

Scale Adaptation of Incivility at Organizations*

(Research Article)

Örgütlerdeki İşyeri Nezaketsizliği Ölçeğinin Uyarlaması

Doi: 10.29023/alanyaakademik.1596440

Hakan YILMAZ¹

¹ Dr., İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi, hakanyilma@gmail.com, Orcid No: 0000-0002-0670-4768

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Incivility, Workplace,
Employee Wellbeing,
Performance

Received:

04.12.2024

Accepted:

08.08.2025

Incivility and its influences on organizational behavior have been subject of growing number of studies for meeting the need to build healthy workplaces. Companies should manage their workforce well as surviving in this fragile environment also depends on employees' performance. Accordingly, this research aimed to adapt and apply a scale of incivility by using four different questionnaires, referring to the techniques of the 2016 International Test Commission (ITC) Guidelines. A qualitative research approach was applied to collect data from the local large corporate firms in Türkiye that are ranked on the BIST 100 list. These companies were chosen for their corporate organizational structure, diversified large number of employees and their dedication to be the best place to work. The findings of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, which were performed by Factor and SPSS software, concluded the scale to be comprised of 39 items within 3 dimensions (CFI = 0.93, AGFI = 0.82, GFI = 0.85, RMSEA = 0.07, $p = .000$). Thus, it can be deduced that new version of the incivility scale is reliable, valid and can be used to measure and assess incivility in the context of healthy workplace.

ÖZET

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Nezaketsizlik, İşyeri,
Çalışan Refahı,
Performans

Nezaketsizlik ve bunun örgütsel davranış üzerindeki etkileri, huzurlu bir çalışma ortamı inşa edilmesi ihtiyacını karşılamaya yönelik olarak, giderek artan sayıdaki çalışmaya konu olmuştur. Şirketlerin iş gücünü iyi yönetmesi gerekmektedir zira bu kırılğan iş ortamında ayakta kalabilmek çalışanların performansına da bağlıdır. Bu araştırma, 2016 Uluslararası Test Komisyonu (ITC) Kılavuzunun tekniklerine uygun olarak dört farklı anketi kullanarak yeni bir nezaketsizlik ölçeğinin uyarlanmasını ve uygulanmasını amaçlamaktadır. BIST 100 listesinde yer alan Türkiye'deki yerel büyük kurumsal firmalardan veri toplamak amacıyla nitel araştırma yaklaşımı uygulanmıştır. Bu şirketler, kurumsal organizasyon yapıları, çeşitlendirilmiş çok sayıda çalışanı ve çalışılacak en iyi yer olma konusundaki özverileri nedeniyle seçilmiştir. Factor ve SPSS istatistik programları tarafından gerçekleştirilen açımlayıcı ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizlerinin bulguları, yeni ölçeğin 3 boyut ve 39 maddeden oluştuğunu göstermiştir (CFI = 0,93, AGFI = 0,82, GFI = 0,85, RMSEA = 0,07, $p = ,000$). Bu sonuçlar çerçevesinde nezaketsizlik ölçeğinin bu yeni versiyonunun güvenilir ve geçerli olduğu; huzurlu bir çalışma ortamı bağlamında nezaketsizliği ölçerek değerlendirebilmek için kullanılabilceği sonucuna varılmıştır.

* Bu çalışmanın verileri 2019 yılında toplandığı için etik kurul onay şartı bulunmamaktadır.

1. INTRODUCTION

Following the industrial revolution and evolvement of global business, different organizational behavior problems has emerged in line with the changing working environment. Interaction between departments, groups and employees is inevitable, where regarding sufficient business requirements can be supplied (Yanmaz & Gulel, 2023). Incivility (depressed energy social abnormal attitude that breaches ethical norms to respect each other) can occur during this interaction when communicating (Lim & Teo, 2009). The term incivility was first used in the mid-15th century, which was derived from the Latin word *incivilitatem*, meaning not civil, an act of rudeness, and uncourteous behavior to others (Etymology Dictionary, 2020).

