University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2008

Organizational culture, workplace incivility, and turnover : the impact of human resources practices.

Dana Cosby Simmons 1969-
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Simmons, Dana Cosby 1969-, "Organizational culture, workplace incivility, and turnover : the impact of human resources practices." (2008). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1327.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1327>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, WORKPLACE INCIVILITY, AND TURNOVER:
THE IMPACT OF HUMAN RESOURCES PRACTICES

By

Dana Cosby Simmons
B.S., Western Kentucky University, 1992
M.A., Western Kentucky University, 1994

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Education Leadership Foundations
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2008

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, WORKPLACE INCIVILITY, AND TURNOVER:
THE IMPACT OF HUMAN RESOURCES PRACTICES

By

Dana Cosby Simmons
B.S., Western Kentucky University, 1992
M.A., Western Kentucky University, 1994

A Dissertation Approved on

March 17, 2008

By the following Dissertation Committee:

Dissertation Director

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family

Perry, Ellie, Molly, Paine, and Susana.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation chair, Dr. Ric Keaster, for his guidance and support. Thank you for reminding me along the way to “get a life”! Special thanks to Dr. Kathi Miner-Rubino for her patience and support during the analysis piece of the project. I would also like to thank the other committee members, Dr. Bud Schlinker, Dr. Carolyn Rude-Parkins, and Dr. Ray Haynes, for their assistance during the dissertation process. I learned much from each of you and appreciate your encouragement during the process. I would like to express my gratitude to people who listened and advised along the way, including Dr. Cecile Garmon, Dr. Sally Ray, Mr. Dan Duncan, Mrs. Toake Kumagai, Mrs. Kari Aikins, my brother, Mr. Joseph Cosby, and my sister, Mrs. Lindsay Brown. Thank you to my parents, Mr. Danny Cosby and Mrs. Lynn Pedigo, for teaching me the importance of an education. Also, a most special message of collegiality goes to my fellow cohort members, including Mrs. Janet Hurt, Mr. Gary Houchens, Mr. James McCaslin, and Mrs. Winnie Cohron. The journey was so much enjoyable with you all as colleagues and friends! Finally, thank you to my wonderful husband, Perry, who patiently waited for me to finish “just one more thing” during the past few years while he took care of everything. You are simply the best!

ABSTRACT

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, INCIVILITY, AND TURNOVER: THE IMPACT OF HUMAN RESOURCES PRACTICES

Dana Cosby Simmons

March 17, 2008

This dissertation examines the relationship between two communication-related dimensions of organizational culture, workplace incivility, and turnover. In particular, it investigates the impact that four human resources practices have on the relationship between incivility and turnover. These practices are (a) training, (b) formal policies, (c) grievance procedures, and (d) vertical hierarchy. Employing data from the National Organizations Survey (2002), the study provides a conceptual model suggesting that “soft” measures such as organizational culture and human resources practices impact the bottom line of an organization.

The dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter One provides an introduction to the research problem and presents the case that workplace incivility, one form of counterproductive workplace behavior, is an important topic for investigation as it is potentially costly to organizations. Chapter Two provides a summary and synthesis of literature differentiating incivility as a behavior construct and describing reported

impact to individuals and organizations. Chapter Three focuses on the methodology and analysis techniques employed by the study, including multiple regression. Chapter Four presents the results of the analysis. Discussion and implications of the study, as well as recommendations for future research is presented in Chapter Five.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Derivation of Items for the Study	68
2. Descriptive Statistics.....	72
3. Moderated Regression Results: Involvement and Climate on Incivility....	78
4. Moderated Regression Results: Incivility on Turnover.....	79
5. Moderated Regression: Formal Training, Incivility and Turnover.....	81
6. Moderated Regression: Formal Policies, Incivility and Turnover.....	82
7. Moderated Regression: Formal Grievance, Incivility and Turnover.....	83
8. Moderated Regression: Vertical Hierarchy, Incivility and Turnover.....	84
9. Moderated Regression: Formal Training on Incivility.....	86
10. Moderated Regression: Human Resource Policies on Incivility.....	87
11. Moderated Regression: Grievance Procedures on Incivility.....	88
12. Moderated Regression: Vertical Hierarchy on Incivility.....	89

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii

CHAPTER

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Problem Statement.....	6
	Purpose of the Study.....	6
	Rationale for Study.....	7
	Conceptual Definitions.....	8
	Significance of Study.....	10
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
	Organizational Culture.....	15
	Workplace Incivility.....	25
	Employee Turnover.....	51
	Human Resources Practices.....	52
	Conceptual Model.....	56
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	60
	Statement of Purpose.....	61
	Hypothesis.....	61

	Research Design.....	62
	Description of the Data Source.....	62
	Data Collection Process.....	63
	Measurement and Description of Study Variables.....	64
	Data Analysis Techniques.....	68
	Limitations.....	70
IV.	RESULTS	71
	Descriptive Statistics.....	71
	Structural Equation Modeling.....	73
	Multiple Regression.....	74
	Regression Analysis of Incivility.....	75
	Summary of Results by Hypotheses.....	76
	Post-hoc Analysis.....	85
	Summary of Model Results.....	90
V.	DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS...	91
	Statement of Problem.....	92
	Review of Methodology.....	92
	Summary of Results.....	93
	Limitations of the Study.....	95
	Recommendations for Practice.....	96
	Suggestions for Future Research.....	98
	Conclusion.....	99

REFERENCES.....	100
APPENDICES.....	114
A. Methodological Report.....	114
B. Human Subjects Approval.....	127
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	128

CHAPTER 1

OVERVIEW OF STUDY

Introduction

Over the past 25 years, the concept of organizational culture has moved to the forefront of behavioral research to describe and predict human systems performance within the organizational context. Whether conducting a needs analysis for training and development, designing incentive plans, or developing human resources policies, organizational culture serves as an important frame of reference for understanding employee behaviors and actions.

Normative behaviors play a vital role in contributing to an organization's competitiveness. Understanding how culture promotes or discourages inappropriate behaviors in the workplace is an important step in eradicating them. For example, workplace violence research often finds a pattern of counterproductive workplace behaviors that escalated from a less intense, innocuous behavior form, such as workplace incivility, to a more serious and overt display of behavior, such as workplace violence (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

The study of culture and its relationship to employee behavior in the workplace relates closely to the field of human resources management. Human resources management is "the direction of organizational systems to ensure that human talent is used effectively and efficiently to accomplish organizational goals" (Mathis & Jackson, 2003, p. 1). Activities that interlock to support human resources management include

strategic partnerships, recruitment and staffing, development, compensation and benefits, health, safety and security, and employee and labor relations.

By definition, human resources management assists in cultivating culture in organizations by creating systems for appropriate employee behavior and aligning this behavior with the organizational goals. One broad framework that is counter to such alignment is counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB), or intentional employee behavior that is contrary to the legitimate interests of the organization (Sackett & DeVore, 2001). Martinko, Gundlach, and Douglas (2002) expanded the definition, adding that CWB results “in harming the organization or its members” (p. 37).

A central question in the examination of CWB is, “What comes first, a toxic environment or the inappropriate behaviors?” In other words, what impact does organizational culture play in promoting or preventing CWB? In an attempt to answer the question, this study extends the literature in the topic of workplace incivility, which falls under the CWB framework (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002). Workplace incivility is “low-intensity behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect; uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p. 457). These behaviors include actions such as using demeaning language, making veiled threats, gossiping, ignoring co-worker requests, sending flaming emails, or otherwise demonstrating disrespect for others in the workplace. Andersson and Pearson contend that the culture created by these low-intensity behaviors promotes more serious workplace aggression.

Workplace incivility is costly to organizations in subtle and pervasive ways. In a

poll conducted by *U.S. News and World Report*. 89 % of survey participants indicated that incivility was a big problem, with 78 % noting that the issue had worsened over the 10 years spanning from 1985 to 1995 (Marks, 1996). Although uncivil behaviors are common, organizations often fail to understand their harmful effects, and most managers are not equipped to deal with them.

Pearson and Porath (2005) found that the targets, witnesses, and additional stakeholders of incivility report acting in ways that erode organizational values and deplete organizational resources. Because of their experiences of workplace incivility, employees noted reductions in work effort, time on the job, productivity, and performance. Where incivility was not curbed, job satisfaction and organizational loyalty decreased as well. Some employees even left their jobs citing the impact of this subtle form of deviance. Conversely, a meta-analysis of 51 organizational studies found that healthy interpersonal interactions related to positively to job satisfaction (Carr, Schmidt, Ford, & De Shon, 2003).

Workplace incivility tends to be sporadic and innocuous. The construct can be dangerous like other related, more overt CWB such as emotional abuse, tyranny, bullying, mobbing, generalized harassment, and workplace violence. While workplace incivility by definition involves low-intensity, ambiguous intent to do harm (Andersson & Pearson, 1999), research suggests that these behaviors often lead to more serious workplace issues such as workplace violence and aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996). Andersson and Pearson posit that workplace incivility can lead to a spiral of continued escalation of misbehavior, resulting in more serious, elevated levels of aggression such as its cousins of emotional abuse, tyranny, bullying, mobbing, and workplace violence.

Namie (2003) conceptualized workplace aggression on a 10-point scale, with incivility at one end and workplace homicide at the other (see Figure 1). Forms of workplace incivility include disrespectfulness, condescension, and degradation with an ambiguous attempt to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Examples of incivility might include general rudeness, flaming emails, leaving trash in community areas, gossiping about coworkers, or making belittling comments. Bullying, consisting of similar types of behavior but on a more persistent basis, falls in the 4 to 9 scoring area on the scale. Laws to make workplace bullying an unlawful employment practice are under consideration in several states across the country (Orey, 2007).

Source: Namie (2003).

Figure 1. Intensity and intentionality of counterproductive workplace behaviors.

In the past decade, research on deviant workplace behaviors increased, resulting in part from the media attention on extreme events such as workplace violence and homicide. In a national survey, the Society for Human Resource Management found that

48 % of employees surveyed experienced a violent incident in the workplace in the previous two years, including verbal threats (39 %), pushing and shoving (22 %), and fistfights (14 %) (www.shrm.org, 2000). The costs associated with the far end of the workplace aggression spectrum are staggering. A U.S. Department of Justice report estimated the cost of workplace violence at \$4.2 billion dollars a year (Duhart, 2001).

As for the outcomes particular to workplace incivility, research shows that this type of behavior is prevalent in the organizations and results in many negative effects. Langhout et al. (2000) found that 71% of survey respondents reported experiencing uncivilized behaviors in the past five years. Those respondents also reported decreased job satisfaction, increased job withdrawal, and increased psychological distress because of the experienced uncivilized behavior. In a related study, Pearson and Porath (2005) reported 20% of survey respondents experienced incivility at least once per week, prompting the desire to retaliate, thus reducing company reputation as outcomes from the encounter(s).

The news media reports with some regularity the negative consequences of negative workplace behaviors. In a recent case, a township terminated four employees for gossiping about their supervisor (retrieved from www.abcnews.go.com/GMA/story?id=3199506 on July 23, 2007). The town council found that, "Gossip, whispering, and an unfriendly environment are causing poor morale and interfering with the efficient performance of town business."

I am interested in workplace incivility as it relates to culture and employee perception of human resources practices. Understanding and correcting the phenomenon could possibly help improve employee commitment to the organization and, ultimately,

the productivity and profitability of the organization. Employees will also benefit from organizational efforts to improve the work environment in ways that would prohibit or deter a culture of mistreatment.

Problem Statement

In the past decade, research relating to workplace incivility advanced the organizational literature. The central finding of research is that the incidence of workplace incivility has detrimental effects on a variety of individual and organizational outcomes. Research found that rude behaviors correlated with retaliation (Bies & Tripp, 1996; Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997); counterproductive behaviors (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002); and reduction in organization citizenship behaviors (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). Other studies show detrimental effects of workplace incivility in psychological distress (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001) and negative emotional effects (Pearson & Porath, 2005). Notwithstanding these studies, the topic of workplace incivility does not possess great depth in the organizational literature. Most published articles investigating workplace incivility explore perpetrator and victim characteristics and self-reported attitudes and experiences, rather than correlations with other types of data. In short, more research is needed about this type of CWB.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to explore the relationships among the antecedents of workplace incivility as they relate to organizational culture. What are the factors that promote or prevent the perceptions of experienced incivility? Secondary questions will examine the moderating influence of the perception of human resources practices on the relationship between incidences of workplace incivility and employee turnover.

Considering the purpose of the study, the following research questions will be examined:

1. What is the relationship between communication-related dimensions of organizational culture and the incidence of workplace incivility?
2. What is the relationship between the incidence of workplace incivility and employee turnover?
3. What is the relationship among human resources practices, incidence of workplace incivility, and employee turnover?

Rationale for Study

Despite the significant impact of workplace incivility on organizational and employee outcomes, little research exists particular to predictors among individual and business environment factors, perceived incidences of workplace incivility, and employee turnover. While the general topic of workplace incivility gained interest during the past decade, especially types and frequency of the behaviors, there exists a need to provide more evidence to raise consciousness about the problem. The goal of this study was to explore the relationships among communication-related dimensions of organizational culture, incidence of workplace incivility, and employee turnover. A unique contribution made by this study is the examination of how perception of human resources practices moderates the relationship between workplace incivility and employee turnover.

Examining these variables can provide insight for important factors in understanding this type of workplace misbehavior, as well as providing empirical support for the negative impact on employee turnover. This, in turn, can assist organizational leaders in focusing attention and efforts on improving this aspect of work life for

employees and retaining an experienced and qualified work force. Finally, the information gleaned relating to the moderating effect of human resources practices, in particular training and development, can aid human resources practitioners and line managers practitioners in advocating employee training programs.

Conceptual Definitions

The following definitions are provided to clarify terms in the study.

Abusive Supervision is “subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178).

Counterproductive Workplace Behavior (CWB) is “intentional employee behavior that an organization views as contrary to its legitimate interests” (Sackett & DeVore, 2001, p. 145). The term is used broadly to define several more specific types of employee misbehavior in the workplace.

Employee Perception of Human Resources Practices refers to “employee perceptions and evaluations of the existence, implementation, and operations of Human Resources practices” (Wright & Boswell, 2002, p. 248). Specifically, this study examines employee perception of human resources practices relating to training, job enrichment, rewards, internal labor market, grievance procedures, and vertical hierarchy.

Employee Turnover is broadly defined as voluntary employee terminations that can be controlled, potentially improving the competitive advantage (Herman, 1997).

National Organization Study (NOS) II is “a survey of business organizations across the United States in which the unit of analysis is the actual workplace. The study was conducted for the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institute of

Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), and the Commonwealth Fund to learn about the employment policies, benefits, and

structures of organizations throughout the country, particularly the effects on business performance and worker productivity of rising workplace stress levels, rising health insurance costs or not having health insurance, and the extent of mental health benefits and service offerings within organizations” (Smith, Kallberg, & Marsden, 2002, p.1).

Organizational Culture is “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 1993, p. 373). The Glaser, Zamanou, & Hacker (1987) study serves as the basis of examination for two communication-related dimensions of organizational culture, climate-morale and involvement. Climate-morale refers to how the employees feel about the relationships between employees and management and the level of trust existing in the workplace between employees and the company. Involvement reflects the level of employee involvement in decision-making, problem-solving and self-management.

Organizational Factors include organizational, and work-related factors selected based on the relevance to the study and as guided by the review of the literature. These factors are measured by three items contained in the NOS survey, including: profit/nonprofit status, company type, and unionization status.

Social Undermining is “behavior intended to hinder, over time, the ability to establish and maintain positive interpersonal relationships, work-related success, and

favorable reputation” (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002, p. 332).

Workplace Aggression is “any form of behavior directed by one or more persons in a workplace toward the goal of harming one or more others in that work place (or the entire organization) in ways the intended targets are motivated to avoid” (Neuman & Keashly, 2002 p. 11).

Workplace Deviance is “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms, and in doing so threatens the well-being of the organization or its members, or both” (Bennett & Robinson, 2000, p. 349).

Workplace Incivility is “low intensity behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p. 457). Items drawn from the Workplace Incivility Scale (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001) measured this construct.

Significance of the Study

The study extended the literature by providing additional empirical data about the construct of workplace incivility. This study makes unique contributions by empirically testing the moderating effect of employee perception of human resources practices on the relationship between workplace incivility and turnover. Moreover, I not only examined the impact of workplace incivility on employee turnover, which has obvious implications for organizations and stakeholders, but the study provided deeper insight on organizational factors or conditions that might facilitate or prevent incivility.

Finally, the study contributes to practice by offering information that may assist policy makers, executives, human resources managers, line managers, employees, and other key stakeholders of organizations in understanding, preventing, and remedying this

workplace issue, particularly through enhanced human resources education and awareness. The information gleaned supports the practical application of the study for persons concerned with creating a positive working environment for employees.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the study. The next chapter presents the literature related to the general topic. Research methodology is discussed in Chapter Three and Chapter Four presents the findings from the data collection. Chapter Five provides a discussion of the results and recommendations from the research compared with the findings and for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

Workplace incivility, the focus of this literature review, is a broad category of misbehavior in the workplace setting. Civility involves treating others with respect and acting with consideration for their feelings (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Andersson and Pearson generally defined workplace civility as behaviors that help to preserve the norms for mutual respect in the workplace. They contended that workplace incivility is “low-intensity behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect; uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others” (p. 457). While civil behavior is expected, and usually not recognized in the workplace, incivility is unexpected and frequently noticed (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Andersson and Pearson (1999) presented a conceptual framework that portrayed workplace incivility as social interaction that spirals and can escalate into more serious levels and forms of mistreatment in the workplace, such as workplace violence. The costs associated with violence in the workplace are staggering. Drawing on the results of a national crime survey, a Justice Report estimated that 1.7 million “violent victimizations” occurred in the workplace each year from 1993 to 1999 (Duhart, 2001). Associated costs to organizations, including items such as lost work time and wages, reduced productivity,

medical costs, workers compensation payments, and legal and security expenses approach billions of dollars in employer expense (Merchant & Lundell, 2001).

Studies also show negative results of workplace incivility incidents at both individual and organizational levels. At the individual level, victims report psychological harm leading to both cognitive and affective reactions such as confusion, fear, or panic (Cortina et al., 2002; Valle, 2005). The organizational level outcomes include decreased satisfaction with work, supervision, coworkers, and the job overall (Donovan, Drasgow, & Munson, 1998; Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994; Moorman, 1991); decreased organizational citizenship behaviors (Moorman, 1991); increases in organizational retaliation behaviors and aggression (Bies & Tripp, 1996); greater absenteeism (Barling & Phillips, 1993); and increased intent to turnover (Donovan, Drasgow, & Munson, 1998). Studies have shown that workplace incivility often coexists with other negative workplace behaviors such as sexual harassment (Cortina et al., 2002).

