nuances of the job satisfaction-incivility relationship; however, previous research suggests a small potential relationship.

Given the proposed relationship between civility norms, job satisfaction and social exchange relationships and the small relationships (and mixed relationships) between OCB, incivility, and respect, it is predicted that:

*Hypothesis 3b: Civility norms will add unique variance to the prediction of employee job satisfaction above and beyond the effects of enacted incivility, experienced incivility, OCBs, and respect.*

**Job Burnout**

Job burnout is conceptualized as a “psychological syndrome in response to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job” (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001, p.399). Previous research suggests there are three dimensions to burnout: exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy (Maslach et al., 2001). Exhaustion refers to the stress dimension of burnout and is considered a necessary but not sufficient criterion for burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). Cynicism is the interpersonal aspect of burnout, which is characterized by increasing psychological distance from the workplace (Leiter, Nicholson, Patterson & Laschinger, 2012). Lastly, inefficacy reflects reduced feelings of
occupational self-esteem (Leiter et al., 2012). Burnout is characterized by high levels of exhaustion and cynicism, and low levels of professional efficacy.

Workplace civility norms involve a supportive, motivating, and safe work environment that employees can draw on as a resource (Leiter et al., 2012). In their intervention study, Leiter et al. (2011) found that as civility increased within workgroups, reports of cynicism decreased. Similarly, Laschinger, Finegan and Wilk (2009) found in a study of new graduates that perceptions of civility predicted less exhaustion and cynicism. Given the role of civility as a work resource, it is likely that civil norms will be predictive of less job burnout.

Other Predictors. Employees who are burnt-out may not have the additional resources to engage in extra-role behaviours such as helping coworkers. For example, Van Dyne, Graham and Diesesch (1994) found a negative relationship between cynicism and engagement in OCBs. On the basis of social exchange theory, Cropanzano, Rupp and Byrne (2003) argued that jobs which produce emotional exhaustion are not producing worthwhile benefits for their employees. As a result, employees will not experience high quality social relationships and they will be less likely to engage in extra-role behaviour. Cropanzano et al., (2003) empirically found emotional exhaustion predicted less engagement in OCBs towards one’s organization but not OCBs towards one’s supervisor. Thus, employees may intentionally or unintentionally refrain from engagement in OCBs as a result of experienced burnout.

The relationship between burnout and respect has largely been absent in the literature. One study by Ramarajan and colleagues (2008) looked at organizational respect as a predictor of emotional exhaustion. They hypothesized that employees who felt respected would be more engaged in their work, while employees who felt disrespected would feel greater emotional exhaustion. Using a sample of certified nursing assistants they found organizational respect at
Time 1 was a significant predictor of emotional exhaustion at Time 2 ($B = -.23$; Ramarajan et al., 2008).

The experience of incivility is a job stressor that over time can wear down employees. Using a sample of Canadian nurses, Leiter, Nicholson, Patterson and Laschinger (2012) found workplace demands (i.e., experienced incivility) were related to both employee exhaustion and cynicism. Interestingly, experienced incivility was not significantly related to perceptions of inefficacy. Laschinger, Leiter, Day, and Gilin (2009) also found moderate-sized correlations between experienced co-worker incivility and exhaustion ($r = .33$) and cynicism ($r = .41$).

Given the proposed role of civility norms as a resource, which is distinct from OCBs, respect, and incivility, the following hypothesis is proposed:

*Hypothesis 3c: Civility norms will add unique variance to the prediction of employee burnout (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy) above and beyond the effects of enacted incivility, experienced incivility, OCBs, and respect.*

**Summary of research questions and hypotheses**

The first goal of the present study was to explore the quantitative relationships between civility, respect, and OCBs. To recap, the hypotheses were as follows:

*Hypothesis 1: Employee perceptions of civility norms will be positively related to employee perceptions of respect.*

*Hypothesis 2: Employee perceptions of civility norms will be positively related to employee engagement in OCBs.*

The second goal was to explore the extent to which civility norms are able to add unique variance to the prediction of work-related outcomes of interest. These analyses help clarify
relationships among variables in the preliminary nomological network. To recap, the hypotheses were as follows:

*Hypothesis 3a:* Civility norms will add unique variance to the prediction of employee affective organizational commitment above and beyond the effects of enacted incivility, experienced incivility, OCBs, and respect.

*Hypothesis 3b:* Civility norms will add unique variance to the prediction of employee job satisfaction above and beyond the effects of enacted incivility, experienced incivility, OCBs, and respect.

*Hypothesis 3c:* Civility norms will add unique variance to the prediction of employee burnout (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy) above and beyond the effects of enacted incivility, experienced incivility, OCBs, and respect.

The following sample consists of archival data collected in 2008 (Time 1) and 2009 (Time 2) by Michael Leiter, Heather K. Spence Laschinger, Arla Day, and Debra Gilin Oore. The data comes from Canadian health care workers and is part of a larger intervention study aimed at improving civility, respect, and engagement among employees. The data set involves two groups: the intervention group and the control group. Given that the current study is interested in the overlap between variables, rather than change in variables over time, I am not interested in the effectiveness of the CREW intervention. Thus, to avoid any effects of CREW I am solely examining the control group as my sample. The availability and applicability of the data set made it ideal to use as an exploratory look into the relationships between civility, respect, and OCBs.
Method

Participants

The current sample consisted of 362 participants who completed surveys at both Time 1 and Time 2 and were part of the control group. The average age was 44.07 years and participants were 89.5% female (8.6% male and 1.9% undisclosed). The most common occupations were: registered nurses (RN; \( n = 188, 51.9\% \)), registered psychiatric nurses (RPN; \( n = 24, 6.6\% \)), unit clerks \( (n = 17, 4.7\%) \), and licensed practical nurses \( (n = 13, 3.6\%) \). The majority of participants worked full time (78.7%).

Procedure

The original design had employees of 41 units complete a self-report survey (Time 1) as part of a project to improve civility among colleagues (Leiter et al., 2011). Eight of the 41 units then participated in a 6-month intervention called CREW developed by Osatuke et al., (2009), while 33 units were assigned to the control group. Six-months after the intervention ended (and one year after the Time 1 survey), employees of the 41 units completed a second self-report survey (Time 2). Again, only employees in the control groups are used in the current study.

Materials

Civility Norms. The eight-item VHA Civility Scale (Meterko, Osatuke, Mohr, Warren & Dyrenforth, 2007) was used to measure civility norms. Sample items include, “people treat each other with respect in my work group” and “this organization does not tolerate discrimination”. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strong disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Internal reliability was good at Time 1 \( (\alpha = 0.87) \) and Time 2 \( (\alpha = 0.87) \).

Experienced Incivility. 10 items from Cortina and colleagues (2001) Workplace Incivility scale were used to measure the extent to which employees have experienced incivility
at work within the last month. Sample items include, “Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie” and “doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility”.

Five-items made reference to supervisor behaviour and five-items made reference to co-worker behaviour. Participants were asked to rate each item on a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from 0 (Never) to 6 (Daily). Internal reliability was good for supervisor incivility ($\alpha = 0.84$ at Time 1, and $\alpha = 0.82$ at Time 2) and coworker incivility ($\alpha = 0.85$ at Time 1, and $\alpha = 0.87$ at Time 2).

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviours.** Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter’s (1990) 24-item scale was used to measure participant self-reported engagement in organizational citizenship behaviours. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) with each statement as it related to their approach to work. Sample items included, “I consider the impact of my actions on co-workers”, “I do not take extra breaks”, and “I read and keep up with organizational announcements, memos, and so on”. Overall, the OCB scale had good reliability ($\alpha = 0.84$ at Time 1, and $\alpha = 0.87$ at Time 2). Reliability for each subscale, including Altruism ($\alpha = 0.79$ at Time 1, and $\alpha = 0.79$ at Time 2), Conscientiousness ($\alpha = 0.69$ at Time 1, and $\alpha = 0.73$ at Time 2), Sportsmanship ($\alpha = 0.78$ at Time 1, and $\alpha = 0.83$ at Time 2), Courtesy ($\alpha = 0.76$ at Time 1, and $\alpha =0.81$ at Time 2), and Civic Virtue ($\alpha = 0.68$ at Time 1, and $\alpha =0.74$ at Time 2) was adequate.

**Respect.** Two-items from the Esteem Reward section of the Effort-Reward Imbalance Questionnaire (Siegrist et al., 2004) were used to measure respect (i.e., “I receive the respect I deserve from my supervisors” and “I receive the respect I deserve from my colleagues”). An additional item has been created by Leiter and colleagues (2011) to capture organizational respect (i.e., Overall, I receive the respect I deserve from this organization). Each item was rated
on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strong disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Internal reliability was good at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.75$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.72$).

**Affective Organizational Commitment.** Two-items from the Affective Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) were used to assess affective organizational commitment. The two items were: “I do not feel like part of a family at my organization [reverse coded]” and “This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me”. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strong disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Internal reliability at Time 1 was adequate ($\alpha = 0.68$). The reliability at Time 2 was poor ($\alpha = 0.59$); thus, analyses were only conducted using the measure of affective commitment at Time 1.

**Job Satisfaction.** Five items were created to assess job satisfaction using conceptual information from previous scales (Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly, 1992). The five items reflected the extent to which participants felt satisfied with a) coworkers, b) supervisors, c) pay and benefits, d) the feeling of accomplishment from doing the job and d) the job overall. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 7 (very satisfied). Internal reliability was adequate at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.68$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.74$).

**Burnout.** The 16-item Maslach Burnout Inventory- General Survey (MBI-GS; Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996; Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach & Jackson, 1996) was used to measure emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy. Participants rated items on a 7-point Likert Scale rating from 0 (never) to 6 (every day). Examples of exhaustion included, “I feel emotionally drained from my work” and “I feel used up at the end of the workday”. Examples of cynicism included, “I doubt the significance of my work” and “I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes to anything”. Examples of efficacy included, “I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work” and “I feel I am making an effective
contribution to what this organization does”. Internal reliability was good at Time 1 for Exhaustion ($\alpha = 0.91$), Cynicism ($\alpha = 0.81$), and Efficacy ($\alpha = .77$). Internal reliability was also good at Time 2 for Exhaustion ($\alpha = 0.91$), Cynicism ($\alpha = 0.85$), and Efficacy ($\alpha = .80$).

**Results**

**Descriptives and Correlations**

The variable descriptives and correlations between variables are presented in Table 1. At Time 1, there were moderate levels of civility norms ($M = 3.76, SD = .67$) and low levels of incivility experienced from a supervisor ($M = .50, SD = .76$) or coworkers ($M = .74, SD = .77$) or engaged in by participants themselves ($M = .50, SD = .45$). Participants reported being fairly satisfied with their job ($M = 5.40, SD = .93$) and moderately committed to their organization ($M = 3.39, SD = .89$). Lastly, participants reported relatively low levels of both cynicism ($M = 1.54, SD = 1.22$) and exhaustion ($M = 2.63, SD = 1.39$) and moderately high levels of professional efficacy ($M = 4.76, SD = .88$). At Time 2, participants reported similar levels of job satisfaction ($M = 5.49, SD = .94$), exhaustion ($M = 2.56, SD = 1.41$), cynicism ($M = 1.55, SD = 1.31$), and professional efficacy ($M = 4.78, SD = .92$) as they did at Time 1.

Hypothesis 1 predicted a positive correlation between civility norms and respect. Results show a positive correlation ($r = .44, 95\% CI [.34, .53]$); thus, Hypothesis 1 is supported. Hypothesis 2 predicted a positive relationship between employee perceptions of civility norms and employee engagement in OCBs. Results show a positive correlation ($r = .22, 95\% CI [.12, .32]$). When looked at as separate factors, perceptions of civility norms were significantly correlated with altruism ($r = .17, 95\% CI [.07, .26]$), sportsmanship ($r = .13, 95\% CI [.02, .24]$), courtesy ($r = .19, 95\% CI [.08, .30]$), and civic virtue ($r = .16, 95\% CI [.06, .26]$) but not conscientiousness; thus, Hypothesis 2 is supported.
Incremental Validity

Incremental validity was tested using hierarchical linear regression. It is important to note that the data are nested within work units and that failing to model non-independence of data is problematic (Bliese, 2002). We tested ICC(1) values and found, for two (out of seven) dependent variables, a substantive amount of variance that could be attributed to unit membership: 11% for affective organizational commitment (2008) and 12% for job satisfaction (2008).

We modeled these two dependent variables using multilevel random coefficient modeling in order to account for unit membership. Results from both multilevel random coefficient modeling and linear multiple regressions showed very similar results in terms of significance, direction, and magnitude. We made the decision of reporting only the linear multiple regression findings because of two main reasons. First, our research questions focus on incremental validity, usually examined using change in $R^2$. Multilevel random coefficient modeling analyses do not provide estimates of change in $R^2$ because the complex way in which variance is analyzed (i.e., within variance, between variance), and the available estimates of explained variance are not as straightforward (Bliese, 2006; Snijders & Bosker, 1994). Second, coefficients were very similar using either approach. Moreover, a simulation study by Bliese and Hanges (2004) suggest that when predicting level-1 outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction) there is an increased risk of Type 1 error but not Type 2 error. In addition, they report that with an ICC of .15, power only dropped from 99% to 98%. Given that the results did not change when using either regression approach, and most variables had very low ICC(1)s, we decided to report results from linear regression analyses for all variables.

In hypotheses 3a-3c I propose a unique effect of civility norms on various outcomes once other similar constructs (e.g., experienced incivility, OCB, and respect) are controlled for. Each
hypothosis was tested twice, once using outcome data from Time 1 and once using outcome data from Time 2. All predictor variables, however, are from Time 1.

Hypothesis 3a predicted that civility norms will add unique variance to the prediction of affective organizational commitment over and above the effects of enacted incivility, experienced incivility, OCBs, and respect. Results in Table 2 shows that this hypothesis was supported in commitment measured in Time 1 ($\beta = 0.17, \Delta R^2 = .02$).

Hypothesis 3b predicted that civility norms will add unique variance to the prediction of job satisfaction over and above the effects of enacted incivility, experienced incivility, OCBs, and respect. Results in Tables 3 and 4 show that this hypothesis was supported in both job satisfaction measured in Time 1 ($\beta = 0.22, \Delta R^2 = .03$) and Time 2 ($\beta = 0.21, \Delta R^2 = .03$).

Hypothesis 3c predicted that civility norms would add unique variance to the prediction of burnout (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy) over and above the effects of enacted incivility, experienced incivility, OCBs, and respect. In the prediction of emotional exhaustion, results in Tables 5 and 6 show that civility norms did not add unique variance in either Time 1 ($\beta = 0.01, \Delta R^2 = .00$) or Time 2 ($\beta = -0.05, \Delta R^2 = .00$). In the prediction of cynicism, results in Tables 7 and 8 show that civility norms did not add unique variance in Time 1 ($\beta = -0.04, \Delta R^2 = .00$) but did in Time 2 ($\beta = -0.12, \Delta R^2 = .01$). In the prediction of professional efficacy, results in Tables 9 and 10 show that civility norms did add unique variance in Time 1 ($\beta = 0.41, \Delta R^2 = .10$) and Time 2 ($\beta = 0.30, \Delta R^2 = .05$). Thus, hypothesis 3c was partially supported.
Discussion

Civility Norms & Respect

A positive relationship between civility norms (as measured by the VHA Civility Scale) and respect was found. The similarities in the constructs are apparent because civility operates in the context of norms for mutual respect. Interestingly, the respect scale that was used was developed as a measure of esteem reward. Items on the scale include, “I receive the respect I deserve from my colleagues” and “I receive the respect I deserve from my superiors”. Rather than tapping into the idea of mutual respect, the current scale may capture the idea that respect is earned through success and represented through status, hierarchy and power. Future research should look at respect scales that tap into the concept of mutual respect (rather than earned respect), which is more commonly aligned with civility to determine how much construct overlap exists.

Another potential explanation for the moderate-sized relationship involves the relative influence of coworkers and supervisors. Interestingly, perceptions of civil norms were more strongly correlated with experiences of coworker incivility ($r = -.51$) than supervisor incivility ($r = -.27$). In contrast, perceptions of respect were more strongly correlated with supervisor incivility ($r = -.32$) than coworker incivility ($r = -.24$). In support of this argument, Fuller and colleagues (2006) argued that respect is a perception of one’s status within a group and the direct supervisor heavily influences an employee’s perceived status. Thus, civility norms may be tapping more influenced by coworker behaviour and respect may be more influenced by supervisory behaviour.

Given that both the VHA Civility Scale and the Respect Scale have items referencing both supervisor and coworkers it is difficult to tease these relationships apart further. Future
research should explore whether or not civility and respect are distinct constructs or if they
represent the same phenomena occurring from different sources. For example, civility may be
communicated through behaviours enacted by coworkers and respect is perceived from a
supervisor’s treatment.

**Civility Norms & OCBs**

A small positive relationship was found between perceptions of civility norms and
engagement in OCBs. When considering the separate factors, the strongest relationship was
between civility and courtesy, which was expected. Some discrepancy between civility norms
and OCBs was predicted given that OCBs are meant to include behaviours that go beyond
civility. Moreover, OCBs are tapping into individual-level behaviours while civility norms tap
into perceptions at a broader higher-level construct.

It is predicted, however, that the way OCBs and civility norms are measured is
exacerbating the differences between them. One reason for this is that there is a difference
between experiencing something (i.e., civility) and engaging in something (i.e., OCBs). For
example, there might be more overlap when measuring how much you either experience both
OCBs and civility or engage in both OCBs and civility. Thus, in order to reconcile these
differences future research needs to measure both civility and OCBs in a similar way (i.e.,
individual-level behaviours) in order to determine the overlap between constructs.

**Incremental Validity of Civility Norms on the Prediction of Job Satisfaction**

The VHA civility norms scale was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, over and
above the effects of experienced and instigated incivility, respect, and engagement in OCBs. In
the current study, the measure of job satisfaction included satisfaction with 5 aspects of work:
coworkers, supervisors, pay and benefits, the feeling of accomplishment from doing the job and
the job overall. Given the breadth of worklife this measure is tapping into, it is possible that civility and respect are related to different aspects of job satisfaction. For example, given that respect captures perceptions of social identity/status/reputation in a group, it might tap into satisfaction with pay and benefits more than civility norms. In contrast, civility focuses more on behaviours showing concern for others and connecting with one another and might be more related to satisfaction with coworkers.

Interestingly, The VHA Civility Scale makes reference to the workgroup, supervisor, and organization as a whole. Similarly, the measure of respect combines assessments of respect coming from coworkers, a supervisor, and the organization. Future research needs to explore how each source (e.g., coworker, supervisor) influences perceptions of civility and respect.

**Relationship to Affective Organizational Commitment**

Affective organizational commitment captures an “employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p.67). The VHA civility norms were a significant predictor of affective organizational commitment at Time 1, over and above the effects of experienced and instigated incivility, respect, and engagement in OCBs.

In the context of workplace safety, McGonagle and colleagues (2014) found that employees perceive civil norms as an indication that the organization cares about them and in exchange they engage in more safety behaviours. Similarly, the more civil norms employees perceive, the more likely they are to feel respected and valued in the organization and in return feel committed to the organization.

Interestingly, respect and engagement in civic virtue OCBs were also unique predictors of affective organizational commitment. Respect taps into social identity within a group or
organization; thus, captures affective commitment based on how much an employee identifies with the organization. Civic virtue involves being a “good citizen” and engaging in behavior that indicates “he/she responsibly participates in, is involved in, or is concerned about the life of the organization” (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p.115). Behaviours include attending meetings that are not mandatory and keeping up with organization announcements and memos. Unlike respect or civil norms, civic virtue may tap into how involved an employee is in their organization – another aspect of affective organizational commitment. Thus, civility norms are capturing a unique component of affective organizational commitment that neither respect nor OCBs are able to explain.

Given the low reliability of affective commitment at Time 2 the regression analysis was not conducted. Alpha is considered a lower bound estimate of reliability (Graham, 2006) and low reliability on a multidimensional scale may be a good thing. Given that we are only expecting one-factor, a low alpha suggests low internal consistency. Only two-items (out of eight) from Allen and Meyer’s (1990) scale were used in the current study. Future research should utilize the full scale and explore the relationships civility, incivility, respect and OCBs have to the full Affective Commitment Scale.

**Relationship to Burnout**

In regards to exhaustion and cynicism, civility norms were generally not a significant predictor (with the exception of Cynicism Time 2) over and above the effects of experienced and instigated incivility, respect, and engagement in OCBs. Interestingly, measures of supervisor incivility and instigated incivility positively predicted both emotional exhaustion and cynicism in Time 1 and Time 2. In contrast, civility norms were a unique predictor of professional efficacy in both Time 1 and Time 2.
In the context of job demands and resources, Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2001) argued that job burnout is particularly related to job demands while engagement at work is particularly related to job resources. Leiter and colleagues (2012) later defined incivility as a “job demand” and civility as a “job resource”. Using this framework it makes sense that incivility was a unique predictor of emotional exhaustion and cynicism while civility was not. Exhaustion represents the energy dimension of burnout and is not an uncommon response to job overload or time pressure at work (Maslach et al., 2001). Civility norms do not directly contribute to feelings of overload or reduced energy. Cynicism represents behaviours people engage in (and attitudes they develop) to cope with emotional stress at work, including becoming less interested in work and developing a cynical attitude (Maslach et al., 2001). Although not directly related, a lack of civility norms may over time foster a more cynical attitude whereby employees don’t want to be bothered by others at work.

In line with the job demands-resources model, the current study found civility was a unique predictor of professional efficacy while incivility was not. As a component of burnout, a lack of professional efficacy suggests reduced feelings of personal accomplishment at work. In contrast, high levels of professional efficacy suggest a high sense of one’s effectiveness, worth and accomplishment at work (Maslach et al., 2001). Civility norms are characterized by respect, cooperation, and concern for others at work. Thus, both professional efficacy and civility norms relate to perceptions of worth and value as a professional and as a person, creating a clear link between the two constructs. In sum, the presence of incivility (as a job demand) may predict different outcomes than the presence of civility (as a job resource).

It is also possible that civility norms have an indirect relationship to exhaustion and cynicism. Previous research suggests burnout can occur in jobs with high workload, time
pressure, role conflict, role ambiguity, and a lack of social support (Maslach et al., 2001). According to the Job Demands-Resources Model, job resources may buffer the negative impact of job demands on job strain (Bakker, Demerouti, Taris, Schaufeli & Schreurs, 2003). In this case, civility (as a job resource) may act as a buffer between the experience of stress and the experience of burnout. Future research should investigate this further and explore both the direct and indirect effects civility may have on individual, group, and organizational outcomes.

**Summary of Findings**

The results from the current study support the distinction between incivility and civility. For example, in predicting burnout, civility norms were a significant predictor of efficacy but a non-significant predictor of exhaustion and cynicism. In contrast, incivility was a significant predictor of exhaustion and cynicism but a non-significant predictor of efficacy. If indeed civility and incivility were opposites civility norms should have been negatively related to exhaustion/cynicism and incivility should have been negatively related to efficacy. The proposed distinction between civility and incivility is similar to the distinctions made between OCBs and CWBs (Spector et al., 2010), happiness and unhappiness (Pawelski, 2013) and, mental health and mental illness (Keyes, 2007), suggesting the positive is not simply the absence of the negative.

The main research question of Chapter 3 involved how civility norms relate to other constructs within the preliminary nomological network. The results presented in the current chapter provide evidence that civil norms are distinct from OCBs and respect and only have small to moderate positive correlations. There is also support for the notion that civil norms add unique variance to the prediction of job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment over and above the effects of incivility, respect, and OCBs. The findings in regards to burnout suggest civility adds unique variance to the prediction of efficacy, but not exhaustion or cynicism.
In sum, the findings suggest the construct of civility is a unique construct that warrants further investigation.

**Limitations & Future Research**

There are several characteristics of the sample that posed limitations. First, we were interested in predicting variance in measures of burnout using civility norms, incivility, respect and OCBs. The sample, however, reported relatively low levels of cynicism and exhaustion. As a result effect sizes may be smaller given the limited variability in criterion variables. In addition, the nature of the applied sample (as part of an intervention study) limited the length of the survey that could be used; thus, only two of eight items from Allen and Meyer’s (1990) affective commitment scale were included. Low reliability at Time 2 did not allow us to test our hypothesis regarding the incremental validity of civility on affective commitment. Lastly, the majority of participants were female (89.5%) nurses who worked in hospitals. Although the applied sample allows us to make inferences about that specific population it does not allow us to generalize the results about civility to other occupations and industries.

Given the exploratory nature of Chapters 2 and 3 there are three core limitations that will be highlighted and examined in depth: the need for improved measures, the need to expand the constructs investigated and the lack of theoretical framework.

**Improved Measures.** In Chapter 2, we used a qualitative approach to examine the relationship between uncivil and civil behaviours. In order to further our understanding, it is important to also examine the potential empirical relationship. Future research should look into the development of an individual-level behavioural measure of civility. Measuring civility in terms of specific behaviours is aligned with the original definition of civility as, “behavior involving politeness and regard for others in the workplace, within workplace norms for respect”
Assessing both civility and incivility at the same level (i.e., as behaviours not norms) is important in order to capture differences in the constructs rather than differences in level of analysis.

In Chapter 3, we used the VHA measure to assess civility norms. The VHA measure of civility is not ideal for three reasons. First, items make reference to coworkers, the supervisor, and the organization. Combining perceptions from multiple reference points is problematic because they may contradict each other. Given the proposed importance of teasing apart the relative effects of coworkers and supervisors, having a measurement tool that focuses only on one subject is important moving forward. Second, items likely go beyond what “civility” really is, to include issues around anti-discrimination and acceptance of diversity.

Lastly, the VHA measure captures perceptions of group norms rather than civil behaviours – this makes it difficult to compare to other constructs measuring specific behaviours. Moreover, although understanding how civility norms relate to other constructs is important, it is not our core research question – what we really want to explore is the construct of “civil behaviours”. Currently, studying civility norms is close, but not quite as proximal as we want to get. Thus, future research should focus on specific civil behaviours in relation to the proposed nomological network and associated antecedents and outcomes.

**Expanded Variables of Interest.** The current study was able to explore the relationships between civility, respect, and OCBs. Beyond this, the relationships between civility and other similar constructs also need to be explored further. For example, Brief and Motowidlo (1986) defined prosocial organizational behaviour (POB) as behaviour which is “a) performed by a member of an organization, b) directed toward an individual, group, or organization with whom he or she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and c) performed with the
intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group, or organization toward which it is directed” (p.711). How might civility be related to POBs? Other constructs that should be explored further include: perceived coworker support and interpersonal justice.

In order to determine how civility norms may (or may not) be a unique construct it is important to assess how it is able to predict outcomes of interest. I was able to test the incremental validity in predicting: job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and burnout. The findings suggest civility norms add unique variance in some cases but not others. Especially in regards to burnout, it appears incivility was able to predict both cynicism and exhaustion (while civility was not) and civility was able to predict efficacy (while incivility was not). Thus, it appears as though the positive may be predicting the positive and the negative is predicting the negative. In order to further explore this, it is important to look at a variety of other positive and negative outcomes, such as: psychological safety, wellbeing, turnover intentions, and affectivity.

Understanding the antecedents of civility (and other similar constructs) is also important. For example, are certain constructs able to predict civil behaviour but not OCBs? Exploring what factors drive behaviours will help determine when civility occurs versus when other positive organizational behaviours occur. Future research should explore the antecedents to civility, potentially including: conscientiousness, agreeableness, and trait affectivity.

**Theoretical Framework.** The final limitation of this study is that it lacked an overarching theory as to how and why civility is related to other similar constructs. Given that research on OCBs, respect, incivility etc. tends to be done in silo’s the research area as a whole is fragmented. An overarching theory would be beneficial to better understand how civility can be understood in relation to other constructs within the realm of positive organizational behaviours.
A framework would be helpful in driving future research questions and synthesizing what we already know into a cohesive framework.

**Conclusion**

The findings presented in Chapters 2 and 3 provide initial groundwork for research on civility to grow in a way that connects to other bodies of literature. More specifically, directly exploring the qualitative relationship between uncivil and civil behaviours helped clarify how these two constructs relate to one another. Combining a review of the literature with empirical evidence, I was able to address how civility norms relate to other similar constructs. Looking forward, I provided a solid basis through which a framework of civility can be built.