The results of incivility can be very harmful not only for companies but also for workers as well in terms of performance, success, job satisfaction and employee turnover (Febriana & Fajrianti, 2022; Ophoff et al., 2015). Nowadays companies have a propensity to create a positive work environment. In this regard, they are trying to eliminate and prevent negative behaviors like incivility, while forming their future business plans accordingly for survival (Akella & Lewis, 2019). The local large corporate firms in Türkiye that are ranked on the BIST 100 list are no exception, fostering their employees. These enterprises are known for their corporate organizational structure, diversified large number of employees and their dedication to be the best place to work, whilst meeting the expectations of stakeholders. The victims of incivility at workplace are tense, demotivated, nervous, insecure, loath to engage in work while suffering from low work performance and job satisfaction (Ophoff et al., 2015; Giumetti et al., 2016).

Today organizations are aware that workforce seeks a greater purpose from employers than just a salary (Kent Business School, 2021). Wellbeing, which avoids negative attitudes like incivility can considered to be one of these purposes. By recognizing incivility that can affect employee performance and engagement, firms can manage their resources and processes better for the benefit of the business, customers, and staff. Usually, in line with the nature of work life some organizations can successfully manage incivility, nonetheless others can't and fail to solve it. The possible reason of this can be correlated with incivility and demographic factors. Respectively, this research tends to help companies, that struggle with negative working environment, to detect incivility and comprehend its outcomes on staff. Being conscious of the factors which cause incivility, firms can be much better supplied to prevent incivility, resulting in being beneficial for their workers and organizations.

In the scope of management theories, companies employing engaged, satisfied, and qualified workforce have a sustainable competitive advantage for surviving. Accordingly human resource management can be considered as required program for creating a competitive advantage. Related to this matter, the main aim of this study is to present how to measure incivility at work on the local large corporate firms in Türkiye that are ranked on the BIST 100 list. In this manner, we focused to adapt a scale that detects and measures incivility behavior at firms in the context of the victims.

The parts of this research are: (1) the conceptual framework; (2) method; (3) results; (4) conclusion and suggestions. The case studies mentioned at the literature section of this paper emphasizes the examples of firms, which could successfully detect and managed incivility This study also investigated the related studies already performed at this subject. At the section of method, the procedure of adapting four different incivility scale into Turkish language and culture was mentioned, whilst testing validity and reliability of the new Turkish version of it (Febriana & Fajrianti, 2022). In conclusion, we outlined the study and added suggestions.

According to the literature search it had been identified that the study at hands validates to be the only study that adapts incivility scale by using four distinct questionnaires, referring to the techniques of the 2016 International Test Commission (ITC) Guidelines from a developing country, Türkiye's BIST 100 list. In this manner, this research is valuable and essential. Outcomes of this study have considerable indications for enterprises pursuing to create more positive working environment, which intends to grow and survive by incorporating with their workers and for scholars working on to reveal the link between incivility and other organizational behavior variables. By adapting and applying a scale of incivility via using four different questionnaires, it is expecting to obtain better data and more accurate outcomes, which will eventually contribute to organizational wellbeing.

1.1. Conceptual Framework

Workplace incivility can be described as low-intensity deviant attitude with a doubtful eager to harm (Schilpzand et al., 2016). Incivility is also known as disrespectful, violent or rude behaviors including insulting remarks, bullying, gossiping, verbal abuse, ignoring, hiding information and refusing to help (Tiberius & Flak, 1999; Gillespie et al. 2017; Samman, 2021). Incivility can be classified as an uncivil behavior, displaying impolite acts and lack of regard for other people at workplace (Keçeci & Turgut, 2018).