Workplace incivility is a concern not limited by occupation, industry, or geographic location. Studies in the literature stream draw from varied populations including both public and private sector occupations spanning the globe. A recent survey on European work conditions reported that 5% of European employees reported exposure to persistent intimidation and bullying in the workplace (Parent-Thirion, Macias, Harley, & Vermeyleylen, 2007). At first glance, the average is misleading, as the individual country data revealed a substantial range of persons reporting repeated exposure, including reports from Finland (17%), Netherlands (12%), Italy (2%), and Bulgaria (2%).

The present study added to the literature stream by examining elements of organizational culture that may affect the incidence of workplace incivility, and

ultimately, employee turnover. Looking in particular at communication-related elements of organizational culture and the way employee perceptions of human resources practices moderate relationships, the study examined organizational conditions that facilitate or promote the instances of workplace incivility. The literature described below showed that culture-bound organizational factors such as values, workgroup norms, and employee reactions to the factors influence the extent to which employees engage in counterproductive behaviors. Understanding the predictive nature of the culture in promotion or prevention of workplace incivility can aid organizations in improving the work experience of employees, leading to improved organizational performance. In addition, understanding the impact of the employee perceptions on human resource management practices positions this study for practical applications for human resources practitioners and managers in the field.

While the literature contains a great deal of work related to the more serious forms of deviant workplace behaviors, such as workplace aggression and workplace violence, the topic of workplace incivility lacks the same level of research depth. Understanding workplace incivility and its relationship with organizational culture provides advancement for the literature stream in this respect.

This chapter provides an overview of the literature about the topic. First, I will discuss the definition of organizational culture, measurement of culture, and its relationship with communication. Next, I present an overview of empirical research on workplace incivility including related forms of misbehavior, field specific studies, and scale development studies. I will then describe human resources practices and explain their relevance to this study. Finally, a summary of the salient points of the literature is

provided and outlined in a conceptual model for the study.

Organizational Culture

Defining Organizational Culture

Workplace incivility incidences occur in environments created by organizational culture. Organizational culture includes the habits, attitudes, and deep-seated values of the organization. Johnson (1988) described a “cultural web” defined by paradigms, control systems, organizational structures, power structures, symbols, rituals and routines, and stories and myths.

Schein (1993) suggested that culture is group-based and is “a pattern of basic shared assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problem of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid, and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (p.12). In short, Schein proposed that the concept of culture helps to explain organizational phenomena and normalizes them. Schein supported a view that culture stems from three major sources: (1) the belief, values, and assumptions of the founders of organizations; (2) the learning experiences of group members as organizations change; and (3) new beliefs, values, and assumptions introduced into the organization by new members or leaders.

Three levels of culture comprise Schein’s model: artifacts, espoused values, and basic underlying assumptions (1993). This study serves to examine culture by looking in particular at the manifestation of culture through two communication-related dimensions drawing from the work of Glaser, Zamanou, and Hacker (1987). These two dimensions are climate-morale and involvement.

Organizational culture provides the setting and the foundation for establishing the work environment that serves to either promote or prevent certain behaviors. These include both group and individual-based norms that influence communication structures, interpersonal responses, and transfer of information. Because workplace incivility involves norms of interpersonal behaviors (Brown & Levinson, 1987), an understanding of the impact of culture provides insight for the construction of these norms. From a broader context, culture can reflect country-based dimensions.

Measurement of Organizational Culture

Measurement of organizational culture serves as a contentious point for researchers. Some scholars feel that the construct requires the richness of naturalistic inquiry, while others argue for a positivistic, quantitative methodology. In a methodological investigation, Sriramesh, Grunig, and Dozier (1996) aimed to determine whether organizational culture should be researched quantitatively or observed qualitatively. Dependent variables for the study included the importance of innovation, tradition, and efficiency as organizational values. Independent variables included management style (participative versus authoritarian), liberal versus conservative values, cooperation versus domination relationship with the public, and type of system (open versus closed).

Employees ($N = 4,631$) of 321 organizations in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom completed questionnaires. Indices developed through factor analysis produced two dimensions of organizational culture, including participatory and authoritarian aspects. These dimensions correlated with 55 variables to form an index for excellence in public relations. The findings suggested that symmetrical internal

communication functions as an entry point for public relations professionals to influence organizational culture that, in turn, begins progress toward public relations excellence. The researchers demonstrated that almost all of the organizational culture characteristics in the literature loaded on two dimensions: participatory and authoritarian. In terms of measuring culture, the authors contended that measuring culture in quantitative terms is possible. The study underscored the importance of including quantitative measures in assessing an organization for particular cultural aspects (Sriramesh, Grunig, & Dozier, 1996).

In another study focusing on appropriate methods for framing organizational culture studies, Yauch and Steudel (2003) described cultural assessment techniques in both quantitative and qualitative paradigms. They used an exploratory case study approach to examine the influence of organizational culture on the conversion process to cell manufacturing for two companies. Qualitative assessment of the company culture took the form of document review, participant observation, and group interviews. Presentation of findings made to management and employees at follow-up meetings served as member checks. Quantitative methods included statistical analysis of a cultural assessment instrument. Employees of the two companies completed the Organizational Culture Inventory (Glaser, 1983) for measurement of two cultural factor variables, avoidance and complacency.

The researchers reported that employing mixed methods at the data and paradigm levels provided a more complete and robust depiction of organization culture. They posited that mixed methods, with the additional features of data triangulation and greater cultural understanding, provided increased validity of the study results.

Role of Communication in Culture

Glaser, Zamanou, and Hacker (1987) examined six communication-related dimensions of organizational culture defined by management and communication research. The independent variables were teamwork-conflict, climate-morale, information flow, involvement, supervision, and meetings. The researchers presented a triangulation approach by employing reliably coded interviews to help interpret and place in the context the results of statistical analysis. The Organizational Culture Survey (Glaser, 1983), a 62-item questionnaire containing five subscales of climate, involvement, communication, supervision, and meetings, served to measure the variables. Participants rated items using a 5-point scale (1 = *to a very little extent* to 5 = *to a very great extent*). Sample items were, "People I work with are direct and honest with each other" and "People I work with function as a team."

A stratified sample of government employees ($N = 195$) of varied levels in six division departments in the Pacific Northwest completed the survey. In addition, 91 subjects completed a 45-minute interview. The format of the interview included three teams of researchers working in pairs. The team conducted the interviews and then blind coded the results according to the six factors under investigation. The researchers performed an ANOVA for each subscale at the organizational level. Researchers used Duncan multiple range tests to investigate the differences between the pairs of groups and the satisfaction and dissatisfaction ratios of reported results. The researchers used the interpretive theme method to analyze the interview information.

Five organizational themes emerged. First, top management and supervisors did not appear to listen to or value the ideas or opinions of the employees. Second, limited

interactions between departments and divisions caused misunderstanding and confusion. Third, meetings tended to focus on informational elements only and did not involve enough interaction or decision-making. Fourth, employees were often unclear about the focus of their activity or where the organization was heading. Fifth, supervisors did not provide enough feedback or recognition. The study held important implications with regard to the types of communication dimensions that are desirable in organizational cultures that promote healthy work environments for employees.

Organizational culture drives several factors important to the organization. One such factor is retention of employees. Sheridan (1992) examined the impact of organizational culture on the retention rates of college graduates hired at six public accounting firms. Independent variables of organizational culture values related to work tasks included detail, stability, and innovation; interpersonal relationship factors included team orientation and respect for people; and individual actions included outcomes and aggressiveness. The dependent variables included retention time, reported as voluntary survivor rates.

The instrument used to measure the organizational culture values was the Organizational Culture Profile (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Senior employees such as partners, managers, and senior staff of the firms completed the surveys. Researchers used factor analysis to determine seven norms or dimensions under investigation as independent variables. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) examined how the organizational culture values varied from firm to firm. The researchers reported significant differences among the firms. Findings of the study suggested that work task values of detail and stability, and interpersonal relations values of team

orientation and respect for people, explained most of the variance in retention rates. The study indicated that innovation was the least important factor in all firms.

Two distinct cultures emerged among the firms; three cultures emphasized work task values and three emphasized interpersonal relationships. The researcher found that voluntary survivor rates among the firms that emphasized interpersonal relationships were significantly higher than firms emphasizing work task values.

A human resources-related factor influenced by culture is the transfer of training information. Earley (1994) investigated the relationship between training and the cultural elements of individual-collectivism with self-efficacy and performance. The research included two components, a laboratory experiment and a field experiment. As for the laboratory experiment, 251 managers from Hong Kong, the People's Republic of China, and the United States served as the sample. The predictor variables included the cultural variable, individualism-collectivism, and three levels of training (task, none, group). An experimental task of correctly completing work scheduling assignments within a specified time served as the criterion variable of performance. A questionnaire measured self-rated effort, individual-collectivism, and self-efficacy.

The field experiment involved 108 service representatives from communication companies in Hong Kong, the People's Republic of China, and the United States. Performance, measured by the company's standard appraisal system, served as the dependent variable. The specific elements examined included overall performance, self-efficacy, self-rated effort, overall effort, and service. The researchers assessed self-rated effort after the training intervention at three and six months. Participants reported self-rated effort, individualism-collectivism, and demographic data on a questionnaire.

Analyses for the field experiment included regression of effort, self-efficacy, collectivism-group, collectivism-individual, and training condition on performance. The researchers used hierarchical regression to examine performance at time one and time two on the demographic variables of age, educational level, gender, company size, and baseline performance. Post-hoc analyses of performance included a series of one-way ANOVAs to examine the high and low levels of individualism-collectivism across training conditions for each of the performance periods (time one, time two). The researchers conducted the least significant test to examine self-efficacy and efforts.

The researchers reported that an employee's cultural orientation affects his or her understanding of training information. Persons with a collectivist orientation experienced less effectiveness in enhancing self-efficacy, effort, and performance when training focused on the individual. Individualistic persons are best trained by targeting personal actions. The most significant finding of the research was that the cultural variable of individualism-collectivism is relevant in understanding how training influences self-efficacy.

Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Workplace Behaviors

Studies have shown that organizational culture influences workplace social interaction norms, particularly in the group context. Further, these norms and group behaviors comprise situational factors that influence job performance and can influence resource allocation. Amsa (1986) conducted a study to measure organizational culture regarding one aspect of work group behavior, loitering. The study took place in textile mills of Ahmedabad in India. Mill workers ($N = 40$) from six private sector and three public sector mills participated in the study. The researchers developed a structured

interview from informal interviews and personal observations of workers. A panel of judges determined content validity. Researchers performed a series of z tests to examine relationships between mills with reported “high levels of loitering” and those with “low levels of loitering.”

The study showed differences with respect to beliefs, norms, values, and traditions between the different groups examined. Additionally, the work supported that a relationship existed between the subculture of a department and a specific work group behavior. Amsa (1986) proposed that the work behavior was not determined by a single cultural element but by a set of elements.

The purpose of a study by Mangione and Mangione (2001) was to examine the relationship between the predictor variables of work group characteristics such as work group cohesiveness, work group interdependence, supervisory presence, and the percentage of women in the work group with the outcome variables of perceived hostility, harassment, and negativity. Employees ($N = 6,540$) from Fortune 500 companies at 16 worksites received a survey questionnaire. The researchers found that workgroup cohesiveness was the most important factor in protecting both men and women against hostility and harassment in the workplace. The second most important factor reported was supervisor interaction. Workgroup interdependence was highly associated with abuse. The more the workgroup depended on each other, the higher the incidence of abuse.

The impact of group social context on individual interpersonal aggression was the focus of a study by Glomb and Liao (2003). Two hundred seventeen employees of an assisted living group health care facility were the participants of the survey-based study.

The dependent variable was workplace aggression, scored at the individual and work group level. The independent variables included individual difference antecedents (negative affectivity, self-monitoring, and anger expression) and perceptions of job and organizational factors (organizational stress, organizational injustice, and work satisfaction).

Glomb and Liao (2003) found support for social exchange or reciprocity as a predictor of individual aggression. The researchers suggested that victims of aggression often engage in aggressive behaviors. The study provided support that even after the consideration of individual factors, dyadic and work group behaviors influence member behaviors.

A study by Miner, Glomb, and Hulin (2005) examined the relationship among job events, mood, and job behaviors. Using the experience sampling method, palmtop computers signaled and then recorded participant responses relating to events, moods, and behaviors throughout the workday. The sample was 68 employees from a light manufacturing company in the Midwest. Forty-two participants completed the experience sampling method phase.

Mood related to all types of positive and negative events, except supervisor events. The data showed different reactions to negative coworker events, positive and negative supervisor events, and negative work events. The relationship between negative events and mood was five times stronger than the relationship between positive events and mood.

In a related investigation of negative events, Kurtzberg and Mueller (2005) conducted a longitudinal study to examine the influence of daily conflict on perceptions

of creativity. Both quantitative and qualitative data from the diaries of employees (N = 228) of seven different organizations in three types of industries (chemical/pharmaceutical, high-tech, and consumer products) comprised the methodology for this study. The researchers used a daily questionnaire and Electronic Event Sampling Methodology to collect workday events and perceptions of outcomes over the study period that ranging from 9 to 38 weeks. The independent variables were task, process, and relationship conflict. Researchers coded open response items from the reported data by participants. The dependent variables related to the Perceptions of Individual Creativity and Perceptions of Team Creative Synergy, measured by scales developed from the daily questionnaire.

The research findings supported the theory that those specific types of events that occur daily affect individuals in measurable forms. Results suggested conflict positively relates to an individual's impression of one's own creativity following a task conflict. All types of conflict affected perceptions of team creativity, if relationships existed. The negative effects of conflict on perceptions of team creativity took precedence over reflections on individual creativity. The data suggested a relationship between process and relationship conflicts. If the participants experienced higher levels of relationship conflict, they were more likely to experience process conflict. Process conflict appeared the most damaging form of conflict from the standpoint of perceptions of individual creativity.

Summary of Organizational Culture and Its Relationship To Study

Research discussed above indicated that organizational culture shapes and frames the interaction of employees. This relates to my study because the deeper understanding

of how perceptions of specific culture dimensions and how they can become antecedents of workplace incivility can have important implications for human resources practitioners, as well as organization leaders.

Workplace Incivility

Defining Workplace Incivility

Workplace incivility involves low intensity aggression in social interactions in the workplace with an ambiguous intent to harm. While the construct is similar to other forms of misbehavior such as emotional abuse, bullying, sexual harassment, and workplace violence, the separation of this form of workplace mistreatment largely relates to the ambiguous nature of the behaviors. Organizations often overlook forms of workplace incivility because of the differences in perception of the various behaviors, creating a hidden and dangerous dynamic in the workplace.

Some of the early studies relating to mistreatment in the workplace sought to investigate the source and type of deviant workplace behaviors in the medical profession (Bjorkvist et al., 1994; Cox, 1991; Diaz & McMillin, 1991; Hansen, 1993; Harvey, 1995; Keashly et al., 1994; Price Spratlen, 1995; Sheehan et al., 1990; Silver & Glick, 1990; Uhari et al., 1994; Wolf et al., 1991). Other studies include a broader range of workplace misbehaviors, including workplace violence and aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996); abusive supervision (Ashforth, 1994; Tepper, 2000); social undermining (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002); victimization (Aquino & Lamertz, 2004); and injustice (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). While these behavioral constructs relate to workplace incivility, studies exist that support workplace incivility as a discernable and separate construct (Blau & Andersson, 2005; Keashly, Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001).

The medical field studies looked in particular at the instigators and types of abuse against nurses, medical students, and interns. Verbal abuse, closely related to the interpersonal interactions comprising workplace incivility, emerged as a most prevalent form of abuse across studies.

Cox (1991) used a sample of nurses ($N = 709$) and nurse managers ($N = 459$) in a survey study that assessed their experience of verbal abuse during their career as nurses. The survey appeared in a trade magazine, and the sample represented nursing professionals from all states except New Hampshire and Washington, DC and included participants from Canada and Saudia Arabia. Approximately 96.7% of nurses and 97.1% of nurse managers experienced verbal abuse during their nursing careers. The source of the abuse was most frequently physicians. Additional questions gathered information relating to the impact of abuse on care, use of time, morale, job satisfaction, job security, productivity, workload, errors, and incidence of lawsuits, attitudes toward unions, turnover, and nursing shortages. Other significant findings included a 25% turnover ratio, reported reduction in patient care, passive acceptance of abuse, and perceived lack of organizational support.

In a study of medical students ($N = 431$) at a major medical school, Silver and Glicken (1990) investigated various types of abuse during the academic experience. Most frequently reported forms of abuse were verbal and academic. The most common source of abuse was clinical professors and house staff. Almost half of the medical students in all classes reported some form of abuse (46.4%), with 80% of the seniors indicating abuse during the course of their program. In addition, the students predicted some form of abuse for all students.

A similar study with medical students ($N = 75$) conducted by Sheehan et al. (1990) examined experiences on forms of abuse during medical school to include verbal, physical, sexual, and racial types. The most prevalent forms of abuse were verbal (85%), sexual (55%), and racial (50%), academic (47%), and physical (24%). The most common sources of abuse were residents, interns, professors, and nurses. The outcomes of the abusive behavior influenced emotional health (67%), family life (43%), and physical health (40%).

Diaz and McMillin (1991) conducted a random survey with a sample of female nurses in a California county ($N = 500$) to assess a multi-item model of types of abuse. Respondents reported on measures of abusive behaviors experienced in the workplace (verbal, sexual, threat, and physical) and the source of behaviors. In addition to the quantitative measures, the researchers asked the participants to describe specific behaviors and frequencies. The researchers inquired about the most unfavorable interaction the respondent had with a physician, including where the incident occurred, whether the behavior was expected, and whether and how this incident influenced future interactions with this physician. They found verbal behaviors most prevalent (64%), followed by sexual (30%), threat (23%), and physical (10%). Physicians were the most prevalent source of abusive behaviors. The researchers used chi-square to test statistical significance of the data. A relationship between age and incidents existed, with younger nurses more vulnerable to abuse.

Uhari et al. (1994) surveyed medical students in Finland to investigate incidence of mistreatment of medical students. Using a survey developed by the American Medical Association, the researchers worked with a sample of first- and third-year students ($N =$

255) at two medical schools. The dependent variable for the study was incidence of medical student abuse. Verbal abuse was the most frequent type of abuse reported in this study.