The aim of Chapter 4 is to build off of the findings from Chapters 2 and 3 by conducting a deeper analysis into whether or not civility is a form of construct redundancy through the theoretical analyses of similar constructs. More specifically, the fourth chapter will propose a theoretical framework through which the nomological network can be understood. Chapter 5 involves an empirical analysis of civility in relation to other similar constructs. In Chapter 5, I also propose a new behavioural measure of civility that can be tested against the established nomological network. In addition, measurement issues in terms of supervisor versus coworker influence and enacted vs. experienced constructs will be teased apart.
Table 1

Summary of Descriptives and Intercorrelations among variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1 Predictors</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 VHA Civility</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Respect</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (coworker)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-51**</td>
<td>-24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (supervisor)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-27**</td>
<td>-32**</td>
<td>-23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-39**</td>
<td>-17**</td>
<td>-55**</td>
<td>-27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 OCB Altruism</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-12*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 OCB Civic Virtue</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-18**</td>
<td>-25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 OCB Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-12*</td>
<td>-30**</td>
<td>-33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 OCB Courtesy</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-25**</td>
<td>-35**</td>
<td>-26**</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 OCB Sportsmanship</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-18**</td>
<td>-27**</td>
<td>-23**</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time 1 Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Organizational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cynicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time 2 Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Organizational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Exhaustion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Cynicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 362; *p < .05; **p < .01 (two-tailed).
### Table 2

*Regression Analyses Predicting Affective Organizational Commitment 2008*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (2008)</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Incivility</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Incivility</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Altruism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Courtesy</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Civic Virtue</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.02**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 356. Standardized Coefficients are presented. †p ≤ .10  * p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01*
Table 3

Regression Analyses Predicting Job Satisfaction 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (2008)</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Incivility</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Incivility</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Altruism</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Courtesy</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Civic Virtue</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change in R^2            | .05**  | .18**  | .03**  |        |
| Total R^2                | .18**  | .23**  | .41**  | .44**  |

*Note. N = 356. Standardized Coefficients are presented. †p ≤ .10  * p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01*
Table 4

Regression Analyses Predicting Job Satisfaction 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (2008)</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Incivility</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.09†</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Incivility</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Altruism</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Courtesy</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Civic Virtue</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 355$. Standardized Coefficients are presented. †$p \leq .10$  * $p \leq .05$  ** $p \leq .01$
### Table 5

*Regression Analyses Predicting Exhaustion 2008*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (2008)</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Incivility</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Incivility</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Altruism</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.10†</td>
<td>-.10†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Courtesy</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Civic Virtue</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 356. Standardized Coefficients are presented. †p ≤ .10  * p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01*
### Table 6

*Regression Analyses Predicting Exhaustion 2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (2008)</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Incivility</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Incivility</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Altruism</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>-.11†</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Courtesy</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Civic Virtue</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 355. Standardized Coefficients are presented. †p ≤ .10  * p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01*
Table 7
Regression Analyses Predicting Cynicism 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (2008)</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Incivility</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Incivility</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.10†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Altruism</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.09†</td>
<td>.08†</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.09†</td>
<td>-.09†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Courtesy</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Civic Virtue</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 356. Standardized Coefficients are presented. †p ≤ .10  * p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01
Table 8

*Regression Analyses Predicting Cynicism 2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (2008)</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Incivility</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Incivility</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Altruism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10†</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.10†</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Courtesy</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Civic Virtue</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 355. Standardized Coefficients are presented. †p ≤ .10  *p ≤ .05  **p ≤ .01*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (2008)</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Incivility</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Incivility</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Altruism</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Courtesy</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Civic Virtue</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2</td>
<td>.01†</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 356. Standardized Coefficients are presented. †p ≤ .10 * p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01*
Table 10

*Regression Analyses Predicting Professional Efficacy 2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (2008)</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Incivility</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Incivility</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.12†</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigated Incivility</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Altruism</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Courtesy</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB – Civic Virtue</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility Norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 355. Standardized Coefficients are presented. †p ≤ .10  * p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01*
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CHAPTER 4

A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR POSITIVE INTERPERSONAL WORKPLACE BEHAVIOURS

Although there are several, very similar, definitions of civility we will be using the definition by Pearson, Andersson and Porath (2000) who defined civility as “behavior that helps to preserve the norms for mutual respect at work; it comprises behaviors that are fundamental to positively connecting with another, building relationships and empathizing” (p.125). Previous research has found that the more employees report the presence of civil norms at work, the less they report turnover intentions and absences (Leiter, Laschinger, Day & Gillin-Oore, 2011; Walsh et al., 2012), incivility (Leiter et al., 2011; Walsh et al., 2012), burnout (Leiter et al., 2011) and engagement in unsafe behaviour at work (McGonagle et al., 2014). In order to further our understanding of workplace civility, we need to stop and reflect on how civility fits with other similar, more established, constructs (e.g., OCBs, coworker support). The literature on positive interpersonal behaviours employees engage in at work is extensive and varied.

As Singh (1991) notes, construct redundancy is problematic for several reasons. For example, researchers may spend unnecessary time advancing their own streams of research on constructs, which significantly overlap, and pragmatically it is not useful to have multiple constructs that tap into the same underlying phenomenon. Is civility a form of construct redundancy?

According to Singh (1991), redundancy can be viewed from two perspectives: conceptual and empirical. From the conceptual perspective, researchers look to see if there are theoretical justifications to view constructs as unique (vs. redundant). From the empirical perspective, researchers look for evidence of the discriminant validity of constructs. I would also argue that
before the issue of discriminant validity can be explored, it is important to understand the measures and methods through which constructs are investigated. For example, some researchers suggest the relationship between OCBs and CWBs is inflated due to measurement artifacts (e.g., rating format, who is completing the ratings; Dalal, 2005; Spector et al., 2010). Understanding methodological variations in the way constructs are investigated will be useful in later interpreting empirical data. Thus, conceptual, empirical, and methodological considerations need to be investigated to fully understand issues of construct redundancy.

The current chapter proposes a framework to better understand the measures and levels of analyses through which constructs related to civility are currently being studied. Having a framework will help integrate different areas of research that are currently developing largely in silos. Furthermore, a framework that focuses on the measurement of constructs will, along with an empirical and conceptual perspective, adds insight into the issue of civility as a form of construct redundancy. A full list of constructs within the proposed nomological network is presented in Table 1.

Theoretical Framework for Positive Interpersonal Workplace Behaviours

Based on a critical analysis of the literature, a Framework for Positive Interpersonal Workplace Behaviours was created to explain how constructs within the proposed nomological network are studied in relation to one another. More specifically, constructs can be categorized based on whether they are a) discrete behaviours or overall perceptions and b) individual- or group-referent constructs. The two dimensions create four independent quadrants within which we can categorize positive interpersonal workplace behaviours (see Table 2). Note that although incivility is not a, “positive interpersonal workplace behaviour” it is included in the table in order to provide a direct contrast to civility.
Dimension 1: Discrete Behaviours vs. Overall Perceptions

How we behave in the workplace and how we perceive the workplace are two related but unique phenomena. *Discrete behaviours* refer to the study of the extent to which certain specific behaviours are experienced or engaged in by employees. For example, OCBs include: reading and keeping up with organizational announcements, not taking extra breaks, and orienting new people even though it is not required. In contrast, *overall perceptions* involve general evaluations employees make that are influenced by a range of observable behaviours. For example, perceived coworker support includes overall perceptions about how coworkers: care about your opinions, care about your general satisfaction at work, and are supportive of your goals and values.

Role of Perceptions influencing Behaviours

Although the current Framework distinguishes perceptions from behaviours it is important to understand that our perceptions still affect the behaviours we notice, remember, and report on self-report surveys. For example, emotions affect our memory for certain events. More specifically, we remember emotionally stimulating events more than neutral events and thus might report experiencing more intense events more frequently due to memory bias (Zeelenberg, Wagenmakers & Rotteveel, 2006).

Employees who are not paying attention may not perceive an event that happens right in front of them. For example, inattentional blindness may lead employees to ignore signs of civility or incivility and thus report experiencing them less on a survey (Simons & Chabris, 1999). In addition, as Cohen and Ebbesen (1979) found, even if two people witness the same event they can remember different behavioural information. The authors argue that this is
because we have schemas in our minds that affect our information processing by directing our attention to certain stimuli and guiding our memory of certain events. Thus, it is important to note that even though we are studying discrete behaviours these are still commonly self-reported measures of “perceived” behaviours rather than objective behaviours.

**The Internalization of Respect Cues by Rogers and Ashforth (2014)**

Rogers and Ashforth (2014) explored the distinction between discrete behaviours and overall perceptions in the context of organizational respect. The authors created a theoretical model (see Figure 1), which shows the relationship between perceptions and behaviours. They argued that there are two ways to interpret the diagram; the first being that a variety of observable behaviours directed toward someone (e.g., displays of justice, civility, compassion, and empowerment) influence both their initial perceptions of respect and their overall aggregated perceptions (schemas) of respect and ultimately their sense of self. The second interpretation involves the shape of the pyramid. More specifically, one’s sense of self (at the bottom of the pyramid) is more stable than perceptions of respect (at the middle of the pyramid), which is more stable than others’ behaviours toward oneself (at the top of the pyramid). For example, whereas behaviours are momentary and shift depending on the situation, aggregated perceptions are more stable over time.

The theoretical model created by Rogers and Ashforth (2014) is useful to the current framework by providing support for the differences between discrete behaviours and overall perceptions. It also brings together the research on respect and civility and provides a clear distinction between respect (as a perception) and civility (as behaviours). Moving forward, the model by Rogers and Ashforth can be used to inform and support the current Framework for Positive Interpersonal Workplace Behaviours.
Perceptions and Behaviours in the Context of Social Support

In order to further understand the differences in how perceptions and behaviours are studied we can draw on the social support literature. According to Barrera (1986), social support is studied in many ways, including: perceived social support and enacted support. Perceived social support is defined as the cognitive appraisal of being reliably connected to others (Barrera, 1986). It focuses on both the availability and adequacy of supportive ties one has. In contrast, enacted support assesses actual behavioural descriptions of support. Although measures of enacted support rely on retrospective evaluations, they focus on what individual’s actually do when they provide support and what that support looks like. Thus, perceived social support focuses more broadly on overall perceptions and enacted support focuses more on discrete behaviours showing support.

Both perceived social support and enacted support are within the realm of social support; however, research has only found a small positive relationship between them (Lakey & Cassady, 1990). Moreover, past research suggests perceived support is more closely linked to cognitive personality variables (e.g., trait anxiety, depression) than enacted support (Lakey & Cassady, 1990) indicating there may be an important difference between perceptions of support and supportive behaviours. In the context of civility, it is important to specify if we are measuring perceptions or behaviours because it can potentially affect the research findings we obtain. Moreover, if we are studying civility as behaviours and respect as perceptions that may also affect how we interpret our research findings.

The way social support constructs are conceptualized (as perceptions vs. behaviours) drives how they fit into models of support. Research on enacted support typically focuses on the *positive* relationship between support and distress. For example, stressful life events lead to more
enacted support because the exposure to stress triggers the mobilization of enacted support (Barrera, 1986). In contrast, research on perceived support tends to focus on the negative relationship between support and distress. For example, the deterioration of perceived social support leads to an increase in depressive symptoms (Barrera, 1986). Thus, the distinction between discrete behaviours and overall perceptions is important in driving different research questions. How we define and measure civility affects how we theorize about it and conduct research. Conceptualizing civility as behaviours but measuring broad perceptions of civility is misleading and may result in different models of civility compared to when civility is defined and measured in terms of behaviours.

Perceived social support and enacted support may also differ in how they operate and affect employees. For example, in an experiment by Lakey and Heller (1988) undergraduates participated in a problem-solving task where half the participants were alone and half were with a companion. The researchers studied both actual supportive behaviours and beliefs that support was available. They found that perceived support was related to perceived stress of the situation, while actual behavioural support was related to the actual task performance (a behavioural measure; Lakey & Heller, 1988). The authors argued that perceived stress may operate primarily through the appraisal process (i.e., the appraisal of stress). In contrast, enacted support may operate through the influence on actual coping behaviour. Although speculative, the study by Lakey and Heller (1988) points to the differential influence of social support when it is conceptualized as perceptions versus behaviours. In relation to civility, civil behaviours may affect actual coping behaviour whereas perceptions of civility and civility norms may affect the appraisal process. Thus, researchers need to specify if they are studying perceptions or behaviours because they could affect outcomes in different ways.
Using examples from the social support literature helps clarify how other researchers study perceptions and behaviours differently. In the context of civility, we need to be explicit about whether we are studying perceptions of civility norms or actual civil behaviours. How researchers conceptualize the construct can have implications for how we theorize, measure, and make inferences about workplace civility. For example, are we interested in more general perceptions of civility within a workplace or are we interested in the day-to-day civil behaviours employees engage in?

Formative and Reflective Measures

Behaviours and perceptions are defined, theorized, and researched in different ways. As a result, they are often measured in different ways as well. More specifically, discrete behaviours traditionally use formative measures and overall perceptions traditionally use reflective measures. Formative measures include a series of items that measure disparate elements of a construct. For example, a measure of workplace aggression could include elements of lying, ignoring, and yelling (Herschovis & Reich, 2013). The underlying assumption is that each item in the measure reflects a different aspect of the underlying latent variable; thus, items may or may not be correlated. In contrast, reflective measures include a series of interchangeable items, which are all meant to get at one underlying latent variable (e.g., “I do my work in my own way”, “I determine the way my work is done, and “I make my own decisions”; Edwards, 2011). Items are meant to be highly correlated and the removal of any single item should not have an effect on construct validity.

Jarvis, Mackenzie and Podsakoff (2003) identified four important ways formative and reflective measures differ involving: the direction of causality, interchangability of items, covariation among items, and the nomological net of items (see Table 3; adapted from Jarvis et
al., 2003). To summarize, in formative measures the items as a group determine the meaning of the construct and each item is important and different from the other items. In contrast, reflective measures are viewed as “outcomes” of an unobserved latent variable such that all items are created to tap into the unidimensional latent variable. As a result, items should be interchangeable and highly correlated.

The distinction between formative and reflective measures is important because it further distinguishes between how we research and make assumptions about perceptions and behaviours. For example, constructs such as incivility, OCBs, and prosocial behaviour all use formative measures to tap into specific behaviours that are unique and important indicators of the construct. In contrast, respect and interpersonal justice use reflective measures that rely on several similar statements to tap into the underlying constructs. Moving forward, the use of formative versus reflective measures should be taken into consideration in order to better understand the relationships between positive interpersonal workplace behaviours. More specifically, similar to incivility, a measure of civility should be formative in nature and capture specific civil behaviours.

Summary

In sum, discrete behaviours and overall perceptions are distinct but related phenomena. Constructs that focus on discrete behaviours involve the study of specific behaviours assessed using formative measures. In contrast, overall perceptions are formed from a combination of observable behaviours, tend to be more stable over time, and are typically assessed using reflective measures. Whether a construct is defined using behaviours or perceptions influences how researchers theorize about the construct, what assumptions are made about the construct, and how the construct is measured.
In the context of civility, aligning the definition and measurement of the construct is an important first step in moving the research forward. Moreover, understanding how other constructs are studied (as perceptions or behaviours) is important in identifying similarities and differences between constructs such as: perceived coworker support, respect and OCBs.

**Dimension 2: Group vs. Individual Referent**

Articulating the level of analysis and measurement of phenomena is important because it drives the types of research questions that can be addressed and how constructs may relate to one another. Constructs at higher-levels (e.g., climate, norms) can have important contextual effects on how individuals choose to behave, perform, and interact with one another day-to-day in a top-down process (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). In contrast, behaviours of individual employees can converge over time and manifest as a group or team phenomenon in a bottom-up process (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000).

**Group-Referent Constructs**

Constructs that make reference to a workgroup or an organization are attempting to capture norms or climates rather than individual experiences. Norms can be in relation to workgroups, units, or the organization as a whole. Constructs such as safety climate or service climate would be considered group-referent constructs. Sample items include, “Management is concerned for the safety of employees” (Neal, Griffin & Hart, 2000) and “Employees receive recognition and rewards for the delivery of superior work and service” (Salanova, Agut & Peiro, 2005). Rather than tapping into individual experiences, these constructs are attempting to ask individuals about broader perceptions of group/organizational norms.

The VHA Civility Scale has items that reflect more general group-level perceptions of behaviours and norms rather than the frequency of personally experienced behaviours. For
example, “people treat each other with respect in my work group” and “this organization does not tolerate discrimination” (Osatuke et al., 2009). Similarly, the CNQ-B is defined as a tool to measure workgroup climate for civility, and has items including, “rude behavior is not accepted by your coworkers” and “respectful treatment is the norm in your work group” (Walsh et al., 2012). Given that both of these scales are tapping into group norms of civility, members within in a workgroup should have similar perceptions of civility; however, the level of agreement among members of a group can vary and reflect the strength of the climate (Chan, 1998; Schneider, Salvaggio & Subirats, 2002).

Climate variables can be conceptualized as individual-level constructs (i.e., reflect individual perceptions of climate) or group-level constructs (i.e., aggregated perceptions of climate from employees within a group; James, Choi, Ko, McNeil, Minton, Wright & Kim, 2008; James & Jones, 1974). Thus, the level of analysis of climate variables can vary. Although these constructs tap into group norms, they are still often measured at the individual-level. For example, Walsh et al. (2012) had employees participants fill out the CNQ-B and then analyzed the data at the individual-level. In contrast, Osatuke and colleagues (2009) took individual responses to the VHA Civility scale and aggregated them to the workgroup-level in order to have an index of civility for each workgroup in their study. To summarize, group-referent constructs are often measured at the individual and group-referent constructs can be analyzed at the individual-level or aggregated to a group-level and then analyzed.

**Individual-Referent Constructs**

Constructs that make reference to individual experiences (rather than norms or climates) are dominant in the organizational psychology literature. Common examples include, job satisfaction, burnout, organizational commitment, bullying, organizational justice and work
stress. Sample items include, “I am very happy being a member of this organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990), “all in all, I am satisfied with my job” (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins & Klesh, 1983), and “I feel emotionally drained from my work” (Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach & Jackson, 1996). The items are all tapping into individual experiences and attitudes at work, and as a result, different employees (even within the same group) may respond differently to these contracts.

Cortina and colleague’s (2001) Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS) assesses the frequency at which employees experience specific uncivil behaviours over a given period of time (e.g., a month, a year). Examples of scale items are: ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie, put you down or was condescending to you, and made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you. It is clear these behaviours measure the individual experience of incivility. As a result, the majority of research on incivility has occurred at the individual-level assessing predictors and outcomes of uncivil behaviour.

Individual-referent constructs can also refer to coworkers or supervisors in the survey items yet remain at the individual-level. For example, perceived coworker support includes items such as, “my coworkers are supportive of my goals and values”, “my coworkers really care about my well-being”, and “my coworkers care about my opinions” (Ladd & Henry, 2000). In this case, individuals are reporting on their own experiences with others in the workplace. It is possible, however, that within a workgroup employees can have very different perceptions of coworker support. Thus, individual-referent constructs focus on the individual experience (rather than a group experience) but can involve other people within a group or organization.

Referent Shift

Shifting the reference from the individual to the group (or vice versa) is possible; however, it creates two distinct constructs instead of one. For example, Ehrhart and Naumann
(2004) explored both OCBs and Group OCB norms. OCBs were measured in the traditional way: the extent to which individuals engage in OCBs in a given period of time. In contrast, the authors argued that group OCB norms were a group-level phenomenon and resided at the group level of analysis. Sample items would include, “members of my group help fellow coworkers when needed” and “members of my group advocate the importance of helping fellow coworkers” (Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004). Thus, it is possible for a construct that is individual-referent (i.e., OCBs) to become a group-referent construct (i.e., group OCB norms); however, it results in two unique constructs.

In the context of civility, the VHA measure of civility (Meterko et al., 2007) is meant to capture perceptions/norms of civility within a group/organization. Perceptions of civility within a workgroup, from an immediate supervisor, and from the organization in general are aggregated to form a broad measure of civility norms. What would a referent shift look like from the group to the individual? How do civil behaviours relate to norms of civility? We will discuss this idea more below.

**Summary**

In sum, group-referent constructs make reference to a workgroup/organization and attempting to capture norms or climates rather than individual experiences. It is important to note, however, that group-referent constructs can still be measured at the individual-level and analyzed at either the individual- or group-level. In contrast, individual-referent constructs make reference to individual experiences not group norms. Although individual-referent constructs may ask about how coworker treatment, they focus on how coworkers treat *you* rather than how coworkers treat *each other in general.*
An Overview of the Four Quadrants

The theoretical model by Rogers and Ashforth (2014) provided a clear distinction between perceptions and behaviours at work. The current theoretical framework builds off of the work by Rogers and Ashforth (2014) to include the distinction between individual- and group-referent construct. The current framework includes two dimensions: discrete behaviours vs. overall perceptions, and individual- vs. group-referent constructs. As a result, four distinct quadrants emerge. Below, each quadrant is described in more detail in relation to positive interpersonal behaviours at work.

**Quadrant 1: Individual-Behavioural**

The Individual-Behavioural quadrant consists of constructs such as OCBs and prosocial organizational behaviour. On the side of negative workplace behaviour, incivility would also fall into this quadrant. Examples of uncivil behaviours include, “put you down or was condescending to you” and “ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie”. These constructs are typically measured in terms of the frequency in which certain behaviours are enacted through the use of formative measures. One reason for this is that OCBs and prosocial organizational behaviour are considered forms of contextual performance that organizations are interested in; thus, the frequency at which they are enacted is an important indicator of performance.

Theoretically, civility, as defined as a specific set of behaviours experienced at the individual-level, fits into this quadrant. Measuring civility as behaviours at the individual-level also allows researchers to study both the experience and enactment of civility.

**Quadrant 2: Individual-Perceptual**

Individual-Perceptual constructs focus more on the subjective experiences of individuals rather than specific behavioural experiences. Reflective measures are used to assess perceptions
of individual experiences in the workplace. Interestingly, perceptions are obtained by asking the extent to which participants agree or disagree with statements rather than the frequency at which they experience behaviours. Perceptions are based on individual experiences rather than group experiences. For example, within a group all members may have different perceptions of the extent to which their coworker support them. The constructs of Perceived Coworker Support and Interpersonal Justice fall into this quadrant.

**Quadrant 3: Group-Perceptual**

The Group-Perceptual constructs typically require participants to rate their general perceptions of phenomena at the group-level. Thus, these constructs represent an individual’s subjective experience with more than one other person. For example, research on respect defines it as the perceived worth accorded to one person by one or more others (Rogers & Ashforth, 2014). Respect has also been defined as involving perceptions of how all others in an organization are treated (not just your own treatment; Ramarajan, Barsade & Burack, 2008). Thus, respect may capture a mix of both individual experiences of respect and norms of respect within an organization.

The way civility is currently measured is at the Group-Perceptual level. For example, employees are asked to rate their perceptions regarding the extent to which civility is the norm in their workgroup and the extent to which their organization does not tolerate discrimination. These scales typically ask participants to rate items based on agreement (rather than frequency). The broad perspective taken is likely a result of the fact that the constructs in this quadrant emerged from a social psychological or sociological perspective. For example, workplace civility arose from the idea of a civil society and was adapted to apply to the workplace.
**Quadrant 4: Group-Behavioural**

The Group-Behavioural quadrant consists of the construct Respectful Engagement. The measure refers to specific behaviours; however, participants are asked in reference to the organization/unit as a whole. For example, items on the Respectful Engagement scale include, “Organizational members here are always available to hear out and listen to each other”, and “Organizational members here pay the utmost attention to each other’s needs”. The response scale ranges from “not at all” to “a very large extent”; thus, tapping into a generalized concept of frequency that lacks a timeframe. Although specific behaviours are used, the broad referent (i.e., organization, unit) makes it more likely that answers will be influenced by a halo effect.

It is interesting to note that none of the commonly studied constructs (e.g., OCB, PCS, justice) fit into this quadrant. Constructs using a group-referent tend to ask about perceptions (rather than behaviours) more because it is difficult to consider specific behaviours from all “organizational members” at once. Instead, perceptions are commonly used because they more easily tap into the norms/climate of a workplace. Moreover, asking about behaviours from organizational members towards “each other” taps into organizational climate rather than any one person’s individual experience. According to Chan (1998) the use of these types of questions are used in referent-shift consensus models whereby individuals are asked about group norms and then responses can be aggregated to form a group-level norms measure. Given that individuals are being asked how organizational members treat each other (not just yourself) there should be relatively high agreement among responses.

In contrast, constructs assessing discrete behaviours typically ask participants about the extent to which they engage in specific behaviours at work (e.g., OCB). When we enact behaviours they are typically directed towards one individual rather than the group as a whole.
Similarly, when we experience specific behaviours they usually come from one individual not the group as a whole. Thus, asking people to report on specific behaviours in which “organizational members” have engaged in is a difficult judgment to make. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

**Benefits of Having a Framework**

There are several benefits to the proposed Framework for Positive Interpersonal Workplace Behaviours. First, it provides parsimony to a diverse set of constructs which allows us to identify relationships between different positive behaviours and make connections between different findings of studies that each use a different type of positive behaviour (e.g., civility, respect; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Moreover, understanding how each positive interpersonal workplace behaviour fits with other similar behaviours allows us to develop more comprehensive theories of positive interpersonal behaviours at work.

Second, the proposed framework also allows us to easily identify mismatches between a construct’s operational definition and measurement. For example, civility is defined in terms of behaviour and typically measured in terms of group norms. Identifying instances of this mismatch is also beneficial when interpreting empirical results. For example, although civility and OCB appear very similar theoretically, results from previous research (see Chapter 3) suggests the two constructs have a small positive correlation. Interestingly, civility is measured in terms of group norms and OCBs are measured in terms of individual behaviours. Thus, applying the proposed framework can help provide insight into empirical findings.

Lastly, the framework provides practical applications to researchers. For researchers interested in studying positive interpersonal behaviours at work it is not enough to simply look at the definitions of various constructs. The framework provides an easy source that can help them
select the most appropriate construct to use given their research question. For example, are scholars interested in perspectives of the group or perspectives of individuals? Are scholars interested in broader perceptions or specific behaviours? Finding the best measure for each specific research questions will reduce the need to include multiple similar constructs in a study, thus reducing the size of the survey participants have to fill out. Given issues of survey fatigue, a shorter survey that hones in on the crucial constructs is beneficial.

**Implications of the Framework for Positive Interpersonal Workplace Behaviours**

**Incivility vs. Civility**

The framework is especially useful in understanding the relationship between civility and incivility. Theoretically, civility and incivility are both defined in terms of specific behaviours that are either civil or uncivil. Methodologically, civility is studied in Quadrant 3 (Group-Perceptual) and incivility is studied in Quadrant 1 (Individual-Behavioural). Looking at the empirical relationship between these two constructs from purely a theoretical lens is misleading because we cannot directly compare the relationship between behaviours and norms and assume we are comparing behaviours to behaviours. Directly comparing civility and incivility using current measures is also misleading to practitioners who are interpreting the research from a surface-level and not exploring the measures used in depth. In order to determine the relationship between civility and incivility as they were originally defined in terms of behaviours (Andersson & Pearson, 1999) we need to empirically assess both in Quadrant 1 (individual-behavioural).

**Theoretical Perspectives**

The gap between measuring incivility in Quadrant 1 and civility in Quadrant 3 also highlights the different theoretical backgrounds from which each construct is approached. For example, the construct of incivility comes out of the deviant behaviour literature (e.g., bullying,
harassment). As a result, researchers care about the specific experience each employee has with incivility at work. Although incivility researchers are also studying civility, the general concept of civility comes out of the idea of a civil society. Thus, group perceptions of civility at the societal level are the most appropriate way to assess civility in that context. As we bring the study of civility into the workplace we need to adapt the theoretical lenses through which we conceptualize the construct.

**Theoretical and Methodological Alignment**

More broadly, the framework also helps to highlight how constructs may be theoretically aligned (e.g., civility, OCB, prosocial behaviour) but misaligned in measurement. For example, the OCB dimension of courtesy is defined as, “discretionary behavior on the part of an individual aimed at preventing work-related problems with others from occurring” and measured in terms of specific behaviours (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). Theoretically courtesy and civility are likely highly related; however, empirically we are comparing courtesy behaviours and civility norms. Assessing the empirical value of civility when it is measured in terms of behaviours allows for the most meaningful test against other constructs such as: incivility, OCB, prosocial behaviour etc.