Definitions, perception, and treatment of incivility changes with cultural differences, for example western society considers incivility as a form of injustice, whilst Asians takes it as a form of normal control and instructions from

managers (Febriana & Fajrianti, 2022). Accordingly, in Asia, workers have tendency to welcome and tolerate orders in rough conversations as a part of daily business, legalizing incivility (Loh et al., 2021)

Porath and Pearson (2013) argued that 98% of employees undergo incivility, with 50% experiencing such attitude every week, causing hidden \$14,000 monetary cost per staff at a year. In this manner, incivility is becoming more significant issue recently especially for the companies aiming to create better working environment while reducing the negative impacts and costs of bad behaviors. In their study it has been determined that 48% of the incivility victims decreased their efforts at work, 38% deliberately reduced quality 66% have lower performance results, and 79% diminished commitment (Porath & Pearson, 2013). Actually, workplace incivility shouldn't be confused with other bad individual behaviors like bullying as it is disparate from them (Vagharseyyedin, 2015). Because incivility doesn't have to include verbal abuse, it can be subject to nonverbal conduct like excluding others (Lim, Cortina, & Magely, 2008).

Another study identified that the individual who is subjected to incivility can cause the effects of incivility to spread to a wider area by gossiping what he/she has experienced with his/her colleagues, subordinates and even superiors at work (Pearson et al., 2000). In addition, it has been determined that workplace incivility harms teamwork (Ricciotti, 2016) and the environment of trust at the organization (Logan, 2016). Next encountered research pointed out that employee's tendency to become discontented with their work and withdraw from their jobs after experiencing incivility can change according to cross-cultural experiences among countries (Vogel et al., 2015). Another study indicated that workers of high-power distance societies are more likely to be allowing incivility at workplace than workers of low power distance societies (Loh et al., 2021). The same study argued that incivility can be a social stressor for menacing laborers' emotional states and causing adverse results like burnout. Next survey that examined a random sample of 522 workers, showed that state of having positive beliefs and sensitivity can be crucial for revealing why incivility is correlated with work linked performance and consequences (Bunk & Magley, 2013).

1.2. Results of Incivility

Earlier studies designed to assess the results incivility among employees and enterprises, at general. Incivility at workplace stimulates negative feelings such as irritation, anxiety, and grief (Porath & Pearson, 2013). Supporting this discussion, past research declared that incivility is correlated with negative business results such as lower job satisfaction, higher job turnover, bad employee mood, health, and work productivity (Cortina et al., 2013; Estes & Wang, 2008; Giumetti et al., 2016). Incivility at workplace is also linked with negative reactions like resigning, reduced task engagement and burnout syndrome (Loh et al., 2021). Likely, other studies argued it's associated with low performance, absenteeism, retirement, and work withdrawal plans (Liu et al., 2009; Cortina, 2008).

Moreover, incivility can evolve to rage and revenge in terms of retribution, especially in cases where workers struggle to keep justice and avoid threats to their future existence and wellbeing (Doshy & Wang, 2014). Additionally, it may involve having longer breaks than required, asking illness core-leave and start working late (Lim et al., 2008). Staff members, who undergo incivility at workplace, consider themselves being treated unfairly, causing inner depression and stress (Giumetti et al., 2016). This situation can derive concentration loses at times. Even witnessing it may lack showing citizenship behaviors and dedication (Doshy & Wang, 2014).

1.3. The Need for a Local Incivility Scale

Looking at the literature it can be said that most of the incivility studies were performed by using the Cortina et al.'s (2001) scale, whose one-dimensional form prevents making a distinction of uncivil behaviors at firms. Moreover, this questionnaire can hide cultural diversities. It should also be considered that regarding scale was created and applied in a self-centered society of USA. In order to acquire more accurate results at other for example socialist countries there is a demand and requirement for a local incivility scale. Gjersing, Caplehorn, and Clausen (2010) highlighted the usefulness of adapting scales to present research context to guarantee that concepts are still valid among original and new language, term, and conditions.

Cultural adaptation needs to be done to incivility scales however, there has been little attention on it (Yuniasanti & Abas, 2019). Literature review indicated that most of incivility studies have been executed at North America and Europe, but few at East particularly for scale adaptation (Yuniasanti & Abas, 2019). In this regard, the study at hands commenced to include the variable of state culture, differentiating the incivility of managers and workers. Accordingly, organizations can determine the demonstrators of incivility for building healthy workplaces whilst defeating its negative consequences.