Wolf et al. (1991) used another type of survey developed by the American Medical Association Office of Educational Research targeting senior medical students at a major medical school in the United States ($N = 87$). As in earlier studies, participants identified verbal abuse as the most frequent type (92%), followed by academic (71%), physical (53%), sexual (52%), and racial (37%). The most common sources of abuse were residents and interns. Major findings of this study indicated that 98.9% of those surveyed reported some form of abuse. Residents reported more verbal abuse than other forms.

Oztunc (2006) examined incidents of verbal abuse in the workplace experienced by nurses in Turkey using descriptive methodology. The sample of nurses ($N = 290$) participated in an interview that consisted of 20 closed and open questions. There were two main sections in data gathered. First, the researchers collected data about the nurses such as place of work, shifts worked, age, and educational status. Second, nurses reported situations of self-experiences of verbal abuse, including source, emotional results, witnesses, and what they did after the abuse.

Similar to earlier research, the study revealed that the majority of nurses faced verbal abuse while working (91.1%). Patient relatives were the most reported source of abuse. In response to the abuse, most often the nurses continued their job without confronting the source of abuse or reporting it to administrators. The most common emotional response to the abuse was anger. The nurses reported emotional exhaustion,

negative effect on morale, and decreased productivity.

The early medical studies raised consciousness in the literature about the varied types of interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace, while also quantifying the nature of experienced mistreatment. In addition, researchers linked the perceived mistreatment to a number of negative effects, such as reduced morale and increased health issues of stress and fatigue. Several studies underscored the importance of the relationship between organization culture and turnover.

Related Forms of Misbehavior in Organizations

Part of the challenge in understanding what workplace incivility is, involves understanding what workplace incivility is not. While abusive supervision, petty tyranny, aggression, and bullying are uncivil behaviors, they are not ambiguous in nature. Studies relating to these constructs often involved the measurement of frequency, source, and consequence of the mistreatment. These studies related strongly to workplace incivility by connecting the milder form of mistreatment to the deleterious individual and organizational outcomes resulting from the incivility spiral (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

The incivility spiral posited by Andersson and Pearson (1999) suggested that perceptions of interactional injustice in social interactions, feelings of negative affect, and the desire to reciprocate increased the probability of the incivility spiral. Understanding the related forms of misbehavior provided information about social interactions “down stream” from the initial acts of workplace incivility.

Hansen (1993) used a statistical sample of Canadian military personnel ($N = 5,642$) in a survey study to examine personal harassment on the job. The instrument, developed by the Canadian forces, included descriptions of personal harassment. Abuse

of the authority (30%) ranked first as the most commonly experienced type of abuse. Other major findings included that women were more likely to be harassed, but men were more likely victims of abuse of authority. Most of those reporting experiences of abuse did not take formal action against the perpetrator. Those who did report the abuse experiences through the formal channel indicated dissatisfaction in the resolution process. Outcomes of the abuse found in the study included job transfer (25%) or consideration of voluntarily leaving the organization. Fourteen percent indicated that increased absenteeism resulted from the mistreatment.

A study by Ashforth (1994) presented a model of antecedents of tyrannical measurement and the effects of tyranny on subordinates. The dependent variable in the study was instances of petty tyranny in organizations. The independent variables included individual predispositions such as beliefs about the organization, subordinates, and self; preferences for action; and situational factors such as institutionalized values and norms, power, and stressors. The outcomes of tyrannical management variables investigated included low self-esteem, performance, work unit cohesiveness, and leader endorsement along with high frustration, stress, reactance, helplessness, and work alienation among subordinates.

The authors found that petty tyranny produced the following effects on subordinates: leader endorsement, frustration, stress and reactance, helplessness and work alienation, lowered self-esteem and performance, and lowered work unit cohesiveness.

Bjorkvist et al. (1994) investigated the relationships among aggression, workplace abuse, harassment, anxiety, and depression. The sample included employees ($N = 338$) of a university located in Finland. The mixed methods study included a questionnaire and

one-on-one interviews.

Findings suggested women and administrators experienced the most harassment. The researchers conducted multivariate analysis (MANOVA) with depression and anxiety and aggressiveness serving as the dependent variables, and gender and work group belonging as the independent variables. While the gender (male or female) of the individuals was not significant, the interaction between gender and group belonging on aggression, was with harassed women feeling significantly more aggressive than harassed men. In follow-up interviews, victims claimed that feelings of depression, anxiety, and aggressiveness were a direct result of the workplace harassment. Symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) reported by participants included insomnia, nervous symptoms, melancholy, apathy, lack of concern, and sociophobia.

In a similar study, Keashly, Trott, and MacLean (1994) examined the extent to which students ($N = 59$) experienced nonsexual, nonphysical abusive behavior on their jobs. The study investigated impact of the experience on job satisfaction, the characteristics of the actor and target, and responses to the behaviors, in particular, turnover. In order to participate in the study, the students had to have paid work experience within the past 12 months.

The most often reported negative behaviors were intellectual belittlement, put down in public, talked to in a sarcastic manner, glared at, sworn at, the target of temper tantrums, and intimidated by unreasonable demands. Approximately 14% of the sample reported experiencing several different types of events. The study found that bosses were named most often as the offender, followed by co-workers. A strategy used in dealing with the event was to not deal directly with the actor (ignoring/avoiding). A notable

finding of the study was that 13.6% left the organization because of the negative experience.

Price Spratlen (1995) used a random sample of faculty and staff members of a major university ($N = 1585$) to investigate the relationship between mistreatment in the workplace and the effects on 10 aspects of work life. Participants responded to a series of questions relating to workplace mistreatment. In order for the researchers to use the case, the participant reported a specific incident, severity, source, timing, location, and negative effects. Measures included items related to employment (position, unit), form of mistreatment (verbal, physical, environmental, other), and an open-ended question to describe the "personal story." Participants rated the severity of the mistreatment incidence using a severity scale. Using the same scale, participants rated the effects of the mistreatment on several factors, including economical/occupational, personal health, self-esteem, self-confidence, leisure time, communication with peers, communication with superiors, attendance, job satisfaction, and productivity.

Respondents indicated environmental mistreatment was most prevalent (65%), followed by verbal mistreatment (54%), inappropriate use of memos (14%), and physical abuse (12%). The supervisor or superior was the most often reported source of abuse. The results of the study indicated moderate to severe impact on aspects of work life experienced by those reporting verbal or environmental abuse. The significant effects of the mistreatment related to job satisfaction, productivity, self-esteem, and communication with supervisors.

In a similar study, Harvey (1995) surveyed a sample of university students ($N = 154$) using the IWEI, a multi-item behavioral scale. Measures included job

satisfaction, tension, intention to leave, negative affectivity, and fear of speaking up. The most reported source of abuse was the boss. Major findings of the study indicated that abusive events affected both individual and organizational outcomes. First, the target was more likely to have a fear of speaking up following abuse. Second, the researchers noted abuse as a workplace stressor.

Other studies report verbal assault and other forms of aggression against supervisors were prevalent in organizations. A study by Allen and Lucero (1998) investigated the antecedents of verbal and physical assaults by subordinate employees on managers. The researchers used content analysis of published arbitration decisions as a primary data source for this mixed methods study. The decisions included those published in labor arbitration reports between June 16, 1978, and June 3, 1993. Of the arbitration cases ($N = 4,310$) examined, 1,916 discharges or disciplinary actions occurred.

Researchers coded the documents based on three descriptive variables including nature of aggression (verbal, physical); type of discipline under review (termination, less than termination); and a triggering event (present, not present). For those with triggering events, further analysis took place. The researchers coded the events as type (direct, indirect); specific target type (aggressor-supervisor, nonspecific targets); and history (observed, not referenced). The results revealed that each case contained at least one triggering event in 96.7% of the arbitration decisions. Manager criticism of job performance was the most common event reported (30.3%). Data support a greater likelihood for aggressive behavior to be verbal in nature (70%).

A study by Douglas and Martinko (2001) considered the relationship between individual differences of employees and incidence of workplace aggression. The

predictor variables for the study included trait anger, attitude toward revenge, negative affectivity, self-control, attribution style, and history. The criterion variable was incidence of workplace aggression. Control variables for the study included gender, age, profession, and education. The sample for the study consisted of employees ($N = 151$) from two organizations located in the northeastern United States.

The researchers found individual differences comprised more than 60% of the variance in workplace aggression. Individuals exhibiting high trait anger were likely to report engaging in workplace aggression. Individuals with positive attitudes toward revenge were more likely to engage in incidents of workplace aggression. Neither negative affectivity nor low self-control was independently associated with workplace aggression. Trait anger, attitudes toward revenge, attribution style, previous exposure to aggressive culture, and trait anger interaction with self-control interaction predicted self-reported incidence of workplace aggression.

Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2002) tested an interactive model of undermining and social support in the workplace. The sample for the study included police officers from the Republic of Slovenia ($N = 740$). The independent variables included social undermining and social support. Social undermining measures included 37 potential coworker and 35 potential supervisor items drawn from the literature base. Dependent variables included self-efficacy, organizational commitment, active and passive counterproductive work behaviors, and somatic complaints. Control variables were tenure and predisposition to negative and positive affectivity.

Social undermining proved significantly related to employee outcomes, usually more strongly than with social support. High levels of undermining and support from the

same source correlated negatively. Support from one source seemed to moderate the negative impact of social undermining from another source.

Mayhew et al. (2004) compared the emotional/stress impact from physical violence with bullying. The researchers suggested that bullying denotes reoccurring behavior that is offensive to the reasonable person and includes behaviors such as intimidation, humiliation, ridicule, degradation, or insulting activities. Mayhew et al. contended that the intensity associated with physical violence and bullying was similar over time. Physical severity of an incident was a poor predictor of the level of emotional/stress injury. The study focused on the application of the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) (Leymann, 1990) in three large-scale studies in education, health, and long-haul transport. The GHQ measures the effects of occupational violence and bullying by reporting the severity of emotional stress repercussions.

In the three studies, a total of 800 employees participated from 2000 to 2003. The self-selected participants volunteered to talk about a personal experience of workplace bullying. The education sample included employees of a Queensland institution who participated in face-to-face interviews. The second sample, from the health industry, involved employees located in 45 hospitals and 14 ambulance stations. The third sample, composed of employees of the long-haul transportation industry, focused on occupational health and safety.

Through both quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques, the researchers identified a continuum of violence in each case. The majority of instances involved verbal abuse or other non-physical threats. Males were more frequently the perpetrators than females. The research indicated that the fear of being bullied has as much impact on

employee well-being as physical assault. Both covert and subtle forms of occupational violence and bullying resulted in significant costs that were grouped as negative individual consequences, organizational, and client or customer group.

Penney and Spector (2005) investigated the relationships among job stressors, negative affectivity and counterproductive work behavior (CWB). The correlational study sought to determine the effects of workplace incivility on employee satisfaction and CWB. The survey research employed both self-report and peer review instruments. The dependent variables for the study were employee satisfaction and CWB . The independent variables were workplace incivility and job stressors.

The researchers found that incivility, organizational constraints, and interpersonal conflict negatively related to job satisfaction and positively related to CWB. Negative affectivity moderated job stressors and CWB. In general, the study suggested that job stressors and CWB were stronger for individuals reporting high in negative affectivity than for those low in negative affectivity.

Aquino, Bies, and Tripp (2001) examined the relationships between blame, offender status, and the pursuit of revenge or reconciliation after a personal offense. The researchers suggested that the study extends the literature, in that they considered organizational factors in the revenge and forgiveness process. Employees ($N = 241$) from a government service agency served as the sample for the survey. The independent variables for the study included blame attribution, victim hierarchical status, and victim-offender status. The dependent variables were revenge and reconciliation.

The researchers found support for direct relationships among blame attribution, revenge, and reconciliation. Victim-offender relative status and victim hierarchical status

moderated blame attribution and revenge behavior. Employees reported they were more likely to exact revenge on less powerful people. However, when the would-be avengers perceived weakened power from resource dependency, the instances of revenge lessened. Victim absolute hierarchical status moderated revenge-seeking behaviors, in that lower status employees who blamed others sought revenge more than those with higher status.

A study by Cortina et al. (2002) examined the experiences of interpersonal mistreatment in the federal court system. A random sample of practicing attorneys ($N = 4,608$) participated in the mixed methods investigation. The theoretical framework was social dominance, sex-role spill-over, cognitive stress, and organizational and intervention theories. The variables under investigation included general incivility and rudeness experiences, general incivility, gender-related incivility, unwanted sexual attention, coping with interpersonal mistreatment, and job-related outcomes of interpersonal mistreatment (job satisfaction, job stress, and job withdrawal).

In addition to the quantitative data gleaned from the study, qualitative methods comprised a portion of the research. Open-ended questions followed a number of the quantitative items.

The researchers analyzed the data in four general stages. First, they examined the nature and incidence(s) of the interpersonal mistreatment experienced in federal practice. Next, they identified factors associated with both the perpetration and victimization of the interpersonal mistreatment. Third, they provided a description of the attorney efforts to deal with the interpersonal mistreatment. Finally, they examined the various effects of the interpersonal mistreatment on the attorney's well-being.

Results indicated that 62% of the participants experienced some form of

interpersonal mistreatment during the previous 5 years. Eleven themes emerged in the qualitative data relative to forms of interpersonal mistreatment: disrespectful or dishonest behavior (most prevalent form); being ignored or excluded; professionally discredited; silence; gender disparagement; threats or intimidation; addressed unprofessionally; generally or sexually suggestive comments about the physical appearance of others; mistaken for non-lawyer personnel (clerks, runners); sexually suggestive comments or behaviors; and physical or sexual touching.

The researchers regressed tenure, minority status, and gender on the Interpersonal Mistreatment Score. Significant predictors were type of practice, minority status, and gender. Chi-square analysis revealed that female targets were more likely than males to report experiencing incivility from other attorneys; however, males were more likely to identify judges as the source of the experienced incivility. Women reported more reliance on coping strategies in general. Men reported the use of one coping behavior, appeasement, more frequently than women.

Structural equation modeling assessed the direct and indirect effects of interpersonal mistreatment on attorney well-being. The researchers found that regardless of gender, there were more experiences of interpersonal mistreatment associated with lowered job satisfaction and increased job stress. The data also revealed that the less satisfied and more stressed attorneys felt, the higher the consideration for leaving the federal law practice.

Lim and Cortina (2005) investigated the relationship between general and sexual forms of interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. The study included the results of two separate surveys given to female respondents working in the federal court system.

In the first study, researchers mailed pen and paper surveys to 1,662 employees, with a response rate of 71%. Lim and Cortina (2005) used existing scales to operationalize the independent variables of incivility: sexual harassment; job-related outcomes (job satisfaction, job withdrawal, and job stress); psychological and health outcomes (psychological well-being and distress, life satisfaction, and health satisfaction).

The second study included a sample of female attorneys ($N = 1,425$). The variables under investigation were incivility, gender harassment, sexual harassment, mistreatment frequency, job satisfaction, job stress, and job withdrawal. Findings of the study revealed that general incivility and sexual harassment related to gender harassment, connecting the two constructs. These behaviors coexisted in organizations, with employee well-being negatively impacted as the number of mistreatments increased.

These studies provide empirical data about other forms of CWB that relate to workplace incivility. Similar aspects of these behaviors include the profile of perpetrators, most often persons with power and the types of outcomes from the experiences such as decreased job satisfaction, intent to turnover, depression, anxiety, and workplace stress. The studies show a number of differences between the related forms of behavior (interpersonal mistreatment, abusive supervision, bullying, petty tyranny) and workplace incivility as related to the ambiguous intent to harm and the level of intensity. In the related forms, the intent to harm is often more clear and the level of intensity stronger.

Early Workplace Incivility Studies

While research supported the existence of other forms of severe forms of mistreatment in the workplace, such as emotional abuse, the lesser intense construct of workplace incivility did not receive attention until the early 2000s. Researchers investigated and examined workplace incivility as a separate construct through the development and validation of measures and instruments.

Keashly, Pearson, Andersson, and Wegner (2001) conducted an inductive study that addressed two questions: (1) What is the nature of workplace incivility and does it differ from and fit among other types of workplace mistreatment? (2) What are the implications for employees and organizations? The investigation involved a variety of settings including metropolitan and suburban police stations, inner city hospital emergency rooms, business locations, and legal offices. Data collection of four distinct samples took place over the course of three years. The researchers employed triangulation to validate data through a four-phase process. The first phase included focused discussions with managers, attorneys, and physicians. In the second phase, researchers distributed questionnaires to managers and attorneys. Structured interviews comprised the data collection activity in phase three. Phase four was a hosted forum of expert managers. The researchers used emergent design as one research techniques.

The workshop and focus group employed in phase one included 670 voluntary participants representing public and private organizations across the Midwest, Southeast, and Western United States. The researchers distributed one-paragraph scenarios describing various antisocial work behaviors. Examples of the types of items included “supervisor publicly and erroneously admonishes a subordinate” and “altercation

between two employees culminates in an exchange of physical threats.” Participants commented on what behaviors were notable, targets of behaviors, assumptions about the instigator and the target, reactions of the person, and how the situation might affect the characteristics of the workplace. The research team compiled the responses, identified themes, and then conducted member checks. Participant checking verified the accuracy of the data captured. A panel of five external judges examined the assumptions of the researchers.

In phase two, the researchers distributed a questionnaire composed of open-ended questions relating to personal experiences of workplace incivility to 51 managers (human resources managers, marketing directors, financial managers) from 30 organizations and 131 attorneys. Thick description for the study, garnered from those who reported experiences of workplace incivility, was the objective of phase three. Questions developed from workshop data and questionnaire information served as the basis for this portion of the study.

The research suggested that characteristics of incivility related to the nature, intent, and intensity of the behaviors and the normative context of this type of behavior. The authors suggested the definition of workplace incivility included the components of low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target. The behaviors were in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Characteristics of workplace incivility include rude and discourteous behaviors that display a lack of regard for others.

The authors posited two bounding characteristics from the findings. First, phenomenon was negative with undertones of immorality. Second, they characterized the behaviors as similar to and distinct from other types of antisocial, deviant behaviors

(aggression and violence). While they found that the intent of harm in incivility appeared ambiguous, the intensity of the behaviors mimicked petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1994).