**Conclusion**

In sum, within the Framework for Positive Interpersonal Workplace Behaviours, constructs can be categorized based on whether they are discrete behaviours or overall perceptions and individual- or group-referent constructs. The two dimensions create four independent quadrants within which we can categorize positive interpersonal workplace behaviours.
Currently, civility is measured in terms of overall perceptions referring to the group, while incivility is measured in terms of specific behaviours individual employees engage in or experience at work. This makes it difficult to directly compare our currently measures of civility and incivility. Moreover, constructs very similar to civility (e.g., OCB, prosocial behaviour) are measured in terms of specific behaviours individuals engage in at work. Understanding where/how civility overlaps with these constructs requires that we measure of all of these constructs in a similar way.

The framework is beneficial in categorizing the similarities/differences in how constructs similar to civility are measured. It also highlights the mismatch between how workplace civility is defined and how it is currently being assessed. Moving forward, the framework will be useful in interpreting the empirical relationships between constructs within the proposed nomological network. Thus, construct redundancy can be explored from both a theoretical and empirical perspective (Singh, 1991) combined with a methodological perspective.
Table 1

* Constructs related to Workplace Civility *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Sample Items</th>
<th>Key References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviours</td>
<td>“Behavior[s] of a discretionary nature that are not part of employees’ formal [role] requirements, but nevertheless promote the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p.4)</td>
<td>Courtesy, civic virtue, altruism, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness</td>
<td>“Helps others who have heavy work loads”; “Attends functions that are not required but help the company image”</td>
<td>Smith, Organ &amp; Near (1983); Organ (1988); Posdakoff et al., (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>“The degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p.427)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“Has he/she treated you in a polite manner?”; “Has he/she treated you with dignity?”</td>
<td>Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter &amp; Ng (2001); Colquitt (2001); Cropanzano, Prehar &amp; Chen (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Organizational Behaviours</td>
<td>Behavior which is “a) performed by a member of an organization, b) directed toward an individual, group, or organization with whom he or she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and c) performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group, or organization toward which it is directed” (Brief &amp; Motowidlo, 1986, p.711)</td>
<td>Behaviours aimed at the organization, individuals, and role-prescribed behaviours</td>
<td>“Speaks favourably about the organization to outsiders”; “offers ideas to improve the functioning of the department”</td>
<td>Brief and Motowidlo (1986); McNeely &amp; Meglino (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Coworker Support</td>
<td>Perceived coworker support represents broad perceptions employees make about the support available to them from coworkers.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“My coworkers really care about my well-being”; “Help is available from my coworkers when I have a problem”</td>
<td>Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa (1986); Ladd &amp; Henry (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Respect represents the “worth accorded to one person by one or more others” (Spears, Ellemers, Doosje &amp; Branscombe, 2006, p.179)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“People at my organization value my ideas and effort”; “People at my organization respect the work I do”</td>
<td>Rogers &amp; Ashforth (2014); Langdon (2007); Bartel, Wrzesniekski &amp; Wiesenfeld (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful Engagement</td>
<td>“Interrelating that conveys a sense of presence and worth and communicates positive regard” (Carmeli et al., 2015, p.3)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“Organizational members here emphasize other members’ good sides”; “Organizational members here make requests, not demands from each other”</td>
<td>Carmeli, Dutton &amp; Hardin (2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Framework for Positive Interpersonal Workplace Behaviours*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discrete Behaviours</th>
<th>Overall Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-Referent</strong></td>
<td>• OCBs</td>
<td>• Perceived Coworker Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prosocial Organizational Behaviours</td>
<td>• Interpersonal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Incivility</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group-Referent</strong></td>
<td>• Respectful Engagement</td>
<td>• Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Civility Norms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Characteristics of Formative vs. Reflective Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Formative Measure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reflective Measure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction of Causality</td>
<td>Items $\rightarrow$ Construct</td>
<td>Construct $\rightarrow$ Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchangability of items</td>
<td>Items are not interchangeable</td>
<td>Items should be interchangeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariation among items</td>
<td>Not necessary</td>
<td>Covariation is expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomological net of items</td>
<td>Nomological net may differ among items</td>
<td>Nomological net should not differ among items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Roger & Ashforth’s (2014) Model of the Internalization of Respect Cues
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CHAPTER 5

CIVIL BEHAVIOURS AT WORK: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Most employees spend five days a week, every week, at work. They interact with their coworkers every day and are often working in close proximity to them. In their meta-analysis of coworker support, Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) found increased coworker support was related to less role ambiguity, role conflict, role overload, effort reduction, and intention to quit. Coworker support was also related to more job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, task performance, and engagement in organizational citizenship behaviours. In sum, coworker relationships matter.

Workplace civility involves behaviours that are polite, show regard to others, and are fundamental to connecting with others and building relationships (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; McGonagle, Walsh, Kath & Morrow, 2014; Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000). Examples of civil behaviours include, engaging in respectful communication, actively listening, acknowledging others, and empathizing (Patterson, Chris, Pogrebtsova, Bouwman & Gonzalez-Morales, 2015). Civility is a core part of fostering coworker relationships.

What role does civility have in the workplace? For example, is civility an important predictor of employee job satisfaction or psychological safety beyond perceptions of coworker support? How is civility different from organizational citizenship behaviours or interpersonal justice at work? The current chapter aims to answer these questions and empirically address how workplace civility fits within the current literature on positive interpersonal workplace behaviours. First, however, we need to stop and reflect on what we already know about workplace civility.
What do we know about Workplace Civility?

As summarized in Chapter 1, a review of the literature indicates that civility norms are important. McGonagle and colleagues (2014) found the presence of civility norms within a workgroup encourages respectful behaviours, promotes helping, facilitates communication, and creates an overall positive workplace. In turn, civility norms also indirectly led to decreased work-safety tension, which reduced unsafe behaviour and on-the-job injuries (McGonagle et al., 2014). Improving workgroup civility through an intervention (CREW; Osatuke, Moore, Ward, Dyrenforth & Belton, 2009) led to increased respect, trust, job satisfaction, and commitment and decreased intentions, supervisor incivility, absences, and burnout compared to the control workgroups (Leiter, Day, Gilin-Oore & Laschinger, 2012; Leiter, Laschinger, Day & Gilin-Oore, 2011). At the workgroup level, civility plays an important role in creating a more positive workplace.

At the individual level, Porath and colleagues (2015) found being perceived as a civil colleague was associated with other positive perceptions (e.g., warmth, competence), which led more people to seek civil colleagues out for advice, and perceive them as leaders. Porath et al.’s (2015) use of social network analysis, however, constrained the measurement of civility such that it had to be a dichotomized variable. As a result, civility was measured more as a stable characteristic of an employee rather than a set of behaviours or norms.

Given that civility is defined in terms of behaviours rather than as a personality characteristic, what do civil behaviours actually look like? Qualitative research presented in Chapter 2 indicated civil behaviours are considered active (rather than passive) and are generally others-focused (rather than self-focused). Examples included, empathizing, being considerate of others, acknowledging others, active listening, helping coworkers, making coworkers feel
included, and respecting shared space. In contrast, uncivil behaviours were described as active (rather than passive) and self-focused (rather than other-focused). Examples included, talking loudly, interrupting someone, belittling coworkers, gossiping, and ignoring someone. Although incivility and civility may appear as opposites, the majority of participants in our study (69%) believed civility and incivility could co-exist within the same workplace. It is still unclear, however, how civil and uncivil behaviours relate to one another quantitatively. Are high levels of civil behaviours always associated with low levels of uncivil behaviours? Are there different predictors of uncivil and civil behaviours?

Understanding civility in relation to other similar constructs is also important in determining if civility is a form of construct redundancy. A lack of established measurement tools does not allow us to directly compare civil behaviours with other similar constructs (e.g., uncivil behaviours, organizational citizenship behaviours); however, we were able to explore these relationships using a measure of civility norms. In Chapter 3, civility norms added unique variance to the prediction of affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and professional efficacy over and above the effects of incivility, OCBs, and respect. The addition of other outcomes (e.g., psychological safety, mental well-being) and predictor variables (e.g., perceived coworker support, prosocial organizational behaviours) can add a more complete understanding of the unique role of civility in the workplace.

Although other constructs may be theoretically similar to civility, they often differ in how they are measured. For example, OCBs are measured by asking participants about the extent to which they engage in specific behaviours at work. Perceived coworker support is measured by asking participants about their perceptions of experienced support at work. Chapter 4 proposed a Framework for Positive Interpersonal Workplace Behaviours that teased apart differences in how
constructs are measured. Constructs were categorized based on whether they are discrete behaviours or overall perceptions and individual- or group-referent constructs. Combining an understanding of the theoretical and methodological similarities between constructs is important in understanding empirical relationships.

**Purpose of the Current Study**

In order to understand issues of construct redundancy, Singh (1991) suggests using both a theoretical and empirical approach. Theoretically, I will explore each construct in the proposed nomological network to understand: the main antecedents and consequences, common theories used to explain the phenomena and similarities/differences with the theoretical definition of civility.

Singh (1991) also discusses the importance of redundancy from an empirical perspective. Unfortunately the majority of published studies only measure one construct in the nomological network. Thus, I first review the literature to identify common antecedents and outcomes of constructs in the proposed nomological network. I then conduct direct empirical analyses with data collected from my own study using an adapted measure to reflect the construct of civil behaviours. I compare the antecedents and outcomes of civil behaviours in relation to the antecedents and outcomes of other established constructs (i.e., civility norms, incivility, OCBs, prosocial organizational behaviour, interpersonal justice, perceived coworker support, and respect). The three main research questions of the current study are:

What empirical evidence is there for the direct relationships between civility and other similar constructs?

Does civility have a unique pattern of predictors compared to other similar constructs?
Is civility an important predictor of organizational outcomes beyond the predictive power of other similar constructs?

In order to empirically compare civil behaviours with other similar constructs, we first need a measure of civil behaviours. Previous research has studied civility as a group-level construct focusing on civil norms rather than civil behaviours. As proposed within the Framework for Positive Interpersonal Behaviours, civility is defined in terms of behaviours and, along with incivility, should be measured within the Individual-Behavioural quadrant. Focusing on specific behaviours allows us to look at both the enactment and experience of behaviours, similar to how we currently study incivility. Moreover, looking at individuals rather than groups is important because civility happens between individuals through conversations and interactions. Within the incivility literature there is also an emphasis on individuals rather than norms through the increased use of daily diary studies (Beattie & Griffin, 2014; Manegold, 2015; Meier & Gross, 2015; Meier & Spector, 2013) and the emphasis on understanding the incivility spiral (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). The current study will propose and provide preliminary validation of a new measure of civil behaviours.

OCBs are measured in terms of the enactment of behaviours, respect is measured in terms of the experience of respect, and incivility is measured in terms of both enactment and experience. As a result, the proposed measure of civil behaviours will be adapted to assess both the enactment of civil behaviours and the experience of civil behaviours (as two separate scales). In turn, constructs focusing on “enactment” will be compared to one another and constructs focusing on reported “experiences” will be compared to one another.

In the next sections I describe the nomological network in more detail and the proposed relationship between each construct (e.g., respect, OCB) and workplace civility. In addition, I
describe the antecedents and outcomes the current study will focus on. Next, I provide the results from the preliminary validation of a civil behaviours scale. I then detail the methods and results from the current empirical study looking at the relationships between the nomological network constructs, antecedents, and outcome (see Figure 1). Lastly, I provide a discussion of the strengths and limitations of my study as well as the future directions for research on workplace civility.

NOMOLOGICAL NETWORK, ANTECEDENTS, AND OUTCOMES

Enacted Constructs and Civility

Workplace Incivility

The incivility phenomena can be best understood as a social interaction such that there are instigators and targets. The majority of past research has focused on how experiencing incivility at work affects employees, capturing the target perspective. Unfortunately, we know significantly less about those who enact incivility compared to those who experience incivility.

Why do employees engage in incivility? Blau and Andersson (2005) found distributive injustice, job dissatisfaction, and exhaustion all predicted engagement in uncivil behaviours. Other research suggests job stress (Roberts, Scherer & Bowyer, 2011) and negative affect (Reio & Ghosh, 2009) are predictors of engagement in uncivil behaviours. Employees who feel stressed, exhausted, and upset at work may intentionally or unintentionally engage in incivility towards others. Intentionally as a response to feeling a sense of injustice, incivility may be a means of restoring justice. Unintentionally employees who are burnt out and upset at work may be less attentive to norms of respect or have less energy to engage with their coworkers (Felson & Tedeschi, 1993; Tedeschi & Felson, 1994)
In contrast to incivility, civility involves behaviours that show concern for and respect for others at work. Employees who are stressed, burnt out and unhappy at work are not likely to engage in many behaviours to show their coworkers they value and care about them. It is possible to engage in both incivility and civility; however, in general employees who are engaging in a lot of rude, discourteous uncivil behaviours are not likely to engage in a lot of supportive, respectful behaviours as well.

**Hypothesis 1: Enacted incivility will be negatively associated with enacted civility**

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviours**

Organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) are the day-to-day prosocial gestures of individuals at work that go beyond formal role requirements (Organ, 1997; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). Organ (1988) identified five major dimensions of OCBs: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

The motives to engage in OCBs have been studied by researchers. Rioux and Penner (2001) found three motives: prosocial values, organizational concern, and impression management. Takeuchi, Bolino and Lin (2015) further examined these three motives and found prosocial values and organizational concern were related to engagement in OCB-I and OCB-O. Mayfield and Taber (2010) explored the idea of a prosocial self-concept, which involves viewing oneself as a prosocial person with socially oriented values. They found students having a high prosocial self-concept had stronger intentions to engage in OCBs directed towards other students and society as a whole (Mayfield & Taber, 2010). Thus, people may have general tendencies (i.e., prosocial values, prosocial self-concept) that motivate them to engage in OCBs and they may also be influenced by contextual factors (i.e., organizational concern).
Theoretically, employees engage in OCBs based on conditions of social exchange (e.g., trust, support, justice) with their organization (Zellers, Tepper & Duffy, 2002). Based on a norm of reciprocity an employee and organization will exchange various resources in an ambiguous (and seemingly unrelated manner). For example, an organization provides status, information, and support to an employee and that employee may engage in OCBs such as helping others who are absent or attending functions that are not required but help the company image.

Both OCBs and acts of civility represent small acts of positive behaviour that are not explicitly required of employees but occur based on both individual differences and the environment in which individuals operate. Given the similarity between OCBs and civility, it is likely that similar group norms influence both types of behaviour; however, OCBs include behaviours that are civil but also go above and beyond civility. Moreover, OCBs are meant to directly benefit the organization in some way. In contrast, civil behaviours may or may not directly benefit the organization. Thus, I expect a positive correlation between OCBs and civility at work.

**Hypothesis 2a: OCBs will be positively associated with enacted civility**

Of the five dimensions of OCB, courtesy, defined as “discretionary behavior on the part of an individual aimed at preventing work-related problems with others from occurring” is most similar to civility. Examples of items include, “Is mindful of how his/her behavior affects other people’s jobs” and “takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers”. Courtesy OCBs and civil behaviours are related because they both represent small behaviours that employees engage in to create a more positive interpersonal culture at work. Courtesy, however, is more focused on preventing conflict than promoting civility. For example, someone who is engaging in courtesy OCBs is actively trying to prevent interpersonal problems from happening by
managing risk. In contrast, civil behaviours are focused on promoting harmony and aimed at proactively creating more positive interpersonal relationships.

Hypothesis 2b: The courtesy dimension will show the strongest relationship with enacted civility compared to the other OCB dimensions

Prosocial Organizational Behaviour

Brief and Motowidlo (1986) first defined prosocial organizational behaviour (POB) as behaviour which is “a) performed by a member of an organization, b) directed toward an individual, group, or organization with whom he or she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and c) performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group, or organization toward which it is directed” (p.711). It is also defined as discretionary and voluntary (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993) or more generally any behaviour performed for the benefit of the organization (Organ, 1990; Tidwell, 2005).

The broad definition used has resulted in various forms of measurement. For example, De Dreu and Nauta (2009) used four-items from Moorman and Blakely’s (1995) measure of OCB to assess prosocial behaviour. Kane and colleagues (2012) adapted an altruism scale, while Michie (2009) used measures of social justice and altruism to assess prosocial behaviour. Other researchers have used both objective and subjective measures of volunteerism (Tidwell, 2005; Winterich, Aquino, Mittal & Swartz, 2013). All of these measures fall within the original 13 kinds of prosocial organizational behaviour originally identified by Brief and Motowidlo (1986). The current study will use a scale developed by McNeely and Meglino (1994) because it assesses three types of POBs: behaviours directed at the organization, behaviours directed at individuals, and role-prescribed behaviours.
Similar to the research on OCB, the majority of research on POB has focused on antecedents rather than outcomes. Personal characteristics such as having a grateful disposition (Michie, 2009), high need for achievement (Baruch, O’Creevy, Hind & Vigoda-Gadot, 2004), high internalized moral identity (Winterich et al., 2013), empathy, and concern for others (McNeely & Meglino, 1994) are related to more engagement in prosocial behaviour. Factors such as organizational commitment (Baruch et al., 2004; Kane, Magnusen & Perrewe, 2012; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Tidwell, 2005), organizational identification (Kane et al., 2012; Tidwell, 2005), job satisfaction (Tidwell, 2005), and rewards and recognition (McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Winterich et al., 2013) also positively relate to engagement in prosocial behaviour.

The broad definition of prosocial behaviour encompasses the concept of workplace civility. The majority of research on POB, however, focuses on more active forms of helping including volunteering (e.g., “volunteers for additional assignments”; “comes in early or stays late to help out”) and engaging in altruistic behaviour (e.g., “assists supervisor with his or her work”, “willing to make sacrifices for the sake of employee well-being”) than what civil behaviours entail (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Michie, 2009; Tidwell, 2005). Moreover, prosocial behaviours can be a) functional or dysfunctional, b) directed at individual or organizational, and c) role prescribed or extra-role. Civility likely falls within the spectrum of behaviours that are extra-role, functional, and directed at individuals.

**Hypothesis 3:** Prosocial organizational behaviours will be positively associated with enacted civility
In the next section I review the antecedents that will be explored in the current study. The constructs were chosen based on a review of common antecedents from previous research on: incivility, OCBs, and POBs.

**Proposed Antecedents**

What predicts engagement in incivility, civility, OCBs, and POBs? Are similar antecedents driving all of these constructs? Exploring what drives engagement in civil behaviours is important in understanding how civility may be unique. The goal of the second research question is to identify if civility has a unique pattern of predictors compared to other similar constructs. The antecedents in the current study include both stable traits (i.e., trait negative affectivity and positive affectivity, gratitude, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) and situational constructs (i.e., procedural justice, affective organizational commitment, and job satisfaction).

The current study looks at the relationship between the proposed antecedents and the “enacted” constructs within the nomological network including: civility, incivility, OCB, and POB. The majority of research on enacted incivility, OCBs and POBs has focused on the antecedents (rather than the outcomes) of these behaviours. Essentially, researchers are interested in what leads employees to engage in these types of behaviours at work. In the section below I first describe each antecedent and the hypothesized relationship with enacted civility. I then describe differences in the proposed relative importance of antecedents I expect between civility and the other nomological network constructs (i.e., incivility, OCB, POB).

**Stable Traits**

**Trait Negative Affectivity.** As a trait, negative affectivity (NA) is a mood-disposition that is relatively stable and predisposes individuals towards negative emotionality. Individuals
high in NA tend to be relatively distressed, upset, and have a negative view of themselves (Watson & Clark, 1984). Individuals low in NA are relatively content and secure with themselves. In the context of incivility, Reio and Ghosh (2009) found negative affect predicted engagement in both interpersonal and organizational incivility. Lee and Allen (2002) also found NA was a predictor of engagement in workplace deviant behaviour but not a significant predictor of engagement in OCBs. Interestingly, previous research has found NA is actually unrelated to experiences of positive emotions (Watson & Clark, 1984). Thus, I hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 4:** Trait NA will not be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility

**Trait Positive Affectivity.** In contrast to NA, positive affectivity (PA) is a trait reflecting one’s disposition towards positive emotional experiences. Individuals high in PA are relatively enthusiastic, mentally alert, interested and have high energy levels (Watson, Clark & Carey, 1988). Individuals low in PA report more lethargy and fatigue (Watson, Clark & Carey, 1988).

In general, PA is related to increased frequency of contact with friends/relatives, making new acquaintances and involvement in social organizations (Watson & Clark, 1984). Isen and Baron (1991) found positive moods encourage the display of helping behaviours (e.g., OCBs). A study of employees in Singapore found trait PA was a significant predictor of intentions to engage in OCBs (Williams & Shiaw, 1999). They speculated that employees high in PA might be more socially aware and willing to display prosocial behaviours. In a meta-analysis of seven studies, Organ and Ryan (1995) found only a small relationship between trait PA and the OCB dimensions of altruism and generalized compliance; however, a more recent meta-analysis by Dalal (2005) found a moderate positive relationship between PA and OCBs. Thus, I hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 5:** Trait PA will be a significant predictor of enacted civility
**Dispositional Gratitude.** McCullough, Emmons and Tsang (2002) defined the grateful disposition as, “a generalized tendency to recognize and respond with grateful emotion to the roles of other people’s benevolence in the positive experiences and outcomes that one obtains” (p.112). Feelings of gratitude come from the perception that you have benefited from a costly, intentional and voluntary action of someone else (McCullough, Kimeldort & Cohen, 2008). In turn, grateful people try to reciprocate through engagement in prosocial behaviours. Gratitude is considered an empathic emotion or prosocial affect, which is distinct from general positive affectivity (Emmons & McCullough, 2003; McCullough et al., 2002). For example, gratitude increases helping towards others even when it is costly to oneself; general positive affect decreases helping when it is costly to oneself (Bartlett & DeSteno, 2006).

Gratitude is a social emotion produced through social exchanges and interactions (Grant & Gino, 2010). It is essential in building trust, altruism, and social relationships (Bartlett & DeSteno, 2006; McCullough et al., 2008). Michie (2009) found having a grateful disposition made people more likely to engage in prosocial behaviours. In an experimental study, Grant and Gino (2010) found feelings of gratitude increased engagement in prosocial behaviours, and this effect was mediated by increased perceptions of social worth. Essentially, when you benefit from someone else’s actions and feel grateful towards the other person it makes you feel valued by others. In turn, feeling valued motivates you to help others and engage in prosocial behaviours yourself. Bartlett and DeSteno (2006) conducted several experiments and found compared to a control condition, those who were primed to feel more grateful towards a peer were more willing to help both the peer as well as a complete stranger. Thus, I hypothesize the following:

*Hypothesis 6:* Gratitude will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility
Agreeableness. As one of the Big Five personality dimensions, individuals high in agreeableness are often described as: sympathetic, trusting, cheerful, generous, courteous, and forgiving (McCrae & Costa, 1987). They are also considered cooperative, empathetic, respectful, and considerate (Goldberg, 1990). In contrast, those low in agreeableness are described as mistrustful, skeptical, unsympathetic, uncooperative and rude (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Compared to other personality traits, agreeableness is strongly related to interpersonal relationships and social evaluation (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell & Hair, 1996). Meta-analytic findings point to a small positive relationship between agreeableness and engagement in OCBs (Borman, Penner, Allen & Motowidlo, 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Given that those high in agreeableness have a cooperative nature and desire to maintain positive relationships, I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 7: Agreeableness will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility

Conscientiousness. Individuals who are conscientious are often careful, reliable, organized, punctual, fair, and deliberate (McCrae & Costa, 1987). They have a tendency to engage in constructive and responsible behaviours and are often hardworking and meticulous (Bowling, 2010). In the workplace, conscientious employees often engage in actions that benefit their organization regardless of whether they’re satisfied with their job or not (Bowling, 2010). Meta-analytic research finds small to moderate positive relationships between conscientiousness and engagement in OCBs and small to moderate negative relationships between conscientiousness and engagement in CWBs (Borman et al., 2001; Dalal, 2005; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Thus, I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 8: Conscientiousness will a significant predictor of increased enacted civility

Organization-Specific
**Procedural Justice.** Research on workplace fairness consists of three distinct types of justice: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Charash-Cohen & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001). Procedural justice focuses on the fairness of the process through which outcomes are determined at work. Examples of rules that yield fair procedures include: consistency in procedures, bias-suppression, and avenues to correct unfair decisions (Leventhal, 1980). Tyler and Blader (2002) found procedural justice was a strong predictor of perceived respect; thus, there appears to be a link between perceptions of fairness and perceptions of respect.

Procedural justice is important because employees value fairness in the workplace and when they experience fairness they react in positive ways. A meta-analysis found perceptions of procedural justice are positively related to engagement in OCBs directed towards individuals and the organization (Colquitt et al., 2001). In contrast, perceived unfairness may trigger negative reactions that motivate employees to engage in behaviours that aim to restore justice. In relation to incivility, previous research has found the experience of procedural injustice is related to increased engagement in counterproductive workplace behaviours, incivility, and withdrawal behaviours (Baron, Neuman & Geddes, 1999; Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). Thus, I hypothesize the following:

*Hypothesis 9:* Perceptions of procedural justice will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility

**Affective Organizational Commitment.** Although only one aspect of the three-component framework, affective commitment refers to an “employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p.67). When employees are committed to their organization it indicates a high-quality social exchange
between the employee and the organization (Taylor, Bedeian & Kluemper, 2012). The more employees feel emotionally attached to their organization, the more they are likely to engage in positive behaviours towards the organization. Previous research has found commitment is an antecedent of engagement in prosocial organizational behaviours (Baruch, O’Creevy, Hind & Vigoda-Gabot, 2004; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Tidwell, 2005). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 10:** Affective organizational commitment will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility

**Job Satisfaction.** A core construct in the organizational literature, job satisfaction reflects a general attitude towards one’s job (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Although it does not directly affect task performance, researchers have theorized that job satisfaction plays a role in contextual performance (e.g., OCBs; Organ, 1997). More specifically, employees who feel satisfied with their job try to reciprocate by engaging in forms of contextual performance towards the organization. Meta-analytic evidence suggests that the average corrected correlation between engagement in OCBs and job satisfaction ranges from 0.12 to 0.23 (Dalal, 2005; LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 11:** Job satisfaction will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility

**The Relative Importance of Antecedents**

**Civility and Incivility.** Antecedents representing positive appraisals of the workplace (e.g., commitment, agreeableness) are expected to be related to enacted civility. The only antecedent to have a hypothesized null relationship with enacted civility is trait negative affectivity (NA). Research suggests NA is often a predictor of incivility and deviance, but not OCBs or positive organizational behaviours (Ghosh, Dierkes & Falletta, 2011; Lee & Allen,
2002; Reio & Ghosh, 2009). Even within Andersson and Pearson’s (1999) incivility spiral, state NA is a core component leading to enacted incivility. Why is NA associated with engagement in negative behaviours? It’s possible that NA leads individuals to be less attentive to norms of respect and less concerned about future consequences of behaviour (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). A lack of NA, however, does not necessarily lead to active engagement in civility. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 12:** Positive constructs (i.e., PA, gratitude, conscientiousness, agreeableness, job satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice) will be more important than negative constructs (i.e., NA) in explaining variance in civility compared to incivility.

**Civility and OCBs.** Both OCBs and civil behaviours represent small acts of positive behaviour that are not explicitly required of employees but occur based on both individual differences and the environment in which individuals operate. OCBs, however, are all designed to directly benefit the organization. Theoretically, researchers often describe how employees engage in OCBs based on conditions of social exchange with their *organization* rather than other individuals (Zellers et al., 2002). Employees make a judgment over whether their organization cares about their wellbeing and values their contribution and in turn based on Social Exchange Theory the employees will reciprocate with OCBs (directed towards the organization). Robinson and Morrison (1995) describe the reciprocal nature of the employee-employer relationship through a contract perspective. More specifically, psychological contracts (i.e., beliefs about the terms of an exchange agreement) develop between an employee and the organization, and the more the organization has fulfills its obligations, the more likely employees are to reciprocate through OCBs. Thus, the decision to engage in OCBs is likely strongly influenced by how the employee feels the organization is treating them and fulfilling the psychological contract.
In contrast, civil behaviours are exchanged between colleagues so it is less relevant how the organization treats the employee. Moreover, often employees engage in civility because, “it’s the right thing to do” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). In sum, the social exchange relationships for OCBs are between the employee and the organization while the social exchange relationships for civil behaviours are between employees. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

\textit{Hypothesis 13}: Stable traits (i.e., PA, NA, gratitude, conscientiousness, agreeableness) will be more important than situation-specific constructs (i.e., job satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice) in explaining variance in civility than OCBs.

