

## Workplace Civility Climate in Higher Educational Institutions -Validating the Assessment Model

**\*Dr. BRAD BEST GFD**

*Research scholar  
Assam University, Silchar*

**\*\* .PROF.S.M.PRASAD**

*(Supervisor) Head, Dept. of Business  
Administration Assam University,*

### Abstract

In today's world maintaining a healthy workplace is crucial. In the higher education institution, the teaching and non-teaching staff should aim to mitigate workplace anxieties by promoting teamwork, mutual support, the wellbeing of the staff and mutual respect. In this article, an attempt has been made to assess and examine means differences of the items scores under the Workplace Civility Climate by the workers/employees at higher educational institutions. The article also tries to revalidate the items and scale of workplace civility climate measures used in the study in higher learning institutions. The article also tries to classify and structure the items under the construct(s) for determining the principal component analysis. To conduct this study a survey-based empirical method was applied including a mixed research design; partly analytical and partly empirical. The data was collected from the survey process for component structure determination under the T-test, factor analysis, and reliability test method. The result of the analysis is explained under the four components i.e. the attributes of the workplace civility climate.

**Keywords:** *tolerance, verbal abuse, disrespectful treatment, interpersonal Conflict, blaming, embarrassment.*

**Introduction:** Organizations dedicated to improving people's health have a major impact on a nation's economy and Organizational climate refers to the individual perceptions employees form regarding an organization's practices, policies and procedures (Rentsch, 1990; Schneider, 1990). Since organizations have multiple goals and methods of attaining goals, they must develop policies and procedures for the facets of organizational functioning for which they are concerned (Zohar, 2002). As a result, it is common practice for climate researchers to be specific concerning some aspects of organizational functioning, such as service and innovation (Schneider, Wheeler, & Cox, 1992; Anderson & West, 1998). Safety climate is concerned with the perceptions employees form about the importance management places upon workplace safety and management action towards safety (Dedobbeleer & Beland, 1998; Flin, Mearns, O'Connor, & Bryden, 2000; Glendon & Stanton, 2000; Probst, 2004; Thompson, Hilton, & Witt, 1998; Zohar, 1980). Specifically, management can take action to promote a safe working environment by instituting policies and procedures that can guide employee behaviours related to safety, such as the use of personal protective equipment in designated hazard areas and the documentation of work-related injuries.

Furthermore, management can create a safe work environment by training employees on how to identify unsafe working conditions and to deal with unsafe situations that might arise at work such as emergency shutdown and evacuation procedures for unexpected system failures. In addition to action, management must show concern for employee safety by being proactive in their approach to safety and fostering a

work environment where employees and management can have an open, free-flowing exchange about safety-related issues (Cheyne, Cox, Oliver, & Tomas, 1998).

Climate constructs are typically assessed by the aggregation of individual perceptions to the required unit of analysis (i.e., workgroup, department, organization) and using the mean of the perceptions or an index of agreement (e.g., intraclass correlation or within-group correlation) to indicate the degree of convergence of employee perceptions (Zohar & Luria, 2005; Reichers & Schneider, 1990). However, measuring safety climate at the individual level is also adequate for two reasons. First, although specific climates in organizations represent a shared perception among individuals, not all individuals are affected in the same way. That is, employee environmental perceptions and their reactions to those perceptions can vary between individuals. Second, because of the number of units required for aggregation, the power required to achieve statistical significance is often limited. The lack of power increases the chances of making a type II error and leads to incorrect conclusions about the climate scale relationships with other variables.

Furthermore, aggregating individual perceptions to represent a climate construct should be used to draw inferences to similar levels of outcomes. For example, researchers would investigate how group-level safety climate relates to group-level outcomes such as accident and injury outcomes for the unit, instead of individual employees. This study employed a multi-source approach to serve as a proxy for group-level measurement that is typically used in climate research. Self- and peer-reports of workplace civility climate were obtained to examine the degree of convergence between employee perceptions of workplace civility climate. This multi-source approach allows us to determine if employees share perceptions regarding workplace civility climate, instead of idiosyncratic perceptions, thus allowing us to go beyond the individual level of perceptions.

Many studies have measured individual perceptions of safety climate and related them to constructs of interest at the individual level. For example, perceived safety climate has been related at the individual level to several safety outcomes such as perceptions of safety (e.g., DeJoy, Schaffer, Wilson, Vandenberg, & Butts, 2004), workplace injury (e.g., Siu, Phillips & Leung, 2004), near misses (e.g., Zacharatos, Barling, & Iverson, 2005), safety behaviours and performance (Hofmann & Stetzer, 1996; Neal, Griffin, & Hart, 2000; Zohar, 2000). In addition, perceived safety climate has been related to employee well-being such as job satisfaction and physical symptoms (Hayes, Perander, Smecko, & Trask, 1998) and psychological strains (Goldenhar, Williams, & Swanson, 2003).

Although safety climate has substantially contributed to the advancement of understanding and practice of workplace safety, it is not able to address employee safety from aggression for several reasons. First, a gap in the safety climate literature is a lack of attention to other types of safety within an organization. Typically, research in this area has been primarily concerned with how safety climate affects the occurrence of injury due to objective factors in the workplace such as ergonomic design, exposure to carcinogens, noise, heat, bacterial/viral agents, and unexpected energy release.

Maintenance for this can be originated in studies that emphasis on job sectors such as manufacturing (e.g., Probst, 2004; Zohar, 2000), oil and chemical process refineries (Flin, Kearns, O'Connor, & Bryden, 2000), construction (e.g., Siu, Phillips, & Leung, 2004), assembly of products and retail (e.g., Dejoy et al., 2004; Hoffman & Morgenson, 1999) and hospitals/nursing (Hayes, Perander, Smeko & Trask, 1998; Neal & Griffin, 2006; Neal, Griffin, & Hart, 2000). The focus of safety researchers on the aforementioned factors within these types of jobs is quite understandable given that they have convincingly shown that many of these workplaces are extremely hazardous to employee safety and health (Smith, Karsh, Carayon & Conway, 2005). As a result of this important focus, safety climate researchers have not addressed how climate can affect the occurrence of workplace aggression and violence.