A study by Cortina, Magley, Williams, and Langhout (2001) investigated the incidence, targets, instigators, and outcomes of incivility in the workplace through survey research. Employees ($N = 1,180$) of the public sector served as the sample. The Workplace Incivility Scale, developed as part of the study, measured the frequency of experiences of disrespectful, rude, or condescending behaviors from superiors or coworkers in the past five years. A sample of the type of item was, "During the past 5 years, have you been in a situation where any of your superiors or coworkers put you down or were condescending to you?" Focus group interviews with employees at all levels of the organization developed the items for the survey. The researchers included a number of control and methodological variables to help strengthen the integrity of the validation of the instrument.

Methods of analyses in the study included confirmatory factor analysis to assess the plausibility of workplace incivility as a single construct. A series of nested regression models tested the demographic variables of the targets. The demographic characteristics included (a) gender; (b) job position (unit heads, managers, supervisors, attorneys, specialists, secretaries, and administrative support staff); (c) ethnicity (African American, European American, Native American or other); (d) job gender context (supervisor gender, coworker gender relation, and gender traditionality of the person's position); (e) marital status (single, married/partnered, separated/divorced or widowed); and (f) age.

The study revealed women experienced greater frequencies of incivility. Attorneys and secretaries reported the least frequent experiences of this kind. Chi-square

analyses revealed that 50% of the instigators were court personnel acting alone. The researchers regressed work satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, pay/ benefits satisfaction, promotional satisfaction, work withdrawal, job withdrawal, career salience, psychological well-being, psychological distress, life satisfaction, and health satisfaction on incivility. The researchers used control variables, including gender, ethnicity, and position within the organization.

Incivility significantly predicted each of the five components of the job satisfaction scale (after controlling for personal demographics and occupational stress). The study showed that satisfaction decreased as incidence of incivility increased. Notably, turnover increased as incivility increased. Those experiencing more frequent instances of incivility on the job were less satisfied with all aspects of employment: their jobs, supervisors, coworkers, pay and benefits, and promotional opportunities. Explained variance ranged from 3% (pay and benefits satisfaction) to 16% (supervisor satisfaction). Organizational withdrawal behavior revealed that the WIS score led to an 8% increase in explained variance in this area. The participants also considered quitting more frequently.

Blau and Andersson (2005) tested a model of instigated workplace incivility as a separate behavioral construct. The study included a sample of working adults in the medical technology profession ($N = 211$) in a longitudinal study. The participants were recent graduates of the Board of Registry of the American Society for Clinical Pathology. The dependent variables for the study were experiences of workplace incivility and instigated workplace incivility. The independent variables included organizational and procedural justice, job satisfaction, job insecurity, work exhaustion, and affective occupational commitment.

The study supported a distinction between experienced versus instigated workplace incivility with empirical differences. The model accounted for 20% of the variance in instigated workplace incivility. In particular, interpersonal deviance consisting of aggressive behaviors proved significantly different from the incivility measures under question. The study supported the idea that instigated workplace incivility is of lesser intensity than general interpersonal deviant behavior. Further, the path analyses showed that distributive justice, procedural justice, job satisfaction, and work exhaustion significantly relate to instigated workplace incivility.

Martin and Hine (2005) engaged in the development and validation of a questionnaire measuring uncivil workplace behavior. This instrument represents the second validated measure of this construct. Five samples of Australian adult employees ($N = 368$) from a broad range of workplaces participated in the survey.

The early workplace incivility studies sought to justify workplace incivility as a separate CWB construct. The studies sought to explain the nature, intent, and intensity of the behaviors through the development of incivility scales. The studies justify a separate construct through the comparison of these scales with existing instruments in the area of interpersonal mistreatment with regard to nature, intent, and intensity.

The perception of justice in the workplace is a key proposition in the workplace incivility spiral. Andersson and Pearson (1999) contended that the perception of interactional injustice by the target in a social interaction increased the probability of an incivility spiral. Studies show that negative experiences in the workplace impacted personnel in a stronger way than positive experiences. The results for negative experiences were more severe and tended to last longer than positive experiences.

Interpersonal relationships and emotionality in the workplace can promote or inhibit the perception of those experiences. Therefore, victimization and the perception of justice in the workplace are important in establishing an understanding of the emotionality involved in workplace incivility.

A study by Aquino and Bommer (2003) investigated whether the performance of organizational citizenship behavior and three indicators of social status (hierarchical position, gender, and race) predicted vulnerability to victimization by the harmful action of others. The sample population for the study was employees of a manufacturing firm with locations in the midwestern (2), southeastern (2), and western (1) United States ($N = 418$). The researchers used survey methodology to gather self-reports of perceived victimization (10 items) and reviewed company records to collect demographic data such as race, gender, and employee level. Organizational citizenship behavior was collected on a 12-item scale and included items relating to courtesy, sportsmanship, and altruism. Control variables included personality characteristics such as aggressiveness and neuroticism.

The researchers found that citizenship strongly and negatively related to perceived victimization for Caucasians as compared to African Americans. Citizenship strongly related to perceived victimization among employees with low, as compared to high, hierarchical status. The researchers reported no moderating effects relating to gender.

Aquino and Lamertz (2004) proposed a model of workplace victimization that incorporated the perpetrator and victim perspectives. The researchers operationalized victims as submissive or proactive and the perpetrators as dominating or reactive. Based on the various combination of roles, the victimization type could be low or high episodic

and low or high institutionalized. Based on these roles, the authors offered a number of hypotheses regarding the relationship between the roles and types of victimization. Further, they suggested that imbalance in dyadic social power between the role players, third-party actors with relationships with both parties, and victim or perpetrators holding central positions within the organization's social networks moderated victim-perpetrator role relation. Finally, they posited that the likelihood of institutionalized victimization occurring increased with the instance of norms, thus supporting the belief that punishments, aggression, and the exercise of coercive power are functional for motivating people or when the norms support incivility or rude behavior.

Supervisor interaction with employees is a common environment for perceived workplace incivility practices. The literature showed that supervisor behaviors are key in establishing the proper behaviors of group membership. A longitudinal study by Tepper (2000) investigated the consequences of abusive supervision in the context of justice theory. Abusive behavior was subordinate perception of the extent of supervisor behaviors such as hostile verbal and non-verbal actions, excluding physical contact. At time one, the researcher administered a survey that included measures of the following variables: abusive supervision, perceived job mobility, interactional justice, procedural justice, and distributive justice.

Time two study activities commenced six months following time one. Researchers telephoned the time one respondents, and those with the same supervisors (as in time one) received information about a follow-up survey. Useable data for time two was provided by 362 persons.

Drawing from instruments that captured non-physical abuse in other types of

relationships and management literature, the researchers developed a 20-item pool of questions. For the time two portion of the study, researchers investigated the outcome variables of voluntary turnover, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, conflict between work and family, and psychological distress. Voluntary turnover measures consisted of individuals who did not have the same supervisor as indicated in time one.

The major findings of the study were that abusive supervision resulted in a number of dysfunctional consequences, subordinate perception of injustice explained reactions to abusive supervision, and more pronounced consequences of abusive supervision existed for subordinates with less mobility. In general, subordinates who reported experiences of abusive supervision also reported higher turnover; less favorable attitudes toward job, life, and organization; greater conflict between work and family life; and higher levels of psychological distress. Effects for job and life satisfaction, family-to-work conflict, and emotional exhaustion increased for subordinates with less mobility.

Another study relating to abusive supervision conducted by Tepper, Duffy, and Shaw (2001) examined whether two personality dimensions, conscientiousness and agreeableness, moderate the relationship between abusive supervision and resistance. The two personality dimensions are a portion of the Big Five Model (Judge, Martocchio, & Thoreson, 1997). The predictor variables were abusive supervision, conscientiousness, and agreeableness. Control variables were neuroticism and extraversion. Criteria variables were dysfunctional resistance and constructive resistance. The longitudinal study used a sample of 2,450 residents of a moderate-sized midwestern city contacted telephonically.

Results of the study supported earlier research that abusive supervision had

negative consequences. Abused subordinates reported the use of dysfunctional resistance and constructive resistance tactics more frequently than non-abused subordinates.

Abusive supervision did not affect all subordinates in the same way. The researchers found that personality traits moderated the effects of negative supervisor behaviors. The relationship between abusive supervision practices and dysfunctional resistance behaviors by subordinates were stronger for subordinates reporting lower conscientiousness than those with higher conscientiousness. However, this effect emerged only for subordinates who were lower in agreeableness. Constructive resistance was stronger among subordinates higher in conscientiousness than those lower in conscientiousness.

Bhanthumnavin (2003) examined the relationship between three dimensions of perceived social support from supervisor, including emotional, informational, and material with self-reported and supervisor-rated subordinate performance. Second, the study investigated the effects of psychological and situational factors on subordinate performance. The criterion variable was subordinate performance. The predictor variables were social support from supervisors, workplace location, self-efficacy, perceived work overload, self-reported work effectiveness, and supervisory rating performance. The correlation study design, conducted in health centers in Thailand, sampled matched supervisor-subordinate pairs ($N = 972$) with 542 supervisors and 517 subordinates returning useable questionnaires.

The study revealed that women receiving all three types of support (emotional, informational, and material) received higher performance ratings than their male counterparts. Perceived organizational support, self-efficacy, and the location of workplace significantly related to subordinate performance. The greater the distance of

the health unit from the center of the province, the higher the self-reported performance score for males and the higher the supervisor rating scales for older subordinates.

Yagil (2005) investigated the self-perceived attribution of positive events internally and of negative events externally with the moderating effects of empowerment. A second component of study reviewed the perspective of the victims and the alleged perpetrator in terms of attribution of blame to the victim. The dependent variable for the study was employee attribution of supervisor behaviors. The independent variables were perceptions of supervisor behaviors and empowerment of workers.

A convenience sample of mainly Israeli-born employees ($N = 289$) in a number of job categories participated in the study. For the first component of the study, the researchers found that a supervisor's negative behavior toward an employee often resulted in the employee's perception that he or she is a victim and not responsible for the negative events.

In the second study, a convenience sample of mainly Israeli-born employees participated in a survey study ($N = 252$) to investigate the attribution of blame from a supervisor's negative behaviors. The researchers used hierarchical regression to investigate the relationship between demographics, frequency of perpetration, and frequency of being a target of negative behaviors. Yagil suggested that perspective does affect the individual's blame assignment of negative behaviors. The results also suggested that individuals underestimated their own negative behaviors.

A study by Valle (2005) sought to describe relationships that predict abusive behavior and to investigate relationships between abusive behavior and individual outcomes. The sample was 77 full-time employees of a medium-sized university in the

southeastern United States. The independent variables were organization type, gender, age, race, and educational level. The dependent variables were supervisor-subordinate relations, abusive behaviors, perceptions of the job environment, and personal outcomes (job satisfaction, job stress, and intentions to turnover).

The study suggested that poor supervisor-subordinate relations led to perceptions of abusive behaviors. Power distance was not significant. The study supported a relationship between abusive behaviors and intention to turnover.

The studies relating to the supervisor-subordinate relationship include topics such as workplace victimization and the perception of justice. The research indicated that the employee perception of justice in the workplace impacted organizational commitment and voluntary turnover. Poor relationships with supervisors led to the perception of abusive behavior in the workplace. Further, environments with emotional, informational, and material support from the supervisor result in better job performance.

Summary of Workplace Incivility and Its Relationship with this Study

The studies included in this literature review supported the proposition that workplace incivility is a separate and distinct construct of counterproductive workplace behavior. Further, the research provided evidence of the negative individual and organizational consequences of the behaviors. This is accomplished by considering the continuum of counterproductive workplace behaviors, including the historical evolution of the construct by tracing the early roots with verbal abuse in the medical field, related misbehaviors, and scale development. While existing studies establish the construct, more information is needed with regard to the organizational antecedents, such as

elements of organizational culture that may promote or prevent this type of workplace behavior. My study investigated this particular gap in the literature.

Employee Turnover

Defining Employee Turnover

Employer turnover refers to the phenomena of employees leaving an organization voluntarily (Shaw, Duffy, Johnson, & Lockhart, 2005). The traditional view of turnover focused on the relationship between turnover and productivity. Osterman (1987) found a negative relationship between turnover and productivity. Other research suggested that high turnover redirects organizational resources away from core business activities, reducing organizational performance (Price, 1977; Shaw et al., 2005). Other negative consequences reported in research include reduced efficiency (Alexander et al., 1994), productivity (Brown & Medoff, 1978), sales growth (Batt, 2002), and safety results (Shaw, et al., 2005).

An employee's decision to leave an organization is costly for both the individual and the organization (Judge, 1993; Lee, Mitchell, Sablinski, Burton, & Holton, 2004; Mobley, 1982). Three basic components are generally considered when computing employee turnover costs, including separation costs, replacement costs, and training costs (Cascio, 1986). Cascio (2003) proposed that turnover costs can be 1.5 to 2.5 times the annual salary of the job incumbent. Steel, Griffeth, and Hom (2002) noted that the average rate of employee turnover in the United States is around 15%; however, this varies by different industries.

Summary of Employee Turnover and Its Relationship with this Study

Employee turnover as a topic of inquiry is important because it is potentially a

controllable area of human resources that directly impacts an organization's bottom line. Other research provided evidence of the negative individual and organizational consequences of employee turnover. My study is unique in that I examined employee turnover rates that are reported at the organizational level.

Human Resources Practices

Understanding the impact of employee perception of human resources practices on moderating the effects of workplace incivility is one of the unique contributions made by this study. This section serves to both conceptualize and operationalize employee perception of human resources practice as an important factor in moderating the relationship between incidence of workplace incivility and organizational commitment.

Human resources management as a topic of research is quite broad. The study of human resources management is concerned with selections that organizations make from the number of policies, practices, and structures available to them (Boxall & Purcell, 2003). One of the conceptual models widely used in human resources management research is Guest's (1997) model. This direct causal model links human resources management strategy, practices, and outcomes with employee behavior outcomes, performance outcomes, and financial organizational outcomes (see Figure 2). This model suggests that human resources practices have a causal link with employee behaviors such as cooperation and organizational citizenship.

HRM Strategy	HRM Practice	HRM Outcomes	Behavior Outcomes	Performance Outcomes	Financial Outcomes
Differentiation (Innovation) Focus (Quality) Cost (Cost reduction)	Selection Training Appraisal Rewards Job design Involvement Status & Security	Commitment Quality Flexibility	Effort/ Motivation Cooperation Involvement Organizational Citizenship	High: Productivity, Quality and Innovation Low: Absence, turnover, conflict, customer complaints	Profit Return on Investments

Figure 2. Guest's (1997) Human resources management framework.

The differentiation between human resources policies and practices is an important point of contention for this study. Policies are stated intentions regarding its various employee management activities, while practices are the activities that actually occur (Boselie, Dietz, & Boon, 2005). Wright and Nishii (2004) contended three distinctions within human resources practices exist. First, they suggested that there are human resources practices designed on a strategic level. Second, there are actual human resources practices that have been implemented, most often by supervision. Finally, they suggest a third level of human resources practices, those perceived by the employees.

Van den Berg et al. (1999) noted, "An organization may have an abundance of written policies concerning human resources management and top management may even believe it is practiced, but these policies and beliefs are meaningless until the individual perceives them as something important to her or his organizational well-being" (p. 302). Other researchers agreed that separating the two constructs of policy and practice is necessary to discern organizational reality (Boselie et al. 2005; Wright & Boswell, 2002).

Kinnie et al. (2005) pointed out that employee attitudes toward policies should be included in human resources studies, as these attitudes can drive discretionary behavior and may influence organizational citizenship behavior. A number of researchers argued

that actual practices are significant points of examination as they have the most impact on organizational outcomes, through employee skills, attitudes, and behaviors (Gerhart et al., 2000; Guest, 1997, 1999; Huselid & Becker 1996; Wright & Boswell, 2002).

Other studies supported the use of employee perceptions of human resources practices with a central focus on whether or not a policy is in place (Gerhart et al., 2000; Guest, 1997, 1999; Wright & Boswell, 2002). Huselid and Becker (1996) insisted that differentiating practice and policy is key to gaining the correct information from the items involved in field research.

As the result of content analysis of 104 peer-reviewed articles specific to the field, Boselie, Dietz, and Boon (2005) identified 26 human resources practices. These include (1) training and development; (2) contingency pay and rewards; (3) performance management; (4) recruitment and selection; (5) teamwork and collaboration; (6) direct participation (empowerment, suggestion schemes); (7) good wages (high or above market pay); (8) communication and information sharing; (9) internal promotion; (10) job design (job rotation, job enrichment); (11) autonomy (decentralized decision-making); (12) employment security; (13) benefits packages; (14) formal procedures (grievances); (15) human resources planning (career development/succession planning); (16) financial participation (employee stock, employee shares); (17) symbolic egalitarianism; (18) attitude survey; (19) indirect participation (unions); (20) diversity and equal opportunity; (21) job analysis; (22) socialistic induction and social activities; (23) family friendly policies and work-life balance; (24) employee exit management (downsizing); (25) professional effectiveness of the human resources department; and (26) social responsibility.

Of these practices, I chose four practices that most closely related to the variables of focus in the study. The indicators selected to measure human resources practices were training, formal human resources policies, grievance procedures, internal labor market, and vertical hierarchy. I chose these practices because they related most directly to communication-related dimensions of organizational culture and workplace incivility.

Human Resources Practices Used in the Study

Grievance procedures are the documented process to be followed by the grievants, the union (if applicable), and management in resolving employee complaints (Tracey, 1991). The internal labor market refers to the internal structures designed to facilitate movement of employees through jobs, through promotion ladders, and through internal bidding systems (Taubman & Watcher, 1986). Vertical hierarchy, linked closely to organizational structure, refers to the number of occupation levels in the organization between the highest and lowest levels (Delaney & Huselid, 1996).

Summary of Human Resources Practices and the Relationship to This Study

The literature revealed that human resources management as a scholarly field is still in the infancy stage. While a number of core practices have been identified in the literature, there are few empirical studies that examine the impact of perception of human resources practices on organizational outcomes. I found no empirical studies that investigated the role of perception of human resources practices as a moderator in the relationship between any form of counterproductive workplace behavior and organizational commitment. Understanding the current status of human resources practices in the literature is key to this study as I propose that positive perceptions of human resources practices will moderate the relationship between incidences of

workplace incivility and organizational commitment.

Employee Turnover

Employee turnover is a topic of inquiry for the past three decades (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Turnover, broadly defined as voluntary terminations, is viewed as a controllable aspect of business. Therefore, a better understanding of the issue can potentially improve an organization's competitive advantage (Herman, 1997). Turnover can have negative consequences such as reductions in both morale and productivity among employees who remain in an organization (O'Reilly, Caldwell, & Banelt, 1989; Sheehan, 1993). Because turnover is an important bottom line issue at the organization level, and potentially linked with workplace incivility, I have included it as a dependent variable for this study.