\textbf{Civility and POBs.} Prosocial organizational behaviours encompass a wide range of behaviours including those directed at the organization (e.g., expresses loyalty to the organization), directed at other individuals (e.g., coordinates department get-togethers), and specific role-prescribed behaviours (e.g., arriving at work on time). While POBs directed towards individuals benefit the individual (more than the organization), POBs directed towards the organization and role-prescribed behaviours have a direct impact on the organization. Given that civility is directed towards coworkers (not the organization), there is a clear link between civility and POBs directed towards individuals. Moreover, McNeely and Meglino (1994) found empathy was a significant predictor of POBs directed at individuals. Similar to the proposed links between gratitude and civility, empathy is a social emotion and associated with behaviours directed towards other people.

In contrast, POBs directed towards the organization and role-prescribed behaviours directly benefit the organization. Theoretically, employees may engage in POBs towards the organization as a way to reciprocate benefits they receive (e.g., job security, salary, fair treatment) from the organization. For example, reward equity was a significant predictor of
POBs directed at the organization (McNeely & Meglino, 1994). In line with Social Exchange Theory, employees who feel they are valued and cared about by the organization may feel obligated to reciprocate with the organization itself. Thus, behaviours that directly benefit the organization are more closely linked to employee perceptions of how the organization treats them. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 14:** Stable traits (i.e., PA, NA, gratitude, conscientiousness, agreeableness) will be more important than situation-specific constructs (i.e., job satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice) in explaining variance in civility than role-prescribed and POBs directed towards the organization.

**Experienced Constructs and Civility**

In the section below I review the “experienced” constructs that will be explored in the current study, including: workplace incivility, civility norms, respect, perceived coworker support, and interpersonal justice.

**Workplace Incivility**

The experience of workplace incivility is associated with many negative outcomes including: reduced task performance (Pearson, 1999; Porath & Erez, 2007; Porath & Erez, 2009), OCBs (Porath & Erez, 2007; Porath & Erez, 2009), job satisfaction (Blau & Andersson, 2005; Cortina, Magley, Williams & Langhout, 2001; Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008), organizational commitment (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim et al., 2008), and wellbeing (Blau & Andersson, 2005; Cortina et al., 2001; Sliter, Jex, Wolford & McInnerny, 2010; Leiter, Laschinger, Day & Gilin-Oore, 2011; Leiter, Day, Laschinger & Gilin-Oore, 2012).

One of the most common theories in relation to incivility is the incivility spiral. Andersson and Pearson (1999) proposed that the experience of incivility triggers perceptions of
unfairness and the desire to reciprocate with more incivility. Thus, incivility breeds more incivility. As Johnson and Indvik (2001) suggest, “it starts with one person, but distrust, disrespect, and dissatisfaction on the job are contagious” (p.707). Thus, I hypothesize the following:

_Hypothesis 15: Workplace incivility will be negatively associated with experienced civility_

**Civilility Norms**

Walsh and colleagues (2012) define a climate for civility as “employee perceptions of norms supporting respectful treatment among workgroup members” (p.407). Research has found positive civility norms are also related to positive perceptions of interactional justice, job satisfaction and affective commitment (Walsh et al., 2012). In contrast, civility norms are negatively related to experiences of incivility (from coworkers and supervisors) and turnover intentions (Walsh et al., 2012).

Organizational climates influence how employees choose to behave, perform and act in the workplace (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). They set the tone for acceptable behaviours. Civility norms reflect group-level perceptions around expectations of civility and respect. As Feldman (1984) suggests, group norms are important because they make the behaviour of the group more predictable. Group norms are formed by individual behaviours but the presence of group norms also influences individual behaviours. Given the link between norms and behaviours at work, I hypothesize the following:

_Hypothesis 16: Civility norms will be positively associated with experienced civility_

**Respect**
Respect represents the “worth accorded to one person by one or more others” (Spears, Ellemers, Doosje & Branscombe, 2006, p.179). As mentioned in Chapter 3, the majority of the literature uses Social Identity Theory as a theoretical framework and draws heavily on the organizational justice literature (e.g., Bartel, Wrzesniekski & Wiesenfeld, 2012; Fuller, Hester, Barnett, Frey, Relyea & Beu, 2006; Tyler & Blader, 2002). Procedural injustice is viewed as an antecedent of respect (or a lack of respect) while reduced self-worth, perceptions of status within a group (Grover, 2013; Rogers & Ashforth, 2014), organizational commitment, organizational identification, organization based self-esteem, and job satisfaction are all outcomes of disrespect (Bartel et al., 2012; De Cremer & Tyler, 2005; van Quaquebeke & Eckloff, 2010).

The emphasis on organization-focused outcomes reflects the focus of the literature on respect as an indicator of relationship quality with the organization as a whole. One reason for this may be the role supervisors’ play in perceptions of status and respect. Fuller et al. (2006) suggested perceptions of respect may be heavily influenced by direct supervisor behaviour because supervisors are strong determinants of perceived organizational status. Thus, there is a clear link between respect and organization-based judgments.

Given that civil behaviour happens within the workplace norms for respect it is clear there is a relationship between civility and respect. While respect focuses on broader perceptions of social identity and organization-based outcomes, civility focuses more on norms of reciprocity and individual-level outcomes (e.g., performance, job satisfaction, safety behaviour, burnout, trust). In support of this, Rogers and Ashforth’s (2014) theoretical model shows that along with other individual-level observable cues (e.g., justice, compassion, empowerment), civility is a behavioural manifestation of respect. More specifically, observable behaviours (i.e., civility)
influence broader aggregated *perceptions* of respect and vice versa. Civility, however, is only one of many potential indicators of respect. Thus, I hypothesize the following:

*Hypothesis 17: Respect will be positively associated with experienced civility*

**Perceived Coworker Support**

The concept of coworker support is broad and can mean many different things. In their meta-analysis, Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) combined measures of task-directed helping, coworker mentoring, friendliness, and positive affect as indicators of coworker support.

In order to be more succinct, the conceptualization of coworker support I will use moving forward is based on perceived coworker support as it emerged from the research on perceived organizational support (POS). According to Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa (1986), POS represents employees’ “global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being” (p.501). Organizational Support Theory suggests that to determine an organization’s readiness to reward work effort and meet socioemotional needs, employees develop beliefs about POS. Based on the norm of reciprocity, POS creates a sense of obligation for the employee to care about, and contribute to, the organization in return (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Perceived coworker support (PCS) was developed as a measure of perceptions of support from one’s coworkers specifically (Ladd & Henry, 2000). PCS is often conceptualized as a form of support that can buffer against stress in the workplace. For example Sloan (2012) found that the presence of coworker support weakened the relationship between unfairness from a supervisor and job satisfaction. Moreover, Rousseau and colleagues (2009) showed coworker support weakened the relationship between procedural and distributive injustice and psychological distress.
Perceived coworker support represents broad perceptions employees make about the support available to them from coworkers. In contrast, civility represents actual behaviours that convey respect, empathy, and support for one another. Thus, I expect being the recipient of civil behaviours would help inform perceptions of coworker support. Civility, however, captures smaller positive “relationship-building” behaviours (e.g., active listening, recognition, respecting someone’s time) rather than specific instrumental helping behaviours (e.g., offering task-related assistance). Given that perceptions of coworker support capture both emotional and instrumental support I expect a strong overlap between civility and PCS.

Hypothesis 18: Perceived coworker support will be positively associated with experienced civility

Interpersonal Justice

Interactional justice is defined as the quality of interpersonal treatment people receive when organizational procedures (e.g., performance reviews, promotion/pay conversations) are being implemented (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice can be broken down into two independent factors: informational justice and interpersonal justice. Informational justice refers to explanations provided to people about why procedures were carried out in certain ways (Colquitt et al., 2001). Interpersonal justice refers to “the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p.427). There is some debate over the overlap between procedural justice and interactional justice; however, research suggests these two constructs are distinct (e.g., Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Moorman, 1991).

Social exchange theory is often used to explain the relationship between organizational justice and important work-related outcomes. More specifically, distributive and procedural
justice relate to the relationship employees form with their organization and interactional justice relates to the relationship employees form with their supervisor. As a result, interactional justice strongly influences perceptions of leader-member exchange, subsequent supervisor satisfaction, and affective organizational commitment (Charash-Cohen & Spector, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2002). Interactional justice is also a significant predictor of engagement in OCB and engagement in organizational retaliatory behaviour (Cropanzano et al., 2002; Moorman, 1991; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). When interpersonal justice is specifically examined (independently from informational justice), outcomes include: positive evaluations of authority, engagement in helping behaviour, and job satisfaction (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). The current study focuses on interpersonal justice (rather than interactional and informational justice).

Both interpersonal justice and civility are similar because they focus on respectful and polite treatment in the workplace. The two constructs are different, however, in the source and context through which interpersonal treatment is evaluated. During the validation of the CNQ-B scale, Walsh and colleagues (2012) found the CNQ-B added incremental validity in predicting experiences of incivility, over and above the influence of interactional justice. They argued that interpersonal justice is restricted to treatment from supervisors in specific outcome allocation conversations while civility is a broader construct, which involves interpersonal treatment from anyone within the workplace. Coworker civility and interpersonal justice, however, may be influenced by broader perceptions of civility climates. For example, it may be the norm in an organization to be polite and respectful as evident during interactions with a supervisor and coworkers.

_Hypothesis 19: Interpersonal justice will be positively associated with experienced civility_
In the next section I review the outcomes that will be explored in the current study. The constructs were chosen based on a review of common outcomes from previous research on: respect, PCS, interpersonal justice, and incivility.

**Proposed Outcomes**

Is civility a significant predictor of important organizational outcomes? How well does civility predict outcomes compared to respect or interpersonal justice? Understanding how/when civility can explain variance in the prediction of both personal and organizational outcomes is important in explaining how civility may or may not be a form of construct redundancy. After a thorough review of the literature, the outcomes chosen for the current study include both personal wellbeing (emotional exhaustion, cynicism, mental well-being) and organization-focused (psychological safety, affective commitment, job satisfaction) constructs.

The current study looks at the relationship between the proposed outcomes and the “experienced” constructs within the nomological network including: civility, civility norms, incivility, respect, perceived coworker support, and interpersonal justice. The majority of research on these constructs has focused on the outcomes (rather than the antecedents) of these constructs. Essentially, researchers are interested in what happens when employees perceive their workplace to be civil, uncivil, respectful or supportive. In the section below I describe each outcome and the hypothesized relationship with experienced civility.

I also propose differences in the relative importance of constructs within the nomological network (incivility, civility norms, respect, interpersonal justice, perceived coworker support) in explaining variance of each outcome. Predictions are based on available theory and evidence, and therefore not all constructs are hypothesized about in each hypothesis. For example, if there is no justification for the relative importance of civility over perceived coworker support in
predicting cynicism then that direct comparison will not be discussed. Moreover, the relative importance analysis will use experienced civility as the focal variable, and hypotheses will be proposed comparing civility to other constructs (i.e., I will not compare the relative importance of interpersonal justice to respect).

Evidence and theory in relation to the core constructs (e.g., respect, civility norms, incivility) is scattered. As a result, when constructing my rationale for the hypotheses I am using the following logic. First, incivility is unique because it reflects negative workplace experiences (in contrast to positive civil experience). Second, respect and interpersonal justice are unique because they reflect more supervisory behaviour rather than coworker behaviour. Third, civility norms are unique because they reflect a group-level construct focused on norms. Lastly, there is little theoretical or empirical support for the distinction between perceived coworker support and civility thus the relative importance of these constructs will be exploratory in nature.

**Personal Wellbeing**

**Emotional Exhaustion.** Emotional exhaustion is the stress dimension of job burnout that is a necessary but not sufficient criterion for burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). A consistent finding in the burnout research is that job demands (e.g., workload, job conflict) are related to emotional exhaustion (Maslach et al., 2001). In a recent meta-analysis, Alarcon (2011) found while both job demands (e.g., workload) and job resources (e.g., control, autonomy) were related to exhaustion, job demands had a stronger relationship. The Job Demands-Resources Model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2001) suggests job demands require extra physiological and psychological costs that over time lead to burnout. In contrast, job resources foster employee motivation and are theorized to promote work engagement (Demerouti et al., 2001).
Leiter, Nicholson, Patterson, and Laschinger (2012) defined incivility as a “job demand” and civility as a “job resource.” Previous research has explored the link between civility norms and emotional exhaustion and found mixed results. In a study of new graduates, Laschinger, Finegan and Wilk (2009) found that perceptions of civility norms predicted less exhaustion. In Chapter 3, civility norms were not a significant predictor of exhaustion over and above the effects of experienced and instigated incivility, respect, and engagement in OCBs. In contrast, Chapter 3 found that measures of supervisor incivility and instigated incivility positively predicted emotional exhaustion. Thus, civility may be related to exhaustion but is a less important predictor than other constructs (e.g., incivility). Thus, I propose the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 20a:** Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of emotional exhaustion

**Hypothesis 20b:** Experienced civility will be a less important predictor of emotional exhaustion than incivility

Although job demands are more strongly related to burnout than job resources, it does not mean job resources play no role in contributing to emotional exhaustion. In particular, job resources coming from the organization or a supervisor may be important in preventing burnout. Within the social support literature, there is evidence for the link between a lack of social support and burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). More specifically, a lack of supervisory support (rather than coworker support) plays a key role. As a result, it is expected that positive and supportive behaviours coming from a supervisor (or the organization) will play a more important role in reducing burnout compare to positive organizational behaviours coming from coworkers. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:
Hypothesis 20c: Experienced civility will be a less important predictor of emotional exhaustion than respect or interpersonal justice

Cynicism. Cynicism is considered the interpersonal factor of burnout; however, it is closely linked to emotional exhaustion (Maslach & Leiter, 2008; Maslach et al., 2001). Employees who experience cynicism attempt to distance themselves both emotionally and cognitively from their work (Maslach et al., 2001). According to the JD-R model of burnout (Demerouti et al., 2001), a lack of job resources leads to withdrawal, which ultimately leads to cynicism. Civility is an example of a job resource. In their intervention study, Leiter et al. (2011) found that as civility increased within workgroups, reports of cynicism decreased. Moreover, Nicholson and colleagues (2014) found coworker civility (but not supervisor civility) was a significant predictor of cynicism. Lastly, Petitta and Vecchione (2011) found a moderate negative relationship between cynicism and colleague support. Thus, I propose the following:

Hypothesis 21a: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of cynicism

Previous research has also found a link between experienced incivility and cynicism. Leiter, Nicholson, Patterson and Laschinger (2012) found experienced incivility was related to employee cynicism. Similarly, Laschinger, Leiter, Day, and Gilin (2009) found moderate-sized negative correlations between experienced coworker incivility and cynicism. According to JD-R (Demerouti et al., 2001), however, job demands are more closely linked to exhaustion while job resources are more closely linked with cynicism. Thus, the relationship between civility and cynicism may be stronger than the relationship between incivility and cynicism. In turn, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 21b: Experienced civility will be a more important predictor of cynicism than incivility
Mental Wellbeing. Positive mental health and wellbeing reflects the degree to which individuals feel they are flourishing in life and experiencing high levels of positive emotional, social and psychological wellbeing (Page, Milner, Martin, Turrell, Giles-Corti & LaMontagne, 2014). As defined by Tennant and colleagues (2007), mental wellbeing consists of three components: positive affect (e.g., feelings of optimism, cheerfulness), satisfying interpersonal relationships, and positive functioning (e.g., energy, competence, autonomy, self-acceptance). Civility involves respectful, considerate, compassionate and caring treatment through positive social interactions (Porath, 2011). Civility can spur positive emotions and foster positive relationships at work (Porath, 2011). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 22a: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of mental wellbeing.

The absence of mental illness does not imply the presence of mental health (Keyes, 2007). Page and colleagues (2014) supported this idea in their finding that positive mental health is only moderated related to psychological illness. Moreover, although mental wellbeing is related to affectivity, Tennant et al. (2007) found a stronger relationship between mental wellbeing and positive affectivity than negative affectivity. In relation to civility, it is expected that the presence of civility will have a stronger impact on mental wellbeing than the absence of incivility. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 22b: Experienced civility will be a more important predictor of mental wellbeing than incivility.

Organizational-Focused

Psychological safety. As defined by Edmondson (1999), psychological safety represents beliefs employees have that their team is safe for taking interpersonal risks. Psychological safety is important for employees to feel they can speak up, discuss errors and failures, ask for help, and
share information (Edmondson, 1999). The majority of research in this area looks at how psychological safety promotes organizational learning (e.g., Edmondson, 1999; Guchair, Pasamehmetoglu & Dawson, 2014; Nembhard & Edmondson, 2011).

What promotes feelings of psychological safety? Nembhard and Edmondson (2011) argued high-quality relationships with peers and inclusive leaders play important roles. More specifically, in high-quality relationships coworkers are able to develop rapport, understanding, and appreciation for one another that reduces feelings of interpersonal risk (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2011). Psychologically safe workplaces encourage trust and mutual respect between coworkers such that people are comfortable being themselves (Edmondson, 1999). Respectful interactions convey a sense of value, respect, and concern that likely contribute to perceptions of psychological safety (Leiter & Patterson, 2014). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 23a: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of psychological safety

Although it is measured at the individual-level, psychological safety was first conceptualized as a group-level variable assessing the shared belief by members of a team in regards to level of interpersonal risk taking (Edmondson, 1999). Taking risks to facilitate learning involves productive discussion among team members in order to accomplish shared goals (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2011). As a result, research tends to focuses on team and organizational learning (rather than individual learning) as an outcome of psychological safety. The most common measure of psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999) uses items that capture broad perceptions of group-level psychological safety (e.g., “it is safe to take a risk on this team”, “members of this team are able to bring up problems and tough issues”). In their study of supervisors in the Veteran’s Health Administration, measures of civility norms and
psychological safety were high correlated ($r = .79$; Hernandez, Luthanen, Ramsel & Osatuke, 2015). Thus, given that both civility norms and psychological safety are both measured as climates rather than individual behaviours, I propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 23b*: Civility norms will be a more important predictor of psychological safety than experienced civility.

**Affective commitment.** Affective commitment refers to an “employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p.67). In their meta-analysis, Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) found coworker support was positively related to organizational commitment. They explained that coworkers are often sources of psychosocial support, mentoring, and even sometimes training. These benefits increase employee loyalty and commitment to the organization. Related to civility, Walsh and colleagues (2012) found civility norms were moderately correlated with affective commitment. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 24a*: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of affective commitment.

Supervisors may have a stronger influence on affective commitment than coworkers do. Given that supervisors are viewed as representatives of the organization, perceptions of one’s supervisor will have a strong effect on organizational-based outcomes (i.e., commitment). Moreover, given that civility is assessed and influenced from coworkers while respect and interpersonal justice and more heavily influenced by supervisors, I propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 24b*: Respect and interpersonal justice will be more important predictors of affective commitment than experienced civility.
**Job satisfaction.** Job satisfaction is an attitude towards one’s job that creates a pleasurable emotional state (Locke, 1969; Organ & Konovsky, 1989). It is influenced by both dispositional and situational factors. For example, in their meta-analysis Connolly and Viswesvaran (2000) found both positive and negative affectivity influenced job satisfaction; however, positive affectivity ($p = .49$) had a larger correlation than negative affectivity ($p = -.33$). In another meta-analysis, Judge, Heller and Mount (2002) found neuroticism ($p = -.31$), extraversion ($p = .25$) and conscientiousness ($p = .28$) were all significantly related to job satisfaction. Thus, employee dispositions (both positive and negative) play a role in explaining their levels of job satisfaction.

Of the situational factors affecting job satisfaction, other employees are often identified as playing an important role. In their meta-analysis, Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) found coworker support was positively related to job satisfaction. Moreover, in a sample of hospital nurses, relations with coworkers that involved friendship, rapport, cooperation and appreciation was an important factor influencing job satisfaction (McNeeese-Smith, 1999). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 25:* Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

In the following sections I describe the results from a preliminary validation of a civil behaviours scale followed by the methods and data analysis techniques used in current study.

**VALIDATION OF A CIVIL BEHAVIOURS SCALE**

In order to test the proposed hypotheses, Carmeli, Dutton and Hardin’s (2015) scale of Respectful Engagement was adapted as a measure of civil behaviours (see Appendix A). Respectful Engagement (RE) refers to interrelating that conveys a sense of presence, worth, and respect among members of an organization or team (Carmeli et al., 2015). Through a process of
item development and validation, the authors ended up with a 9-item scale (Carmeli et al., 2015). Sample items include, “organizational members here are always available to hear out and listen to each other” and “organizational members here appreciate how valuable other members’ time is”. The concept of RE came out of Dutton’s (2003) work on High-Quality Connections (HQC). Connections are considered high quality when they are marked by: feelings of vitality, positive regard, and felt mutuality (Stephens, Heaphy & Dutton, 2011). HQCs represent an umbrella-term used to capture short-term, dyadic, positive interactions at work. Previous research has found high-quality relationships are related to more feelings of psychological safety, thriving at work and learning (Carmeli & Gittell, 2009; Stephens et al., 2011). One way in which HQCs develop is through respectful engagement (Stephens et al., 2011).

There are several reasons why we believe adapting a scale of Respectful Engagement is an appropriate way to measure civil behaviours. Similarities exist between RE and civility in both the definition and sets of behaviours. As previously mentioned, RE is defined as interrelating that conveys a sense of presence, worth, and respect among members of an organization or team (Carmeli et al., 2015). Similarly, civility is defined in terms of behaviours involving politeness, regard and concern for others, which foster positive interpersonal relationships (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; McGonagle et al., 2014; Pearson et al., 2000). Moreover, in contrast to high-quality connections in general, previous research (e.g., Dutton, 2003; Dutton & Heaphy, 2003) often cites examples of incivility as forms of low-quality connections. Thus, similar to RE, civility would also fall under the umbrella of HQCs.

The second similarity involves behaviours used to measure RE and behaviours that convey civility. The RE behaviours were developed based on Dutton’s (2003) work on high quality connections. Behaviours are specifically meant to convey respect, and include:
recognizing another person, understanding and appreciating them, listening, emphasizing another’s good qualities, making requests not demands and attending to needs (Carmeli et al., 2015; Rosenberg, 2003). Previous work (Patterson et al., 2015) suggests the most common behaviours that convey civility include: helping coworkers, communicating in a respectful manner, being considerate of others, empathizing, listening to others, engaging in pleasantry, and respecting shared space. The lists of behaviours are very similar and seem to be tapping into the same idea.

The current chapter adapts the RE measure in order to use it as a measure of behavioural civility. The adaptation is important because a behavioural measure of civility allows for alignment in the definition and measurement of civility as behaviours, is theoretically distinct from current measures of civility (i.e., VHA Civility and CNQ-B), and allows us to empirically test the nomological network proposed in Chapter 4. It is important to note, however, that although the civil behaviours scale assesses specific behaviours, they are “perceived” behaviours rather than “objective” behaviours. Participants have to perceive the behaviours that occur in order to self-report their occurrence on our scale. As previous research suggests, our schemes, emotions, and attention influence the extent to which we perceive behaviours in the workplace (Cohen & Ebbesen, 1979; Simons & Chabris, 1999; Zeelenberg, Wagenmakers & Rotteveel, 2006). Thus, the civil behaviours scales refer to behaviours but they do not disentangle perception from the specific behaviour.

**Adaptation Process**

The RE measure consists of 9-items which participants rate on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (to a very large extent) indicating the extent to which organizational members display behaviours indicating respectful engagement. Sample items include,
“organizational members here are always available to hear out and listen to each other” and “organizational members here pay the utmost attention to each other’s needs”. The scale displayed adequate reliability and a single factor structure (Carmeli et al., 2015).

The RE scale was adapted to create a scale assessing Civil Behaviours. The adaption involved changes to: the referent, the frequency of behaviours, and the response format. First, a reverse referent-shift was used in order to shift the referent from broad “organizational members” to more specific instances where the “self” has engaged in or experienced certain behaviours form coworkers (Chan, 1998). Having broad statements about “organizational members” may make participants more susceptible to a halo effect and rating behaviours in generalizations rather than based on actual experiences. Moreover, Herschovis and Reich (2013) recommend that for formative-based measures, having a clear frame of reference is very important.

Second, the RE measure includes indicators of frequency within the items (e.g., “always available”). The adapted measure will remove these indicators and instead use a response scale that taps into the frequency at which behaviours are experienced. For example, participants will have to rate behaviours on a scale from 1 (never) to 7 (everyday). As Spector, Bauer and Fox (2010) found in their analysis of measurement artifacts in the assessment of OCBs and CWBs, scales that focus on agreement (rather than frequency) tend to tap into whether an individual is likely to engage in that behaviour rather than actual engagement in the behaviour. Thus, by shifting the referent, removing items referencing to frequency from items themselves, and creating a Likert response scale that taps into frequency will shift the RE measure to an Individual-Behavioural measure of civility.

Lastly, the RE measure was adapted to include both a measure of experienced civility and a measure of enacted civility. Within the incivility literature, the WIS captures the individual
experience of incivility. Blau and Andersson (2005) adapted the WIS to create a measure of instigated incivility. The inclusion of both experienced and enacted incivility is important because these two constructs are core to the Incivility Spiral theory. Within the nomological network, constructs differ in whether they measure the experience or enactment side of the equation. For example, OCBs and POBs are assessed in terms of the extent to which a given employee engages in these behaviours. In contrast, perceived coworker support, respect, and interpersonal justice are assessed in terms of the extent to which a given employee experiences them. Thus, having measures of both experienced and enacted civility allows for a more thorough comparison between constructs in the nomological network.

**Scale Validation: Theoretical**

As previously mentioned, items for the RE scale included behaviours meant to convey respect (Carmeli et al., 2015); thus, these behaviours should theoretically be aligned with civil behaviours. Moreover, previous qualitative work (Patterson et al., 2015) found behaviours that convey civility most often include: respectful communication, empathizing and being considerate of others, listening to and acknowledging others, and engaging in helping behaviours. Looking at the scale items for Civil Behaviours it is clear there is significant overlap between content in the items and content found in our previous qualitative study. Thus, although not tested, is it likely the Civil Behaviours scale will have high face validity among participants.

**Scale Validation: Empirical**

**Participants**

Ninety-eight participants participated in a study to determine the internal consistency and convergent validity of the new civil behaviours scale. Attention checks were used to ensure participants were paying attention to each question. Eight participants failed the attention checks,
resulting in a final sample of ninety participants (92% of the original sample). All participants were recruited from the psychology undergraduate subject pool and received 0.5 course credits for participation. Of the final sample, 81% (N = 73) were female and ages ranged from 18-25, with an average age of 19 years. The majority of participants were Caucasian (85.6%) and identified as heterosexual (94.4%). All participants worked part-time, most in a permanent position (69%). The average tenure was 23 months.

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited to complete a 30-minute survey on interpersonal dynamics in the workplace. Participants were told that questions on the survey refer to their “work” and “coworkers” and that they were to respond in relation to their part-time work experiences. In order to help control for common method bias, participants were also told to answer the questions as honestly as possible, that there are no right or wrong answers, and their responses were confidential (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003).

**Measures**

**Civil Behaviours.** A 9-item scale was used to assess the frequency at which participants experienced civil behaviours from coworkers. Sample items include, “available to listen to me” and “respect how valuable my time is.” Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale running from 1 (Never) to 7 (Everyday). Internal reliability was good for experienced civil behaviours ($\alpha = .93$).

The 9-item scale assessing experienced civil behaviours was also used to measure enacted civil behaviours by changing the question stem from “How often have you experienced the following behaviours from coworkers” to “How often have you engaged in the following
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behaviours towards coworkers”. Internal reliability was good for enacted civil behaviours ($\alpha = .93$).

**Workplace Incivility.** Cortina and colleagues’ (2001) 7-item Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS) was used to measure experienced incivility from your coworkers within the last month. Sample items include, “Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie” and “doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility”. Participants were asked to rate each item on a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from 0 (Never) to 4 (Most of the Time). Internal reliability was good ($\alpha = .79$).

Blau and Andersson’s (2005) adapted 7-item WIS was used to measure the extent to which participants exhibited uncivil behaviours towards someone at work in the past month. Sample items include, “Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie” and “doubted someone’s judgment in a matter over which they have responsibility”. Participants were asked to rate each item on a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from 0 (Hardly ever) to 4 (Frequently). Internal reliability was good ($\alpha = .82$).