However, two studies have investigated the effects of climate on the occurrence of workplace violence and related outcomes. First, Spector, Coulter, Stockwell and Matz (2007) developed a perceived violence

climate measure that assesses the extent to which employees perceive that management emphasizes the control and elimination of workplace violence. Using a sample of nurses in a hospital setting they found a significant negative relationship between nurses' perceptions of security climate and experiences of violence and verbal aggression, supporting their primary hypothesis that a good violent climate is related to low levels of aggression.

Kessler, Chang, Spector, and Parr (2008) constructed upon the efforts of Spector et al. (2007) by emerging a three-dimensional violence climate survey. The violence climate scale is composed of three dimensions: Policies and Procedures, Practices, and Pressure for unsafe practices. Their study found some encouraging results in that all dimensions of their scale correlated significantly with job satisfaction and verbal aggression. Furthermore, dimensions of violent climate predicted various strain outcomes, such as anger and job satisfaction, above and beyond the exposure to aggression and violence.

The studies on violent climate lend support to the idea that safety climate can be extended into the domain of workplace aggression. However, their scales considered more manifest and active forms of aggression and violence; whereas, the observed workplace civility climate scale pursues to see how an organization's practices, policies, and procedures against indirect, passive, and more frequently occurring acts of uncivil acts of aggression and individual and organizational outcomes.

Perceived Workplace Civility Climate Perceived workplace civility climate, is a direct extension of safety climate in that it is concerned with the perceptions employees form regarding the importance the organization places upon managing and preventing acts of incivility and verbally aggressive actions in the workplace. It addresses workplace conditions that encourage employees to treat co-workers respectfully and to avoid verbal forms of aggression in their interactions. An issue that employees face is the degree to which organizations are aware of employee experiences with these acts of aggression and the actions management will take, if any, to address these experiences.

Many uncivil and low-intensity items of verbally hostile behaviours go unnoticed by outside witnesses, specifically management, because of the uncertainty concerning the intention behind the acts (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). However, affected employees might still expect management to monitor and address these behaviours, even though management might not notice these behaviours. As a result, these behaviours might continue without concern or intervention from management, employees might feel like the organization does not care about their safety from these behaviours. In addition, research has shown that employees tend to view supervisors as representatives of management (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). As a result, employees might hold their immediate supervisors responsible for their situation. Thus, employee perceptions of this lack of awareness, concern, and action by the organization can lead to feelings of dissatisfaction with their job and supervision.

Civil treatment of individuals is often expected, and it is unlikely that organizations will post signs or send communications reminding employees to monitor their attitudes and treatment of co-workers. To disappoint acts of workplace violence members of management might have to model preferred behaviours and vigorously monitor the behaviour of employees to manage civility in the workplace. Similar to safety climate, the commonality principal all of these features of workplace civility climate is that it is primarily a top-down process (Zohar, 2000). Specifically, employees can be influenced by the interpersonal behaviour of supervisors and employees at higher levels within the hierarchy of the organization, such as behaviour management condones by employees, e.g., permitting employees to gossip about each other.

Thus, management can establish a good workplace civility climate in several ways. Management can state and emphasize to employees how co-workers are to be treated, urge supervisors to be cognizant of their behaviour in the workplace, discuss employee treatment of co-workers during performance reviews, and provide employees with adequate means for addressing issues of verbal aggression in the workplace without the fear of retaliation or punishment from the organization and its members. Just as a good safety climate relates to fewer injuries from accidents, then the same concept should apply to workplace civility

climate. That is, workplaces with good civility climates should have practices and policies in place that serve to mitigate the effects of experienced and committed acts of verbal aggression in the workplace.

An institute with a respectable workplace civility climate should relate to a lesser manifestation of verbalized aggression in the workplace. The climate for incivility would create a strong situation where employees who commit acts of verbal aggression would be likely to perceive negative consequences for their aggressive actions and help motivate employees to get along with co-workers because of norms of conduct in the workplace.

We must ponder the effect personality might have on employees' observation of workplace civility climates since the involvement of verbal aggression in the workplace is more open to explanation than more overt forms of aggression. Negative affectivity is the dispositional tendency for an individual to experience a myriad of negative mood states (Watson & Clark, 1984). Individuals high in negative affectivity might not recognize a workplace as having a good workplace civility climate despite evidence to the contrary because they tend to focus on negative aspects of their experiences in the workplace. Thus, when employees high in negative affectivity experience verbal aggression they might be less likely to seek, recognize, or even utilize any systems that might be in place to deal with their experience of workplace aggression.

Furthermore, studies have found that negative affectivity can strengthen the relationship between adverse environmental conditions and employee acts of CWB. Specifically, in a study examining the effects of personality on the relationship between fairness and retaliation, a form of CWB, Skarlicki, Folger, and Tesluk, (1999) found that the higher individuals were in negative affectivity the more likely they were to retaliate when they perceived unfairness. In addition, Penny and Spector (2005) found that negative affectivity moderated the relationship between organizational constraints and acts of CWB. The positive relationship between employee reports of organizational constraints and CWB became stronger as negative affectivity increased. Thus, individuals rating high in negative affectivity who experience workplace aggression might be less likely to seek or utilize any procedures that might be in place to address their experience of workplace aggression.

Lastly, an important research question is if workplace civility climate can act as a buffer between the relationship between experienced incivilities and negative behaviour they direct towards co-workers or the organization. Andersson and Pearson (1998) have theoretically described a process of aggressive acts leading to violence as an incivility spiral. Incivility spirals occur when an individual experiences aggression from a co-worker and responds with an act of aggression that can be of the same intensity or greater. How targets deal with these acts of aggression can vary depending on their dispositions and status in the organization. For example, an introverted individual may be less prone to confront the issue and hope for management to intervene and prevent acts of aggression from occurring in the future. Furthermore, a nurse might feel helpless confronting management about a surgeon who throws medical instruments when he becomes angry.