Upon these studies, it has been determined that currently incivility, which is hard to be identified by regulations, can be experienced at firms, and since its long-term results are harmful, improving recommendations need to be established by enterprises for corporate firms. Hence, it is crucially required to conduct new studies and form new enhanced scales (Işıkay & Taslak, 2021).

2. METHOD

In the context of this survey, incivility scale was adapted by using four different measuring instruments (Cortina et al., 2013; Rosen et al., 2016; Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Keçeci & Turgut, 2018). The process of adaptation was held by using Beaton et al.'s (2000) and International Test Committee (2017) guidelines. Firstly, forward translation was made by two professional independent translators from English to Turkish. Secondly, the synthesis processes were performed by consolidating the outcomes of the interpretations by using the same meaning words. The main goal of this process is to ensure that it has the same meaning with the first version. Next, back translation and specialists' review were done by different two bilingual interpreters to ensure that the sentences have same meaning, are grammatically accurate, appropriate, and meet the requirements of equivalence. In this regard, the context of the items 7, 9, 11, 20, 35, 37, 40, and 41 were revised. At the fourth stage four experts, who were briefed about the scope of this study, shared their comments about language resemblance and content validity via assessment forms. Identical questions were scored with 1, whilst totally distinct one's scores were 7. Expert check results revealed that comparability mean score was 1.8 and similarity mean score was 2.2, which shows that no further formal review is required (Burdick et al., 2017).

Accordingly, all the versions of the questionnaire are united, and a new form of the scale was developed to be applied at the pilot search (Febriana & Fajrianti, 2022). Furthermore, experts rated content validity in terms of relevancy, suitability, adequacy, and clarity (Dikko, 2016; Heale & Twycross, 2015). For ensuring both the validity and reliability of the scale a separate pilot study was executed. At pilot testing for adaptation process a sample size of ten to forty attendants are required (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2016). In this manner, in terms of pre-testing the pilot testing was performed by this pre-final version of the measurement on 20 workers, who were selected by random sampling among millennials. The initial validity, reliability and dimensionality analyses of the adapted scale was analyzed by this pilot research, using a 5-point scale (1= never, 2= once or two times, 3= occasionally, 4= often, 5= always or so many times). Through pretesting participants evaluated the questionnaire and marked "E" (Evet/Yes) if the items were understandable, appropriate, not confusing, and suitable for Turkish culture; "H" (Hayır/No) for else. Lastly, the final draft of the scale was formed in line with the results of the pilot testing where regarding (content, size, type of letters, word replacements like "you" instead of "I"...etc) changes were made.

Qualitative method was selected to be used due to the assumption that it can provide more effective results than quantitative methods to evaluate the real experiences of incivility other than common perceptions or imaginations. Qualitative research, which is the opposite of quantitative research, involves collecting and examining non-numerical data (passage, video, or audio) by observations, one-on-one conversations, and focus groups, to understand concepts, opinions, or experiences (Bhandari, 2023). It is applied to collect in-depth observations into a problem or create new notions for research. Accordingly, in-depth interview technique qualitative method was chosen for data collection. The reason for this selection is that in-depth interview method was assumed to be more useful for analyzing incivility at enterprises. In-depth interviews aim to acquire detailed data showing personal view and perception regarding a specific subject Rutledge and Hogg (2020).

The data was collected from the population of the most reputable local large corporate firms in Türkiye that are ranked on the BIST 100 list, operating at service, foreign trade, manufacturing sectors. BIST 100 index, which is of great importance in the stock exchange, is considered as the indicator of the 100 stocks with the highest market value traded in Borsa Istanbul. BIST 100 index is determined by Borsa Istanbul at four different index periods. This study was based on the list published in the January-March 2019 period. These companies were chosen for their corporate organizational structure, diversified large number of employees and their dedication to be the best place to work.