Conceptual Model

The Relationship Between Climate-morale and Incidence of Workplace Incivility

Bowen and Ostroff contended that a crucial link between human resources management and performance is organizational climate. They define climate as "a shared perception of what the organization is like in terms of practices, policies, and procedures what is important and what is rewarded" (2004, p. 204). Further, research found that employee perception of the work environment drives work attitudes and performance (Parker, et al., 2003).

H_{1a}: Employee perception of an environment with positive climate-morale will report a lower frequency of the incidence of incivility.

The Relationship Between Involvement and Incidence of Workplace Incivility

Involvement process and structures in the workplace provide the opportunity for organizations to value employee contributions. Often employee involvement includes

worker responsibilities, including decision-making (Guest, 1992). A study by Lawler and Youn (1996) suggested that when parties work for a common goal, relational cohesion increases. Therefore, when involvement opportunities are agreeable, I predict that incidence of workplace incivility will decrease.

H_{1b}: Employee perception of an environment with high involvement will report a lower frequency of incidence of incivility.

The Relationship Between Workplace Incivility and Turnover

Research suggested that organizations that promote cultures that emphasize interpersonal relationships have higher voluntary survivor rates than those that do not (Sheridan, 1992). Hansen (1993) found empirical evidence that victims of workplace abuse were likely to consider voluntarily leaving the organization either by transferring from the facility or voluntarily resigning from the company. Therefore, I predict that for organizations reporting high frequencies of workplace incivility, reported turnover organization will be higher than those reporting lower frequencies of workplace incivility.

H₂: Employees reporting high frequencies of incivility will report higher levels of turnover.

Employee Perception of Human Resources Practices as a Moderator of the Relationship between the Incidence of Workplace Incivility and Turnover.

Research indicated that organizational response to deviant workplace behaviors such as sexual harassment is associated with more frequent episodes of the behavior (Glomb & Liao, 2003). I found no studies that examined the impact of organizational response on the incidence of workplace incivility and its relationship with organizational commitment. In this

dissertation, I examined the influence that employee perceptions of human resources practices have on the relationship between incidence of workplace incivility and organizational commitment. The human resources practices selected for the study drew from Guest (1997). These practices include: (a) training, (b) formal policies, (c) grievance procedures, and (d) vertical hierarchy. I chose these practices because these indicators are most relevant to the main focus of the study, workplace incivility.

H₃: Employee perceptions of human resources practices will moderate the relationship between incidence of incivility and turnover.

H_{3a}: Turnover will be lower for organizations reporting a high frequency of incivility, as well as the use of high performance human resources practices, which include (a) training, (b) formal policies, (c) grievance procedures, and (d) vertical hierarchy.

Summary of Conceptual Model

In summary, the review of the literature described the relationships among the variables investigated in this study (see Figure 3). The study examined the relationships among four communication dimensions of organizational culture, incidence of workplace incivility, and organizational commitment. A moderating variable considered in the model was perception of human resources practices to include four common practices in the literature: training, policies, grievance procedures, and vertical hierarchy.

Figure 3. Conceptual Model of Study

Chapter Three describes the research method used for the study. Information included in this chapter includes the design, sample, and data analysis performed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study sought to examine factors that promote or prevent incidences of incivility and to determine the impact that the perception of human resources practices has on moderating the relationship between incivility and organizational commitment. More specifically, based on the research questions presented in Chapter 1, I tested the following null hypotheses using data reported in the National Organization Survey (II) (Smith, Kallberg, & Marsden, 2002).

1. There is no relationship between the incidence of incivility and (a) involvement and (b) climate-morale, two cultural artifacts relating to communication manifested in organizational structure.
2. There is no relationship between incidence of workplace incivility and turnover.
3. There is no moderating relationship between the incidence of incivility and turnover, and the following human resources practices: (a) training, (b) formal human resources practices (c) grievance procedures, (d) vertical hierarchy, those human resources practices impacting organizational culture, employee motivation, and organization structure.

The methodology is organized according to the following topics: (a) statement of purpose, (b) hypotheses, (c) research design, (d) description of the data source, (e) data collection process, (f) measurement and description of study variables, (g) data analysis techniques, and (h) limitations.

Statement of Purpose

Research concerning the impact of incidence of workplace incivility on organizational commitment adds to the literature stream. Although previous research established workplace incivility as a separate construct, few empirical studies exist to deepen our understanding of its influence on organizations today. This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between communication-related dimensions of organizational culture and the incidence of workplace incivility?
2. What is the relationship between the incidence of workplace incivility and employee turnover?
3. What is the relationship among human resources practices, incidence of workplace incivility, and employee turnover?

Hypothesis

H₁: Culture elements will predict the incidence of incivility.

H_{1a}: Organizations with an environment high in involvement will report a lower frequency of incidence of incivility.

H_{1b}: Organizations reporting an environment with a positive climate-morale will report a lower frequency of incidence of incivility.

H₂: Organizations reporting high frequencies of incivility will report higher levels of employee turnover.

H₃: Organizations reporting use of high performing human resources practices will realize a moderation between the incidence of incivility and employee turnover.

H_{3a}: Turnover will be less for organizations employing the human resources

practices of formal training, formal policies with regard to counterproductive workplace behaviors, formal grievance and complaint procedures, and vertical hierarchy.

Research Design

I employed a basic correlational design for the study (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). With this model, relationships among a number of variables can be considered within a single study. Information concerning the strength and relationships of the variables can also be garnered (Pagano, 1998). The study tested an a priori conceptual model suggesting a moderating influence of human resources practices on the relationship between incidence of workplace incivility and turnover.

Description of the Data Source

This study employed a secondary data set, the National Organizational Survey (2002). The National Organization Survey (NOS II) employs the actual workplace as the unit of analysis (Smith, Kallberg, & Marsden, 2002). The data for the NOS II is constructed from information from the 2002 General Social Survey (GSS). During participant interviews for the GSS, 50 % of the households were asked to provide information about their place of employment, including business name, address, and telephone number. The NOS II survey questionnaire was then administered to those identified organizations ($n = 516$).

The NOS II survey was underwritten by the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), and the Commonwealth Fund, in order to investigate human resources-related policies, benefits, and structures and the impact on worker productivity and business performance (Smith, Kalberg, & Marsden, 2002). The instrument consisted of 12 sections addressing

descriptive data and questions relating to the organization such as occupations, products, services, and various human resources policies and benefits. The questionnaire was pilot-tested with a convenience sample of Chicago-area businesses selected to represent a wide range of organization sizes, industries, and ownership types.

Data Collection Process

During the data collection phase, researchers verified the organization information as reported in the cases from the GSS survey through personal contact. Further, the addresses and contact information were processed through SmartMailer, a computer program licensed from Pitney-Bowes to improve the quality of the address information prior to distribution.

Interviewers involved in the survey participated in both lecture and hands-on training sessions. Certification through a skills check process was required for each interviewer prior to participating in the data collection phase of the project.

The researchers collected the data during the period of October 24, 2002 to May 16, 2003 using telephone interviews and mailback questionnaires. Several steps were taken to increase response rates. Such measures included the use of seasoned interviewers, multiple contacts with respondents, a performance improvement workgroup, two different refusal conversion packages, and a series of non-monetary incentives such as books or reports. The unadjusted return rate for the survey effort was 59% (n = 516). After adjustments were made for companies that no longer existed or duplications, the return rate was 62.4%.

The survey used the generic “establishment name” or <EN> to protect the confidentiality of the organizations in the report. Also, the survey asked the organization

representative to identify “core” or key jobs for the organization. In the question stems, the term “core” is used to designate items that were specific to this job within the organization.

The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICFPC) at the University of Michigan served as the distributor when the dataset was released to the public in October 2004.

Measurement and Description of Study Variables

Organizational Culture

I chose to measure organizational culture quantitatively in my study to increase the generalizability of my study. Drawing from the Glaser, Zamanou, and Hacker (1987) model of Organizational Culture, I selected two communication-related dimensions of organizational culture: involvement and climate-morale. Two items formed a scale to measure the dimension of involvement. The first item was “Self-managed teams are on-going work teams that have some degree of responsibility and discretion over such decisions as methods of work, task schedules, assignments of members to different tasks, and feedback about group performance. What percent of your nonmanagerial and nonsupervisory employees are currently involved in self-managed work teams?” The second item was, “Quality circles and employee involvement committees are temporary or ongoing groups that occasionally meet to solve key production or service problems. What percent of your nonmanagerial and nonsupervisory employees are currently involved in quality circles or employee involvement groups or committees.” The alpha for this scale was .74.

Climate-morale was measured by a four-item scale. The first item was, “How

would you rate the relationship between management and employees at this workplace?"

The scale was 1 = *very good* to 5 = *very poor*. I reverse coded these items for better alignment to the rest of the scale to 1 = *very poor* to 5 = *very good*. The second, third and fourth measures were scored on an agreement scale with 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. The items were, "Job security is good," "Employees are proud to work here," and "Employees trust management here at this place." The alpha for this scale was 0.77.

Incidence of Workplace Incivility

Three survey items comprised a scale for workplace incivility and were based on the work of Cortina, Magley, Williams, and Langhout (2001). The items were rated on a frequency scale (*never* = 1, *rarely* = 2, *sometimes* = 3, *often* = 4). The first item was, "How often in the past year has incivility occurred at (Enterprise Name) such as acting rude or discourteously?" The second item was "How often in the past year have verbal or written threats occurred at <EN> including incidents of shouting, swearing, threatening emails, or attempts to provoke arguments?" The final item was "How often in the past year has bullying occurred at <EN> including repeated intimidation, slandering, social isolation, or humiliation by one or more persons against another?" The alpha for this scale was .77.

Turnover

The outcome variable of turnover was measured with one item, "About what percent of your permanent workforce quit their jobs in the past year (excluding retirements or disability-related quits)." Respondents reported a percentage.

Human Resources Practices

Four indicators measured human resources practices present in the organization. These were (a) formal training, (b) formal human resources policies, (c) formal grievance and complaint procedures, and (d) level of vertical hierarchy. For scale development purposes, items were converted to standardized scores and then combined.

A scale consisting of nine items were used to measure formal training ($\alpha=.80$). These items included, "To what extent does <EN> train its CORES to keep their skills current" (1 = *not at all* to 3 = *to a great extent*), "To what extent was formal training used to teach or provide (a) teamwork skills and (b) skills and techniques to ensure a safe workplace" (1 = *not at all* to 3 = *great extent*), "Is there sexual harassment training for managers at <EN>" (1=*yes*, 2=*no*)", "Is there a diversity training program for managers at <EN>" (1=*yes*, 2=*no*); and "Has <EN> ever offered any of the following kinds of training specifically on (a) workplace violence, (b) seminars on workshops on general workplace violence risk factors and specific prevention strategies, (c) hands on classroom training in conflict resolution or de-escalation techniques, (d) hands on training in restraint of disruptive person or management of disruptive behaviors" (1=*yes*, 2=*no*). The alpha for this scale was .80.

Measures for human resources practices included four items combined to form a scale. "Do each of the following documents exist at <EN> including (a) written job descriptions for most jobs, (b) a written record of nearly everyone's job performance, (c) documents describing safety and hygiene practices, (d) documents describing policy about workplace violence" (1=*yes*, 2=*no*). The alpha for this scale was .83.

A single item measured employee perceptions of grievance procedures, "Are

there formal procedures for resolving disputes between their supervisors or coworkers.” (1 = *yes*, 2 = *no*). One item measured vertical levels of hierarchy, “About how many levels are there between the highest and lowest positions at (EN), including both the highest and lowest levels?”

Organizational Factors

I controlled variables that previous research showed to have moderate or strong influence on organizational commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Single items were used to measure organization demographic information including: for-profit/not for-profit status, product or service, and unionization status.

Table 1.

Derivation of Items for the Study

Variable Measured	Number of items	Literature source of items selected
Organizational Culture (climate-morale, involvement)	1 scale for each dimension	Glaser, Zamanou, & Hacker (1987)
Incidence of Workplace Incivility	3 items	Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout (2001)
Turnover	1 item	Mowday, et al., (1979)
Human Resources Practices (training, policies, grievance procedures, and vertical hierarchy)	2 scales (training and policies) (consisting of multiple items); 1 item measures for grievance procedures and vertical hierarchy	Guest (1997)
Organizational Factors (profit/not for profit; product or service organization; unionization status)	3 items	Mathieu & Zajoc (1990)

Data Analysis Techniques

I created a path diagram that depicted the relationships between the key variables I hypothesized. Path analysis is a type of multivariate analysis in which causal relations among several variables are graphically represented in a flow graph or path diagram (Vogt, 2005). I developed the path diagram based on the various hypotheses posited for the study.

To complete the analysis, first I engaged in structural equation modeling (SEM). I followed a two-stage approach for the modeling as recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). First, I estimated the measurement model for the latent variables. The purpose of the measurement model was to assess that degree to which the indicators correctly measured the related constructs. To do a further check of the psychometric properties of the measures, I evaluated the overall fit of the model and reviewed the individual parameter estimates. Following the tests of the measurement model, I then estimated the structural model. The purpose of this second step was to evaluate the degree of commonality between the theoretical model and the relationships emerging from the data.

Structured equation modeling (SEM) is a general but powerful form of multivariate analysis (Cohen & Cohen, 2000). Some of the applications for this type of procedure include path analysis or causal modeling, regression models, covariance structures, correlation structures, and factor analysis. The basic idea behind structured equation modeling is that variables inter-relate through linear equations. Through the examination of variances and covariances, tests of the interrelationships between variables are possible.

In short, structural equation modeling uses graphs to describe causal relations among variables. The procedures for structural modeling in this study included five basic steps. First, I stated the hypotheses and posited the relationships between variables. I then constructed a path diagram to illustrate the relationships. Next, I made a determination about the implications of the variances and co-variances. I conducted tests to determine the goodness of fit for the model through the tests of variances and co-variances. Results

of the statistical tests parameter estimates and standard errors for the numerical coefficients are reported in Chapter Four. In addition, the determination of the manner in which the model fits the data is discussed.

Limitations

There are some limitations of the study. First, the correlation method cannot establish a cause-effect relationship between variables that are correlated (Pagano, 1998). Also, because the study uses secondary data, there were some inherent, expected problems. For example, some of the measures were nominal scale, which detracts from the preciseness of some of the procedures. Finally, some of the measures contained mid-point scales, while others were forced-choice with no mid-points. Ideally, all of the measures would have included a mid-point.

The results of the study are presented in Chapter IV and discussion and recommendations for future research in this area are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In this chapter, I present research findings relative to the relationships among culture, incivility, high performance human resources practices, and turnover. First, I will provide descriptive statistical results. Next, I will report the findings of the multiple regression analysis for the model.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 summarizes descriptive statistics for all variables in the study.

Interestingly, high performance human resources practices were generally correlated with incivility. Workplace incivility significantly negatively correlated with training, formal human resources policies, grievance procedures, profit/non-profit status, and company type. It was significantly positively correlated with vertical hierarchy; however, it was not significantly correlated with turnover or unionization status.

Turnover was not significantly correlated with vertical hierarchy or unionization status. Turnover was significantly negatively correlated with formal training, human resources policies, grievance procedures, profit/nonprofit, and company type

For the control variables, profit/nonprofit status was significantly positively correlated with involvement, incivility, turnover, formal training, human resources policies, and grievance procedures. Profit/nonprofit was not significantly correlated with involvement, however, it was significantly negatively correlated with vertical hierarchy.

Company type was not significantly correlated with involvement. Company type was significantly negatively correlated with turnover, training, formal human resources practices, grievance procedures, and profit/nonprofit status. Unionization status was significantly positively correlated with profit/nonprofit status.

Internal consistency reliabilities for scales used in the study were generally acceptable, including formal training ($\alpha=.80$), climate-morale ($\alpha=.77$), incivility ($\alpha=.77$), formal human resources policies (.83) and involvement ($\alpha=.74$).

Structural Equation Model Results

First, I analyzed the data for the proposed model using structural equation modeling with latent variables. For constructs with three items, each item represented a single indicator of the construct. When constructs included only one item, the item was treated as a single indicator of the latent construct.

I undertook a two-stage approach to modeling as suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The measurement model assesses the degree to which the manifest indicators appropriately measure their corresponding latent constructs. Indicators were permitted to load freely on their hypothesized latent constructs with the first (or only, in the case of single-indicator constructs) factor loading set to 1.0 for each factor to assist in model identification. To ensure that the psychometric properties of the measures were adequate, I then evaluated the overall fit of the model and inspected individual parameter estimates. After testing the measurement model, I found that the single-item indicators did not provide a robust view of the data. Although my data set included a number of items relevant to the variables, the literature suggests that only continuous variables be used in structural equation modeling (Diamantopoloulos & Siguaw, 2000). Therefore, the

(INSERT CORRELATION TABLE)

analysis with structural equation modeling was limited by the number of items that met that requirement.

I assessed the fit of the measurement model using several elements. For example, I assessed the Chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio. Because the Chi-square is sensitive to sample size (Bentler, 1990), I also used other indices that are less sensitive to sample size (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). These indices included the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA, Steiger, 1990), the root mean squared residual (RMSR, Joreskog & Sorbom, 1989), the comparative fit index (CFI, Bentler, 1990), the goodness of fit index (GFI, Joreskog & Sorbom, 1989), the adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI, Joreskog & Sorbom, 1989), and the non-normed fit index (NNFI, Tucker & Lewis, 1973). The RMSEA and RMSR are estimates of the discrepancy (or misfit) between the fitted and observed covariance matrices and should be close to or under .06 to provide reliable evidence of acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). In contrast, the CFI, GFI, AGFI, and NNFI represent the degree of similarity or fit among the matrices and should be close to .95 to show acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Because my initial analysis did not reveal acceptable levels, coupled with the literature suggestion that single-item indicators were problematic, I employed multiple regression for the analysis of my model (Diamantopoloulos & Siguaw, 2000).

Multiple Regression

Multiple regression is a highly general and flexible data analytic system broadly applicable to hypotheses drawing from research in the behavioral sciences, health sciences, education, and business (Cohen & Cohen, 2000). In my research, I employed multiple regression to investigate the relationships among communication-

related dimensions of organizational culture, incivility, high performance human resources practices, and turnover.

A common problem for interaction terms is a high correlation between the product terms and the main effect terms which can result in multicollinearity.