Given that it is unlikely that perceived and actual aggression can be eliminated in the workplace, establishing a climate of workplace civility should decrease the likelihood that an individual will commit acts of aggression towards co-workers. That is when an employee experiences verbal aggression from co-workers, for whatever reason, he still has the choice to respond negatively towards the organization or co-workers. However, if there are effective policies and practices in place to manage issues of incivility in the workplace, then employees might be more likely to handle their issues in a non-aggressive manner. Lastly, Pearson, Andersson, and Wegner (2001) proposed a model based on findings that view organizational climate as a moderator between experienced workplace incivility and individual and organizational outcomes.

**Significance of the study:**

Enhancing the working environment and strengthening the bonds between teaching and non-teaching staff are crucial elements that can raise the organization's performance and productivity and preserve teaching and non-teaching staff's work (Ajayi et al., 2018). In Egypt, Hossny et al. (2015) assessed the effect of workplace civility structural and psychological empowerment on newly appointed teaching and non-teaching staff organizational commitment at higher educational institutions in Assiut City and reported that civility constitutes an important part of the organizational climate perceived by teaching and non-teaching staffs.

Moreover, the study by Leiter et al. (2012) established that optimistic teaching and non-teaching staffs and workplace consequences have been linked to a more civil workplace climate, including increased job satisfaction, organizational commitment, management trust, presentation on the job, and organizational residency behaviour, and decreased turnover, anxiety, pressure, absenteeism, and counterproductive behaviour. A culture of civility is important for building morale, strengthening relationships, and maximizing productivity in the workplace.

**Statement of Problem:**

This dissertation addresses the problem of workplace incivility in higher education institutions. Workplace incivility refers to rude and disrespectful employee behaviour that falls short of bullying and aggression, and that may or may not be intended to cause harm (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). In 14 years Porath and Pearson (2013) conducted surveys with thousands of American employees across a range of industries and observed that 98% of respondents reported having experienced incivility while at work. Remarkably, undergoing workplace incivility can destructively influence employees' emotions. Nicholson and Griffin (2015) found that people were 27% unhappier after work if they had been the target of uncivil behaviour by a colleague. Similarly, Porath and Pearson (2012) presented that people who had practised incivility were more likely to report feelings of unhappiness, anger, and fear. The harmful emotional impact of incivility can affect employee behaviour and create significant contests at the organizational level, such as poor job performance (Zhang et al., 2018), high turnover (Sguera et al., 2016), and absenteeism (Welbourne & Sariol, 2017). These organizational contests can, in turn, translate into major financial costs. Before instituting a program to improve civility across the company, Cisco resolute that it was spending around \$12 million per year dealing with the effects of incivility (Porath & Pearson, 2013). Given the significant unfavourable effects that incivility can have on an organization, it is a significant problem to solve.

**Objectives:**

The purpose of this study was to reconnoitre what higher education institutions can do to assess workplace civility climate. More specifically, this study sought to revalidate the items that measure the workplace civility climate scale and increase workplace civility for administrative staff at their institutions. The three objectives that guided this study were as follows:

1. To assess and examine means differences of the items scores under the WPCC;
2. To revalidate the items and scale of WPCC measures used in the study in HLI
3. To classify and structure the items under the construct(s) for determining the principal component analysis.

**Methodology:**

**Perceived Workplace Civility Climate (PWCC):** Depending on the literature on aggression prevention and existing measures of safety climate (Zohar, 1980; Hayes, et al., 1998) and violence climate (Spector et al., in press), items for the perceived workplace civility climate scale were found. Furthermore, items were theoretically derived to assess the extent to which employees feel that management is responsive and discourages workplace aggression. Five advanced industrial/organizational psychology graduate students whose research area was occupational health psychology were given a description of workplace

civility climate, along with items from safety and violence climate measures as guides for item development. In addition to creating new items, they were asked to adapt the safety and violence climate items to fit the construct definition of PWCC. Once the initial item pool was developed, the items were tested concurrently with the other study variables.

The participants were asked to level the extent to which PWCC items reproduce their current work environment by following the instructions: "To what extent does each of your agreement of the following statements accurately represent your workplace." The items were accessible on a five-point Likert scale 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4= agree to 5 = strongly agree. Higher scores on the PWCC measure specify constructive perceptions of workplace civility climate.

**Method:** The current study will focus on an attempt that has been made to assess and examine means differences of the items scores under the Workplace Civility Climate by the workers/employees at higher educational institutions. The article also tries to revalidate the items and scale of workplace civility climate measures used in the study in higher learning institutions. The article also tries to classify and structure the items under the construct(s) for determining the principal component analysis

### **Research Design:**

A Research Design is simply an essential framework of various research methods as well as techniques that are developed by a researcher.

**Mixed research design:** Mixed methods research needs a determined mixing of methods in data collection, data analysis and interpretation of the proof. The basic word is 'mixed', as an important step in the mixed methods method is data connection or integration at a suitable stage in the research process. The development of mixed methods research in teaching and non-teaching staff has occurred at a time of globally increasing complexity in educational delivery.

**Partly analytical:** Analytical study projects quantify a connection between different variables. Analytical studies answer the questions of why and how. They're used to test hypotheses and make forecasts.

**Partly empirical:** As directly practised by the researcher, on view and measurement of occurrences, the empirical research is a research study that is founded. The data thus collected may be compared against a theory or hypothesis, but the results are still based on real-life experience.

**Sample:** The participants in this study consisted of 14 different public and private universities in Assam. It consists of 40 teaching staff and 12 non-teaching staff from Assam University, 31 teaching staff and 17 non-teaching staff from Bodoland University, 33 teaching staff and 17 non-teaching staff from Dibrugarh University, 37 teaching staff and 13 non-teaching staff from Gauhati University, 20 teaching staff and 10 non-teaching staff from Kumar Bhaskar Varma University, 31 teaching staff and 17 non-teaching staff from Tezpur University, 37 teaching staff and 17 non-teaching staff from Kaziranga University, 33 teaching staff and 17 non-teaching staff from Assam Down Town University, 32 teaching staff and 13 non-teaching staff from Cotton College State University, 36 teaching staff and 12 non-teaching staff from Royal Global University, 44 teaching staff and 21 non-teaching staff from Sankardev University of Health Sciences, 33 teaching staff and 17 non-teaching staff from Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University, 32 teaching staff and 17 non-teaching staff from Assam Agriculture University and 31 teaching staff and 17 non-teaching staff from Bhattadev University. All total data for teaching and non-teaching staff collected from different universities of Assam are 688 no's. Initially, I distributed the questionnaire group but in that process, the response rates were not good, it was like 35 out of 60. Later on, I decided to collect the data by visiting the staff personally and thus I have collected almost 688 no's out of my 700 questionnaires. All participants held their jobs in the higher educational sector only.