**Civility Norms.** The 8-item VHA Civility Scale (Meterko, Osatuke, Mohr, Warren & Dyrenforth, 2007) was used to measure civility norms. Sample items include, “people treat each other with respect in my work group” and “this organization does not tolerate discrimination”. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strong disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Internal reliability was good ($\alpha = .87$).

**Results**

Both measures of experienced civil behaviours and enacted civil behaviours showed good internal consistency. Both scales also had a large amount of variance in responses. For example, participant scores on experienced civil behaviours ranged from 1.67 to 7.00 (on a scale from 1-7)
with a sample average score of 5.48 ($SD = 1.27$). Similarly, participant scores on enacted civil behaviours ranged from 2.33 to 7.00 with a sample average score of 6.00 ($SD = 1.03$).

A principal components analysis (PCA) conducted on the experienced civility scale suggested a single factor solution, which was able to account for 65.41% of the variance. A visual inspection of the scree plot supported the single factor structure. Eight of the 9-items had factor loadings greater than .70 (ranging from .74 to .90) while one item had a factor loading of .69. A separate PCA was conducted on the enacted civility scale suggested a single factor solution, which was able to account for 66.57% of the variance. Again, a visual inspection of the scree plot supported the single factor structure. All 9-items had factor loadings greater than .70 and ranged from .71 to .90.

The civil behaviour scales also showed good convergent validity. Experienced civil behaviours was negatively correlated with experienced incivility ($r = -.51$, 95% CI $[-.65, -.34]$) and positively correlated with perceptions of civility norms ($r = .71$, 95% CI $[.59, .80]$). Enacted civil behaviours was negatively correlated with enacted incivility ($r = -.59$, 95% CI $[-.71, -.44]$) and positively correlated with perceptions of civility norms ($r = .49$, 95% CI $[.32, .63]$). Thus, empirical relations match the theoretical expectations in regards to the direction of relationship.

**AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CIVIL BEHAVIOURS AT WORK**

Previous research has been unable to test the empirical relationships between civility and other similar constructs due to a lack of a behavioural measure of civility. The current study uses the measure proposed and validated above to explore the similarities in antecedents and outcomes between civility and other similar constructs. Below I describe the methods used, followed by a description of the analyses and results.
Method

Research Design

A 2-wave panel design will be used such that at Time 1 participants filled out surveys related to proposed antecedent constructs and the nomological network constructs (e.g., civility, incivility, respect), and at Time 2 the same participants filled out surveys related to the nomological network constructs (e.g., civility, incivility, respect) and proposed outcome constructs (see Figure 1). Using this design we are able to connect Time 1 antecedents with Time 2 nomological network constructs. In addition, we are able to connect Time 1 nomological network constructs with Time 2 outcomes. Creating a temporal separation between measurements of certain constructs has been proposed as a method to help control for common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003).

Participants

At Time 1, participants completed an online survey (see Appendix B). Of the 800 participants who passed several attention checks (48.5% male), the average age was 42 years, with a range from 19 to 77 years. The entire sample was from North America with 72.4% coming from the United States and 27.6% coming from Canada. The majority of the sample was White/Caucasian (85.9%), heterosexual (92.5%), and did not identify as a person with a disability (89.8%). For 91.6% of the participants, English was their first language. The majority of participants also worked full-time in a permanent position (96.4%).

At Time 2, 400 participants (56.8% male) completed the survey again (see Appendix C), for a response rate of 50%. Of the 400, the average age was 42 years, with a range from 23 to 78 years. The majority of the sample was White/Caucasian (87%), heterosexual (93%), and did not identify as a person with a disability (91.5%). For 90.8% of the participants, English was their
first language. Lastly, the majority of participants also worked full-time in a permanent position (95.8%).

**Non-Response Bias.** In the current study, 50% of participants who completed the survey at Time 1 completed the survey again at Time 2. A series of independent samples t-tests were conducted in order to examine whether mean differences between responders and nonresponders in the Time 1 measured variables exist.

The average age for responders was 42 years, while the average age for nonresponders was 41 years. The responders were 56.8% male while the nonresponders were only 41.5% male; thus, males were more likely to complete the survey at both Time 1 and Time 2. Both samples consisted of participants who were mostly Caucasian.

In regards to reported levels of civility t-tests showed a non-significant difference between responders and non-responders; the VHA Civility Norms ($p = .90$), Civility Norms Questionnaire – Brief ($p = .63$), Experienced Civil Behaviours ($p = .66$), and Enacted Civil Behaviours ($p = .13$).

In regards to reported levels of incivility, compared to non-responders, those that responded at both Time 1 and Time 2 reported slightly higher instances of incivility (both experienced and enacted) at Time 1. T-tests showed a significant differences between responders and non-responders in terms of experienced coworker incivility ($M_{responders} = 1.98$, $SD = 1.16$, $M_{nonresponders} = 1.81$, $SD = .99$, $p = .03$), and enacted incivility ($M_{responders} = 1.69$, $SD = .82$, $M_{nonresponders} = 1.51$, $SD = .70$, $p = .001$) The means of reported levels of incivility, however, were still low in both groups.

**Measures at Time 1 and Time 2**
**Civil Behaviours.** The measure was previously described on page 160. Internal reliability for the current sample was high for experienced civil behaviours at Time 1 ($\alpha = .94$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.94$) and enacted civil behaviours at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.94$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.94$).

**VHA Civility Norms.** The measure was previously described on page 161. Internal reliability for the current sample was good at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.91$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.92$).

**Civility Norms Questionnaire – Brief (CNQ-B).** The 4-item CNQ-B developed by Walsh and colleagues (2012) was used to assess workgroup climate for civility. It assesses employee perceptions of norms of respectful treatment among group members. Sample items include, “rude behavior is not accepted by your coworkers” and “respectful treatment is the norm in your workgroup”. Although originally reported as a one-factor scale, Walsh and Clark (2015) later found support for a two-factor solution with one factor focused on discouraging incivility and the other factor focused on encouraging civility. Internal reliability was good for Discouraging Incivility at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.88$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.86$) and Encouraging Civility at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.90$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.87$). Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Workplace Incivility.** The measures were previously described on page 158. Internal reliability for the current sample was high for experienced incivility at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.97$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.97$). Internal reliability was also high for enacted incivility at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.95$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.96$).

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviours.** Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter’s (1990) 24-item scale was used to measure participant self-reported engagement in organizational citizenship behaviours. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) with each statement as it related to their
approach to work. Sample items included, “I consider the impact of my actions on co-workers” and “I do not take extra breaks.” Reliability for each subscale, including Altruism (\(\alpha = 0.87\) at Time 1, and \(\alpha = 0.87\) at Time 2), Conscientiousness (\(\alpha = 0.79\) at Time 1, and \(\alpha = 0.81\) at Time 2), Sportsmanship (\(\alpha = 0.91\) at Time 1, and \(\alpha = 0.92\) at Time 2), Courtesy (\(\alpha = 0.82\) at Time 1, and \(\alpha =0.84\) at Time 2), and Civic Virtue (\(\alpha = 0.77\) at Time 1 and \(\alpha =0.79\) at Time 2) was good.

**Perceived Respect.** A 4-item scale by Bartel, Wrzesniewski and Wiesenfeld (2012) was used to measure the extent to which one is included and valued as a member of the organization. Sample items include, “people at my organization value my ideas and efforts” and “people at my organization respect the work I do”. Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Internal reliability was high at Time 1 (\(\alpha = 0.93\)) and Time 2 (\(\alpha = 0.94\)).

**Perceived Coworker Support.** Based on Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) construct of Perceived Organizational Support, Perceived Coworker Support (PCS) is a 9-item scale assessing perceptions that your coworkers value your contribution and care about your wellbeing (Ladd & Henry, 2000). Sample items include, “my coworkers are supportive of my goals and values” and “my coworkers care about my general satisfaction at work”. Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Internal reliability was good at Time 1 (\(\alpha = 0.84\)) and Time 2 (\(\alpha = 0.86\)).

**Prosocial Organizational Behaviour.** A 20-item scale by McNeely and Meglino (1994) was used to assess prosocial organizational behaviours. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they engage in specific prosocial behaviours at work. Sample items include, “is receptive to new ideas” and “uses work time wisely.” Each item was rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always). Behaviours fell into one of three categories (representing 3-
factors): behaviours that benefit the organization ($\alpha = 0.86$ at Time 1; $\alpha = 0.87$ at Time 2), role-prescribed behaviours ($\alpha = 0.78$ at Time 1; $\alpha = 0.82$ at Time 2), and behaviours that benefit individuals ($\alpha = 0.89$ at Time 1; $\alpha = 0.88$ at Time 2).

**Interpersonal Justice.** Four-items from Colquitt (2001) were used to measure interpersonal justice, defined as “the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p.427). Sample items refer to a supervisor and include, “has he/she treated you in a polite manner” and “has he/she treated you with dignity”. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (to a small extent) to 5 (to a large extent). Internal reliability was good at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.93$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.90$).

**Job Satisfaction.** Three items from Cammann and colleagues (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins & Klesh, 1979; Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983) were used to assess job satisfaction. Sample items include, “all in all, I am satisfied with my job” and “in general, I like working here.” Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). Internal reliability was adequate at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.75$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.73$).

**Trait Positive and Negative Affectivity.** Trait Affectivity was assessed using Watson, Clark and Tellegen’s (1988) Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). This consists of a 10-item negative affect scale representing NA at both high and low levels of arousal (e.g., guilty, afraid, irritable, nervous, upset, distressed, hostile) and a 10-item positive affect scale representing PA at both high and low levels of arousal (e.g., proud, enthusiastic, active, attentive). Participants were asked to rate each item based on how they feel in general from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely). Internal reliability was good for PA at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.92$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.93$) and NA at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.95$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.95$)
Affective Organizational Commitment. Allen and Meyer’s (1990) 8-item scale was used to measure affective commitment, defined as “employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p.67). Sample items include, “I am very happy being a member of this organization” and “I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own”. Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Internal reliability was good at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.84$) and Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.83$).

Measures only at Time 1 (Antecedents)

Procedural Justice. The 7-item scale by Colquitt (2001) was used to measure perceptions of fairness regarding the process through which outcomes are determined. Sample items include, “have those procedures been free of bias” and “have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures”. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (to a small extent) to 5 (to a large extent). Internal reliability was adequate at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.95$).

Dispositional Gratitude. McCollough, Emmons and Tsang’s (2002) 6-item scale was used to measure dispositional gratitude. Sample items include, “I have so much in my life to be thankful for” and “if I had to list everything that I felt grateful for, it would be a very long list”. Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Internal reliability was adequate at Time 1 ($\alpha = 0.72$).

Personality. Two facets of the Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue & Kentle, 1991; John, Naumann & Soto, 2008) were used. More specifically, a total of 18-items were used to assess agreeableness (9-items, e.g., “it helpful and unselfish with others”, “has a forgiving nature”) and conscientiousness (9-items, e.g., “does a thorough job”, “is a reliable worker”). Participants were
asked to rate on a 5-point Likert Scale (1 = disagree strongly; 5 = agree strongly) the extent to which characteristics may or may not apply to them. Internal reliability at Time 1 was good for Agreeableness ($\alpha = 0.80$) and Conscientiousness ($\alpha = 0.82$).

**Measures only at Time 2 (Outcomes)**

**Burnout.** The 16-item Maslach Burnout Inventory- General Survey (MBI-GS; Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996; Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach & Jackson, 1996) was used to measure emotional exhaustion and cynicism. Although the scale also measures professional efficacy, exhaustion and cynicism are considered the two core dimensions of burnout (Leiter et al., 2012). Participants rated items on a 7-point Likert Scale rating from 0 (never) to 6 (every day). Examples of exhaustion included, “I feel emotionally drained form my work” and “I feel used up at the end of the workday”. Examples of cynicism included, “I doubt the significance of my work” and “I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes to anything”. Internal reliability was good at Time 2 for Exhaustion ($\alpha = 0.94$) and Cynicism ($\alpha = 0.93$).

**Mental Wellbeing.** The 14-item Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (Tennant et al., 2007) was used to assess different aspects of positive mental health. Participants rated the extent to which certain feelings and thoughts described them over the last month. Sample items include, “I’ve been thinking clearly” and “I’ve been feeling close to other people.” Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (none of the time) to 7 (always). Internal reliability was adequate at Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.96$).

**Psychological Safety.** Edmondson’s (1999) 7-item scale was used to assess the belief held by group members of a team that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking. Sample items include, “members of this team are able to bring up problems and tough issues” and “it is safe to
take a risk on this team”. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Internal reliability was adequate at Time 2 ($\alpha = 0.70$).

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited by email via Qualtrics Online Sample. Participants had to have been employed at the same location for at least the last 6 months. If participants were interested, they were able to click on a link from the recruitment email that brought them to the online survey. Participants then had to respond to questions about their workplace experiences related to civility, incivility, respect, coworker support etc. Unique to the Time 1 survey, participants were also asked to complete measures of the proposed antecedents of civility/incivility (e.g., personality, procedural justice, dispositional gratitude). Lastly, they completed a list of demographic questions.

Two weeks after completion of the Time 1 survey, participants who completed the Time 1 survey received another email via Qualtrics Online Sample. If participants were interested, they were able to click on a link from the recruitment email that brought them to the online survey. Participants then had to again respond to questions about their workplace experiences related to civility, incivility, respect, coworker support etc. Unique to the Time 2 survey, participants were also asked to complete measures of the proposed outcomes of civility/incivility (e.g., mental wellbeing, psychological safety, and burnout). Lastly, they completed a list of demographic questions.

**Preliminary Results**

**Descriptives at Time 1**

In general, participants reported low levels of incivility ($M_{coworker} = 1.98$, $SD = 1.16$; $M_{enacted} = 1.69$, $SD = .82$) and relatively high levels of civility norms on the CNQ-B
Discouraging Incivility $= 5.54$, $SD = 1.46$; Civility Encouraged $= 5.63$, $SD = 1.42$) and VHA Civility Scale ($M = 3.97$, $SD = .75$), as well as high levels of reported civil behaviours ($M_{\text{Civil behaviour experienced}} = 5.47$, $SD = 1.39$; $M_{\text{Civil behaviour enacted}} = 5.92$, $SD = 1.16$). Participants reported moderate to high levels of perceived coworker support ($M = 5.14$, $SD = 1.00$). Participants reported moderate to high levels of interpersonal justice ($M = 5.64$, $SD = 1.37$) and procedural justice ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 1.51$). Participants showed moderate affective commitment to their job ($M = 4.69$, $SD = 1.23$) and were generally satisfied with their job ($M = 3.92$, $SD = .99$).

**Descriptives at Time 2**

Again, participants reported low levels of incivility ($M_{\text{Coworker}} = 1.92$, $SD = 1.16$; $M_{\text{Enacted}} = 1.67$, $SD = .86$) and high levels of civility norms on the CNQ-B ($M_{\text{Discouraging Incivility}} = 5.58$, $SD = 1.42$; $M_{\text{Civility Encouraged}} = 5.76$, $SD = 1.26$) and VHA scale ($M = 3.99$, $SD = .78$). Participants also reported high levels of experienced and enacted civil behaviours ($M_{\text{Civil behaviour experienced}} = 5.52$, $SD = 1.33$; $M_{\text{Civil behaviour enacted}} = 5.94$, $SD = 1.08$). Participants reported moderate to high levels of perceived coworker support ($M = 5.19$, $SD = 1.03$) and moderate amounts of perceived psychological safety in their workgroup ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .68$). Participants were generally satisfied with their job ($M = 3.88$, $SD = .96$) and showed moderate affective commitment to their job ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 1.17$). Lastly, participants reported relatively high levels of mental wellbeing ($M = 5.22$, $SD = 1.08$) yet moderate levels of both exhaustion ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.81$) and cynicism ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.88$).

**Stability over Time**

Constructs in the proposed nomological network were measured at both Time 1 and Time 2. In regards to measures of incivility, there were strong positive correlations between experienced coworker incivility at T1 and T2 ($r = .78$, 95% CI [.74, .82]) and enacted incivility
at T1 and T2 ($r = .79, 95\% \text{ CI} [.75, .82])$. For measures of civility, there were also positive correlations between the CNQ-B Discouraging Incivility subscale at T1 and T2 ($r = .52, 95\% \text{ CI} [.45, .59])$, CNQ-B “Encouraging Civility subscale at T1 and T2 ($r = .61, 95\% \text{ CI} [.55, .67])$, VHA Civility Norms at T1 and T2 ($r = .64, 95\% \text{ CI} [.58, .69])$, experienced civil behaviours at T1 and T2 ($r = .72, 95\% \text{ CI} [.67, .76])$, and enacted civil behaviours at T1 and T2 ($r = .72, 95\% \text{ CI} [.67, .76])$. The strong correlations indicate moderate levels of stability over time, with T1 variables explaining 64-81\% of the variance in their T2 counterparts. Given that most of the constructs ask participants to reflect on the past month (and there was only a 2 week time lag between T1 and T2) significant strong positive correlations were expected.

**Further Validation of the Civil Behaviours Scale**

Factor analyses were conducted in order to investigate the underlying factor structure of the civil behaviour scales. In order to increase the power of the analysis, the full sample from Time 1 ($N = 800$) was used. The analysis used listwise deletion to handle missing data resulting in a final sample size of 773 participants.

**Enacted Civility**. A confirmatory factor analysis was performed whereby all 9-items loaded onto a single latent factor. Based on a review of the modification indices and the previous PCA conducted, four error variances were correlated in the final model. In general, the model showed adequate fit ($\text{CFI} = .950; \text{GFI} = .907; \text{RMR} = .068, \text{TLI} = .921$); however, the RMSEA (.134) was high. A combination of a large alpha ($\alpha = .95$), single-factor extraction using PCA (see page 40) and an adequate model fit using a CFA, the results support the use of the enacted civil behaviours scale as a single factor scale.

**Experienced Civility**. A confirmatory factor analysis was performed whereby all 9-items loaded onto a single latent factor. Based on a review of the modification indices and the previous
PCA conducted four error variances were correlated in the final model. In general, the model showed adequate fit (CFI = .968; GFI = .931; RMR = .079, TLI = .950); however, again the RMSEA (.109) was high. A combination of a large alpha ($\alpha = .95$), single-factor extraction using PCA (see page 40) and an adequate model fit using a CFA, the results support the use of the experienced civil behaviours scale as a single factor scale.

**Data Analysis**

To review, the three main research questions of the current study are: (1) What empirical evidence is there for the direct relationships between civility and other similar constructs, (2) Does enacted civility have a unique pattern of predictors compared to other similar constructs and (3) Is experienced civility an important predictor of organizational outcomes beyond the predictive power of other similar constructs? A combination of correlations, confirmatory factor analyses, multiple regression, and relative weights analyses were used to analyze the data.

**Nomological Network Correlations and Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

Zero-order correlations between constructs within the nomological network were used to determine the relationship between constructs. In addition, confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted comparing one-factor and two-factor models. More specifically, in each CFA, the items of civility and one other core construct (e.g., civility and PCS; civility and incivility; civility and respect) were modeled as either a one-factor model or a two-factor model. If the two-factor model showed better model fit it provides partial evidence for the distinction between civility and other similar constructs. The analysis used listwise deletion in order to manage missing data.

**Regression Analysis**
In regards to the second research question (regarding antecedents of enacted civility), the zero-order correlation (between each predictor and civility) and $R^2$ of the regression model was analyzed in order to determine if each predictor was, on its own, predicting a significant amount of variance in enacted civility. It is important to understand the direct relationship between antecedents and enacted civility before exploring patterns of relative importance.

In regards to the third research question (regarding outcomes), the zero-order correlation and $R^2$ of the regression model were examined to determine if experienced civility was an independent predictor of the proposed outcomes (e.g., exhaustion, mental wellbeing). Again, it is important to understand the direct relationship between experienced civility and the outcome variables before exploring patterns of relative importance.

Relative Weights Analysis

There are many ways to determine the importance of variables in a regression analysis. For example, when the research question is to find the single-best predictor, examining zero-order correlations is sufficient. However, most psychological phenomena cannot be accurately studied by considering variables in isolation and therefore it is fundamental to understand the effects of predictors when combined with other predictors.

Determining relative importance requires considering, not only the contribution a variable makes on its own (i.e., zero-order correlation), but also in combination with other predictors. Regression coefficients reflect the rate of change in a criterion by each predictor as all other predictors are held constant. Although regression coefficients do take into consideration other variables, many times predictors in a regression are correlated with one another. Thus, it is not meaningful to think of change in the criterion “while all other predictors remain constant”
because a change in one predictor is likely associated with a change in another predictor (Azen & Budescu, 2003).

On the other hand, squared partial (or semi-partial) correlations indicate the predictive power of each predictor conditional on other predictors included in the model (LeBreton, Ployhart & Ladd, 2004). The benefit of these coefficients is the ability to examine a predictor’s importance after controlling for specific subsets of predictors. However, correlations between predictors make interpretation difficult because of how shared variance is partitioned (LeBreton et al., 2004). In a Monte Carlo simulation, LeBreton et al., (2004) found that collinearity between predictors, strength of relationships between the predictors and criterion, and number of predictors, affected rankings of importance for correlation coefficients and regression coefficients. The authors recommended using dominance analysis or relative weights analysis as relative importance statistics. Although these two statistics are different, they yield very similar results and are generally considered interchangeable by scholars (e.g., Johnson & LeBreton, 2004; LeBreton, Hargis, Griepentrog, Oswald & Ployhart, 2007; Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011).

The use of relative weights analysis (RWA) is beneficial because it offers a more complete assessment of relative importance due to its ability to handle correlated predictors. The underlying premise is that almost all the statistical measures of relative importance (e.g., regression coefficients) yield the same results when predictors are uncorrelated (Lundby & Johnson, 2006). First, RWA takes all the predictors and transforms them into new variables that are as highly related as possible to the original predictors but are uncorrelated with one another (Lundby & Johnson, 2006). Second, the criterion is regressed on the uncorrelated predictors. The squared standardized regression coefficients represent the relative importance of the uncorrelated predictors (Johnson, 2000).
Relative weights analysis (Johnson, 2000) provides information about the magnitude of relative importance each variable has in a regression equation. More specifically, each predictor is given a relative weight ($rw$) and all of the $rw$’s sum up to the model’s total $R^2$. Thus, $rw$’s can be interpreted as effect sizes. In addition, confidence intervals can be created through bootstrapping (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011).

The second research question proposed in this chapter is, does enacted civility have a unique pattern of predictors compared to other similar constructs? We are interested in the relative importance of different predictors for enacted civility compared to enacted incivility, OCB, and POB. If the strength, direction, and patterns of importance are similar between constructs it suggests a more clear case of construct redundancy. Many predictors (e.g., gratitude, agreeableness, positive affectivity) may be highly correlated. As a result, RWA is preferable over other indicators of importance.

The third research question proposed in this chapter involves the relative importance of experienced civility in predicting important organizational outcomes (e.g., exhaustion, job satisfaction, organizational commitment). We are interested in how important experienced civility is in predicting these outcomes in relation to other similar constructs. Given that civility is highly correlated with the other predictors in the regression (e.g., respect, perceived coworker support), RWA is preferable over other indicators of importance.

RESULTS

Enacted Constructs and Civility

Zero-Order Correlations. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1, correlations are presented in Table 2 (intercorrelations between Time 1 constructs), Table 3 (intercorrelations between Time 2 constructs) and Table 4 (intercorrelations between Time 1 and Time 2
constructs). Hypotheses 1-3 predicted zero-order correlational relationships with enacted civility and other constructs within the nomological network. In support of hypothesis 1, enacted civility was negatively related to enacted incivility at Time 1 ($r = -0.17, 95\% CI \left[{-0.26, -0.07}\right]$) and Time 2 ($r = -0.22, 95\% CI \left[{-0.31, -0.13}\right]$).

In support of hypothesis 2a, enacted civility was positively related to the enactment of OCBs, specifically the subscales of conscientiousness (Time 1 $r = 0.35, 95\% CI \left[{0.26, 0.43}\right]$; Time 2 $r = 0.47, 95\% CI \left[{0.39, 0.54}\right]$), civic virtue (Time 1 $r = 0.36, 95\% CI \left[{0.27, 0.44}\right]$; Time 2 $r = 0.46, 95\% CI \left[{0.38, 0.53}\right]$), courtesy (Time 1 $r = 0.44, 95\% CI \left[{0.36, 0.52}\right]$; Time 2 $r = 0.57, 95\% CI \left[{0.50, 0.63}\right]$), and altruism (Time 1 $r = 0.51, 95\% CI \left[{0.43, 0.58}\right]$; Time 2 $r = 0.59, 95\% CI \left[{0.52, 0.65}\right]$). However, the relationship between enacted civility and sportsmanship OCBs was non-significant (Time 1 $r = 0.04, 95\% CI \left[{-0.06, 0.14}\right]$; Time 2 $r = 0.09, 95\% CI \left[{-0.01, 0.19}\right]$). Contrary, to hypothesis 2b, enacted civility had the strongest relationship with altruism not courtesy.

In support of hypothesis 3, enacted civility was positively related to prosocial organizational behaviours directed at individuals (Time 1 $r = 0.34, 95\% CI \left[{0.25, 0.42}\right]$; Time 2 $r = 0.30, 95\% CI \left[{0.21, 0.39}\right]$), the organization (Time 1 $r = 0.50, 95\% CI \left[{0.42, 0.57}\right]$; Time 2 $r = 0.54, 95\% CI \left[{0.47, 0.61}\right]$) and role-prescribed behaviours (Time 1 $r = 0.41, 95\% CI \left[{0.33, 0.49}\right]$; Time 2 $r = 0.48, 95\% CI \left[{0.40, 0.55}\right]$).

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis.** CFAs were conducted comparing one-factor and two-factor models (one with correlated latent factors and one with uncorrelated latent factors). In each CFA, the items of civility and one other core construct (e.g., civility and OCBs; civility and incivility; civility and POBs) were compared at a time. As shown in Table 5, the two-factor models showed better model fit (higher CFI and GFI, lower Chi Square and RMSEA). We conducted Chi-Squared Difference Tests between the two-factor (uncorrelated) and two-factor
(correlated) models to determine if one was a significantly better fit than the other. In all cases, the two-factor (correlated) model was a significantly better fit ($p < .001$) than the two-factor (uncorrelated) model. Thus, the CFA results provide additional evidence for the distinction between enacted civility and OCBs, POBs, and enacted incivility.

The next section will further investigate the differences and similarities between predictors of enacted civility and predictors of OCBs and POBs.

**Antecedents of Enacted Civility**

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if each proposed antecedent significantly predicted variance in enacted civility. After running the regression analysis, the relative importance of predictors was tested using relative importance analysis code from the RWA website by Scott Tonidandel and James LeBreton. For comparison purposes, bivariate predictor-criterion correlations ($r$) and standardized regression weights ($\beta$) are included in Table 6 along with relative weights and rescaled relative weights.

To recap, we hypothesized that trait negative affect would not be a significant predictor (Hypothesis 4), while trait positive affect (Hypothesis 5), gratitude (Hypothesis 6), agreeableness (Hypothesis 7), conscientiousness (Hypothesis 8), procedural justice (Hypothesis 9), affective organizational commitment (Hypothesis 10), and job satisfaction (Hypothesis 11) would all be significant predictors of increased enacted civility. Adding all antecedents as predictors, the overall regression was significant ($R^2 = .22$, $F(8, 391) = 13.70$, $p < .001$) with 22% of the variance in enacted civility being explained by the predictor variables.

As previously mentioned, relative weights sum to the $R^2$ of the full model while rescaled relative weights represent percentages of how much each predictor accounts for in the total $R^2$. Confidence intervals were calculated using 10,000 bootstrapped samples.
As shown in Table 6, the rescaled relative weights indicate that the greatest amount of variance was explained by procedural justice (23%) and agreeableness (19%), followed by gratitude (16%), trait positive affectivity (12%), conscientiousness (9%), affective organizational commitment (9%), and job satisfaction (8%). Trait negative affectivity (5%) did not account for a significant amount of variance in enacted civility. Thus, hypotheses 4 -11 are all supported.

**Relative Importance of Antecedents of Enacted Constructs**

**Civility vs. Incivility.** Table 7 shows the results from the relative weighs analysis of enacted incivility. The rescaled weights indicate that all predictor variables were significant and trait negative affect (37%) accounts for the greatest amount of explained variance in enacted incivility followed by conscientiousness (21%), agreeableness (20%), gratitude (10%), trait positive affectivity (6%), procedural justice (2%), job satisfaction (2%) and affective organizational commitment (2%).