Having no strict sample size rule, qualitative studies can be performed on a small number of groups for in-depth analysis (Shaheen, Pradhan, & Ranajee, 2019). In this context, instead of populous sample, a total of 70 employees were accidentally chosen among millennial generation from separate units and jobs to eliminate bias, whilst improving reliability. The rationale behind this is that millennials imply that they are having problems regarding workplace incivility. Within the selected class, number of 61 workers from 11 disparate companies admitted to voluntarily answer the questionnaire, which shaped the sample of the survey.

In this qualitative research, having interviewed with the chosen participants provided the required quality for the representativeness of the sample. Moreover, different roles of staff end up with varied approaches and attitudes in terms of data. From Cortina et al.'s (2013) scale question numbers 1-12, from Rosen et al.'s (2016) scale question numbers 13-16, from Bennett and Robinson's (2000) scale question numbers 17-23 and finally Keçeci and Turgut's (2018) scale question numbers 24-42 were adapted to the questionnaire in this research. Validity is a combined subjective analysis regarding the extent to which empirical proof and theoretical explanations endorse the suitability and sufficiency of assumptions and behaviors depending on test scores (Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & Heerden, 2004). It shows the accuracy of the scales, measuring the related variables (Mostert, 2022). The updated version of the scale consisted of 5 demographic and 42 close-ended questions (33 are positive, 9 are negative) to

find out their exposure to incivility. The respondents were briefed about the principle of confidentiality as well as the composition, significance and aim of the research. The replies attained via approximately 40-minute face-to-face interviews, were directly recorded on the forms. The data were studied with qualitative content analysis process, which is a method used for analyzing audios, symbols, texts, documents, and videos (Schreier, 2012; Seidman, 2013). The link among the factors were analyzed via exploratory factor, confirmatory factor and correlation analyses, respectively. Using the Likert scale the positive questions were scored as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and the negative items are scored as 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 (5 for strongly agree and 1 for strongly disagree).

3. RESULTS

The interviewees were comprised of 36 men (59 %) and 25 women (41 %), whose mean age was calculated to be 33 (SD = 7.92, min = 25, max = 52). Besides, 74% of the participants have less than 10 years of work experience, 60% have job titles below manager and 40% are working in operational units. The construct validity was executed out via nomological validity, using the method of explanatory factor analysis and the confirmatory factor analysis (Ziegler, 2014). Exploratory factor tests were performed via FACTOR software for exploring both factors and their dimensions. Factors, which had a value less than 0.40 were deleted from the scale are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Items Deleted After Factor Analysis

Over the past year, have any of your supervisors or co-workers:	Factor Loadings
4. Addressed you in rude terms in public or private.	0,19
13. Insulted you or treated you in an insulting way.	0,30
22. Belittled you	0,23

Three determined dimensions for incivility are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Factor Dimensions Determined for Incivility

Dimensions	Items
1. Malicious Interruption	2,6,10,16,19,20,23,27,33,35,36,40,42
2. Ignorant Interruption	1,5,9,14,15,26,28,29,30,34,38,39,41
3. Intentional Disrespect	3,7,8,11,12,17,18,21,24,25,31,32,37

The factor loads in Table 3 shows that the values of items of Malicious Interruption vary from 0.47 to 0.83, at the Ignorant Interruption range from 0.41 to 0.79, and at the Intentional Disrespect vary from 0.59 to 0.80. The first dimension demonstrates 47% of the variance; the second explains 22%, and the third demonstrates 11%; reaching up to 80% totally.

Table 3. Factorial Structure of Incivility

		Dimensions		
		1	2	3
Söylemlerinize çok az dikkat etti veya fikirlerinize çok az ilgi gösterdi.	Paid little attention to your remarks or showed little interest in your ideas.		.45	
Sorumluluğunuz olan bir konu hakkında kararlarınızdan şüphe etti.	Doubted your judgment about a matter for which you were responsible.	.83		
Size olumsuz, ya da alaycı bakışlar attı.	Gave you negative or sarcastic looks.			.59
Sözünüzü birçok defa kesti.	Interrupted you many times.		.41	
Bir değerlendirmede size hak ettiğinizden daha düşük puan verdi.	Gave you a lower score than you deserved in a review.	.68		
Size bağırdı, çağırdı ya da küfretti.	Shouted, called or cursed at you.			.60
Hakkınızda aşağılayıcı veya saygısız ifadelerde bulundu.	Made derogatory or disrespectful remarks about you.			.65
Sizi görmezden geldi veya sizinle konuşmadı.	Ignored you or didn't talk to you.		.70	
Sizi beceriksizlikle suçladı.	Accused you of incompetence.	.79		
Sizi öfke patlamaları veya öfke nöbetleri geçirerek hedef aldı.	Targeted you with outbursts or tantrums.			.65
Sizin aleyhinize rahatsız edici kötü şaka(lar) yaptı.	Made a bad joke(s) that was offensive to you.			.60