### Data Collection Tools

**Analysis Tools:** Considering the 15 items of the questionnaire for workplace civility climate as:

1= My workplace has written policies that prohibit verbal abuse among co-workers.

2 Management has a high tolerance for nasty acts (e.g.: tasteless jokes, tasteless email forwards, inappropriate behaviour, etc.) that contribute to a hostile work environment.

3= I think that supervisors never support verbal abuse policies.

4= I notice that supervisors react quickly to employee complaints of verbally abusive behaviour from co-workers.

5= At my workplace, employees are not reprimanded for disrespectful, non-face-to-face communications (e.g.- email and phone) with co-workers.

6 In my point of view management does not provide a formal process for filing complaints of verbal abuse from co-workers.

7= My workplace does not provide training/seminars on how to avoid interpersonal conflict with co-workers.

8= At my workplace, supervisors ignore employee complaints of disrespectful treatment from co-workers.

9 At my workplace, employees are not provided with options (e.g. human resources and supervisors) for reporting verbally abusive behaviour from co-workers.

10= At my workplace, reporting verbally abusive behaviour can not hurt an employee's career within the organisation.

11= I think that supervisors never discussed with employees how to improve the quality of interpersonal treatment among co-workers.

12 I noticed that employees are reprimanded for verbally abusive behaviour towards co-workers only when an employee files a formal complaint.

13 At my workplace, reporting verbal abuse from a co-worker will create more problems than it solves.

14= At my workplace it is easy to get away with verbally abusive behaviour by saying that you did not mean to cause harm.

15 I noticed that it is easier for employees to put up verbal abuse from co-workers than reporting it to management.

### Analysis Findings

**T-test:** A T-test is a statistical method of comparing the means or proportions of two samples gathered from either the same group or different categories.

To find out the mean or average of one group to compare it against the set average value, One-sample t-test is used

**Table 1:**

items	Assam University (df=51)		Bodoland University (df=47)		Dibrugarh University (df=49)		Gauhati University (df=49)		Kumar Bhaskar Varma University (df=29)		Tezpur University (df=47)		Kaziranga University (df=54)	
	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference
1	80.838	4.769	53.552	4.646	73.586	4.72	98.044	4.86	60.691	4.767	69.331	4.688	71.93	4.655
2	80.838	4.769	51.793	4.583	73.586	4.72	98.044	4.86	60.691	4.767	69.331	4.688	71.93	4.655
3	118.79	4.904	109.875	4.896	145.608	4.94	114.333	4.9	69.841	4.833	139.84	4.938	139.428	4.927
4	47.807	4.385	51.094	4.292	44.458	4.38	51.559	4.36	33.222	4.133	45.068	4.417	49.883	4.364
5	15.161	1.577	17	1.417	15.051	1.56	15.474	1.68	13.26	1.7	14.844	1.583	16.634	1.545
6	16.162	1.692	19.7	1.417	16.638	1.88	16.039	1.68	12.105	1.6	15.901	1.813	17.569	1.764
7	20.31	1.288	19.413	1.313	20.108	1.26	19.902	1.38	15.577	1.433	19.605	1.271	21.164	1.255
8	20.937	1.462	20.065	1.458	21.999	1.56	21.297	1.52	16.155	1.5	21.593	1.563	22.183	1.509
9	15.161	1.577	17	1.417	15.051	1.56	15.474	1.68	13.26	1.7	14.844	1.583	16.634	1.545
10	16.162	1.692	19.471	1.375	16.638	1.88	16.039	1.68	12.105	1.6	15.901	1.813	17.569	1.764
11	16.162	1.692	19.411	1.354	16.638	1.88	16.039	1.68	12.105	1.6	15.901	1.813	17.569	1.764
12	15.161	1.577	17	1.417	15.051	1.56	15.474	1.68	13.26	1.7	14.844	1.583	16.634	1.545
13	15.161	1.577	16.619	1.354	15.051	1.56	15.474	1.68	13.26	1.7	14.844	1.583	16.634	1.545
14	15.161	1.577	16.619	1.354	15.051	1.56	15.474	1.68	13.26	1.7	14.844	1.583	16.634	1.545
15	15.161	1.577	17	1.417	15.051	1.56	15.474	1.68	13.26	1.7	14.844	1.583	16.634	1.545

items	Assam down town University (df=49)		Cotton College State University (df=44)		Royal Global University (df=47)		Sankardev University of Health Sciences, Assam (df=64)		Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University (df=49)		Assam Agriculture University (df=48)		Bhattadev University, Bajali (df=47)	
	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference	t	Mean Difference
1	78.018	4.76	67.184	4.689	84.529	4.813	84.439	4.723	75.644	4.74	90.663	4.837	80.888	4.792
2	78.018	4.76	67.184	4.689	84.529	4.813	84.439	4.723	75.644	4.74	90.663	4.837	80.888	4.792
3	145.608	4.94	131.188	4.933	94.29	4.854	164.399	4.938	177.18	4.96	47.655	4.592	51.303	4.667
4	46.957	4.5	39.584	4.289	36.387	3.979	54.066	4.431	46.957	4.5	15.492	1.429	14.986	1.479
5	14.967	1.6	14.398	1.556	15.095	1.604	17.584	1.585	15.051	1.56	14.247	1.776	13.539	1.708
6	15.436	1.78	16.355	1.822	16.308	1.646	18.435	1.785	15.75	1.8	21.179	1.184	20.858	1.188
7	19.956	1.28	18.863	1.289	19.411	1.354	22.965	1.262	20.108	1.26	20.648	1.49	19.866	1.438
8	21.629	1.54	20.765	1.556	19.568	1.396	24.126	1.508	21.999	1.56	15.492	1.429	14.986	1.479
9	14.967	1.6	14.398	1.556	15.095	1.604	17.584	1.585	15.051	1.56	14.247	1.776	13.539	1.708
10	15.436	1.78	16.355	1.822	16.308	1.646	18.435	1.785	15.75	1.8	14.247	1.776	13.539	1.708
11	15.436	1.78	16.355	1.822	16.308	1.646	18.435	1.785	15.75	1.8	15.492	1.429	14.986	1.479
12	14.967	1.6	14.398	1.556	15.095	1.604	17.584	1.585	15.051	1.56	15.492	1.429	14.986	1.479
13	14.967	1.6	14.398	1.556	15.095	1.604	17.584	1.585	15.051	1.56	15.492	1.429	14.986	1.479
14	14.967	1.6	14.398	1.556	15.095	1.604	17.584	1.585	15.051	1.56	15.492	1.429	14.986	1.479
15	14.967	1.6	14.398	1.556	15.095	1.604	17.584	1.585	15.051	1.56				