Multicollinearity “exists when two or more independent variables are highly correlated” (Vogt, 2005, p. 198) making it difficult to determine the separate effects on the dependent variable, which can impede the model’s estimation. To reduce the potential for this type of problem, I centered ($x_{center} = x_i - E(x)$), the continuous variables in accordance with the suggestion of Aiken and West (1991). In addition to reducing multicollinearity, the centering process can aid in the ease of interpretation (Aiken & West, 1991; Cohen & Cohen, 2000).

Regression Analysis of Incivility

In this section, I describe the regression analysis results: the descriptions of the findings are developed from the study hypotheses. To test my hypotheses, I performed separate analyses for communication-related elements of organizational culture and incivility, incivility and turnover, and the interactions among human resources practices, incivility, and turnover. By conducting separate analyses for each human resources practice, I was able to examine the distinctiveness of each variable while maintaining adequate statistical power. Independent variables in each analysis consisted of the control variables (company type, product or service, and unionization status), the predictor variables (involvement and climate-morale or incivility), and the two-way and three-way interactions among the human resources practices, incivility, and turnover.

The dependent variable for the first model was workplace incivility. To complete the analysis, I entered the control variables on step one. For step two, I entered the climate-morale and involvement dimensions of organizational culture.

The dependent variable for the second model was turnover. First, I entered the control variables on step one. For step two, I entered workplace incivility.

To examine the moderating effect of human resources on the relationship between incivility and turnover, I performed a series of multiple regression analyses. For each analysis, I entered the control variables on step one. For step two, I entered the specific human resources practice and incivility. In the third step I entered the interaction between the specific human resource practice and incivility on the dependent variable of turnover.

Below, I describe the findings for the multiple regression models. First I present the impact that the communication-related dimensions of involvement and climate-morale have on incivility, followed by the results for incivility on turnover. Next, I examine the moderating effect of formal training, formal policies, formal grievance and complaint procedures, and vertical hierarchy on the relationship between incivility and turnover. Finally, I present results from a post-hoc analysis.

Summary of Results by Hypotheses

In the first set of hypotheses, I predicted that employee perception of an environment with positive climate-morale will report a lower frequency of the incidence of incivility and that employee perception of an environment with high involvement will report a lower frequency of incidence of incivility.

To examine the first set of hypotheses, I regressed incivility on involvement and climate morale. As shown in Table 3 below, the results revealed that 5% of the variance

in incivility could be explained by these two dimensions of organizational culture.

According to Cohen et al. (2003), the criteria for multiple regression effect sizes are large effect ($R^2 = .26$), medium effect ($R^2 = .13$), and small effect ($R^2 = .02$). The effect size for communication-related dimensions of organizational culture provided for a practically significant amount of variance. Climate-morale ($\beta = .22$, $p < .001$) was a better predictor than involvement ($\beta = .01$, $p > .05$). The results of the analysis indicate that there is a relationship between organizational culture and climate-morale in particular.

Organizations perceived to have a work environment with a more positive employee morale were less likely to have workplace incivility. There was a significant main effect for climate-morale on incivility, the higher the morale, the less incivility, supporting Hypothesis 1_a. This effect accounted for 5% of the variance in incivility. Hypothesis 1_b was not supported.

Table 3.

Multiple Regression: Communication-Related Dimensions of Organizational Culture on Incivility.

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	-.41(-.22)***	-.42(-.23)***
Product or Service	.15(.06)	.12(.05)
Unionization Status	.37(.18)**	.31(.15)**
Involvement		.01(.01)
Climate-Morale		-.27(-.22)***
Total R^2	.11***	.16***
ΔR^2	.11	.05
ΔF	15.57***	9.93***

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that employees reporting high frequencies of incivility will report higher levels of turnover. To test the relationship between incivility and turnover, I regressed turnover on incivility. As shown in Table 4, the analysis revealed that 4% of the variance of turnover could be explained by incivility. Although the effect size was small, it was significant. There was a significant main effect for incivility on turnover. Organizations reporting frequent incidence of incivility were more likely also to have increased levels of employee turnover, thus the second hypothesis was supported.

Table 4.

Multiple Regression: Incivility on Turnover.

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	2.60(0.8)	4.16(.13)
Product or Service	.17(.00)	-.42(-.01)
Unionization Status	-5.74(- .16) †	-7.17(- .19)*
Incivility		3.83(.21)**
Total R^2	.04†	.08**
ΔR^2	.04	.04
ΔF	.07†	.01**

Note. † $p < .10$ * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

In the third hypothesis, I proposed that perceptions of human resources practices will moderate the relationship between incidence of incivility and turnover, that turnover will be lower for organizations reporting a high frequency of incivility and the use of high performance human resources practices which include (a) training, (b) formal policies, (c) grievance procedures, and (d) vertical hierarchy.

In order to determine whether or not human resources practices moderated

the relationship between incivility and turnover. I examined separate models for each of the human resources practices.

First, I examined formal training. As shown in Table 5, there was a main effect of formal training on incivility, but the interaction was not significant. The more formal training an organization provided, the less employee turnover experienced. Formal training accounted for 10% of the variance in turnover; however, it did not moderate the relationship between incivility and employee turnover.

Table 5.

Multiple Regression: Formal Training as a Moderator

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)	Step Three B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	2.60(0.8)	7.29(.22)	7.14(.22)
Product or Service	.17(.00)	-1.16(-.03)	-1.17(-.03)
Unionization Status	-5.74(-.16) †	-8.75(-.24)	-8.82(-.24)
Incivility		2.51(.14)	2.73(.15)
Formal Training		-5.45(-.29)	-5.36(-.29)
Formal Training X Incivility			.89(.04)
Total R^2	.04†	.14***	.14***
ΔR^2	.04	.10	.00
ΔF	2.46†	9.99***	.27

Note. † $p < .10$ * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Second, I examined formal human resources policies. As shown below in Table 6, 14% of the variance in turnover could be explained by formal human resources policies. The main effect of formal human resources policies was significant; however, the interaction effect of formal human resources policies and incivility was not. The impact of formal human resources practices represents a large effect in practical terms. Organizations reporting more formality in written policies, performance expectations,

and safety policies were less likely to report frequent episodes of uncivil behaviors.

Table 6.

Multiple Regression: Formal Policies as a Moderator

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)	Step Three B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	2.6(0.8)	6.74(.21) †	7.06(.21)**
Product or Service	.17(.00)	-2.14(-.05)	-2.25(-.05)
Unionization Status	-5.74(-.16)	-9.20(-.25)**	-9.2(-.25)**
Incivility		1.82(.10)	1.34(.07)
Formal HR Policies		-7.86(-.42)***	-8.51(-.46)***
Formal HR Policies X Incivility			-1.98(.08)
Total R^2	.04†	.23***	.23***
ΔR^2	.04	.18	.00
ΔF	2.46†	20.27***	1.06

Note. † $p < .10$ * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Third, I examined formal grievance and complaint procedures. As shown in Table 7, formal grievance and complaint procedures as a main effect was significant, but the interaction between formal grievance and incivility was not. Similar to the formalization of human resources policies such as safety policies, the presence of formal

grievance and complaint procedures accounted for practical significance, explaining 17% of the variance. However, grievance and complaint procedures did not moderate the relationship between incivility and turnover.

Table 7.

Multiple Regression: Formal Grievance Process as a Moderator

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)	Step Three B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	2.60(0.8)	7.67(.23)**	7.67(.23)**
Product or Service	.17(.00)	-2.29(-.05)	-2.27(-.05)
Unionization Status	-5.74(-.16) †	-9.32(-.25)**	-9.33(-.25)**
Incivility		1.90(.11)	2.12(.12)
Formal Grievance Process		-6.69(-.42)***	-6.52(-.41)***
Formal Grievance Process X Incivility			.62(.03)
Total R^2	.04†	.21***	.21
ΔR^2	.04	.17	.00
ΔF	2.46†	18.65***	.13

Note. † $p < .10$ * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Finally, I examined vertical hierarchy. As presented in Table 8, main effect for vertical hierarchy was significant at the main level. Overall, vertical hierarchy and its relationship with incivility explained 5% of the variance in turnover. As vertical

hierarchy within an organization decreases, the more likely it is for the organization to report less incivility.

Table 8.

Multiple Regression: Vertical Hierarchy as a Moderator

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)	Step Three B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	2.79(0.08)	4.84(.14)	5.10(.15) †
Product or Service	.84(.02)	-.16(-.00)	-.04(-.00)
Unionization Status	-5.8(-.15) †	-7.56(-.20)	-7.24(-.19)*
Incivility		3.43(.18)*	3.33(.18)*
Vertical Hierarchy		.32(.11)	-.45(-.15) †
Vertical Hierarchy X Incivility			-.35(-.12)
Total R^2	.04†	.09*	.10*
ΔR^2	.04	.05	.01
ΔF	2.28†	4.18*	2.19

Note. † $p < .10$ * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Considering the results of the moderator analyses, each of the human resources practices have significant main effects with turnover, but none of them have a significant interaction effect. Therefore, the analyses do not support hypothesis three.

Post-hoc Analysis

Because human resources practices can play such a central role in the development of organizational climate, I decided to conduct further analyses of the relationship between each of the organizational practices and incivility.

First, I regressed formal training on incivility. As shown in Table 9, the results indicated that 6% of the variance in incivility was explained by formal training. The more formal training reported, the less likely was the incidence of incivility. As shown in Table 10, the presence of formal human resources policies accounted for 6% of variance in incivility. Those organizations reporting formal systems were less likely to have increase incivility. Similarly, as displayed in Table 11, the analysis showed that formal grievance and complaint procedures explained 6% of variance in turnover. Likewise, organizations reporting clear systems and guidelines for employee behaviors and complaints also had less incidents of incivility. As shown in Table 12, vertical hierarchy explains 3% of the variance in incivility. The positive relationship suggests that as vertical hierarchy increases, so does the incidence of incivility. The predictors of formal training, formal human resources practices, formal grievance and complaint procedures, and vertical hierarchy explained 21% of the variance in incivility. Relatively, the order of contribution was formal training ($\beta=.13$), vertical hierarchy ($\beta =-.13$), formal grievance and complaint procedures ($\beta =.11$), and formal policies ($\beta=.10$).

Table 9.

Multiple Regression: Formal Training on Incivility.

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	-.41(-.22)**	-.20(-.11)*
Product or Service	.15(.06)	.10(.04)
Unionization Status	.37(.18)**	.26(.13)*
Formal Training		.30(-.29)***
Total R^2	.11***	.18***
ΔR^2	.11	.06
ΔF	16.69***	30.18***

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Table 10.

Multiple Regression: Human Resources Policies on Incivility

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	-.41(-.22)***	-.29(-.16)**
Product or Service	.15(.06)	.08(.03)
Unionization Status	.37(.18)**	.28(.14)**
Human Resources Policies		.28(-.27)***
Total R^2	.11***	.18***
ΔR^2	.11	.06
ΔF	16.69	29.40

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Table 11.

Multiple Regression: Grievance Procedures on Incivility

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	-.41(-.22)***	-.25(-.14)*
Product or Service	.15(.06)	.07(.03)
Unionization Status	.37(.18)**	.27(.13)*
Grievance Procedures		-.25(-.28)***
Total R^2	.11***	.18***
ΔR^2	.11	.06
ΔF	16.69***	29.56***

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Table 12.

Multiple Regression: Vertical Hierarchy on Incivility

Variable	Step One B (β)	Step Two B (β)
Profit or Nonprofit	-.41(-.22)***	-.34(-.19)**
Product or Service	.15(.06)	.14(.05)
Unionization Status	.37(.18)**	.38(.19)**
Vertical Hierarchy		.01(.18)***
Total R^2	.11***	.15***
ΔR^2	.11	.03
ΔF	15.95***	13.40***

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

Summary of Model Results

The final model, depicted in Figure 4, summarizes the findings of study relative to the original model. Climate-morale was a significant predictor of incivility and workplace incivility was a significant predictor of turnover. Of the four human resources practices examined as moderators, vertical hierarchy was the only significant moderator of the relationship between incivility and turnover.

Figure 4. Path Analysis Results

Original Model

Model Including Post-hoc Analysis

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the results of my study obtained through quantitative analyses of the data obtained from the National Organizations Survey (Smith, Kallberg, & Marsden, 2002)). This study was guided by three primary research questions:

(1) What is the relationship between communication-related dimensions of organizational culture and the incidence of workplace incivility? (2) What is the relationship between the incidence of workplace incivility and employee turnover? (3) What is the relationship among human resources practices, incidence of workplace incivility, and employee turnover? The overall goal of the study was to contribute to the field of human resources education by highlighting key elements of organizational culture, involvement and climate-morale, and to understand how the perception of human resources practices support and/or discourage workplace incivility, and ultimately to provide additional empirical evidence on how this relates to employee turnover.

The purpose of Research Question 1 was to gain information about the role that communication-related dimensions of organizational culture play in predicting the incidence of workplace incivility. The second research question examined the impact that incivility has on one organizational outcome, turnover. The third research question investigated the impact that four human resource practices (formal training, formal policies, grievance and complaint procedures, and vertical hierarchy) have on moderating

the relationship between the incidence of workplace incivility and employee turnover.

This chapter is designed to interpret the findings in a meaningful way for a number of stakeholders, including educators, human resources professionals, executives, and leaders for organizations at large. In particular, organization leaders can use the suggestions for practice to develop new impetus for controlling the factors and implementing strategies that can deter or prevent workplace incivility among employees.

I summarize the following sections below: statement of the problem, review of methodology, summary of results by each research question, recommendations for practice, and suggestions for future research.

Statement of the Problem

Workplace incivility is a relatively new construct related to counterproductive workplace behaviors that has received attention during the past decade (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Cortina, et al., 2002). More research is needed to develop breadth in the literature for this topic. One of the underdeveloped areas, the impact of organizational culture on incivility, was addressed by this study.

Review of the Methodology

I used a nationwide survey of organizations, the National Organizations Survey (Smith, Kallberg, & Marsden, 2002) to explore the problem at the organization level. Using an a priori conceptual model, I investigated two communication-related dimensions of organizational culture (involvement and climate-morale), workplace incivility, employee turnover, and human resources practices. I employed a series of moderated multiple regression analyses to examine the relationships. After completing the main study, I conducted a post-hoc analysis to investigate additional relationships that

were identified through the study procedures.

Summary of Results

The study consisted of three main research questions. The first question related to the impact that communication-related dimensions of climate-morale and involvement had on the incidence of incivility. The study revealed that climate-morale predicts workplace incivility, but that involvement does not. Those organizations reporting more employee pride and higher morale also reported less incivility in the workplace. Why does this matter? First of all, contemporary organizations are sandwiched between “means and ends.” Stockholders and stakeholders expect more results for fewer resources. This often results in the reduction of important employee-organization fit strategies. For example, with tightening budgets there is a lack of funding for human resources programs that engender those important organizational connections. Often organizations stretch personnel too thin, overloading managers with extra responsibilities in such a way that they are unable to devote time and attention to the management-employee relationships. This brings to the forefront the question, what are the additional hidden costs associated with these types of business decisions?

Through the findings of my second research question, my study provides additional justification that that a climate of mistreatment has an impact on an organization’s bottom line, linking incivility to turnover. Therefore, I contend that promoting an environment that supports pride in the organization and encourages healthy interpersonal communication can reduce incivility, decrease turnover, and improve organizational performance. On the other hand, my study showed that involvement systems, such as employee empowerment groups or self-directed work teams, did not

significantly predict workplace incivility. This suggests that relationships between employees and the organization is more important than a formalized structure in the workplace, such as high performing teams. Future research could focus specifically on examining differences between organizations with and without those specific structures. The scope of this particular study did not include the scope of those issues.

With regard to Research Question 2, the present study showed that incivility does predict turnover. This is a downstream validation of earlier studies (Cortina et al., 2001; 2002) that link the incidence of incivility with lowered organizational commitment. While turnover is certainly an important and costly organizational performance dimension, there are significant costs associated with employees who have lowered organizational commitment but remain in the organization. Research findings that can help organizations curtail incivility, and in turn organizational commitment, and thus, turnover, can make bottom line contributions to the organization. More importantly, significant improvements in work environments for employees can be gained. As responsible members of society, managers have an obligation to look out for the best interest of the employees.

The third hypothesis of my study related to the impact that the perception of human resources practices would have on the relationship between the incidence of workplace incivility and turnover. The four practices examined were formal training, formal human resources policies, grievance procedures, and vertical hierarchy. Of the practices examined for moderation, none proved significant. The impact of the policies “after the fact” were not significant. However, because human resources practices

provide the structure for interpersonal and procedural relationships in many respects. I determined that a post hoc analysis would be needed.

Interestingly, I found that formal training, formal policies, and formal grievance procedures did impact both turnover and incivility in separate analyses. This is important primarily because it suggests that human resources practices can play a significant role in shaping the climate of mistreatment. The results indicated that formal human resources policies, systems, training, and flattened hierarchy can reduce both the incidence of incivility and turnover. This is an important finding because the field of human resources development as a field is in the infancy stages. In order to garner respect from the established management fields, more empirical links are needed. My study shows that a focus on human resources development is more than a nicety, it can add to an organization's competitive advantage.

The study also supports and underscores the proposition of Guest's (1997) framework that suggests that human resources has a causal link with behavioral outcomes, in this case, workplace incivility. While I expected the study to provide information about the relationship between organizational culture and incivility, a more interesting aspect related to the impact of the four human resources practices on incivility and turnover.

Limitations of the Study

Since the study used secondary data, there are some limitations. First, some of the variables were measured with single items. According to Wainous, Reichers, & Hudy (1997), single-item measures can be used when the construct to be measured is narrow, clear to the respondent, or as the result of limited space on the questionnaire. In my study

I used single-item indicators for each of the three control variables (profit/non-profit, service or product, and unionization status), as well as two predictor variables (grievance procedures and vertical hierarchy), and the outcome variable of employee turnover. Second, the data was self-report information at the organization level. Because two or more of the variables were self-reported by participants, common-method variance could be an issue (Fiske, 1982). Third, the design of the survey included questions both with and without midpoints. I would have preferred that all items have midpoints for a more precise analysis of the data. However, the generalizability of my study was increased by the use of the large, national dataset.

Recommendations for Practice

Based on my research, I have five recommendations to aid organizational leaders and practitioners. First of all, organizations must place priority on the relationship between management and employees. The underpinnings of a healthy climate and high morale environment include employee pride and trust in management. In challenging economic times, management in organizations often neglect this aspect of organizational communication. Therefore, my first recommendation is to design, implement, and maintain formal channels of communication between management and employees. In small organizations, this could include strategies as simple as an “open door” policy with company managers. As the size of the organization increases, the sophistication of the system would likewise increase. For example, management could implement digital bulletin boards in a manufacturing facility to communicate important information about the organization. This ongoing means of communication can help employees feel a sense of connectedness with management and the organization at large.