Hypothesis 12 predicted positive constructs (i.e., PA, gratitude, conscientiousness, agreeableness, job satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice) would be more important than negative constructs (i.e., NA) in explaining variance in civility compared to incivility. Given that NA has the largest relative importance weight in predicting enacted incivility and a non-significant relative importance weight in predicting enacted civility, hypothesis 12 is supported.

**Civility vs. OCBs.** Relative weights analyses were conducted on each factor of enacted OCBs. For Courtesy OCBs (Table 8), the rescaled weights show significant variance explained by agreeableness (26%), gratitude (23%), trait PA (17%), conscientiousness (12%), and procedural justice (9%). For Altruism OCBs (Table 9), the rescaled weights show significant variance explained by trait PA (26%), agreeableness (16%), gratitude (14%), procedural justice
(13%), conscientiousness (12%), affective organizational commitment (9%), and job satisfaction (6%). For Conscientiousness OCBs (Table 10), the rescaled weights show significant variance explained by conscientiousness (32%), gratitude (21%), agreeableness (17%), and trait PA (16%). For Civic Virtue OCBs (Table 11), the rescaled weights show significant variance explained by trait PA (32%), procedural justice (26%), affective organizational commitment (13%), gratitude (11%), agreeableness (8%), and job satisfaction (6%). For Sportsmanship OCBs (Table 12), the rescaled weights show significant variance explained by conscientiousness (20%), agreeableness (20%), trait NA (20%), gratitude (18%), trait PA (12%), procedural justice (6%), affective organizational commitment (2%) and job satisfaction (2%).

Hypothesis 13 predicted that stable traits (i.e., PA, NA, gratitude, conscientiousness, agreeableness) would be more important than situation-specific constructs (i.e., job satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice) in explaining variance in civility than OCBs. Contrary to expectations, affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and procedural justice were consistently ranked near the bottom in terms of amount of variance explained in OCBs (with the exception of civic virtue OCBs). Moreover, positive affectivity, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and gratitude are often ranked fairly highly in terms of amount of variance explained in OCBs. In terms of enacted civility, while affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction were ranked lowest, procedural justice had the highest relative importance weight. Thus, hypothesis 13 was not supported.

Civility vs. POB. Relative weights analyses were conducted on each factor of enacted POBs. For POBs directed towards the organization (Table 13), the rescaled weights show significant variance explained by trait PA (26%), procedural justice (21%), job satisfaction (15%), affective organizational commitment (13%), gratitude (12%), and agreeableness (9%).
For POBs directed towards individuals (Table 14), the rescaled weights show significant variance explained by trait PA (43%), procedural justice (29%), affective organizational commitment (11%), job satisfaction (6%), trait NA (4%), and conscientiousness (3%). For role-prescribed POBs (Table 15), the rescaled weights show significant variance explained by conscientiousness (40%), agreeableness (19%), gratitude (14%), trait PA (12%), and trait NA (8%).

Hypothesis 14 predicted that stable traits (i.e., PA, NA, gratitude, conscientiousness, agreeableness) would be more important than situation-specific constructs (i.e., job satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice) in explaining variance in civility than role-prescribed and POBs directed towards the organization. In relation to POBs directed towards the organization, while PA accounted for the most amount of variance, procedural justice, job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment had more relative importance than gratitude, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and NA. In relation to role-prescribed POBs, none of the situation-specific constructs explained a significant amount of variance according to their relative weights. Thus, hypothesis 14 is partially supported because stable traits were more important that situation-specific constructs in explaining variance in civility than POBs directed towards the organization but not role-prescribed POBs. A summary of the hypotheses presented above and the extent to which they were supported is presented in Table 16.

**Experienced Civility and the Nomological Network**

Hypotheses 15-19 predicted zero-order correlational relationships of experienced civility with other constructs within the nomological network. In support of Hypothesis 15, experienced civility was negatively related to experienced incivility at Time 1 ($r = -0.12, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.22, -0.02]$) and Time 2 ($r = -0.15, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.24, -0.05]$). In support of hypothesis 16, experienced civility was
related to civility norms as measured by the VHA Civility Scale (Time 1 \( r = .62, 95\% \text{ CI} [.56, .68] \); Time 2 \( r = .57, 95\% \text{ CI} [.50, .63] \)), CNQ-B encouraging civility subscale (Time 1 \( r = .43, 95\% \text{ CI} [.35, .51] \); Time 2 \( r = .51, 95\% \text{ CI} [.43, .58] \)), and the CNQ-B discouraging incivility subscale (Time 1 \( r = .30, 95\% \text{ CI} [.21, .39] \); Time 2 \( r = .33, 95\% \text{ CI} [.24, .41] \)).

In support of hypothesis 17, experienced civility was positively related to respect at Time 1 \( (r = .66, 95\% \text{ CI} [.60, .71]) \) and Time 2 \( (r = .60, 95\% \text{ CI} [.53, .66]) \). In support of hypothesis 18, experienced civility was positively related to perceived coworker support at Time 1 \( (r = .68, 95\% \text{ CI} [.62, .73]) \) and Time 2 \( (r = .76, 95\% \text{ CI} [.72, .80]) \). Lastly, in support of hypothesis 19, experienced civility was positively related to interpersonal justice at Time 1 \( (r = .51, 95\% \text{ CI} [.43, .58]) \) and Time 2 \( (r = .52, 95\% \text{ CI} [.45, .59]) \).

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis.** CFAs were conducted comparing one-factor and two-factor models (one with correlated latent factors and one with uncorrelated latent factors). In each CFA, the items of civility and one other core construct (e.g., civility and PCS; civility and incivility; civility and respect) were compared at a time. As shown in Table 17, the two-factor models showed better model fit (higher CFI and GFI, lower Chi Square and RMSEA). We conducted Chi-Squared Difference Tests between the two-factor (uncorrelated) and two-factor (correlated) models to determine if one was a significantly better fit than the other. In all cases, the two-factor (correlated) model was a significantly better fit \( (p < .001) \) than the two-factor (uncorrelated) model. Thus, the CFA provides additional evidence for the distinction between experienced civility and civility norms, respect, perceived coworker support, and interpersonal justice.
The next section will further investigate how experienced civility relates to organizational outcomes in comparison to experienced incivility, civility norms, respect, interpersonal justice, and perceived coworker support.

**Predicting Organizational Outcomes**

We are interested in the effects of experienced civility on 6 outcome variables: emotional exhaustion, cynicism, mental wellbeing, psychological safety, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. A multiple regression analysis and relative weights analysis was conducted for each outcome variable with experienced civility, incivility, respect, interpersonal justice, civility norms, and perceived coworker support as predictors. For comparison purposes, bivariate predictor-criterion correlations ($r$) and standardized regression weights ($\beta$) are included along with relative weights and rescaled relative weights in Tables 18 to 23. As previously mentioned, relative weights sum to the $R^2$ of the full model while rescaled relative weights represent percentages of how much each predictor accounts for in the total $R^2$. Confidence intervals were calculated using 10,000 bootstrapped samples.

**Emotional Exhaustion.** As shown in Table 18, the rescaled weights indicate that experienced incivility (62%) account for the greatest amount of variance in emotional exhaustion followed by perceived coworker support (12%), civility norms of “encouraging civility” (as measured by the CNQ-B; 7%), interpersonal justice (6%), and VHA civility norms (5%). Hypothesis 20a predicted that experienced civility would be a significant predictor of emotional exhaustion. Experienced civility only accounted 3% of the explained variance in emotional exhaustion and was non-significant; thus, hypothesis 20a was not supported.

In terms of relative importance, Hypothesis 20b predicted that experienced civility would be a less important predictor of emotional exhaustion than incivility. Given that experienced
incivility accounted for 62% of the explained variance and experienced civility accounted for 3% of the explained variance in emotional exhaustion, hypothesis 20b was supported.

Hypothesis 20c predicted that experienced civility would be a less important predictor of emotional exhaustion than respect or interpersonal justice. Interpersonal justice was a significant predictor, accounting for 6% of the variance in emotional exhaustion; however, respect was a non-significant predictor accounting for 3% of the variance emotional exhaustion. Given that experienced civility was a non-significant predictor accounting for 3% of the variance in emotional exhaustion it appears as though interpersonal justice was a more important predictor but respect was not; thus, hypothesis 20c was partially supported.

**Cynicism.** As shown in Table 19, the rescaled weights indicate that experienced incivility (58%) accounted for the greatest amount of variance in cynicism followed by perceived coworker support (11%), respect (8%), interpersonal justice (7%), and civility norms of “encouraging civility” (as measured by the CNQ-B; 6%). Hypothesis 21a predicted that experienced civility would be a significant predictor of cynicism. Experienced civility only accounted 4% of the explained variance in emotional exhaustion and was non-significant; thus, hypothesis 21a was not supported.

Moreover, in line with the Job-Demands Resources Model (Demerouti et al., 2001), hypothesis 21b predicted that experienced civility would be a more important predictor of cynicism than incivility; however, incivility accounted for 58% of the explained variance in cynicism while civility accounted for only 4%. Thus, hypothesis 21b was not supported.

**Mental Wellbeing.** As shown in Table 20, the rescaled weights indicate that all predictor variables were significant. Respect (25%) accounted for the greatest amount of variance in mental wellbeing followed by experienced civility (17%), VHA civility norms (13%), perceived
coworker support (13%), experienced incivility (12%), civility norms of “encouraging civility” (as measured by the CNQ-B; 9%), interpersonal justice (7%), and civility norms of “discouraging incivility” (as measured by the CNQ-B; 4%). Hypothesis 22a predicted that experienced civility would be a significant predictor of mental wellbeing; thus, hypothesis 22a was supported. Hypothesis 22b predicted that experienced civility would be a more important predictor of mental wellbeing than incivility. Civility was relatively more important than incivility in accounting for explained variance in mental wellbeing; thus hypothesis 22b was supported.

**Psychological Safety.** As shown in Table 21, the statistically significant rescaled weights indicate that perceived coworker support (25%) and experienced incivility (20%) accounted for the greatest amount of variance in psychological safety followed by VHA civility norms (12%), interpersonal justice (12%), respect (12%), experienced civility (9%), and civility norms of “encouraging civility” (as measured by the CNQ-B; 6%). Hypothesis 23a predicted that experienced civility would be a significant predictor of psychological safety; thus, hypothesis 23a was supported.

Hypothesis 23b predicted that civility norms would be a more important predictor of psychological safety than experienced civility. VHA norms (12%) accounted for more variance than experienced civility (9%). Although the separate factors of civility norms (as measured by the CNQ-B) do not on their own account for more variance than experienced civility, as a whole they account for 10% of the variance while experienced civility accounts for 9% of the variance; thus, hypothesis 23b is supported.

**Affective Organizational Commitment.** As shown in Table 22, the rescaled weights indicate that all predictor variables were significant. Respect (30%) and perceived coworker
support (22%) accounted for the greatest amount of variance in affective organizational commitment followed by experienced civility (13%), VHA civility norms (12%), civility norms of “encouraging civility” (as measured by the CNQ-B; 8%), interpersonal justice (7%), experienced incivility (5%), and civility norms of “discouraging incivility” (as measured by the CNQ-B; 3%). Hypothesis 24a predicted that experienced civility would be a significant predictor of affective commitment; thus, hypothesis 24a was supported.

Hypothesis 24b predicted that respect and interpersonal justice would be more important predictors of affective commitment than experienced civility. While relative to the other predictors, respect was the most important predictor (accounting for 30% of the explained variance in AOC), interpersonal justice only accounted for 7% of the explained variance. Experienced civility (accounting for 13% of the variance) was a more important predictor than interpersonal justice but a less important predictor than respect; thus, hypothesis 24b was partially supported.

**Job Satisfaction.** As shown in Table 23, the statistically significant rescaled weights indicate that perceived coworker support (19%) and respect (19%) accounted for the greatest amount of variance in job satisfaction followed by interpersonal justice (18%), experienced civility (14%), VHA civility norms (12%), and civility norms of “encouraging civility” (as measured by the CNQ-B; 11%). Hypothesis 25 predicted that experienced civility would be a significant predictor of job satisfaction; thus, hypothesis 25 was supported. A summary of the hypotheses presented above and the extent to which they were supported is presented in Table 24.

**DISCUSSION**

The three main research questions of the current chapter were:
What empirical evidence is there for the direct relationships between civility and other similar constructs?

Does civility have a unique pattern of predictors compared to other similar constructs?

Is civility an important predictor of organizational outcomes beyond the predictive power of other similar constructs?

Each research question will be discussed in relation to the results presented above. First, I will discuss the results in relation to enacted civility and then I will discuss the results in relation to experienced civility. Theoretical and practical implications will also be discussed. Lastly, areas for future research are outlined based on results from the current study.

**Enacted Civility**

Enacted civility was compared to enacted incivility, OCBs, and POBs to determine the amount of overlap between constructs.

**Civility vs. Incivility.** As expected, enacted civility was negatively related to enacted incivility. The small negative correlation supported the notion that engagement in civility is related to a lack of engagement in incivility; however, the lack of strong correlation suggests this is not always the case. Thus, engaging in civil behaviours goes beyond a simple lack of engaging in uncivil behaviours. Research and theory in the area of positive psychology supports the notion that the positive (i.e., civility) is not simply the opposite of the negative (i.e., incivility; Pawelski, 2013; Pawelski, 2016; Seligman, 2002).

Focusing on specific uncivil and civil behaviours helps explain the small negative relationship between enacted civility and incivility. In Chapter 2, we found civil behaviours included: helping behaviours, small acts of kindness, pleasantries, active listening, and caring for
others. In contrast, uncivil behaviours included: talking loudly, taking advantage of others, belittling people, and interrupting others. Someone who is good at active listening and engaging in small acts of kindness is less likely to interrupt others; however, they may engage in uncivil behaviour from time to time. Interestingly, when looking at civility profiles, Leiter (2016) found groups of individuals who are high in civility and low in incivility, high in incivility and low in civility, or low in both civility and incivility; however, there was not a group who was high on both civility and incivility. Thus, the relationship between incivility and civility may be asymmetric. Future research should explore this further in understanding the relationship between enacted civility and incivility.

Further distinction between enacted civility and incivility lies in the differential importance of predictors. For civility, the three most important predictors were procedural justice, agreeableness, and gratitude. For incivility, the three most important predictors were trait negative affect, conscientiousness, and agreeableness. One similarity is that both incivility and civility are predicted by agreeableness; thus, agreeable people have a tendency to engage in civility and not engage in incivility. People high in agreeableness are often cooperative, empathetic, respectful, and considerate (Goldberg, 1990). They might be overly attentive to others’ needs and engage in civility more actively while intentionally not engaging in incivility.

Conscientiousness was also a significant predictor of both enacted civility and incivility (although a stronger predictor of incivility). Individuals who are conscientious are often careful, reliable, organized, fair, and deliberate (McCrae & Costa, 1987). They might be extra careful not to engage in incivility while also deliberately engaging in civility when it is appropriate. The relative importance of personality characteristics in the enactment of civil or uncivil behaviours
suggests a pattern whereby certain people are naturally more likely to be civil and certain people are naturally more likely to be uncivil.

It is also important to highlight the significant role of emotions as predictors. First, trait negative affect was a significant predictor of incivility but not civility. Previous research has focused on the relationship between NA and incivility finding that NA is often a predictor of uncivil behaviour (e.g., Lee & Allen, 2002; Reio & Ghosh, 2009). As expected, NA accounted for 37% of the explained variance in enacted incivility, but was not a significant predictor of enacted civility. If enacted civility and incivility were truly opposites NA should have been a strong negative predictor of enacted civility. In regards to positive emotions, gratitude and PA accounted for 28% of the explained variance in enacted civility and only 16% of the explained variance in enacted incivility.

In Spector and Fox’s (2002) emotion-centred model of voluntary work behaviour, they proposed negative emotions and counterproductive work behaviours have a bidirectional relationship while positive emotions and OCBs have a bidirectional relationship. The current study found support for the positive relationship between NA and enacted incivility, and PA and enacted civility, providing further support for their model.

Civility vs. OCBs. As expected, engagement in OCBs was positively related to enacted civility. Altruism OCBs and courtesy OCBs had the strongest relationships to enacted civility. Given that altruism and courtesy fall within the realm of OCB-I (and not OCB-O) this highlights the interpersonal nature of civility (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Altruism OCBs involve discretionary helping behaviours while courtesy OCBs involve discretionary behavior aimed at preventing problems from occurring. Contrary to expectations, civility was more strongly related to altruism OCBs than courtesy OCBs. The pattern of relationships highlights the active and interpersonal
nature of civil behaviours similar to the finding in Chapter 2 that civil behaviours are active and others-focused.

Are civil behaviours distinct from altruism or courtesy OCBs? Correlations were moderate-sized, suggesting shared and unique variance. The relative importance of predictors suggests agreeableness and gratitude are important in predicting civil behaviour, courtesy OCBs and altruism OCBs. Thus, based on personality characteristics some employees are simply more likely to engage in positive behaviours at work including civility and OCBs.

The main difference arises in regards to procedural justice. More specifically, procedural justice was the most important predictor of enacted civility (accounting for 23% of the explained variance). In contrast, procedural justice only accounted for 8% of the explained variance in courtesy OCBs and 13% of the explained variance in altruism OCBs. Procedural justice reflects the fairness of the process through which outcomes are determined at work (Colquitt, 2001). Sample items include, “have those procedures been free of bias” and “have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures” (Colquitt, 2001).

Previous research has found a strong relationship between procedural justice and perceived respect, highlighting the link between justice, fairness, and respect (Tyler & Blader, 2002). Civility involves behaviours that are polite, show regard for others, and preserve norms for mutual respect at work (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; McGonagle et al., 2014; Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000). Thus, civility and procedural justice are both related to perceptions and displays of respect at work. In contrast, OCBs are extra-role behaviours that indirectly contribute to the maintenance of the organizations’ social system (Organ, 1997). While respect at work may influence engagement in OCBs it may not be a key driver. Thus, a core distinction
between engagement in civility and engagement in OCBs may be related to respect and fairness at work.

In regards to conscientiousness OCBs and civic virtue OCBs, enacted civility showed moderate positive relationships. It is not surprising that employees who engage in OCBs also engage in civil behaviours because they are all small positive behaviours in the workplace. The moderate sized correlations suggest some overlap between constructs but not enough to suggest construct redundancy. In regards to the relative importance of predictors, while the personality trait of conscientiousness accounted for 32% of the explained variance in conscientious OCBs but only 9% of the explained variance in civility. Similarly, PA accounted for 32% of the explained variance in civic virtue OCBs but only 12% of the explained variance in civility. Thus, the findings suggest conscientiousness OCBs and civic virtue OCBs are related to, but distinct from, enacted civility.

The most surprising finding was the lack of relationship between sportsmanship OCBs and enacted civility. Sportsmanship OCBs reflect an employee’s willingness to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining. All items measuring sportsmanship OCBs are reverse coded, such that items include, “tends to make mountains out of molehills” and “always finds fault with what the organization is doing” (Podsakoff et al., 1990). Given the negative framing of the items an employee who disagrees that they always find fault in the organization may not necessarily agree that they are championing what the organization is doing. In this sense, it is possible employees who have high scores on these items may be avoiding engaging in incivility but not necessarily engaging in civility. Support for this idea is found in the strong negative relationship ($r = -.66$) between sportsmanship OCBs and enacted incivility. Again, this highlights that not engaging in incivility is different from engaging in civility.
Civility vs. POBs. As expected, engagement in POBs was positively correlated with enacted civility ranging from .54 (organizational POBs) to .30 (individual POBs). Both civility and POBs are positive social acts that are performed in the workplace. POBs encompass a wider range of social acts and are specifically “performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group, or organization toward which it is directed” (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986, p.711). Thus, moderate positive relationships suggest some overlap between constructs but not an indication of construct redundancy.

Interestingly, enacted civility was more strongly related to organizational POBs and role-prescribed POBs than individual POBs. Why is the relationship between civility and individual POBs not stronger? Similar to individual POBs, civil behaviours are directed towards other coworkers (not the organization). Looking at survey items for POBs, however, it appears as though individual POBs represent more time-intensive activities compared to civil behaviours. Examples of items include, “coordinates department get-togethers”, “does a personal favour for someone” and “collects money for flowers for sick coworkers.” In contrast, civil behaviours are small acts that do not require a lot of time but can have meaningful impact, such as expressive appreciation, making requests not demands, and respecting other people’s time. Thus, although the definition of individual POBs and civil behaviours sound similar in reality they are capturing different types of interpersonal behaviours.

The relationship between civility and organizational POBs was moderate and positive. Similar to enacted civility, procedural justice was an important predictor of organizational POBs, accounting for 21% of the explained variance. In contrast, while job satisfaction accounted for 15% of the explained variance in organizational POBs and affective commitment accounted for 13% of the explained variance in organizational POBs, neither was significant in predicting
enacted civility. Thus, organizational factors may be more important in explaining organizational-POBs than civility.

In contrast, role-prescribed POBs were strongly predicted by conscientiousness (40%), agreeableness (19%) and gratitude (14%) but not procedural justice, affective commitment, or job satisfaction. Thus, personality factors may be of particular importance in explaining role-prescribed POBs. In support of this finding, McNeely and Meglino (1994) found job satisfaction was significantly related to organizational and interpersonal POBs but not role-prescribed POBs. Given that enacted civility is moderately related to both organizational and role-prescribed POBs, it supports the notion that engagement in civility is driven by both organizational and personal factors.

**Enacted Civility Summary**

Previous research has relied on comparing civility norms to incivility and OCBs to understand the relationships that exist (e.g., Leiter et al., 2011; Leiter et al., 2012; Walsh et al., 2012). Using a new scale to measure enacted civil behaviours (and not norms), the current study was able to directly compare the enactment of civility, incivility, OCBs, and POBs to determine similarities and differences between behaviours at work. In sum, based on the size of correlations and relative importance of predictors, the current study found enacted civility is distinct from incivility, OCBs and POBs.

**Experienced Constructs and Civility**

Experienced civility was compared to experienced incivility, perceptions of civil norms, respect, perceived coworker support, and interpersonal justice to determine the amount of overlap between constructs.
**Civility vs. Incivility.** As expected, experienced civility was significantly negatively related to experienced incivility; however, the correlation was small ($r = -.12$). Thus, employees are likely experiencing both civil and uncivil behaviours at work and a lack of incivility does not imply the presence of civility. The existence of a work environment that has both civility and incivility highlights the need to study both phenomena (instead of just one) in order to fully understand coworker relationships. As Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) state in their meta-analysis of coworker behaviour, “employees are likely to experience both positive and negative behaviors originating from coworkers” (p.1096).

Previous research has looked at characteristics of employees who are more likely to experience incivility at work. For example, employees high in neuroticism and negative affect report experiencing more workplace incivility than employees low in either neuroticism or negative affect (Milam, Spitzmueller & Penney, 2009; Naimon, Mullins & Osatuke, 2013). The current study found support for the positive relationship between NA and experienced incivility but a non-significant relationship between NA and experienced civility. Given that the experience of incivility is only marginally related to the experience of civility, what are target characteristics of employees who commonly experience civility? Future research should explore both dispositional and situational differences in employees’ experiences of civil and uncivil behaviours.

**Civility vs. Civil Norms.** As expected, experienced civility was positively related to civility norms. In general, group norms are emergent properties of groups that reflect accepted attitudes about beliefs, feelings and behaviours (Wellen, Hogg & Terry, 1998). Organizational and group norms influence how employees behave in the workplace through a top-down process (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). Civil norms set the tone that incivility is not accepted and civility is
encouraged. Employee behaviours can also influence norms through a bottom-up process whereby over time employee behaviours are incorporated into models of acceptable workplace behaviour (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000).

A main difference between civil behaviours and civil norms revolves around the difference between individual behaviours and group norms. The VHA measure of civility captures broad perceptions of civility at work coming from coworkers, supervisor, and the organization as a whole. The CNQ-B captures group norms around civility and incivility. As discussed in Chapter 4, although measured at the individual level, civil norms reflect a group-referent construct while civil behaviours reflect an individual-referent construct. Thus, employees in a group should have similar perceptions of group norms of civility but may have different individual experiences with civil behaviours. Researchers should consider these differences between levels when determining which constructs to include in their research studies.

Future research should also look into the strength of civility norms within groups and how norms affect engagement in civil behaviour. For example, Wellan and colleagues (1998) suggested that group norms predict behavioural intentions but only for people who strongly identify with the group. How do civil norms influence employees who already engage in civility? What about employees who engage in incivility?

**Civility vs. Respect.** A strong positive relationship \((r = .66)\) was found between experiencing civil behaviours at work and perceptions of respect at work. According to Rogers and Ashforth (2014) respect is the perceived worth accorded to one person by others, and is manifested through a variety of behaviours at work (e.g., expressions of sympathy, support, civility). In relation to civility and respect, civility is one of many behavioural manifestations of
respect (Rogers & Ashforth, 2014). Thus, as described in Chapter 4, respect as a measure of *perceptions* differs from civility as a measure of *behaviours*. Future research should consider the relative importance of other possible behavioural manifestations of respect (e.g., displays of empowerment, compassion, OCBs).

An important similarity between experienced civility and respect may involve perceptions of justice. Although not directly compared to respect, procedural justice was the most important predictor of enacted civility. Previously research has found procedural justice as an antecedent of experienced respect (Tyler & Blader, 2002). Future research should continue to explore the relationships between civility, respect, and organizational justice.

The measure of respect used in the current study reflects the idea of mutual respect through value and inclusion. In contrast, the measure used in Chapter 3 focused more on esteem respect and the perception that employees were getting the respect they deserved. Given that civility is more closely aligned with the concept of mutual respect rather than esteem respect, it was important to use a measure of mutual respect in order to determine the amount of overlap between similar constructs. The findings indicate that although there is a strong positive relationship between constructs it is not sufficiently high to be an indicator of construct redundancy. Moreover, as described below, civility and respect showed unique patterns of relative importance in explaining outcomes (e.g., affective organizational commitment, mental wellbeing, and cynicism) in the current study.

**Civility vs. Perceived Coworker Support.** As expected, a strong positive relationship was found between experienced civility and perceived coworker support (PCS). In fact, compared to all of the other constructs in the nomological network, civility was most closely related to PCS. PCS measures perceptions of support from one’s coworkers and includes items
such as, “my coworkers are supportive of my goals and values” and “my coworkers care about my general satisfaction at work”. In contrast, civility captures specific behavioural displays of respect and concern for others. Sample items include, “available to listen to me”, “recognize what goes into my work” and “express appreciation for my contribution to the organization”.

As described in Chapter 4, PCS taps into general perceptions rather than specific behaviours at work. In the context of social support, Lakey and Heller (1988) found perceived social support was related to perceived stress of a situation, while supportive behaviours were related to actual task performance. Given the behavioural nature of civility, would civility be more effective in predicting other behaviours (e.g., performance) than PCS? Future research should consider whether they are interested in perceptions or behaviours because they may affect and relate to outcomes in different ways.

The use of a behavioural measure of civility (rather than perceptual) has several advantages. First, it aligns with the operational definition of civility. Second, it complements Cortina and colleagues (2001) behavioural Workplace Incivility Scale allowing researchers to measure both civil and uncivil behaviours at the same level (individual) and with the same content (behaviours). Third, it fits within Andersson and Pearson’s (1999) social interactionist perspective whereby civility and incivility are interactive behaviours and events between two or more employees. Fourth, behaviours in the workplace change at a faster rate than general perceptions. As a result, researchers are able to study more nuanced research questions through the use of daily diary studies and experience sampling methodologies.

**Civility vs. Interpersonal Justice:** A moderate positive relationship was found between experienced civility and interpersonal justice. The two constructs are similar because they both focus on high quality interpersonal treatment at work related. For example, interpersonal justice
involves polite, dignified and respectful treatment while civility involves behaviour showing respect, concern for others, and empathizing (Colquitt et al., 2001). Interestingly the best predictor of civility was procedural justice, highlighting a strong link between respect and fairness at work.

The main difference between civility and interpersonal justice is that the current study assessed civility only from coworkers while interpersonal justice displays come directly from an authority figure while executing organizational procedures or determining outcomes (Colquitt et al., 2001). The distinction between coworker and supervisor behaviour has been studied in the context of interpersonal conflict. Defined by Caza and Cortina (2007) as top-down incivility and lateral incivility, other researchers have found the experience of top-down incivility is related to negative organizational outcomes (e.g., turnover intentions) while the experience of lateral incivility is related to negative personal outcomes (e.g., depression; Bruk-Lee & Spector, 2006; Frone, 2000). Moreover, Pearson and Porath (2009) suggested a powerful instigator of incivility may be more likely to get away with their actions than a less powerful instigator.