Comparing the mean differences for the 1<sup>st</sup> item for all the universities it is seen that the mean difference for Assam University is 4.769, Bodoland University is 4.646, Dibrugarh university 4.72, Gauhati University is 4.86, Kumar Bhaskar Varma University 4.767, Tezpur university 4.688, Kaziranga University 4.655, Assam down town University 4.76, Cotton College State University 4.689, Royal Global University 4.813, Sankardev University of Health Sciences, Assam 4.723, Krishna Kanta Handique State Open University 4.74, Assam Agriculture University 4.837, and for Bhattadev University, Bajali 4.792. Comparing the values this study found that all the means in between the range 4.655-4.837. Similarly, for the 2<sup>nd</sup> item for all the 14 different universities, the mean differences are between 4.583 and 4.86. Similarly, for the 3<sup>rd</sup> item, the mean differences are between 4.8-4.9. In this way from Table 1 analyzing the data of mean differences it can be summarized that for all 14 universities, the mean differences are in the same ranges for a particular item. But the mean difference for item no 15 for Assam Agriculture



University and Bhattadev University, Bajali universities are found missing. Thus this study also found that all the items are statistically significant for all the 14 universities as sig =0.000, which is <0.05. Thus the results of the t-test (Table) fulfill the need for the first objective of this study.

**Hypotheses:** Therefore, the following hypotheses can be generated depending on the data analysis of the t-test.

**Ha:** The mean of all items used for measuring the workplace civility climate is significant.

**Ho:** The mean of all items used for measuring the workplace civility climate is not significant.

**Factor analysis:**

Factor analysis is a method of data reduction. Thus using SPSS statistics factor analysis is done for all 15 components which are reduced to 4 components (table-2). These four components will be retained for this study.

**Table: 2**

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.085	40.568	40.568	6.085	40.568	40.568	5.995	39.964	39.964
2	3.258	21.722	62.29	3.258	21.722	62.29	3.207	21.377	61.342
3	1.995	13.3	75.59	1.995	13.3	75.59	2.129	14.191	75.532
4	1.366	9.105	84.695	1.366	9.105	84.695	1.374	9.162	84.695
5	0.88	5.868	90.563						
6	0.751	5.004	95.566						
7	0.547	3.647	99.214						
8	0.057	0.377	99.591						
9	0.033	0.217	99.808						
10	0.014	0.093	99.901						
11	0.009	0.057	99.958						
12	0.005	0.035	99.994						
13	0.001	0.006	100						
14	-3.17E-16	-2.12E-15	100						
15	-7.74E-16	-5.16E-15	100						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

**Table: 3**

**Workplace Civility Climate: Component Matrix**

Items	Construct-1	Construct-2	Construct-3	Construct-4
<b>Initial Eigen Value (Variance %)</b>	40.568	40.568	40.568	40.568
<b>Extraction of Sum Square Loading (%)</b>	40.568	40.568	40.568	40.568
<b>Rotation of Sum Square Loading (% of Var)</b>	39.964	39.964	39.964	39.964
5	.984			
9	.991			
12	.991			
13	.989			
14	.987			
15	.991			
6		.926		
10		.925		
11		.929		
1			.843	
2			.842	
4			.406	
3			.	-.726
7				.761

8				.490
---	--	--	--	------

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 4 components were extracted.

As we can see four components are extracted (footnote table-3). Now these are the factors that are most interesting in finding their name. The factors are renamed as below depending on their characteristics of overall involvement.

Table: 4

Sl no	Construct	no of items
1	Verbal abuse	6 items
2	Quality of work	3 items
3	Workplace policy and environment	3 items
4	Disrespectful treatment	3 items

**Reliability test:** Our in-depth review of the incivility construct reveals three distinct characteristics that conceptually differentiate it from other forms of mistreatment. First, incivility is a low-intensity and non-physical form of mistreatment. Typical uncivil behaviours include disrespectful behaviours such as making insensitive remarks, violating privacy, glaring, and ignoring, which are generally seen as minor deviant acts (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Cortina et al., 2001; Lim, Cortina, & Magley, 2008). As such, incivility is different from violent or aggressive behaviour (e.g., aggression, bullying) which consists of more persistent and severe deviant acts such as coercive physical intimidations and grave humiliations (Einarsen, 2000; Hershcovis et al., 2007). Some other types of mistreatment, such as abusive supervision and sexual harassment, can also involve aggressive or physical acts, and thus are distinguishable from incivility (Lim & Cortina, 2005; Tepper, 2000).