My second recommendation is to provide ongoing interpersonal skills training and education to management. Communication is a skill that must be learned, practiced, and updated. Organizations should provide ongoing communication skills and team work training to employees, members of management in particular, to equip them with the right interpersonal techniques for professional management-employee relationships. Techniques modeled by management such as active listening, constructive criticism, and positive feedback can create important norms for the employees in an organization, helping to deter a climate of mistreatment.

My third recommendation is that organizations should encourage honesty and consistency, or trustworthiness, among employees in the workplace. Trustworthiness, a key competency for managers, is the foundation for a positive leader-follower relationship (Hackman & Johnson, 1991). By adopting a values-based culture and emphasizing the importance of the particular dimension of trust, organizations can set the tone for a positive employee-management relationship.

My fourth recommendation focuses on the area of job security, a critical element of employee morale. Organizations, faced with tough financial challenges, are often too quick to reduce employees through restructuring and closure activities. I would like to suggest that the costs of employee morale, in terms of impact on both employees and the organization, be considered critically in the analysis of the business or organizational plan.

Finally, I would propose that organizations formalize human resources policies and programs to structure the work environment and interpersonal climate in a consistent manner. When employees are provided with guidelines, processes, and procedures that

set expectations of employee responsibilities and behaviors, they will be more likely to act accordingly.

Suggestions for Future Research

In support of Guest's (1997) framework, the present study sets the stage for additional investigation about the causal relationship between human resources practices and employee behaviors. Other future research might include further development of the conceptual model, in particular, a broadening of the types of human resources practices examined. I would propose that organizations that include high performance human resources practices such as pay for performance programs, internal career development programs, and work-life balance programs will experience lower levels of workplace incivility.

Also, as contemporary organizations struggle to compete in the global economy, a number of strategic human resources practices such as downsizing and outsourcing may have additional deleterious consequences other than those known. Further empirical research is needed to examine the human side of emerging trends. A question for future research might be the following: How does downsizing impact incivility among survivors in organizations? I propose that organizations that have experienced downsizing and lowered levels of employee trust will see an increase in incivility among employees.

In general, further investigation is needed to identify the antecedents of incivility that are controllable at the organizational level. It is at this level that formal policies and leadership modeling strategies may help to prevent or deter this workplace behavior.

My study was limited in some respects in the use of the existing dataset of the

National Organizations Survey (Smith, Kallberg, & Marsden, 2002). While the scope of the survey was quite broad, my study could have been improved with the inclusion of some additional items. For example, other organizational performance indicators such as financial performance (annual sales or profit) would have added an interesting dimension to the analysis.

Conclusion

The findings of the research in this study show that incivility can negatively impact an organization's bottom line in terms of employee turnover. The research also underscores the importance of maintaining a positive workplace climate and employee morale in curtailing incivility, thereby decreasing employee turnover. Finally, the findings suggest that human resources practices can significantly contribute to organizational performance by impacting employee behaviors, in particular, workplace incivility.

REFERENCES

- Aikin, L.S., & West, S.G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Allen, R. E., & Lucero, M. A. (1998). Subordinate aggression against managers: Empirical analyses of published arbitration decisions. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 9, 234.
- Amsa, P. (1986). Organizational culture and work group behaviour: An empirical study. *Journal of Management Studies*, 23, 347-362.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 411-423.
- Andersson, L., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 452-471.
- Aquino, K., Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (2001). How employees respond to personal offense. The effects of blame attribution, victim status, and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 52-59.
- Aquino, K., & Bommer, W. H. (2003). Preferential mistreatment: How victim status moderates the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and workplace victimization. *Organization Science*, 14, 374-385.

- Aquino, K., & Lamertz, K. (2004). A relational model of workplace victimization: Social roles and patterns of victimization in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 1023-1034.
- Ashforth, B. E. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, 47, 755-778.
- Avolio, B., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. (1995). *MLQ: Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Technical Report. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
- Barling, J., & Phillips, M. (1993). Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *Journal of Psychology*, 127, 649-656.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Violence and US regional culture. *American Psychologist*, 48, 441-449.
- Bennett, R., & Robinson, S. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360.
- Bentler, (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Bhanthumnavin, D. (2003). Perceived social support from supervisor and group members psychological and situational characteristics as predictors of subordinate performance in Thai work units. *Human Resources Quarterly*, 14, 79-97.
- Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1996). Beyond distrust: Getting even and the need for revenge. In R. M. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 246-260) Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. Giacalone & J. Giacalone

- (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 18-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 173-184.
- Blau, G., & Andersson, L. (2005). Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 595-614.
- Boselie, P., Dietz, G., & Boon, C. (2005). Commonalities and contractions in HRM and performance research. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 15, 67-94.
- Bowen, D. E., & Orstroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of the strength of the HRM system. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 203-221.
- Boxall, P. & Purcell, J. (2003) *Strategy and human resource management*. London: Macmillan.
- Boxx, W. R., Odom, R.Y., & Dunn, M. (1990). Organizational values and value congruency and their impact on satisfaction, commitment, and cohesion: An empirical examination within the public sector. *Public Personnel and Management*, 20, 195-206.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, J., Lee, T., & Holtom, B. (2002). The influence of motivation to attend, ability to attend, and organizational commitment on different types of absence behaviors. *Journal of Management Issues*, 14, 181-197.
- Carr, J. Z., Schmidt, A. M., Ford, J. K., & De Shon, R.P. (2003). Climate perceptions

- matter: A meta-analytic path analysis relating molar climate, cognitive and affective states, and individual level work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 605-619.
- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (2000). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for behavioral sciences*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aikin, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the social sciences (3rd ed.)*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Cortina, L., Magley, V., Williams, J., & Langhout, R. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 64-80.
- Cortina, L. M., Lonsway, K. A., Magley, V. J., Freeman, L. V., Collinsworth, L. L., Hunter, M., & Fitzgerald, F. F. (2002). What's gender got to do with it? Incivility in the federal courts. *Law and Social Inquiry*, 27, 235-270.
- Cox, H. (1991). Verbal abuse nationwide. Part II : Impact and modifications. *Nursing Management*, 22, 66-69.
- Delaney, J. T., & Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on performance in for-profit and nonprofit organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 949-969.
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Siguaw, J. A. (2000). *Introducing Lisrel*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Diaz, A. L., & McMillin, J. D. (1991). A definition and description of nurse abuse. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 13(1), 97-109.
- Donovan, M. A., Drasgow, F., & Munson, L. J. (1998). The perceptions of fair

- interpersonal treatment scale: Development of a measure of interpersonal treatment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 683-692.
- Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 547-559.
- Doty, D., & Glick, W.II. (1998). Common methods bias: Does common method variance really bias results? *Organizational Research Methods* 1, 374-406.
- Duhart, D. T. (2001). *Violence in the workplace, 1993-1999*. U.S. Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report (NCJ No. 190076).
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 331-351.
- Earley, P. C. (1994). Self or group? Cultural effects on training on self-efficacy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 89-117.
- Fiske, D.W. (1982). Convergent-discriminant validation in measurement and research strategies. In D. Brinberg & L. Kidder (Eds.). *New directions for methodology of social and behavioral science: Forms of validity in research* (Vol. 12, pp. 77-92). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Gerhart, B., Wright, P., & McMahan, G. (2000). Measurement error in research on the human resources and firm performance relationship: Further evidence and analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 855-872.
- Glaser, S. R. (1983, November). *Assessing organizational culture: An interpretive*

- approach*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Washington, DC.
- Glaser, S. R., Zamanou, S., & Hacker, K. (1987). Measuring and interpreting organizational culture. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 1, 173-198.
- Glisson, C. & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Quarterly*, 33, 61-81.
- Glomb, T., & Liao, H. (2003). Interpersonal aggression in work groups: Social influence reciprocal, and individual effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 486-496.
- Guest, D. E. (1992). Employee commitment and control. *Employment Relations*. Ed. J. Hartley and G. Stephenson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guest, D. E. (1997). Human resource management and performance: A review and research agenda. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41, 297-314.
- Guest, D. E. (1999). Human resource management: The worker's verdict. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 9, 5-25.
- Hackman, M.Z., & Johnson, G.E. (1991). *Leadership: A communication perspective*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through work design: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Hansen, R. J. (1993). Personal harassment in the Canadian Force: 1992 survey. Working Paper 93-1, Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit, Willowdale, Ontario.

- Harvey, S. (1995). *Workplace hostilities: Relationship of boss's negative interpersonal behaviors to fear, tension, job satisfaction and intention to leave*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Guelph, Ontario.
- Herman, R. (1997). Reducing costly turnover. *HR Focus*, 74(6), 15-16.
- Hu, L.T., & Bentley, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conditional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- Huselid, M. A., & Becker, B. E. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-sectional and panel estimates of the HR-firm performance link. *Industrial Relations*, 35, 400-422.
- Johnson, G. (1988). Rethinking incrementalism. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9, 75-91.
- Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1989). *LISREL 7 users reference guide*. Mooresville, IN: Scientific Software, Inc.
- Judge, T. A., Martocchio, J. J., & Thoreson, C. J. (1997). Five factor model of personality and employee absence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 745-755.
- Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 125-141.
- Keashly, L., Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, J. W. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations*, 54, 1387-1419.
- Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Purcell, J., Rayton, B., & Swart, J. (2005). Satisfaction with HR practices and commitment to the organization: Why one size does not fit all.

- Human Resource Management Journal*, 15, 9-29.
- Langhout, R. D., Hunter Williams, J., Munson, L., Cedusky, A. A., Salisbury, J. C.,
Drasgow, F., et al., (2000). *Feedback report related to organizational climate*.
Technical report prepared for a grocery distributor company.
- Lawler, E., & Youn, J. (1996). Commitment in exchange relations: Test of a theory of
relational cohesion. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 89-108.
- Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and
Victims*, 5, 119-126.
- Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The
interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of
Applied Psychology*, 90, 483-496.
- Mangione, L. L., & Mangione, T. W. (2001). Workgroup context and the experience of
abuse: An opportunity for prevention. *Work*, 16, 259-267.
- Marks, J. (1996, April 22). In your face: Whatever happened to good manners? *US News
& World Report*, 66-72.
- Martin, R. J., & Hine, D. W. (2005). Development and validation of the uncivil
workplace behavior questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*,
10, 477-490.
- Martinko, M. J., Gundlach, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. (2002). *Toward an integrative theory
Of counterproductive workplace behavior: A causal reasoning perspective*.
International Journal of Selection and Assessment 10(1/2), 36-50.
- Mathieu, J., & Zajoc, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates,

- and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Mathis R. L., & Jackson, J. A. (2003). *Human resource management* (10th ed.). Austin, TX: South-Western.
- Mayhew, C., McCarthy, P., Chappell, D., Quinlan, M., Barker, M., & Sheehan, M. (2004). Measuring the extent of occupational violence and bullying on traumatized workers. *Employees Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 16, 117-132.
- McDonald, P., & Gandz, J. (1991). Identification of values relevant to business research. *Human Resources Management*, 30, 217-236.
- Merchant, J. A., & Lundell, J. A. (2001). *Workplace violence : A report to the nation*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Injury Prevention Research Center.
- Miner, A. G., Glomb, T. M., & Hulin, C. (2005). Experience sampling mood and its correlates at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 171- 193.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Nadler, L. (1984). *The handbook of human resources development*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Namie, G. (2003). Workplace bullying: Escalated incivility. *New Business Journal*, 68, 1-6.
- Neuman, J. H., & Keashly, L. (2002). *Workplace Aggression Research (WAR-Q)*.
Unpublished manuscript.
- Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- O'Reilly, C.a., Caldwell, D., & Barnett, W.P. (1989). Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 21-37.
- O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J. A., & Caldwell, D. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 3, 487-516.
- Orey, M. (2007, May 7). Attacks by colleagues are creeping us. *Business Week*, 14.
- Oztunc, G. (2006). Examination of incidents of workplace verbal abuse against nurses. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 21, 360-365.
- Pagano, R. R. (1998). *Understanding statistics in the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.).
Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Parent-Thirion, A., Macias, E. F., Harley, J., & Vermeyleylen, G. (2007). *Fourth European working conditions survey*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
- Parker, C. P., Baltes, B. B., Young, S. A., Huff, J. W., Altmann, R. A., Lacost, H. A., & Roberts, J. E. (2003). Relationship between psychological climate perceptions and

- work outcomes: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2, 389-416.
- Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for nice? Think again. *Academy of Management Executives*, 19, 7-18.
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P.E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 777-796.
- Price Spratlen, L. (1995). Interpersonal conflict which includes mistreatment in a university workplace. *Violence and Victims*, 10(4), 285-297.
- Quarles, R. (1994). An examination of promotion opportunities and evaluation criteria as mechanisms for affecting internal auditor commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 6, 176-194.
- Sackett, P. R., & Devore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. Ones, H. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 145-164.
- Schein, E. (1993). Organizational culture and leadership. In *Classics of Organization Theory*. Fort Worth: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Sheehan, E.P. (1993). The effects of turnover on the productivity of those who stay. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133, 699-706.
- Sheehan, K. H., Sheehan, D.V., White, K., Leibowitz, A., & Baldwin, D.C. (1990). A pilot study of medical student abuse. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 263, 533-537.

- Sheridan, J. E. (1992). Organizational culture and employee retention. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 1036-1056.
- Silver, H. K., & Glicker, A. D. (1990). Medical student abuse: Incidence, severity, and significance. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 263(4) 527-532.
- Smith, T. W., Kallberg, A. L., & Marsden, P. V. (2002). National Organizations Survey (NOS). 2002 (Computer file). ICPSR version. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center (NORC) <producer>. 2003. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research <distributor>, 2004.
- Sriramesh, K., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (1996). Observations and measurement of two dimensions of organizational culture and their relationship to public relations. *Journal of Public Relations*, 24, 541-552.
- Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 25, 173-180.
- Taubman, P., & Wachter, M. L. (1986). Segmented labor markets in O. Sshenfleter and R. Layard, *Handbook on Labor Economics Volume II*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Tepper, B. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 974-983.
- Tett, R. P., Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic finds. *Personnel*

- Psychology*, 46, 259-293.
- Tracey, W. R. (1991). The human resources glossary. New York: AMACOM.
- Tucker, L.R., & Lewis, C. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor Analysis. *Psychometrika*, 38, 1-10.
- Uhari, M., Kokkonen, I., Nuutinen, J., Vainionpaa, L., Rantala, H., Lautala, P., & Vayrynen, M. (1994). Mistreatment of medical students: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271, 1049-1051.
- Valle, M. (2005). A preliminary model of abusive behavior organizations. *Southern Business Review*, 30(2), 27-35.
- Van den Berg, R. J., Richardson, H. A., & Eastman, L. J. (1999). The impact of high involvement work processes on organizational effectiveness. *Group and Organization Management*, 24, 300-339.
- Vogt, P. W. (2005). *Dictionary of statistics and methodology*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wanous, J., Reichers, A., & Hudy, M. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 247-252.
- Williams, L., & Hazer, J. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in turnover models: A re-analysis using latent variable and structural equation methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 219-231.
- Wislar, J. S., Richman, J. A., Fendrich, M., & Flaherty, J. A. (2002). Sexual harassment, generalized workplace abuse, and drinking outcomes: The role of personality vulnerability. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 32, 1071-1088.
- Wolf, T. M., Randall, H. M., Von Almen, K., & Tynes, L. L. (1991). Perceived

- mistreatment and attitude change by graduating medical students: A retrospective study. *Medical Education*, 25, 184-190.
- Wright, P. M., & Boswell, W. R. (2002). Desegregating HRM: A review and synthesis of micro and macro human resource management research. *Journal of Management*, 28, 247-276.
- Wright, P. M. & Nishii, L. H. (2004). *Strategic HRM and organizational behaviour: Integrating multiple levels of analysis*. Working paper presented at the international seminar on “HRM: What’s Next?” organized by the Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Yagil, D. (2005). Employees attribution of abusive supervisory behaviors. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 13, 307-326.
- Yauch, C. A., & Steudel, H. J. (2003). Complementary use of qualitative, quantitative cultural assessment methods. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6, 440-464.
- Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1068-1076.

NOS 2002 Methodology Report

NOS 2002

NOS

The National Organizations Study

Conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago

METHODOLOGY REPORT

NORC

Subcontracted by Jones Smith

Date July 28, 2005

★NOS 2002★P.O. Box 547★Urbana, IL 61805★(312) 244-2007

1. Background

The National Organization Study (NOS) II is a survey of business organizations across the United States in which the unit of analysis is the actual workplace. The study was conducted for the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), and the Commonwealth Fund to learn about the employment policies, benefits, and structures of organizations throughout the country, particularly the effects on business performance and worker productivity of rising workplace stress levels, rising health insurance costs or not having health insurance, and the extent of mental health benefit and service offerings within organizations. NOS II is a follow up to the 2002 General Social Survey (GSS) and the sample is therefore constructed from this dataset.

2. Project Staff

The NOS 2002 was staffed with managers, supervisors, and programmers. Alma Kuby was the project director and in that role was responsible for managing all aspects of the project. Phil Panczuk was responsible for systems and data delivery. Angela Herrmann and Lauren Seward were the telephone supervisors responsible for monitoring the quality of telephone interviewers and the other day-to-day tasks associated with the supervision of interviewers. Kim Feindt, Tina Hembree and Michael Weitzenfeld were responsible for implementing the questionnaires, providing programming and operational support during data collection, and developing the study materials. LaShanda Carter and Gloria Rauens were the computer programmers responsible for developing the CATI and CADE systems and delivering the data, respectively.

3. Institutional Review Board Certification

In July of 2002, the project director prepared a package and submitted it to the NORC Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the pretest. The package contained an application for the project, a description of the project, and a copy of the introduction and draft of the questionnaire. The committee granted full approval for the pretest soon afterwards. An amended protocol was submitted to the NORC IRB in October of 2002 for the main study. This package contained the revised questionnaire, revised advanced mail-out materials and a protocol to deal with the interconnectedness of the GSS 2002 and NOS 2002 public use data.

4. Questionnaire Development

The final questionnaire is comprised of 12 sections, three of which identify locating information (locating information is required in the event that follow up interviews are needed, or if an incentive is due), and one of which allows for interviewers to record general observations. The core sections of the questionnaire gather basic descriptive information, in addition to information pertaining to the primary:

NOS 2002 Methodology Report
 occupation/product/service, corporate human resources policies, health and other
 benefits, and workplace violence.