Söylemlerinize çok az dikkat etti veya görüşlerinize çok az ilgi gösterdi.	Paid little attention to your remarks or showed little interest in your views.	.71
Sizi görmezden geldi veya dışladı.	Ignored or excluded you.	.60
Sorumluluk sahibi olduğunuz bir konuda kararlarınızdan şüphe etti.	Doubted your decisions about something for which you were responsible.	.58
Sizinle dalga geçti.	Made fun of you.	.80
Size kırıcı veya incitici bir şey söyledi.	Said something hurtful or hurtful to you.	.59
Hakkınızda etnik, dini veya ırksal bir yorumda bulundu.	Made an ethnic, religious or racial comment about you.	.80
Size kaba davrandı.	Was rude to you.	.64
Sizi herkesin önünde utandırdı.	Embarrassed you in front of everyone.	.60
Uzmanı olmasa bile sizin uzmanlık alanınıza müdahale etti.	Even if he is not an expert, he intervened in your area of expertise.	.70
Sizinle rahatsız edici şekilde, sizden daha yüksek sesle konuştu.	Spoke to you annoyingly, louder than you.	.73
Sizin hakkınızda dedikodu yaptı.	Gossiped about you.	.61
Siz konuşurken çalışmaya devam etti.	Continued working while you talked.	.57
Sizden ödünç aldıklarını geri vermedi.	Did not give back what he borrowed from you.	.74
Sizi koridorda gördüğünde selam vermedi.	Didn't greet you when he saw you in the hallway.	.52
Sizi dinlemedi ve söylediklerinizi dikkate almadı.	Didn't listen to you and didn't pay attention to what you said.	.55
Siz konuşurken cep telefonu ya da bilgisayarını kullandı.	Used his cell phone or computer while you were talking.	.70
Toplantılarınıza geç geldi.	Came late to your meetings.	.60
İsteklerini size emir olarak söyledi.	Told you his wishes as orders.	.68
İşini yaptırmak için sürekli arayıp taciz etti.	Constantly called and harassed me to get his work done.	.58
Görüşlerinizi ciddiye almadı.	Did not take your opinions seriously.	.59
Belirgin bir sebep olmadan sizi başkalarının önünde eleştirdi.	Criticized you in front of others for no apparent reason.	.57
Son dakika değişiklik veya yeni iş istedi.	Wanted a last minute change or new job.	.60
Sizi azarladı.	Scolded you.	.62
Kolektif olarak alınması gereken bir kararda sizin fikrinizi sormadı.	Did not ask your opinion on a decision that should be made collectively.	.79
Konuşma sırasında sizinle göz teması kurmadı.	Did not make eye contact with you during the conversation.	.60
İyi yapılmış işlerinizi takdir etmedi.	Did not appreciate your work well done.	.62
Özel günlerinizi önemsemedi (Örneğin "Doğum günün kutlu olsun" ya da "Geçmiş olsun" demedi).	Didn't care about your special days (For example, he didn't say "Happy Birthday" or "Get well soon").	.55
Teşekkür etmedi ya da hatalı olduğu halde sizden özür dilemedi.	Didn't thank you or apologize even though he was wrong.	.47

The correlation coefficients among the dimensions were calculated for nomological validity. Results indicated a positive link between incivility and its dimensions: malicious interruption ($r= 0.755$; $n= 61$; $P= 0.000$), ignorant interruption ($r= 0.794$; $n= 61$; $P= 0.000$), intentional disrespect ($r= 0.865$; $n= 61$; $P= 0.000$). In this regard outcomes

revealed that the scale meets the requirements of nomological validity (Kane, 2006). In terms of construct validity, explanatory factor analysis (EFA) was used. The EFA result was calculated to be 0.89 at the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and the Bartlett scoring test outcome ($\chi^2= 2380.1$; $P< 0.00001$) was accepted to be significant (Kline, 2005). Afterwards, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted for establishing the factorial structure of the scale.