Second, incivility carries an ambiguous intention to harm. It is generally tough to interpret or determine the instigator's intention behind uncivil acts, whereas an individual might suffer from incivility, For example, when an employee makes a joke about a colleague's clumsiness, the target may not know whether the employee is deliberate or is simply trying to be humorous. As such, incivility is in direct contrast to undermining, which represents interpersonal INCIVILITY META-ANALYSIS 7 behaviours with clear evil intention and easily attributed as harm-inflicting (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002). Duffy et al. (2002) also highlighted that the intentional harm carried by undermining is aimed at hindering relationships, work success, and favourable reputation. This instrumental focus is in contrast to incivility, whose scope lies largely within social interaction incidents (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

Third, incivility is more generic. It contains no explicit gendered or sexualized content, implies no difference in power between the instigator and the victim, and takes both active (e.g., making condescending remarks) and passive forms (e.g., paying little attention). Uncivil behaviours can be differentiated from sexual harassment and abusive supervision, which include sexual violations or negative leadership (Lim & Cortina, 2005; Tepper, 2000), respectively, and are often associated with a specific group of targets (e.g., women or subordinates). Incivility can also be distinguished from a purely passive form of mistreatment – ostracism (Ferris et al., 2017). Ostracism is characterized by “inaction”, as it measures the extent to which an individual or group ignores, excludes or omits socially appropriate actions towards others (Ferris, Brown, Berry, & Lian, 2008; Robinson, O'Reilly, & Wang, 2013).

Despite its unique characteristics, incivility is situated together with other interpersonal misbehaviours under the conceptual umbrella of workplace mistreatment. Various mistreatment constructs (incivility, aggressive behaviour, sexual harassment, social undermining, abusive supervision, and ostracism) capture different forms of unwanted interpersonal behaviours in workplace interactions. Researchers who study these constructs have drawn on similar perspectives such as appraisal (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) and

deviance theories (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007) to explain how and why mistreatment experiences affect people (Duffy INCIVILITY META-ANALYSIS 8 et al., 2002; Sliter, Sliter, & Jex, 2012; Hershcovis et al., 2007; Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012). Thus, different forms of mistreatment are likely manifestations of an essential higher-order construct of mistreatment. While acknowledging the distinctions and linkages between incivility and other mistreatment constructs, we focus on conceptually and empirically establishing the construct validity of incivility, which has a unique value if incivility's effects on outcomes are independent of other forms of mistreatment. Other researchers have also examined a construct in its merit while recognizing it as a manifestation of a higher-order construct. For example, researchers have studied helping, voice (Whiting, Podsakoff, & Pierce, 2008), and charisma (Balkundi, Kilduff, & Harrison, 2011) while recognizing the former two as dimensions of OCBs (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009) and the latter as a dimension of transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

**Table: 5**

Construct	No Item in the Construct	Inter-Item Correlation		Single Measure Intra-Class Correlation	Average Measure Intra Class Correlation	Significant	Reliability Coefficient (Chronbach $\alpha$ )	
		Max	Min				$\alpha$	Standard Item $\alpha$
Workplace civility climate	15	1.000	-0.291	5.384	5.384	0.000	0.814	0.787

Table 5 indicates that for all 15 items, the maximum inter-item correlation is 1.000 and the minimum inter-item correlation is 0.291. The single measure intra-class correlation value is 5.384 and the average measure intra-class correlation value is 5.384. As the sig value is 0.000 the items are 99% significant. The Reliability Statistics provides the value for Cronbach alpha which in this case is .814 and reflects the high reliability of the measuring instrument. Furthermore, it indicates a high level of internal consistency concerning the specific sample.

Now the reliability tests for all four constructs are done separately (table-6). The results indicate that construct-1(verbal abuse) is 99% significant with Cronbach alpha 0.998 and standard item Cronbach alpha 0.998 reflecting high reliability. Similarly, construct-2 (quality of work) is at a 99% significant level with Cronbach alpha 0.998 and standard item Cronbach alpha 0.998 reflecting high reliability. Again construct-3(workplace policy and environment) is 99% significant with Cronbach alpha 0.554 and standard item Cronbach alpha 0.684 reflecting high reliability. But the construct-4(disrespectful treatment) is at a 95% significant level with Cronbach alpha 0.184 and standard item Cronbach alpha 0.117 reflecting low reliability. Thus the internal consistency for the three items is at a high level compared to the other item (disrespectful treatment).

**Table: 6**

Construct	No Item in the Construct	Inter-Item Correlation		Single Measure Intra-Class Correlation	Average Measure Intra Class Correlation	Significant	Reliability Coefficient (Chronbach $\alpha$ )	
		Max	Min				$\alpha$	Standard Item $\alpha$
Verbal abuse	6	1.000	0.981	597.35	597.35	0.000 @99%	0.998	0.998
quality of work	3	0.996	0.998	404.47	404.47	0.000 @99%	0.998	0.998
Workplace policy and environment	3	0.080	0.975	2.241	2.241	0.000 @99%	0.554	0.684
Disrespectful treatment	3	0.111	-0.069	1.121	1.121	0.004 @ 95%	0.108	0.117

**Implication and Conclusion:** Incivility can demonstrate bias against undervalued social groups it can be seen from a social perspective, (Cortina, 2008). As a result, an organizational climate of incivility may put an organization at a greater risk of treating employees unevenly depending on their social group identity status. Whether or not such disparate treatment is intentional does not negate the danger that it can place the organization at a greater risk of costly litigation and damage to the organization's reputation.

The organization can improve the working environment for its employees and improve the quality of interactions with co-workers, supervisors, or those outside the organization by effectively managing the civility climate within the organization.

This study did the validation evidence that may influence perceptions of organizational civility climate. The findings should motivate future researchers to investigate further the relationship between incivility and other characteristics related to workplace climate. Most of the findings were significant, further research should explore incivility within and across various groups. Given the complexity and importance of incivility, the researcher recommends ongoing studies on the influence of incivility using a variety of methods and populations. Further research should explore from the point of view of both target and agent. The development of an organizational climate occurs over time. As new employees join the organization, their attitudes and perceptions are likely to adapt to those of other co-workers within the organization. The variations in acuties of incivility at different points in time within an organization could be explored by a longitudinal study.