NORC pre-tested the questionnaire July 23 through August 16, 2002 using a
 convenience sample of Chicago-area employers selected to represent firms of different
 sizes, industries, and ownership types. The Principal Investigators provided NORC
 with the final questionnaire on October 3, 2002. The final version of the questionnaire
 was developed into a Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) instrument for
 self-employed persons and into a Paper-and-Pencil Instrument for all other businesses.
 NORC set up both a Telephone Number Management System (TNMS) and CATI to
 support the telephone interviewer activities.

The estimated administration time of the questionnaire for the main study was
 approximately 55 minutes. For the most part, each respondent was asked the same
 questions unless the business did not contain certain types of employees, such as full- or
 part-time or temporary employees, offer health insurance, or report certain incidences
 of workplace violence.

3. Survey Sample Preparation

NORC used respondent information from the GSS 2002 dataset to build the NOS
 sample. During the GSS 2002 interviews, half of all household respondents were asked
 to provide contact information for their place of employment including business name,
 address, and telephone number. NORC completed interviews with 888 GSS
 respondents eligible for the NOS study.

As expected, not all of the NOS information collected from the GSS respondents was
 complete. Tables 1 through 3 provide the proportion of the 888 GSS respondents who
 did not provide a complete establishment name, address or telephone number during
 the GSS 2002 interview.

Table 1: Information on Establishment Name, for Total NOS Sample

<i>Response</i>	<i>Percentage (n=888)</i>	<i>Total (n=888)</i>
Supplied	81.8	726
Refused	15.2	135
Don't Know or Incomplete Information	3.0	27

Table 2: Information on Establishment Address, for Total NOS Sample

<i>Response</i>	<i>Percentage (n=888)</i>	<i>Total (n=888)</i>
Supplied	68.7	610
Refused	17.3	154

Don't Know or Incomplete Information	14.0	124

Table 3: Information on Establishment Telephone Number, for Total NOS Sample

<i>Response</i>	<i>Percentage (n=888)</i>	<i>Total (n=888)</i>
Supplied	68.5	608
Refused	19.0	169
Don't Know or Incomplete Information	12.5	111

Those who did not provide a telephone number did not provide an address 95% of the time. Of the 888 original cases, 14 cases were duplicates of existing cases in that more than one GSS respondent worked at the same physical location. Therefore, the final sample for NOS 2002 consisted of 874 unique physical locations.

Although a pre-field locating task was undertaken to verify and update the establishment name, address and telephone number for the 874 cases, including a search through the GSS 2002 industry and occupational verbatim responses to obtain any additional establishment information that might clearly identify an establishment and its location, we were not able to obtain usable address information for 156 cases. Predominantly, these were cases in which the GSS 2002 respondent refused to provide their employer's name, address and telephone number.

Instead of excluding these cases from the NOS sample altogether, the project decided to impute the establishment name, address and telephone number using the GSS 2002 industry and geographic codes as criteria for selection. For each of the 156 cases, the name, address and telephone number of an organization within the same industry and geographic area was chosen from yellowpages.com to replace the missing sample information.

6. Data Collection Preparation

a. Pre-field Locating

As discovered in the pretest, verifying the establishment's address information and obtaining the name and telephone number of the person most likely to be the respondent to personalize advanced materials and avoid gatekeepers would greatly aid in increasing participation.

Prior to the main data collection period, two interviewers contacted each case between September 28th and October 12th, 2002 using a short CATI locating questionnaire to verify the establishment name, address and telephone number and to collect the name, title, department, telephone and fax number of the Human Resources manager or the

NOS 2002 Methodology Report

person who does the hiring for the establishment. Overall, address and respondent information was verified and collected for 502 establishments at a cost of 21 minutes per case. Sixty-seven cases were deemed unlocatable and earmarked for further locating. The remainder of the cases was unreachable. Addresses for these cases were passed through SmartMailer, an address management computer software program licensed from Pitney-Bowes, to clean, standardize, and improve the quality of the address information prior to the initial mail-out.

b. Sample File Preparation

Prior to the start of data collection, NORC reviewed and prepared the sample for advance notification. All addresses and zip codes were standardized and any incorrectly spelled or unclear addresses were reviewed and corrected by NORC using on-line resources after all of the addresses had been processed by the locating interviewers and SmartMailer. Addresses that could not be improved were included in the mail-out, based on NORC's experience that postal workers can sometimes deliver packages despite errors identified by SmartMailer or interviewing clerks.

c. Development of Training Materials

The interviewer Manual developed for NOS was written during the months of September and October; it contained the following:

- Description of NORC's history, the study's sponsors, and an overview of the NOS questionnaire
- Explanation of the respondent selection process
- Strategies for gaining cooperation in establishment surveys
- General interviewing techniques and standard conventions
- Job aids
- Information about how to use CAI and NORC's Telephone Number Management System (TNMS), an automated call scheduler.

d. Interviewer Training

One daytime interviewer training session was held on October 23, 2002. The training consisted of both lecture and hands-on experience, with emphasis on the latter.

NORC staffed 11 telephone interviewers for this project. In selecting interviewers, NORC gave priority to those who have a track record in obtaining cooperation and interviewing respondents by telephone. Several of the 12 interviewers were recruited

NORC 2002 Methodology Report
from the American Time Use Survey, including the study's production center
supervisor. The other interviewers were recruited from outside of NORC.

Interviewers were expected to review the study materials prior to the training. In
preparation for interviewer training, NORC developed and prepared project specific
materials that include the following:

- Confidentiality
- Project Background
- Frequently asked questions
- Gaining cooperation techniques
- Questionnaire review
- Practice exercises
- Mock interview sessions

NORC always tries to keep lecture-style training to a minimum so that most of the
training is orientated toward giving the interviewers first-hand experience and practice;
therefore, mock interviews, role-playing introduction situations and round-robin
exercises were built into most of the training modules.

d. Interviewer Certification

After training and before being allowed to start telephoning respondents, each
interviewer was required to pass a checkout procedure that included testing the
interviewer's ability to gain cooperation and administer the survey. The checkout was
also designed to test the interviewer's knowledge of the material presented in training
and that the interviewer understood how to use the PAPI version of the questionnaire.
Interviewers assigned to survey the self-employed were tested on their knowledge of
the CATI questionnaire and system and the TNMS software.

All interviewers were individually certified after the training. Each interviewer
completed a "mock" interview through a long version of the questionnaire. "Mock"
trainers evaluated each interviewer's:

- familiarity with strategies to gain respondent cooperation
- familiarity with the questionnaire and study protocols
- telephone voice and interviewing presence
- adeptness with NORC systems

e. Data Collection Materials

Each case received an advanced mail-out package containing a cover letter signed by
the NORC project director and a tri-fold brochure describing the purpose of the study
and the nature of the request. Each interviewer received a project manual containing all
of the material covered in the initial project training and a faxable cover letter, FAQ
sheet and NORC confidentiality statement to aid in their gaining cooperation activities.

Interviewers also received a list of interviewer scripts to use to gain cooperation with both gatekeepers and respondents and from which they could build their own telephone introductions.

7. Systems Development

a. TNMS, Survey Management System and CATI/PAPI Features of Collection

NORC developed a Computer Assisted Telephone Interview, or CATI, program to capture the interview data online for the self-employed. The capabilities of our CATI system included automated sample management by which the telephone number management system (TNMS), rather than the interviewing staff, maintained the status of each case in the sample which facilitated production reporting, as well as, sample analysis. All cases were managed using the electronic tracking capabilities of TNMS to better facilitate PAPI collection for all organizations other than the self-employed.

Each version of the instrument, CATI and PAPI, provided the following features:

- Display of interviewer instructions, survey questions and response categories.
- For CATI, Screen displays including "fills," that is, text based on prior answers. For PAPI, clearly marked visual cues to help interviewers with text fills.
- For CATI, editing of answers by sets of permissible values, by ranges, or by logical arithmetic operations.
- For CATI, responses to edit failures by requests for reentry or displaying of probes.
- Entry of open-ended or verbatim text.
- Branching or skipping within the questionnaire based on response or preloaded data.
- Capacity to break off an interview in midcourse and resume it at another time.

PAPI was used to give the interviewers the ability to back up to and change prior entries and, after backing up, the ability to resume the interview without losing previously entered answers.

b. IDS/DAS and CADE

To facilitate the CATI development and subsequent data review, NORC utilized two of its standard systems, the Instrument Development System (IDS), and the Data Access System (DAS).

The IDS standardized the way in which a questionnaire was converted into a CATI instrument. Through the process of using the IDS, staff determined the specifications

NOS 2002 Methodology Report

for the data set and so that the data set automatically produced by CATI was as close as possible to the specifications for the delivered data set. Also using IDS, the questionnaire was converted into a computer-assisted data entry (CADE) system to facilitate entry of data collected by PAPL.

The DAS allowed project staff to access and export the CATI and CADE data throughout the data collection field period. Staff could choose to export individual variable, the full data set or cross tabs.

DAS was also used to generate frequencies. Throughout the data collection period, NORC staff held data frequency review sessions to evaluate the quality and completeness of the interview data. Should the need for any data editing or cleaning specifications have been identified through this process, it would be documented and shared with the Principal Investigator. Furthermore, should this process have revealed any interviewer problems, feedback was given to the supervisors and interviewer immediately to minimize the problem, and improve the overall quality of the data.

8. Data Collection

a. Schedule

Project activity for NOS's main data collection period began on August 16, 2002 and was completed on June 5, 2003. The project had a 13-week period of performance. Within the period of performance was a 10-week data collection period, from December 19, 2001 through February 23, 2001. Milestone dates for the data collection period were as follows:

- Pre-field Locating Begins - September 28, 2002
- Pre-field Locating Ends - October 12, 2002
- Advance Package Mail-out - October 18, 2002
- Interviewer Training - October 23, 2002
- Data Collection Begins - October 24, 2002
- Data Collection Ends - May 16, 2003
- Final Data Delivery - June 5, 2003

b. Respondent Incentives

To increase response rates, NORC offered self-employed respondents \$25 and all non-self-employed \$20 at the outset of the study as an incentive to participate. All non-respondents were offered \$40 on February 28, 2003 and then \$50 beginning March 17, 2003. To urge reluctant respondents to participate, a \$100 incentive was offered beginning on March 25, 2003. NORC sent a brief thank-you letter and respondent fees to the completed cases. These packages were mailed 1.5 months after the completion of data collection.

NOS 2002 Methodology Report

NORC paid a total of \$19,480 in incentives to 396 respondents. 120 respondents were offered but did not accept an incentive. 209 respondents received \$20, 47 received \$40, and 96 received \$100. Some organizations received more than \$100 total because more than one respondent was used to complete the questionnaire after the \$100 incentive was offered on March 25th.

c. Locating

Cases requiring a more in-depth locating effort were sent to locating specialists who used the following sources to find respondents:

- Directory Assistance
- Internet Database Search Sites
- Telephone calls to neighboring business and local Chambers of Commerce

The locating efforts identified all but 16 cases. Two cases were determined to be duplicates not caught before the field period and 29 cases were found to be out-of-business. Organizations found to no longer exist were designated so only after verbal confirmation.

9. Quality Control

a. Monitoring

NORC's telecommunication system allows aural monitoring, and SurveyCraft, the data collection software used by NORC, allows visual monitoring of all interviewer activity. Interviewers were monitored more heavily in the beginning and end of the survey. This activity involves real-time on-line aural and visual monitoring and the capture of evaluation data of all data collection activity. In addition to evaluating the quality of the data collected, monitors also evaluate gaining cooperation and professionalism.

Supervisors analyzed monitoring data to ensure that the interviewing process met the expected standard. Interviewers received feedback on the quality of their work after the monitoring session. The feedback began with pointing out the things the interviewer did well, then moved on to constructive criticism and ended on a positive note.

Overall, there were few observations of interviewer problems with administering the questionnaire. We identified some problems with gaining cooperation. As we have already mentioned, many courses of action were taken to improve interviewers' ability to gain respondent cooperation.

b. Frequency Review

At two different times during data collection, questionnaire frequencies were reviewed

to be sure that the instrument was performing according to specification. No errors were detected during data collection.

10. Production

Production Report

a. Predicted Performance

During the data collection period, NORC did not meet the unadjusted response rate of 70% (n=612). All cases sent to the interviewers for interviewing were worked completely and evenly, with an average level of effort of 19 respondent contacts per completed case, 20 contacts for each refusal, and 31 contacts for each non-respondent. The expected hours per case was 4.2 and the expected cost per case was \$80.09.

b. Actual Performance

We have computed 2 response rates for this survey: an unadjusted response rate, or complete rate, and an adjusted response rate, or participation rate. The unadjusted response rate is 59% (n=516). The adjusted response rate (that is, adjusted for all cases that were not located, found to no longer exist, or found to be a duplicate of another physical location) is 62.4%. The actual hours per case was 10.43 and the actual cost per case was \$271.53.

c. Final Sample Disposition

Overall, the project collected 516 completed or sufficiently completed questionnaires. Table 4 contains the final disposition of the NOS sample. Unlike the Respondent, Gatekeeper and Hostile Refusals, Non-respondents are those potential respondents who did not tell explicitly tell our interviewers that they did not want to participate in the study. Only those organizations in which we obtained verbal verification of their discontinuance were labeled as No Longer Exists. The remainder of the organizations that could not be found and verbally verified as out-of-business identified as labeled unlocatable. All of the unlocatable establishments represented self-employed persons from the GSS 2002 study.

Table 4. Final Disposition of the National Organizations Study 2002

<i>Final Disposition</i>	<i>Case Count (n=874)</i>
Completed by PAPI	384
Completed by CAPI	70
Completed by Self-administered Questionnaire	53
Partially Completed Questionnaires	9
Gatekeeper Refusal	11
Hostile Refusal	11
Respondent Refusal	183
Non-respondents	106
Organization No Longer Exists	29
Duplicate of Another Physical Location	2
Unlocatable	16
Grand Total	874

d. Additional Activities to Increase Response Rates

In mid-November 2002, it was clear that achieving an acceptable response rate by year's end was infeasible. NORC took the following steps to increase response rates:

1. In mid-November 2002, NORC replaced one-third of the interviewer staff with more seasoned interviewers from within the organization. The task of navigating through an organizational hierarchy, finding the appropriate respondent and gaining cooperation with busy businesspeople proved to be too difficult for new interviewers. In early January 2003, NORC replaced an additional one-third of the interviewers again with the most seasoned interviewers from within the organization to further increase our interviewing capabilities.
2. To avoid wasting resources when respondents were not likely to be in the workplace or available to fulfill our request, we did not conduct any interviews the weeks of December 28th, 2002 and January 4th, 2003.
3. In early February 2003, NORC convened a performance improvement workgroup including a specialist from NORC's Quality Assurance Department to help turnaround the NOS cost and production performance. The performance improvement workgroup met biweekly through the beginning of May 2003.
4. On February 28th, 2003 NORC mailed out a refusal conversion package to all non-respondents. Each package contained a tailored refusal conversion letter, a FAQ sheet containing reasons to participate in the study, a sheet explaining the next steps to take to complete the interview.

NOS 2002 Methodology Report

a form offering either a \$40 incentive or a set of non-monetary incentives to choose from, and a piece of chocolate (attached to the FAQ sheet). Approximately 25% of the cases received a self-administered version of the questionnaire (SAQ). The reasons why each respondent did not participate was gathered from the interviewers before the mailing and letters were tailored to groups of cases with like reasons for not participating. SAQ's were sent to respondents if interviewers identified them as most likely to complete the interview on their own.

5. On March 17th, 2003 all non-respondents were offered a \$50 incentive over the phone as part of the interviewers' regular gaining cooperation activities.
6. On March 25th, 2003 NORC mailed out a second refusal conversion package to all non-respondents. Each package contained a tailored refusal conversion letter with the offer of a \$100 incentive if an interview was completed within the next three weeks, a faxable sheet asking for the best time to contact the respondent to complete the interview, a FAQ sheet containing reasons to participate in the study and a sticker containing a reminder of the \$100 incentive if an interview was completed within the next three weeks, and a piece of chocolate and a \$2 bill (both attached to the FAQ sheet). All of the non-respondents received a self-administered version of the questionnaire (SAQ) in the second mailing.
7. In addition to the different monetary incentive offerings, a series of non-monetary incentives were offered in the first refusal conversion mailing. The success rate of the non-monetary offerings was not overwhelming in that only 17 respondents requested either a book or report when offered, but the materials did serve to generate some respondent interest in the study and presented the study's purpose in a more identifiable way. The non-monetary incentives were:

1.	BOOK #1	FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS- "Non-Standard Work Substandard Jobs: Flexible Work Arrangements in the U.S."
2.	BOOK #2	STOCK OPTIONS- "In the Company of Owners: The Truth about Stock Options and Why Every Employee Should Have Them."
3.	BOOK #3	RESULTS FROM THE 1991 NOS STUDY- "Organizations in America: Analyzing Their Structures and Human Resources Practices."
4.	REPORT #1	THE FUTURE OF HEALTH CARE POLICY- Lessons for the future of health care.

5.	REPORT #2	QUALITY OF HEALTH CARE IN THE US- Quality of health care in the United States: A Chartbook.
6.	REPORT #3	HELPING THE UNINSURED- From place to place: Innovations in health policy.

c. Data Delivery

The final export occurred within three weeks of the end of the data collection period and contained the complete data set with combined CATI and CAIDI data, a codebook with the frequencies for each variable with the full question text printed and data formatted to SAS and SPSS cards, and a complete accounting for sampled and imputed cases. New case numbers were assigned to each case to prevent the disclosure of GSS 2002 respondents via the NOS 2002 data set. The final delivery occurred on March 7, 2002.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Dana Cosby Simmons

ADDRESS: 1509 Neptune Way
Bowling Green, KY 42104

DOB: February 26, 1969

EDUCATION

& TRAINING: B.S., Behavior Science
Western Kentucky University
1987-1992

M.A., Organizational Communication
Western Kentucky University
1993-1994

WORK EXPERIENCE:

August 2007-present
Executive-in-Residence
Management Department
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY

1994-2008
Assistant General Manager, General Affairs
Sumitomo Electric Wiring Systems, Inc.
North American Headquarters
Bowling Green, Kentucky

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES:

Society for Human Resources 1995-present
World at Work 2000-present
Academy of Human Resources Development 2008-present

PUBLICATIONS:

Cosby, D.M. (September, 2002). Job analysis: The missing ingredient. *Workspan Magazine*.