In relation to civility and interpersonal justice, given the power dynamic associated with interpersonal justice, how might it affect employees differently than displays of civility? What happens when there is a disconnect between coworker and supervisor civility (as assessed by interpersonal justice)? Future research should explore the alignment and misalignment between displays of respect, justice, and fairness coming from different sources at work.

Outcomes of Experienced Civility

**Personal Wellbeing.** As expected, civility was a significant predictor of increased mental wellbeing. Although respect accounted for the most explained variance in mental wellbeing, experienced civility was the second most important predictor. Mental wellbeing consists of three
components: positive affect (e.g., optimism, cheerfulness), positive interpersonal relationships, and positive functioning (e.g., energy, self-acceptance; Tennant et al., 2007). Civility can foster positive emotions and positive relationships at work, contributing to positive mental health (Porath, 2011). Future research should expand outcomes we study to include more positive indicators of health and wellbeing. For example, how is civility related to thriving or empowerment at work?

Contrary to expectations, experienced civility was not a significant predictor of either emotional exhaustion or cynicism. Based on the relative weights analysis, experienced incivility was the strongest predictor of both emotional exhaustion and cynicism. Thus, incivility predicts poor mental health outcomes while civility predicts positive mental health outcomes. Given the active, positive nature of civility it may important in creating not just neutral, but positive flourishing workplaces.

**Organizational-Focused.** As expected, experienced civility accounted for a significant amount of the explained variance in psychological safety, affective organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. Civility had strong zero-order correlations with the outcomes ranging from .45 to .52. The relative importance analysis determined which predictor variables account for variance in the outcome variables based on both unique and shared variance. Given that all eight predictor variables were highly related to one another the fact that civility was still a significant predictor is important.

Perceived coworker support and respect were consistently more important predictors than civility possibly because all three outcomes are measures of perceptions rather than specific behaviours. Interestingly, other than incivility and civility all of the other predictor variables are perceptions rather than behaviours. Organizational research has typically studied behaviours that
are enacted (e.g., OCBs, POBs) and perceptions that are experienced (e.g., respect, interpersonal justice). In this context civility and incivility are unique because they can be studied in terms of both enacted and experienced civility/incivility. Future research interested in behavioural outcomes or the interaction between enacted and experienced positive behaviours should consider using civility as a construct of interest. In contrast, researchers interested in more broad organizational perceptions may find studying respect or PCS more useful.

**Experienced Civility Summary**

The current study found support for the distinction between experienced civility and experienced incivility. The two constructs had a small negative correlation and while civility was stronger than incivility at predicting positive mental health (e.g., mental wellbeing), incivility was stronger than civility at predicting negative mental health (e.g., cynicism, exhaustion). Experienced civility is also distinct from the group-level construct of civil norms and the supervisory-driven construct of interpersonal justice. Although experienced civility was closely related to respect and PCS they showed different patterns of relative importance in explaining important personal and organizational outcomes. For example, although experienced civility was a significant predictor of psychological safety, affective commitment, and job satisfaction it was less important than both respect and PCS.

**Theoretical Implications**

Although other researchers have studied workplace civility (e.g., Leiter et al., 2011; McGonagle et al., 2014; Osatuke et al., 2009; Porath et al., 2015; Walsh et al., 2012) the literature is largely disconnected and presents issues around the lack of a nomological network, varying levels of analysis being studied, and a variety of measurement tools being used. As a result, there has been no previous theory building around workplace civility. The current
dissertation aimed to identify its nomological network and better understand how civility is positioned within other established constructs.

One theoretical contribution of the dissertation is the development of a Framework for Positive Interpersonal Workplace Behaviours in Chapter 4. First, we identified constructs within the nomological network that were theoretically similar to civility. We then provided a framework for understanding how constructs are being conceptualized and measured by researchers. Highlighting the various uses of group- or individual-level constructs and perceptions or behaviours is important in our understanding of the constructs that cluster in the area of positive interpersonal workplace behaviours. The framework was applied to Chapter 5 in understanding relationships between constructs. For example, given that civility norms are measured at the group-level, it was hypothesized and shown that civility norms were more strongly predictive of psychological safety (another group-level construct) than civil behaviours.

Using a new behavioural measure of civility that is aligned with the original operational definition of civility, the current study was able to empirically determine how similar and how distinct civility is from other similar constructs. Exploring both enacted and experienced civility was important in order to provide a comprehensive analysis and align the study of civility to the study of incivility. The current study found evidence for the empirical distinction of enacted civility from enacted incivility, OCBs, and POBs. Moreover, the current study found evidence for the empirical distinction of experienced civility from experienced incivility, civility norms, respect, PCS, and interpersonal justice. Thus, the present dissertation found support for the theoretical and empirical distinction of civility from other similar constructs. In order to further build theory around workplace civility, scholars should continue to understand the similarities and differences similar these constructs, in particular PCS, respect, and civility.
Given the empirical support for civility as its own construct, future research should continue building theory around positive organizational behaviours. Similar to how Andersson and Pearson (1999) mapped out forms of mistreatment in organizations (e.g., antisocial behaviour, deviant behaviour, violence, aggression, incivility), researchers should consider further mapping out constructs and processes on the positive side further. Moreover, Sypher (2004) ranked forms of mistreatment on a scale of increasing intentionality and intensity. For example, ignoring and interrupting are lower in both intentionality and intensity while bullying and verbal harassment are higher in both intentionality and intensity. On the positive side, can civil behaviours, OCBs and POBs be ranked in order to increasing intensity? Is there an escalation of positive interpersonal behaviours that can happen in the workplace?

Although researchers study incivility, bullying and social undermining as independent constructs, are they really all the same? Herschovis (2011) conducted a review and meta-analysis and found little evidence for the distinction of these constructs. We have distinguished incivility from civility (in Chapters 2-5) and have done preliminary work separating civility from OCBs, POBs, respect, etc. We need to further identify how civility is unique compared to other positive organizational constructs, when studying civility is worthwhile and meaningful, and why civility is a unique phenomenon.

The study of workplace incivility largely relies on theories of stress, job demands-resources, and discrimination to explain its related phenomena. For example, Rosen, Koopman, Gabriel and Johnson (2016) used Ego Depletion Theory (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven & Tice, 1998) to understand why employees who are experience incivility later engage in incivility themselves. Moreover, using JD-R (Demerouti et al., 2001), Leiter and colleagues (2012) identify incivility as a job stressor leading to job burnout and civility as a job resource leading to
work engagement. Scholars should continue to explore the negative effects of incivility while incorporating potential positive effects of civility.

Research on incivility has focused on the central role of negative emotion using Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) and Spector and Fox’s (2002) emotion-centred model of voluntary work behaviour. Both of these theories can also be used to understand the role positive emotions play in why employees engage in civility and how experiencing civility affects them. For example, the current study found trait PA was a significant predictor of enacted civility. Are there specific emotions that are driving this relationship? Moreover, is state PA an outcome of experienced civility? Theorizing about emotions in relation to both civility and incivility can provide a more comprehensive lens through which to view people’s experiences in the workplace.

Civility should also be studied through the lenses of other theories typically not used in the study of incivility. More specifically, given that civility reflects positive interpersonal behaviour researchers should propose positive theories to explain these behaviours rather than flipping theories in the area of job stress and discrimination. Using Broaden and Build Theory (Fredrickson, 1998) can help us understand workplace civility and positive emotions. For example, does experiencing civility increase positive emotions in turn help build an employee’s social resources? Would this process help building intellectual resources as well? Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) suggests that work environments that are able to fulfill employee’s needs of competence, autonomy and relatedness, will support intrinsic motivation and healthy functioning. How does civility fulfill the need for relatedness? Does civility support employee’s basic need to belong? As research in this area moves forward,
scholars should explore how civility, its outcomes and antecedents, can be studied through theories related to growth, thriving, and positive emotions at work.

**Practical Implications**

First, researchers should not dismiss civility as a form of construct redundancy or a set of behaviours too minor to matter in the workplace. Experienced workplace civility was consistently a significant predictor of important personal and organizational outcomes (e.g., mental well-being, affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction). Moreover, enacted workplace civility showed moderate relationships with both OCBs and POBs suggesting the behaviours are distinct; thus, employees may engage in civil behaviours for different reasons than they engage in OCBs.

Second, given the large set of constructs that represent positive interpersonal workplace behaviours, researchers should be thoughtful about the construct that most accurately captures what they are interested in studying. For example, are scholars interested in group norms around civility or individual experiences of civil behaviours? Are scholars more interested in general perceptions of coworker support or daily fluctuations of experienced civility? Moreover, given the research questions and design, are scholars able to assess constructs at the group-level and/or individual-level? Although several constructs sound interchangeable at the surface level it is important for researchers to understand the theoretical and methodological strengths and limitations of civility and other similar constructs.

Given that previous research on civility has focused on workplace interventions (e.g., CREW; Leiter et al., 2011; Osatuke et al., 2009) the current research has several implications for practitioners. First, the new measure of civil behaviours provides organizations with a tool to measure employee’s experiences with both experiencing and engaging in civil behaviours at
work. Second, the set of behaviours within the scale provides the basis for organizations to understand what civility looks like and what behaviours should be promoted at work. Especially when organizations are trying to implement the MHCC’s Standard for Psychological Health and Safety at Work, understanding how “civility and respect” looks is important. Third, the distinction of civility from incivility and other positive behaviours supports the notion that even small behaviours that don’t take a lot of time (e.g., expressing appreciation) matter in the workplace.

**Future Directions and Limitations**

Through the lens of Andersson and Pearson’s (1999) social interactionist perspective, civility involves behaviours that occur between two or more employees. One of the limitations of the current study was that we were only able to measure constructs from one employee’s perspective. Taking into account a single perspective of an event makes it difficult to fully understand the exchange of civil behaviours at work. Future research should explore the dynamic between dyads and the close relationship between enacted and experienced civility. The benefit of studying behaviours (rather than perceptions) is that the experience of civil behaviours likely changes at a faster rate than general perceptions of civility at work. For example, Rosen and colleagues (2016) found experienced incivility in the morning was related to enacted incivility in the afternoon. Similarly, does experiencing civil behaviours from coworkers in the morning predict future enactment of civil behaviours later in the day? Future research should consider the use of daily diary studies to provide insight into how enacted and experienced civil behaviours affect employees at work.

Future research should be done to further validate the civil behaviours scales that were used in the current study. The single factor structure and validity of the scales should be
replicated in different samples. The civil behaviours scales created alignment between the operation definition and measurement of civility. They also allowed us to parallel the measurement of workplace incivility (e.g., based on frequency of behaviours). It is important to further validate the civil behaviours scales in different samples to ensure that the factor structure holds.

Moving forward, it is also important to test the incremental validity of the civil behaviours scales. Incremental validity is important to determine if a predictor taps into unique variance of a dependent variable; thus, increasing the amount of variance we can account for in important outcomes. Incremental validity, however, cannot identity which predictors are driving the $R^2$ or how to interpret the contribution of all predictors, including new ones, to the $R^2$ (LeBreton, Hargis, Griepentrog, Oswald & Ployhart, 2007). Given that the research questions in Chapter 5 were more focused on the relative importance of specific predictors, rather than maximizing the total $R^2$ of the regression, incremental validity of the civil behaviours scales was not tested. Future research should examine how the experience of civil behaviours can help predict outcomes such as: thriving, psychological capital, and state positive emotions.

The use of a North American sample allowed us to better understand civility within the North American context; however, it limits the generalizability of our research findings. Future research should consider the cultural context in which employees function. Workplace incivility appears to exist and have similar negative outcomes worldwide (Schilpzand, de Pater & Erez, 2016); however, given the ambiguous and cultural nature of incivility what is considered rude in one country (or region) might not be considered rude in another. For example, when power distance is high, being ignored by a supervisor might be less uncivil compared to when power
distance is low (Schilpzand et al., 2016). In the context of civility, are civil behaviours the same across cultures? Is civility expected more (or less) in different cultures?

Future research should also take into consideration the organizational culture in understanding workplace civility. For example, are employees interacting face-to-face or do a high percentage of employees operate in a virtual environment through telecommuting? Moreover, what are the organizational policies regarding workplace behaviour? Gallus and colleagues (2014) found that a lack of workplace policies predicted more enacted incivility. How do organizational values, standards or policies affect the enactment or experience of civility? Understanding the broader context within which civil behaviours are being exchanged provides a more comprehensive understanding of interpersonal dynamics at work.

In Chapter 3 I was able to look at civil norms as a predictor of burnout, commitment, and job satisfaction. In Chapter 5 I studied eight antecedents (e.g., trait PA, agreeableness) of enacted civility and six outcomes (e.g., burnout, psychological safety) of experienced civility. Given concerns over survey fatigue, the constructs were chosen based on a review of the incivility, OCB, respect, PCS, and interpersonal justice literatures. Interestingly, experienced civility was strongly related to mental wellbeing, which is not a commonly studied construct in organizational psychology. Future research should explore a wider range of constructs that may relate more to civility than OCBs, POBs, or respect. For example, how does experienced civility affect thriving at work? Could savouring mediate the relationship between experienced civility and positive outcomes?

Given the finding that procedural justice was the most important predictor of enacted civility, future research should continue to explore how perceptions of justice or fairness
influence civility. If supervisors support procedures and processes that are fair, does that set the tone for respect and fairness between employees as well?

Lastly, the goal of the current study was to provide preliminary insight into how civility is unique from other similar constructs. Based on our findings we can conclude that civility is not simply a lack of incivility it is something more active and positive. Enacted civility is also unique from OCBs and POBs. Moderate-sized correlations and a differential pattern of predictors suggest employees who engage in civil behaviours do not necessarily engage in OCBs or POBs.

Our research suggests experienced civility is not the same thing as civility norms; however, future research should look into how civil behaviours create civility norms and the potential moderating effect of group cohesion. Moreover, future research should look into how civility norms influence the experience of civil behaviours particularly through the lens of social learning theory (Bandura, 1986). We also found experienced civility and interpersonal justice were distinct constructs, likely because interpersonal justice focused on supervisory behaviour while civil behaviours in our study focused on coworker behaviours.

The relationship between experienced civility, respect, and perceived coworker support is more complex. Compared to civil behaviours, which involve specific discrete behaviours, respect and perceived coworker support are constructs that involve overall perceptions. Future research should look at the types of behaviours that influence perceptions of both respect and perceived coworker support. For example, are civil behaviours solely responsible for perceptions of respect or do displays of compassion, justice, and instrumental support also play a role?

Future research should also explore more complex research questions. For example, in seeking to understand how civility spreads we can look into the role of emotional contagion and
feelings of gratitude. Moreover, future research should seek to better understand the factors that influence our perceptions of civil behaviours. For example, how do our emotions, memory bias, and expectations of civil treatment influence our perception (and self-reported experience) of civil behaviours? It is important to understand the nuances of workplace civility so organizations can effectively foster and promote civil interactions and positive group norms.

CONCLUSION

Increasing our understanding of civility in the workplace complements not only the incivility literature but also the positive organizational behavior literature. Having a solid theoretical and empirical basis for both positive and negative phenomena will allow researchers to study them together. For example, what are the implications for employees who experience a lot of both (civility and incivility) or none of either? As Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) state in their meta-analysis of coworker behaviour, “employees are likely to experience both positive and negative behaviors originating from coworkers” (p.1096); thus, including both civil and uncivil behaviours in future research will help create a more holistic representation of an employee’s day-to-day work life reality.

Drawing attention to civility is important because simply asking employees to refrain from incivility will not necessarily create a civil, positive, or thriving environment. Civility involves behaviours and perceptions that are over and above demonstrations of status and recognition, captured by the narrower construct of respect, or basic social exchange behaviours among coworkers that lead to perceived coworker support. Civility is more specifically “behavior that helps to preserve the norms for mutual respect at work; it comprises behaviors that are fundamental to positively connecting with another, building relationships and empathizing” (Pearson et al., 2000, p.125).
SUMMARY AND KEY POINTS

The purpose of my dissertation was to better understand workplace civility as a construct in relation to other constructs studied in the area of organizational psychology. Chapters 2 to 5 build upon one another and reflect the process of understanding what civility is, how civility is different from incivility, and then how civility is unique in relation to a broader nomological network. The culmination of the five chapters provides the groundwork researchers can use to propel the study of workplace civility forward.

The following are six main take-away points:

• Workplace civility should be studied in terms of behaviours (not norms), which are enacted and experienced by employees at work. Civility norms are a separate construct which includes norms in relation to both uncivil and civil behaviour.

• As suggested by the empirical evidence presented in Chapters 2, 3, and 5, workplace civility was not the opposite of workplace incivility.

• We provided evidence for the construct validity of a civil behaviours scale. Future research should continue to validate the scale with different samples.

• Enacted civility was distinct from enacted OCBs and POBs as evidenced by different patterns of predictors and moderate positive correlations between factors.

• Experienced civility was most closely related to the constructs of respect and perceived coworker support. Future research should continue to understand the similarities and differences among constructs.

• Experienced civility was a significant predictor of positive organizational outcomes, in particular mental wellbeing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1 Constructs</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNQ-B - Discouraging Incivility</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNQ-B - Encouraging Civility</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Incivility (coworker)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Civility (coworker)</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Coworker Support</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait NA</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait PA</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositional Gratitude</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 2 Constructs</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enacted Incivility</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted Civility</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Courtesy</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Civic Virtue</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Altruism</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POB - Individual</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POB - Organizational</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POB - Role prescribed</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Well-being</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Safety</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 400$. 
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Table 2
Correlations Between Study Variables Measured at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VHA Civility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNQ-B - Discouraging Incivility</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNQ-B - Encouraging Civility</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Incivility (coworker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNQ-B - Discouraging Incivility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNQ-B - Encouraging Civility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Civility (coworker)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Civility (coworker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Coworker Support</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait NA</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait PA</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositional Gratitude</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. r's greater than .10 are significant at .05 level. r's greater than .13 are significant at .01 level. N = 400.
Table 3

Correlations Between Study Variables Measured at Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Enacted Incivility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Enacted Civility</td>
<td>- .22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OCB - Courtesy</td>
<td>- .14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 OCB - Civic Virtue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 OCB - Altruism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 POB - Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 POB - Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 POB - Role prescribed</td>
<td>- .32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Exhaustion</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>- .11</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>- .09</td>
<td>- .34</td>
<td>- .09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>- .22</td>
<td>- .15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Cynicism</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>- .24</td>
<td>- .15</td>
<td>- .17</td>
<td>- .19</td>
<td>- .40</td>
<td>- .20</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>- .32</td>
<td>- .24</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mental Well-being</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>- .23</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>- .25</td>
<td>- .26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Psychological Safety</td>
<td>- .38</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>- .44</td>
<td>- .57</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Affective Commitment</td>
<td>- .20</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>- .44</td>
<td>- .61</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>- .22</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>- .54</td>
<td>- .67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. r's greater than .10 are significant at .05 level. r's greater than .13 are significant at .01 level. N = 400.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>VHA Civility</th>
<th>CNQ-B - Discouraging Incivility</th>
<th>CNQ-B - Encouraging Civility</th>
<th>Experienced Incivility (coworker)</th>
<th>Experienced Civility (coworker)</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Perceived Coworker Support</th>
<th>Interpersonal Justice</th>
<th>Trait NA</th>
<th>Trait PA</th>
<th>Dispositional Gratitude</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enacted Incivility</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted Civility</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Courtesy</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Civic Virtue</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Altruism</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Sportsmanship</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB - Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POB - Individual</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POB - Organizational</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POB - Role prescribed</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Well-being</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Safety</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *r*s greater than .11 are significant at .05 level. *r*s greater than .14 are significant at .01 level. *N* = 400.
Table 5

*CFA Fit Indices for Enacted Civility One-Factor and Two-Factor Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enacted Civility</th>
<th>One-Factor Model</th>
<th>Two-Factor Model (Uncorrelated)</th>
<th>Two-Factor Model (Correlated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>CFI .519</td>
<td>CFI = .882</td>
<td>CFI = .895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI .403</td>
<td>GFI = .810</td>
<td>GFI = .820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA .146</td>
<td>RMSEA = .073</td>
<td>RMSEA = .069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI .487</td>
<td>TLI = .872</td>
<td>TLI = .887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2 (495) = 8783.87$</td>
<td>$X^2 (490) = 2503.096$</td>
<td>$X^2 (489) = 2271.970$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POB</td>
<td>CFI .577</td>
<td>CFI = .860</td>
<td>CFI = .879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI .472</td>
<td>GFI = .801</td>
<td>GFI = .815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA .143</td>
<td>RMSEA = .083</td>
<td>RMSEA = .077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI .544</td>
<td>TLI = .848</td>
<td>TLI = .869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2 (377) = 6347.60$</td>
<td>$X^2 (374) = 2354.882$</td>
<td>$X^2 (373) = 2074.775$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incivility</td>
<td>CFI .543</td>
<td>CFI = .928</td>
<td>CFI = .931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI .410</td>
<td>GFI = .856</td>
<td>GFI = .859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA .249</td>
<td>RMSEA = .099</td>
<td>RMSEA = .097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI .473</td>
<td>TLI = .917</td>
<td>TLI = .920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2 (104) = 5215.26$</td>
<td>$X^2 (104) = 906.83$</td>
<td>$X^2 (103) = 873.85$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 (1) = 231.13, p < .001$

$X^2 (1) = 280.11, p < .001$

$X^2 (1) = 32.98, p < .001$

Note. $N = 773$. CFI = comparative fit index; GFI = goodness of fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index
Table 6

*Relative Importance Analyses for Enacted Civility (T2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 7

Relative Importance Analyses for Enacted Incivility (T2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-.56*</td>
<td>-.58*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 8  
*Relative Importance Analyses for OCB Courtesy (T2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.  
*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 9
Relative Importance Analyses for OCB Altruism (T2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 10

*Relative Importance Analyses for OCB Conscientiousness (T2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 11

**Relative Importance Analyses for OCB Civic Virtue (T2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>31.67</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 12
Relative Importance Analyses for OCB Sportsmanship (T2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-.56*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the R^2 of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 13  
*Relative Importance Analyses for Prosocial Organizational Behaviour (T2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>14.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 14
*Relative Importance Analyses for Prosocial Individual Behaviour (T2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>42.96</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the R² of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 15
Relative Importance Analyses for Role Prescribed Prosocial Organizational Behaviour (T2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>GRAT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.06*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GRAT = gratitude; AGREE = agreeableness; CON = conscientiousness; PJ = procedural justice; AOC = affective organizational commitment; JS = job satisfaction. Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 16

*Summary of Hypotheses for Enacted Civility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1</strong></td>
<td>Enacted incivility will be negatively associated with enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2a</strong></td>
<td>OCBs will be positively associated with enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2b</strong></td>
<td>The courtesy dimension will show the strongest relationship with enacted civility compared to the other OCB dimensions</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3</strong></td>
<td>Prosocial organizational behaviours will be positively associated with enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 4</strong></td>
<td>Trait NA will not be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5</strong></td>
<td>Trait PA will be a significant predictor of enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 6</strong></td>
<td>Gratitude will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7</strong></td>
<td>Agreeableness will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 8</strong></td>
<td>Conscientiousness will a significant predictor of increased enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 9</strong></td>
<td>Perceptions of procedural justice will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 10</strong></td>
<td>Affective organizational commitment will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 11</strong></td>
<td>Job satisfaction will be a significant predictor of increased enacted civility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 12</strong></td>
<td>Positive constructs (i.e., PA, gratitude, conscientiousness, agreeableness, job satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice) will be more important than negative constructs (i.e., NA) in explaining variance in civility compared to incivility.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 13</strong></td>
<td>Stable traits (i.e., PA, NA, gratitude, conscientiousness, agreeableness) will be more important than situation-specific constructs (i.e., job satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice) in explaining variance in civility than OCBs.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 14</strong></td>
<td>Stable traits (i.e., PA, NA, gratitude, conscientiousness, agreeableness) will be more important than situation-specific constructs (i.e., job satisfaction, affective commitment, procedural justice) in explaining variance in civility than role-prescribed and POBs directed towards the organization.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-Factor Model</td>
<td>Two-Factor Model (Uncorrelated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Civility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>CFI = .784</td>
<td>CFI = .898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI = .631</td>
<td>GFI = .826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA = .208</td>
<td>RMSEA = .143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI = .741</td>
<td>TLI = .877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( X^2 (65) = 2312.45 )</td>
<td>( X^2 (65) = 1133.55 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X^2 (1) = 495.12, ( p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Coworker Support</td>
<td>CFI = .783</td>
<td>CFI = .837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI = .612</td>
<td>GFI = .773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA = .164</td>
<td>RMSEA = .142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI = .755</td>
<td>TLI = .816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( X^2 (135) = 3026.94 )</td>
<td>( X^2 (135) = 2305.24 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X^2 (1) = 723.18, ( p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incivility</td>
<td>CFI = .503</td>
<td>CFI = .934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI = .361</td>
<td>GFI = .851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA = .278</td>
<td>RMSEA = .102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI = .426</td>
<td>TLI = .924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( X^2 (104) = 6480.98 )</td>
<td>( X^2 (104) = 953.71 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X^2 (1) = 33.87, ( p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal justice</td>
<td>CFI = .716</td>
<td>CFI = .914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI = .588</td>
<td>GFI = .840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA = .235</td>
<td>RMSEA = .130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI = .660</td>
<td>TLI = .897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( X^2 (65) = 2943.48 )</td>
<td>( X^2 (65) = 939.31 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X^2 (1) = 257.44, ( p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNQ-B</td>
<td>CFI = .761</td>
<td>CFI = .859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI = .698</td>
<td>GFI = .800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA = .203</td>
<td>RMSEA = .155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI = .713</td>
<td>TLI = .831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( X^2 (65) = 2174.68 )</td>
<td>( X^2 (65) = 1307.95 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X^2 (1) = 209.90, ( p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHA</td>
<td>CFI = .773</td>
<td>CFI = .888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civility</td>
<td>GFI = .592</td>
<td>GFI = .834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA = .163</td>
<td>RMSEA = .115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI = .741</td>
<td>TLI = .872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( X^2 (119) = 2632.92 )</td>
<td>( X^2 (119) = 1362.99 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X^2 (1) = 433.76, ( p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 773 \). CFI = comparative fit index; GFI = goodness of fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index.
Table 18  
*Relative Importance Analyses for Emotional Exhaustion (T2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>CIVILITY</th>
<th>INCIVILITY</th>
<th>VHA</th>
<th>CNQ-B-C</th>
<th>CNQ_B-I</th>
<th>RESPECT</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>IJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. VHA = VHA civility norms; CNQ_B-C = civility subscale; CNQ_B-I = incivility subscale; PCS = perceived coworker support; IJ = interpersonal justice; Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the \( R^2 \) of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.  
*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 19

Relative Importance Analysis for Cynicism (T2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>CIVILITY</th>
<th>INCIVILITY</th>
<th>VHA</th>
<th>CNQ-B-C</th>
<th>CNQ_B-I</th>
<th>RESPECT</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>IJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>58.38</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. VHA = VHA civility norms; CNQ_B-C = civility subscale; CNQ_B-I = incivility subscale; PCS = perceived coworker support; IJ = interpersonal justice; Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 20
**Relative Importance Analyses for Mental Wellbeing (T2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>CIVILITY</th>
<th>INCIVILITY</th>
<th>VHA</th>
<th>CNQ-B-C</th>
<th>CNQ-B-I</th>
<th>RESPECT</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>IJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. VHA = VHA civility norms; CNQ_B-C = civility subscale; CNQ_B-I = incivility subscale; PCS = perceived coworker support; IJ = interpersonal justice; Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 21
Relative Importance Analyses for Psychological Safety (T2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>CIVILITY</th>
<th>INCIVILITY</th>
<th>VHA</th>
<th>CNQ-B-C</th>
<th>CNQ_B-I</th>
<th>RESPECT</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>IJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>20.31</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>12.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. VHA = VHA civility norms; CNQ_B-C = civility subscale; CNQ_B-I = incivility subscale; PCS = perceived coworker support; IJ = interpersonal justice; Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>CIVILITY</th>
<th>INCIVILITY</th>
<th>VHA</th>
<th>CNQ-B-C</th>
<th>CNQ_B-I</th>
<th>RESPECT</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>IJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. VHA = VHA civility norms; CNQ_B-C = civility subscale; CNQ_B-I = incivility subscale; PCS = perceived coworker support; IJ = interpersonal justice; Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the R² of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 23
Relative Importance Analyses for Job Satisfaction (T2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>CIVILITY</th>
<th>INCIVILITY</th>
<th>VHA</th>
<th>CNQ-B-C</th>
<th>CNQ_B-I</th>
<th>RESPECT</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>IJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized regression coefficient</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance Weight</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescaled Importance Weight</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. VHA = VHA civility norms; CNQ_B-C = civility subscale; CNQ_B-I = incivility subscale; PCS = perceived coworker support; IJ = interpersonal justice; Relative importance weights are univariate relative weights, which sum to the $R^2$ of the full model. Rescaled importance weights are calculated by dividing the raw importance weights by the full model and sum to 1.