#### References:

- Andersson, L., & Pearson, C. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiralling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 452–471.
- Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, 47(7), 755–778. Blanchard, K. (2015). *Refire! Don't retire*. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Boyd, R. (2006). The value of civility. *Urban Studies*, 43(5/6), 863–878.
- Bulutlar, F., & Oz, E. (2009). The effects of ethical climates on bullying behaviour in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 86, 273–295.
- Callahan, J. (2011). Incivility as an instrument of oppression: Exploring the role of power in constructions of civility. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(1), 10–21. doi:10.1177/1523422311410644
- Caza, B., & Cortina, L. (2007). From insult to injury: Explaining the impact of incivility. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(4), 335–350.
- Clark, C. (2008). Student perspectives on faculty incivility in nursing education: An application of the concept of rankism. *Nursing Outlook*, 56(1), 4–8.
- Clark, C. (2010, March 1). Why civility matters. *Reflections on Nursing Leadership*, 36(1), 4.
- Clark, C., & Carnosso, J. (2008). Civility: A concept analysis. *The Journal of Theory Construction and Testing*, 12(1), 11–15.
- Clark, C., & Landrum, E. (2012). Development and description of the Organizational Civility Scale. Cortina, L. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 55–75.
- Cortina, L., Lonsway, K., Magley, V., Freeman, L., Collinsworth, L., Hunter, M., & Fitzgerald, L. (2002). What's gender got to do with it? Incivility in the federal courts. *Law and Social Inquiry*, 27, 235–270.

- Cortina, L., & Magley, V. (2003). Raising voice, risking retaliation: Events following interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(4), 247–265. doi:10.10137/1076 8998.8.4.247
- Cortina, L., & Magley, V. (2009). Patterns and profiles of response to incivility in the workplace. *Journal of Occupation Health Psychology*, 14(3), 272–288.
- Donaldson, S. & Grant-Vallone, E. (2002). Understanding self-report bias in organizational behaviour research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(2), 245-260.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., & Collins, K. (2002). *Aggravating circumstances: A status report on rudeness in America*. New York, NY: Public Agenda.
- Farooqui, M. (2012). Measuring organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) as a consequence of organizational climate (OC). *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 4(3), 294–302. Foucault, M. (1982). *The Subject and Power*. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777–795.
- French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power*. (pp. 259–269). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Friel, J., & Friel, L. (2012). The power and grace between nasty or nice: Replacing entitlement, narcissism, and incivility with knowledge, care, and genuine self-esteem. Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications, Inc.
- Ghosh, R., Jacobs, J., & Reio, T. (2011). The toxic continuum from incivility to violence: What can HRD do? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(1), 3–9. doi:10.1177/1523422311410641
- Keller, S. (1988). Does the roof have to cave in?: The landlord/tenant power relationship and the intentional infliction of emotional distress. *Cardozo Law Review*, 9, 1663–1698.
- Kerbo, H. R. (2012). *Social stratification and inequality: class conflict in historical, comparative, and global perspective*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Lareau, A., & Conley, D. (2010). *Social class: How does it work?* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Leiter, M. (2013). *Analyzing and theorizing the dynamics of the workplace incivility crisis*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Lewin, Kurt. (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers*. New York, NY: Harper Torchbooks.
- Lim, S., & Cortina, L. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 483–496.
- Lim, S., Cortina, L., & Magley, V. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 95–107.
- Massey, D. (2007). *Categorically unequal: the American stratification system*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Michinov, N., Dambrun, M., Guimond, S., & Meot, A. (2005). Social dominance orientation, prejudice, and discrimination: A new computer-based method for studying discriminatory behaviours. *Behaviour Research Methods*, 37(1), 91–98.
- Nelson, S., Larson, J., Sheikh, C., & Starks, R. (2006). The effects of gender and status in interactional context. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada: University of Arizona. Retrieved from <http://www.u.arizona.edu/~jlarson/Papers/Gender.pdf>
- Nydegger, R. (2001). Violence, aggression and passive-aggression in the workplace remedies. *Management Development Forum*, 3(1), 00.
- Ottinot, R. (2010). *A multi-level study investigating the impact of workplace civility climate on incivility and employee well-being*. (Dissertation). University of South Florida. Retrieved from <http://scholrcommons.usf.edu/etd/3537>

- Pearson, C., Andersson, L., & Porath, C. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29, 123–137.
- Pearson, C., Andersson, L., & Wegner, J. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations*, 54, 1387–1419.
- Pearson, C., & Porath, C. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for “nice”? Think again. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), 7–18.
- Pearson, C., & Porath, C. (2009). *The cost of bad behaviour: How incivility ruins your business and what you can do about it*. New York: Portfolio.
- Penney, L., & Spector, P. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 777–796. doi:10.1002/job.336
- Pinker, S. (2002). *The blank slate: the modern denial of human nature*. New York: Penguin.
- Porath, C., & Erez, A. (2007). Does rudeness matter?: The effects of rudeness on task performance and helpfulness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1181–1197.
- Porath, C., & Erez, A. (2009). Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers’ performance on routine and creative tasks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109, 29–44.
- Porath, C., & Erez, A. (2011). How rudeness takes its toll. *The Psychologist*, 24(7), 508–511.
- Porath, C., MacInnis, D., & Folkes, V. (2010). Witnessing incivility among employees: Effects on consumer anger and negative inferences about companies. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 292–303.
- Porath, C., Overbeck, J., & Pearson, C. (2008). Picking up the gauntlet: How individuals respond to status challenges. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(7), 1945–1980.
- Pratto, F., & Shih, M. (2000). Social dominance orientation and group context in implicit group prejudice. *Psychological Science*, 11, 515–518.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L., & Malle, B. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 741–763.
- Pratto, F., & Stewart, A. L. (2011). Social dominance theory. In D. J. Christie (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Raven, B. (1993). The bases of power: Origins and recent developments. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49(4), 227–251.
- Raven, B. (2008). The bases of power and the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Analyses of Social Issues & Public Policy*, 8(1), 1–22. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2008.00159.x
- Raven, B. H. (1992). A power interaction model of interpersonal influence - French and Raven 30 Years Later. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 7(2), 217–244.
- Reio, T., & Ghosh, R. (2009). Antecedents and outcomes of workplace incivility: Implications for human resource development research and practice. *Human Resource Development*, 20(3), 237–264.
- Schmidt, P. (2010, May 4). Chief targets of student incivility are female and young professors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/ChiefTargets-of-Student/65396/>
- Scott, J. (2007). Power, domination, and stratification: Towards a conceptual synthesis. *Sociologia, Problemas E Practicas*, 55, 25–39.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (2012). Social dominance theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W.
- Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology (Vol 2)*. (pp. 418–438). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

- Trevino, L., & Youngblood, S. (1990). Bad apples in bad barrels. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 378–385.

**Appendix:**  
**Workplace civility climate:**

Sl No.	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	My workplace has written policies that prohibit verbal abuse among co-workers					
2	Management has a high tolerance for nasty acts (e.g.: tasteless jokes, tasteless email forwards, inappropriate behaviour, etc.) that contribute to a hostile work environment.					
3	I think that supervisors never support verbal abuse policies					
4	I notice that supervisors react quickly to employee complaints of verbally abusive behaviour from co-workers					
5	At my workplace, employees are reprimanded for disrespectful, non-face-to-face communications (e.g.- email and phone) with co-workers.					
6	In my point of view, management does not provide a formal process for filling complaints of verbal abuse from co-workers					
7	My workplace does not provide training/seminars on how to avoid interpersonal conflict with co-workers					
8	At my workplace, supervisors ignore employee complaints of disrespectful treatment from co-workers					
9	At my workplace, employees are not provided with options (e.g. human resources and supervisors) for reporting verbally abusive behaviour from co-workers					
10	At my workplace, reporting verbally abusive behaviour can not hurt an employee’s career within the organisation					
11	I think that supervisors never discussed with employees how to improve the quality of interpersonal treatment among co-workers					
12	I noticed that employees are reprimanded for verbally abusive behaviour towards co-workers only when an employee files a formal complaint					
13	At my workplace, reporting verbal abuse from a co-worker will create more problems than it solves					
14	At my workplace, it is easy to get away with verbally abusive behaviour by saying that you did not mean to cause harm					
15	I noticed that it is easier for employees to put up the verbal abuse from co-workers than reporting it to management					

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	1	0.945	-0.13	0.171	0.055	0.166	-0.23	0.178	0.05	0.172	0.175	0.05	0.051	0.051	0.05
2	0.95	1	-0.14	0.175	0.058	0.17	-0.22	0.187	0.044	0.18	0.179	0.04	0.054	0.054	0.044
3	-0.13	-0.14	1	-0.034	0.099	0.153	-0.29	-0.12	0.099	0.152	0.152	0.1	0.097	0.097	0.099
4	0.17	0.175	-0.03	1	0.145	-0.14	-0.1	-0	0.154	-0.13	-0.14	0.15	0.148	0.148	0.154
5	0.06	0.058	0.099	0.145	1	-0.11	0.134	-0.05	0.983	-0.11	-0.1	0.98	0.993	0.981	0.983
6	0.17	0.17	0.153	-0.14	-0.105	1	-0.1	0.289	-0.105	0.99	0.996	-0.11	-0.1	-0.102	-0.11
7	-0.23	-0.22	-0.29	-0.095	0.134	-0.1	1	0.111	0.138	-0.08	-0.09	0.14	0.133	0.138	0.138
8	0.18	0.187	-0.12	-0.001	-0.046	0.289	0.111	1	-0.062	0.281	0.294	-0.06	-0.05	-0.064	-0.06
9	0.05	0.044	0.099	0.154	0.983	-0.11	0.138	-0.06	1	-0.1	-0.11	1	0.99	0.99	1
10	0.17	0.18	0.152	-0.132	-0.11	0.99	-0.08	0.281	-0.102	1	0.991	-0.1	-0.1	-0.099	-0.1
11	0.18	0.179	0.152	-0.14	-0.101	0.996	-0.09	0.294	-0.106	0.991	1	-0.11	-0.1	-0.103	-0.11
12	0.05	0.044	0.099	0.154	0.983	-0.11	0.138	-0.06	1	-0.1	-0.11	1	0.99	0.99	1
13	0.05	0.054	0.097	0.148	0.993	-0.1	0.133	-0.05	0.99	-0.1	-0.1	0.99	1	0.989	0.99
14	0.05	0.054	0.097	0.148	0.981	-0.1	0.138	-0.06	0.99	-0.1	-0.1	0.99	0.989	1	0.99
15	0.05	0.044	0.099	0.154	0.983	-0.11	0.138	-0.06	1	-0.1	-0.11	1	0.99	0.99	1

<b>Item Statistics N=688</b>			
SI no	item	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	My workplace has written policies that prohibit verbal abuse among co-workers	4.75	0.446
2	Management has a high tolerance for nasty acts (e.g.: tasteless jokes, tasteless email forwards, inappropriate behaviour, etc.) that contribute to a hostile work environment.	4.74	0.448
3	I think that supervisors never support verbal abuse policies	4.93	0.257
4	I notice that supervisors react quickly to employee complains of verbally abusive behaviour from co-workers	4.39	0.682
5	At my workplace, employees are not reprimanded for disrespectful, non-face to face communications (e.g- email and phone) with co-workers.	1.56	0.711
6	In my point of view management does not provide a formal process for filling complaints of verbal abuse from co-workers	1.73	0.768
7	My workplace does not provide training/ seminar on how to avoid interpersonal conflict with co-workers	1.28	0.450
8	At my workplace, supervisors ignore employee complaints of disrespectful treatment from co-workers	1.50	0.500
9	At my workplace, employees are not provided with options (e.g. human resources and supervisors) for reporting verbally abusive behaviour from co-workers	1.56	0.711
10	At my workplace, reporting verbally abusive behaviour can not hurt an employee's career within the organisation	1.73	0.769
11	I think that supervisors never discussed with employees how to improve the quality of interpersonal treatment among co-workers	1.73	0.769
12	I noticed that employees are reprimanded for verbally abusive behaviour towards co-worker only when an employee files a formal complaint	1.56	0.711
13	At my workplace, reporting verbal abuse from a co-worker will create more problems than it solves	1.56	0.712
14	At my workplace it is easy to get away with verbally abusive behaviour by saying that you did not mean to cause harm	1.56	0.712
15	I noticed that it is easier for employees to put up the verbal abuse from co workers that reporting it to management	1.56	0.711