*Significance of coefficients or weights due to 95% confidence intervals not including zero.
Table 24
Summary of Hypotheses for Experienced Civility

**Hypothesis 15**: Workplace incivility will be negatively associated with experienced civility
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 16**: Civility norms will be positively associated with experienced civility
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 17**: Respect will be positively associated with experienced civility
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 18**: Perceived coworker support will be positively associated with experienced civility
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 19**: Interpersonal justice will be positively associated with experienced civility
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 20a**: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of emotional exhaustion
- **Not Supported**

**Hypothesis 20b**: Experienced civility will be a less important predictor of emotional exhaustion than incivility
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 20c**: Experienced civility will be a less important predictor of emotional exhaustion than respect or interpersonal justice
- **Partially Supported**

**Hypothesis 21a**: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of cynicism
- **Not Supported**

**Hypothesis 21b**: Experienced civility will be a more important predictor of cynicism than incivility
- **Not Supported**

**Hypothesis 22a**: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of mental wellbeing
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 22b**: Experienced civility will be a more important predictor of mental wellbeing than incivility
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 23a**: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of psychological safety
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 23b**: Civility norms will be a more important predictor of psychological safety than experienced civility.
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 24a**: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of affective commitment.
- **Supported**

**Hypothesis 24b**: Respect and interpersonal justice will be more important predictors of affective commitment than experienced civility.
- **Partially Supported**

**Hypothesis 25**: Experienced civility will be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.
- **Supported**
Figure 1. Summary of Antecedents, Outcomes, and Core Constructs
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APPENDIX A: CIVIL BEHAVIOURS SCALE

RESPECTFUL ENGAGEMENT SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Organizational members here are always available to hear out and listen to each other
2. Organizational members here pay the utmost attention to each other’s needs
3. Organizational members here express genuine interest in each other’s position and the units they are managing and responsible for
4. Organizational members here recognize and understand what goes into each other’s work
5. Organizational members here emphasize other members’ good sides
6. Organizational members here express appreciation and respect for each other’s contribution to the organization
7. Organizational members here appreciate how valuable other members’ time is
8. Organizational members here make requests, not demands from each other
9. Organizational members here speak to each other in a respectful rather than in a demanding way

BEHAVIOURAL CIVILITY SCALE: (Experienced)

How often have you experienced the following behaviours from coworkers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Available to hear me out and listen to me
2. Pay the utmost attention to my needs
3. Express genuine interest in my position
4. Recognize and understand what goes into my work
5. Emphasize my good sides
6. Express appreciation and respect for my contribution to the organization
7. Appreciate how valuable my time is
8. Make requests, not demands from me
9. Speak to me in a respectful rather than in a demanding way
BEHAVIOURAL CIVILITY SCALE: (Enacted)

How often have you engaged in the following behaviours towards coworkers:

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have been available to hear out and listen to my coworkers
2. I have paid the utmost attention to my coworker’s needs
3. I have expressed genuine interest in my coworker’s position
4. I have recognized and understood what goes into my coworker’s work
5. I have emphasized my coworker’s good sides
6. I have expressed appreciation and respect for my coworker’s contribution to the organization
7. I have appreciated how valuable my coworker’s time is
8. I have made requests, not demands from my coworkers
9. I have spoken to my coworkers in a respectful rather than in a demanding way
APPENDIX B: TIME 1 SURVEY

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Civility in the Workplace

As a full-time employee you are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Ashlyn Patterson and Dr. M. Gloria González-Morales at the University of Guelph in Guelph, Ontario, Canada. The results will contribute to Ashlyn Patterson’s PhD dissertation.

The only requirement is that you have been employed at the same location for at least the last 6-months.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact: Dr. M. Gloria González-Morales at gonzalez.morales@uoguelph.ca or Ashlyn Patterson at ashlyn@uoguelph.ca.

PLEASE PRINT THIS CONSENT FORM AND SAVE FOR YOUR RECORDS

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research study is to identify how workplace relationships affect work-related outcomes.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

- Complete two 30-minute surveys (taken at least 2 weeks apart).
- Participation will take one hour of your time in total.

Follow-Up

You can contact Dr. M. Gloria González-Morales for the aggregated results at gonzalez.morales@uoguelph.ca.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

We do not anticipate any major risks unless there was a data breach. If the results of the surveys were made publicly available with identifiers, the impact in the workplace could be quite large. This breach could lead to the termination of employment of an employee or to risks related to the public image of an organization (e.g., finding out that most employees have common negative issues with the organization).

By sending identifying information electronically, security cannot be guaranteed. We will minimize the risk by sending the data and the identifying and contact information in separate electronic transmissions. Please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the internet. De-identified data (codes instead of emails) will be sent electronically to the research team.

Computers and hard drives where data is stored are password protected and encrypted. All results will be reported without identifying information.
If you feel any discomfort at any time please contact the researcher. Please, remember that you can leave the study without negative consequences for you,

**POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY**

In terms of benefits to the participants: participation may provide insights about your workplace relationships.

This study will add to the body of knowledge and extend our understanding of how workplace relationships impact important work-related outcomes.

In terms of benefits to society, this research will assist in understanding how to make work more fulfilling and supportive.

**PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION**

Participants will receive 30 market points (equivalent to $1.50 USD) each time they complete the survey (60 points total) which you can redeem for various gift cards. Qualtrics will handle payment.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study.

All the information gathered through the research study will be confidential and only the research team from University of Guelph will have access to identifying study data. An encrypted master list of the participants will be kept in a separate and encrypted location in Dr. Gonzalez-Morales computers (office or lab) in case further contact with participants is needed.

No data that identifies any participant or a participant’s study data will be disclosed to the management of your company. If there is any risk of possible participant identification, the information will only be reported in a way that guarantees confidentiality. Any data reported through reports or presentations arising from the study will be anonymized and contain no information tying it to an individual participant.

Data will not be anonymous because the study compares questionnaire results at different points in time. **However, the data will be recoded with a personal code rather than an email so that complete confidentiality can be assured.** Data from surveys completed by participants will be encrypted and kept on secure servers.

*"If you think IT or management may monitor your responses either use a private (off the network) computer."

If you choose to use a public computer to fill out the online questionnaire, use the following instructions after completing the survey ensure confidentiality:

1. Clear the browsing history
2. Clear the cache
3. Clear the cookies
4. Clear the authenticated session
5. LOG OFF

**PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL**

You can choose whether to be in this research study or not.
Your decision to participate or not participate in this study will not affect your relationship or professional standing with your employer.

If you volunteer to be in this research study, you may withdraw your consent to use your data for research at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also skip questions you do not want to answer.

If you withdraw from the research project, prior to completion, you will be paid.

You may exercise the option of removing your data from the study up until the second survey is complete. If you wish the data collected to date to be destroyed, this will be done.

In order to withdraw from the study please contact Ashlyn Patterson at ashlyn@uoguelph.ca. Nobody else will know that you withdrew from the study.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants.

If you have any questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB #16JA010), please contact: Director, Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; 1-519-824-4120 ext. 56606.

You do not waive any legal rights by agreeing to take part in this study.

I have read the information provided for the study “Civility in the Workplace” as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction.
Please respond to the following questions honestly as possible – there are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be confidential and nobody but the research team will have access to your data.

**Civility Norm Questionnaire-Brief**

Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rude Behaviour is not accepted by your coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Angry outbursts are not tolerated by anyone in your work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Respectful treatment is the norm in your work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Your coworkers make sure everyone in your work group is treated with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VHA Civility Scale**

Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>People treat each other with respect in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A spirit of cooperation and teamwork exists in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Disputes or conflicts are resolved fairly in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The people I work with take a personal interest in me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The people I work with can be relied on when I need help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>This organization does not tolerate discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Differences among individuals are respected and valued in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Managers/supervisors work well with employees of different backgrounds in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experienced Workplace Incivility Scale

During the past month, have you been in a situation where any of your supervisors or coworkers:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Never                                      Most of the Time

1. Put you down or was condescending to you?
2. Paid little attention to your statement or showed little interest in your opinion?
3. Made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you?
4. Addressed you in unprofessional terms, either publically or privately?
5. Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie?
6. Doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility?
7. Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal matters?

Enacted Workplace Incivility Scale

How often have you exhibited the following behaviours in the past month to someone at work?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hardly Ever                                      Frequently

1. Put down others or were condescending to them in some way
2. Paid little attention to a statement made by someone or showed little interest in their opinion
3. Made demeaning, rude or derogatory remarks about someone
4. Addressed someone in unprofessional terms either privately or publicly
5. Ignored or excluded someone from professional camaraderie (e.g., social conversation)
6. Doubted someone’s judgment in a matter over which they have responsibility
7. Made unwanted attempts to draw someone into a discussion of personal matters
**BEHAVIOURAL CIVILITY SCALE: (Experienced)**

How often have you *experienced* the following behaviours *from* coworkers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Available to listen to me
2. Pay the utmost attention to my needs
3. Express genuine interest in my work position
4. Recognize what goes into my work
5. Emphasize my good sides
6. Express appreciation for my contribution to the organization
7. Respect how valuable my time is
8. Make requests, not demands from me
9. Speak to me in a respectful rather than in a demanding way

**BEHAVIOURAL CIVILITY SCALE: (Enacted)**

How often have you *engaged in* the following behaviours *towards* coworkers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have been available to listen to my coworkers
2. I have paid the utmost attention to my coworker’s needs
3. I have expressed genuine interest in my coworker’s work position
4. I have recognized what goes into my coworker’s work
5. I have emphasized my coworker’s good sides
6. I have expressed appreciation for my coworker’s contribution to the organization
7. I have respected how valuable my coworker’s time is
8. I have made requests, not demands from my coworkers
9. I have spoken to my coworkers in a respectful rather than in a demanding way
Perceived Coworker Support

Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.


1. My coworkers are supportive of my goals and values
2. Help is available from my coworkers when I have a problem
3. My coworkers really care about my well-being
4. My coworkers are willing to offer assistance to help me perform my job to the best of my ability
5. Even if I did the best job possible, my coworkers would fail to notice
6. My coworkers care about my general satisfaction at work
7. My coworkers show very little concern for me
8. My coworkers care about my opinions
9. My coworkers are complimentary of my accomplishments at work
10. Please select “Strongly Disagree” for this statement” **This was used as an attention check

Prosocial Organizational Behaviour

Please rate the extent to which you engage in the following behaviours:


1. Speaks favourably about the organization to outsiders
2. Is receptive to new ideas
3. Tolerates temporary inconveniences without complaint
4. Offers ideas to improve the functioning of the department
5. Expresses loyalty toward the organization
6. Takes action to protect the organization from potential problems
7. Uses tact when dealing with others
8. Arrives at work on time
9. Assigns work to student workers fairly
10. Gives advance notice if unable to attend work
11. Uses resources without unnecessary waste
12. Uses work time wisely
13. Completes work requested as soon as possible
14. Complies with organizational policies and procedures
15. Sends birthday greetings to co-workers in the office
16. Collects money for flowers for sick co-workers or funerals
17. Brings in food to share with co-workers
18. Coordinates department get-togethers
19. Assists co-workers or students with personal problems
20. Does a personal favour for someone

Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements describing your approach to work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Helps others who have heavy work loads
2. Is the classic ‘squeaky wheel” that always needs greasing
3. Believes in giving an honest day’s work for an honest day’s pay
4. Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters
5. Tries to avoid creating problems for coworkers
6. Keeps abreast of changes in the organization
7. Tends to make “mountains out of molehills”
8. Considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers
9. Attends meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important
10. Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her
11. Attends functions that are not required, but help the company image
12. Reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on
13. Helps others who have been absent
14. Does not abuse the rights of others
15. Willingly helps others who have work related problems
16. Always focuses on what’s wrong, rather than the positive side
17. Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers
18. Attendance at work is above the norm
19. Always finds fault with what the organization is doing
20. Is mindful of how his/her behaviour affects other people’s jobs
21. Does not take extra breaks
22. Obeys company rules and regulations even when no one is watching
23. Helps orient new people even though it is not required
24. Is one of my most conscientious employees
Interpersonal Justice

The following items refer to your supervisor, the person that you report to in terms of tasks and responsibilities. To what extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Has he/she treated you in a polite manner?
2. Has he/she treated you with dignity?
3. Has he/she treated you with respect?
4. Has he/she refrained from improper remarks or comments?

Perceived Respect

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. People at my organization value my ideas and efforts
2. People at my organization respect the work I do
3. People at my organization value me as a member of the organization
4. People at my organization react well to me and make me feel included

Job Satisfaction

Please rate to what extent you believe the following statement apply to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All in all, I am satisfied with my job
2. In general, I don't like my job
3. In general, I like working here
**Procedural Justice**

The following items refer to the procedures used by your company (for example by your supervisor, management, HR) to determine the work that you do (amount, type, assigned tasks and teams) and how you are compensated for your work. To what extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures?
2. Have you had influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?
3. Have those procedures been applied consistently?
4. Have those procedures been free of bias?
5. Have those procedures been based on accurate information?
6. Have you been able to appeal the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?
7. Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards?

---

**Dispositional Gratitude**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have so much in life to be thankful for.
2. If I had to list everything that I felt grateful for, it would be a very long list.
3. When I look at the world, I don’t see much to be grateful for.
4. I am grateful to a wide variety of people.
5. As I get older I find myself more able to appreciate the people, events, and situations that have been part of my life history.
6. Long amounts of time can go by before I feel grateful to something or someone.
7. Please select “Strongly Disagree” for this statement” **This was used as an attention check**
The PANAS (Trait)

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you generally feel this way, that is, how you feel on the average. Use the following scale to record your answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distressed</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guilty</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scared</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostile</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irritable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alert</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ashamed</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspired</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determined</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jittery</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Affective Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am very happy being a member of this organization
2. I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it
3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one (Reverse)
5. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization (Reverse)
6. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization (Reverse)
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me
8. I do not feel a ‘strong’ sense of belonging to my organization (Reverse)

### The Big Five Inventory

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I am someone who…

1. _____ Is talkative
2. _____ Tends to find fault with others
3. _____ Does a thorough job
4. _____ Is depressed, blue
5. _____ Is reserved
6. _____ Is helpful and unselfish with others
7. _____ Can be somewhat careless
8. _____ Is relaxed, handles stress well.
9. _____ Is full of energy
10. _____ Starts quarrels with others
11. _____ Is a reliable worker
12. _____ Can be tense
13. _____ Generates a lot of enthusiasm
14. _____ Has a forgiving nature
Demographics

1. What is your gender identity?
   a. Man
   b. Woman
   c. Another gender identity, please specify: __________
   d. I prefer not to respond

2. What is your racial or ethnic identification
   a. Aboriginal/First Nations/Indigenous/Inuit/Metis
   b. African/Black/Caribbean
   c. Chinese
   d. Filipino
   e. Japanese
   f. Korean
   g. Latin American
   h. Middle Eastern
   i. South Asian (i.e., East Indian, Pakistani etc.)
   j. Southeast Asian (i.e., Vietnamese, Cambodian etc.)
   k. West Asian (i.e., Iranian, Afghan etc.)
   l. White/Caucasian
   m. Mixed
   n. Other

3. Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?
   a. Heterosexual
   b. Lesbian
   c. Gay
   d. Bisexual
   e. Another sexual orientation, please specify: __________
   f. Questioning or unsure
   g. I prefer not to respond

4. Do you identify as a person with a disability?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I prefer not to respond

5. Is English your first language?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I prefer not to respond

6. How old are you in years:

7. Are you currently married/in a serious relationship?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I prefer not to respond

8. Do you have children?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I prefer not to respond

9. How long have you been working in your current position in this organization?

10. Do you work…?
    a. Full-time (permanent position)
    b. Full-time (not permanent position)
    c. Part-time (permanent position)
    d. Part-time (not permanent position)
    e. As a student assistant/intern
    f. Other type of work. Please specify: __________
“Thank you for completing the survey! You will be contacted again in 2 weeks asking you if you are interested in completing another 30-minute survey which you will be compensated again”
APPENDIX C: TIME 2 SURVEY

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Civility in the Workplace

As a full-time employee you are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Ashlyn Patterson and Dr. M. Gloria González-Morales at the University of Guelph in Guelph, Ontario, Canada. The results will contribute to Ashlyn Patterson’s PhD dissertation.

The only requirement is that you have been employed at the same location for at least the last 6-months.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact: Dr. M. Gloria González-Morales at gonzalez.morales@uoguelph.ca or Ashlyn Patterson at ashlyn@uoguelph.ca.

PLEASE PRINT THIS CONSENT FORM AND SAVE FOR YOUR RECORDS

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research study is to identify how workplace relationships affect work-related outcomes.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

- Complete two 30-minute surveys (taken at least 2 weeks apart).
- Participation will take one hour of your time in total.

Follow-Up

You can contact Dr. M. Gloria González-Morales for the aggregated results at gonzalez.morales@uoguelph.ca.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

We do not anticipate any major risks unless there was a data breach. If the results of the surveys were made publicly available with identifiers, the impact in the workplace could be quite large. This breach could lead to the termination of employment of an employee or to risks related to the public image of an organization (e.g., finding out that most employees have common negative issues with the organization).

By sending identifying information electronically, security cannot be guaranteed. We will minimize the risk by sending the data and the identifying and contact information in separate electronic transmissions. Please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the internet. De-identified data (codes instead of emails) will be sent electronically to the research team.

Computers and hard drives where data is stored are password protected and encrypted. All results will be reported without identifying information.
If you feel any discomfort at any time please contact the researcher. Please, remember that you can leave the study without negative consequences for you,

**POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY**

In terms of benefits to the participants: participation may provide insights about your workplace relationships.

This study will add to the body of knowledge and extend our understanding of how workplace relationships impact important work-related outcomes.

In terms of benefits to society, this research will assist in understanding how to make work more fulfilling and supportive.

**PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION**

Participants will receive 30 market points (equivalent to $1.50 USD) each time they complete the survey (60 points total) which you can redeem for various gift cards. Qualtrics will handle payment.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study.

All the information gathered through the research study will be confidential and only the research team from University of Guelph will have access to identifying study data. An encrypted master list of the participants will be kept in a separate and encrypted location in Dr. Gonzalez-Morales computers (office or lab) in case further contact with participants is needed.

No data that identifies any participant or a participant’s study data will be disclosed to the management of your company. If there is any risk of possible participant identification, the information will only be reported in a way that guarantees confidentiality. Any data reported through reports or presentations arising from the study will be anonymized and contain no information tying it to an individual participant.

Data will not be anonymous because the study compares questionnaire results at different points in time. However, the data will be recoded with a personal code rather than an email so that complete confidentiality can be assured. Data from surveys completed by participants will be encrypted and kept on secure servers.

"If you think IT or management may monitor your responses either use a private (off the network) computer.

If you choose to use a public computer to fill out the online questionnaire, use the following instructions after completing the survey ensure confidentiality:
1. Clear the browsing history
2. Clear the cache
3. Clear the cookies
4. Clear the authenticated session
5. LOG OFF

**PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL**

You can choose whether to be in this research study or not.
Your decision to participate or not participate in this study will not affect your relationship or professional standing with your employer.

If you volunteer to be in this research study, you may withdraw your consent to use your data for research at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also skip questions you do not want to answer.

If you withdraw from the research project, prior to completion, you will be paid.

You may exercise the option of removing your data from the study up until the second survey is complete. If you wish the data collected to date to be destroyed, this will be done.

In order to withdraw from the study please contact Ashlyn Patterson at ashlyn@uoguelph.ca. Nobody else will know that you withdrew from the study.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants.

If you have any questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB #16JA010), please contact: Director, Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; 1-519-824-4120 ext. 56606.

You do not waive any legal rights by agreeing to take part in this study.

I have read the information provided for the study “Civility in the Workplace” as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction.
Please respond to the following questions honestly as possible – there are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be confidential and nobody but the research team will have access to your data.

**Civility Norm Questionnaire-Brief**

Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Rude Behaviour is not accepted by your coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Angry outbursts are not tolerated by anyone in your work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Respectful treatment is the norm in your work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Your coworkers make sure everyone in your work group is treated with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VHA Civility Scale**

Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>People treat each other with respect in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>A spirit of cooperation and teamwork exists in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Disputes or conflicts are resolved fairly in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The people I work with take a personal interest in me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The people I work with can be relied on when I need help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>This organization does not tolerate discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Differences among individuals are respected and valued in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Managers/supervisors work well with employees of different backgrounds in my work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experienced Workplace Incivility Scale

During the past month, have you been in a situation where any of your supervisors or coworkers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Put you down or was condescending to you?
9. Paid little attention to your statement or showed little interest in your opinion?
10. Made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you?
11. Addressed you in unprofessional terms, either publically or privately?
12. Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie?
13. Doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility?
14. Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal matters?

Enacted Workplace Incivility Scale

How often have you exhibited the following behaviours in the past month to someone at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardly Ever</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Put down others or were condescending to them in some way
9. Paid little attention to a statement made by someone or showed little interest in their opinion
10. Made demeaning, rude or derogatory remarks about someone
11. Addressed someone in unprofessional terms either privately or publicly
12. Ignored or excluded someone from professional camaraderie (e.g., social conversation)
13. Doubted someone’s judgment in a matter over which they have responsibility
14. Made unwanted attempts to draw someone into a discussion of personal matters
**BEHAVIOURAL CIVILITY SCALE: (Experienced)**

How often have you *experienced* the following behaviours *from* coworkers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Available to listen to me
11. Pay the utmost attention to my needs
12. Express genuine interest in my work position
13. Recognize what goes into my work
14. Emphasize my good sides
15. Express appreciation for my contribution to the organization
16. Respect how valuable my time is
17. Make requests, not demands from me
18. Speak to me in a respectful rather than in a demanding way

**BEHAVIOURAL CIVILITY SCALE: (Enacted)**

How often have you *engaged in* the following behaviours *towards* coworkers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I have been available to listen to my coworkers
11. I have paid the utmost attention to my coworker’s needs
12. I have expressed genuine interest in my coworker’s work position
13. I have recognized what goes into my coworker’s work
14. I have emphasized my coworker’s good sides
15. I have expressed appreciation for my coworker’s contribution to the organization
16. I have respected how valuable my coworker’s time is
17. I have made requests, not demands from my coworkers
18. I have spoken to my coworkers in a respectful rather than in a demanding way
Perceived Coworker Support

Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My coworkers are supportive of my goals and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Help is available from my coworkers when I have a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My coworkers really care about my well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My coworkers are willing to offer assistance to help me perform my job to the best of my ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, my coworkers would fail to notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My coworkers care about my general satisfaction at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My coworkers show very little concern for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My coworkers care about my opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>My coworkers are complimentary of my accomplishments at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Please select “Strongly Disagree” for this statement <strong>This was used as an attention check</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prosocial Organizational Behaviour

Please rate the extent to which you engage in the following behaviours:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Speaks favourably about the organization to outsiders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Is receptive to new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Tolerates temporary inconveniences without complaint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Offers ideas to improve the functioning of the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Expresses loyalty toward the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Takes action to protect the organization from potential problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Uses tact when dealing with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Arrives at work on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Assigns work to student workers fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Gives advance notice if unable to attend work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Uses resources without unnecessary waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Uses work time wisely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Completes work requested as soon as possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Complies with organizational policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Sends birthday greetings to co-workers in the office
36. Collects money for flowers for sick co-workers or funerals
37. Brings in food to share with co-workers
38. Coordinates department get-togethers
39. Assists co-workers or students with personal problems
40. Does a personal favour for someone

Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements describing your approach to work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Helps others who have heavy work loads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Is the classic ‘squeaky wheel’ that always needs greasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Believes in giving an honest day’s work for an honest day’s pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Tries to avoid creating problems for coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Keeps abreast of changes in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Tends to make “mountains out of molehills”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Considers the impact of his/her actions on coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Attends meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Attends functions that are not required, but help the company image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Reads and keeps up with organization announcements, memos, and so on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Helps others who have been absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Does not abuse the rights of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Willingly helps others who have work related problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Always focuses on what’s wrong, rather than the positive side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Takes steps to try to prevent problems with other workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Attendance at work is above the norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Always finds fault with what the organization is doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Is mindful of how his/her behaviour affects other people’s jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Does not take extra breaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Obeys company rules and regulations even when no one is watching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Helps orient new people even though it is not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Is one of my most conscientious employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interpersonal Justice**

The following items refer to your supervisor, the person that you report to in terms of tasks and responsibilities. To what extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Has he/she treated you in a polite manner?
6. Has he/she treated you with dignity?
7. Has he/she treated you with respect?
8. Has he/she refrained from improper remarks or comments?

**Perceived Respect**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. People at my organization value my ideas and efforts
6. People at my organization respect the work I do
7. People at my organization value me as a member of the organization
8. People at my organization react well to me and make me feel included

**Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate to what extent you believe the following statement apply to you:

4. All in all, I am satisfied with my job
5. In general, I don’t like my job
6. In general, I like working here
Affective Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I am very happy being a member of this organization
10. I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it
11. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own
12. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one (Reverse)
13. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization (Reverse)
14. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization (Reverse)
15. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me
16. I do not feel a ‘strong’ sense of belonging to my organization (Reverse)

Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are some statements about feelings and thoughts. Please select the response that best describes your experience of each over the last month…

1) I’ve been feeling optimistic about the future
2) I’ve been feeling useful
3) I’ve been feeling relaxed
4) I’ve been feeling interested in other people
5) I’ve had energy to spare
6) I’ve been dealing with problems well
7) I’ve been thinking clearly
8) I’ve been feeling good about myself
9) I’ve been feeling close to other people
10) I’ve been feeling confident
11) I’ve been feeling loved
12) I’ve been able to make up my own mind about things
13) I’ve been interested in new things
14) I’ve been feeling cheerful
15) Please respond “always” to this item **This was used as an attention check
Psychological Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If you make a mistake on this team, it is often held against you
2. Members of this team are able to bring up problems and tough issues
3. People on this team sometimes reject others for being different
4. It is safe to take a risk on this team
5. It is difficult to ask other members of this team for help
6. No one on this team would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts
7. Working with members of this team, my unique skills and talents are valued and utilized

Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)*

Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items for the MBI are copyrighted and cannot be reproduced in theses or dissertations.
Demographics

11. What is your gender identity?
   a. Man
   b. Woman
   c. Another gender identity, please specify: __________
   d. I prefer not to respond

12. What is your racial or ethnic identification
   a. Aboriginal/First Nations/Indigenous/Inuit/Metis
   b. African/Black/Caribbean
   c. Chinese
   d. Filipino
   e. Japanese
   f. Korean
   g. Latin American
   h. Middle Eastern
   i. South Asian (i.e., East Indian, Pakistani etc.)
   j. Southeast Asian (i.e., Vietnamese, Cambodian etc.)
   k. West Asian (i.e., Iranian, Afghan etc.)
   l. White/Caucasian
   m. Mixed
   n. Other

13. Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?
   a. Heterosexual
   b. Lesbian
   c. Gay
   d. Bisexual
   e. Another sexual orientation, please specify: __________
   f. Questioning or unsure
   g. I prefer not to respond

14. Do you identify as a person with a disability?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I prefer not to respond

15. Is English your first language?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I prefer not to respond

16. How old are you in years:

17. Are you currently married/in a serious relationship?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I prefer not to respond

18. Do you have children?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I prefer not to respond

19. How long have you been working in your current position in this organization?

20. Do you work…?
   a. Full-time (permanent position)
   b. Full-time (not permanent position)
   c. Part-time (permanent position)
   d. Part-time (not permanent position)
   e. As a student assistant/intern
   f. Other type of work. Please specify: __________