Mueller and Hancock (2001) asserted that CFA supports the judgment of fit between gathered data and theoretical model which defines the hypothesized link among latent factors and their variables. The CFA structural validity analyses were practiced via the goodness of fit statistics, convergent validity, and discriminant validity, using both SPSS and AMOS statistics programs (Crede & Harms, 2019; Byrne, 2016).

The goodness of fit statistics of the confirmatory factor analysis of incivility given at Table 4, indicated clearly that there is an acceptable model-data fit at the scale (Eid, 2012; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002).

Table 4. The Goodness of Fit Statistics of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Incivility

Goodness of fit scales	Suggested value	Incivility calculated value
Chi-square/degrees of Freedom (χ^2/df)	≤ 5.00	2.89
CFI (Comparative Fit Index)	≥ 0.90	0.93
AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index)	≥ 0.80	0.82
GFI (Goodness of Fit Index)	≥ 0.85	0.85
RMSEA (Root Mean Square Residual)	≤ 0.10	0.07

Moreover, convergent validity tests were conducted via calculating the indicator reliability (IR), average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) values (Table 5). For OCB, all the standard factor loads of variables are > 0.41 , indicator reliability value is > 0.70 , average variance extracted is > 0.50 and composite reliability is > 0.70 . Thus, convergent validity has been reached for the scale at all dimensions (Randall & Lomax, 2004).

Regarding discriminant validity, it was searched if the average variance extracted value of a factor is higher than the correlation of this factor with others (Henseler, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2015). Accordingly, average variance extracted values are identified by entering factor loads of AMOS, into Excel by a unique formula. The outcomes showed that the conceptual constructs have discriminant validity because all the correlation coefficients are higher than average variance extracted average variance extracted values (Tables 5).

Table 5. CR, Correlation Coefficient and AVE Values for HCM

Dimensions	# of items	Composite reliability	Indicator reliability	Average variance extracted	Correlation coefficients		
					Malicious interruption	Ignorant interruption	Intentional disrespect
Malicious Interruption	13	0.94	0.92	0.88			
Ignorant Interruption	13	0.87	0.89	0.85	0.78		
Intentional Disrespect	13	0.89	0.84	0.77	0.79	0.91	

Next, reliability analyses of the scale were performed via three different methods: Calculating the correlations between items, testing split-half, Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega reliability. The correlation of the 13 items of the malicious interruption dimension ranged between 0.38 and 0.52 among each other and accordingly the average of the inter-item correlation values was found to be 0.44. Besides, regarding the ignorant interruption dimension, the correlation coefficients of items fluctuated between 0.40 and 0.47, where their average value was 0.44. Moreover, for the last dimension intentional disrespect, correlation values between 13 items varied among between 0.52-0.60 and the average of the item correlation values was calculated to be 0.56. Thus, the correlations between the items of the incivility scale were accepted to be compliant with the expected values (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2011).

Next, in terms of split-half reliability, Spearman-Brown formula was utilized. The correlation coefficients between the even and odd items were 0.84 and 0.89, which are higher than the threshold of 0.80 (De Vet et al., 2017). In terms of McDonald's omega and Cronbach's alpha reliability analyses, expected coefficients need to be over 0.70 (Edwards et al., 2021; Kalkbrenner, 2023). Regarding analyses was executed via Factor and SPSS software. Results disclosed that the reliability of the incivility scale and its three dimensions are higher than the threshold of 0.70 (Table 6). Additionally, there has been no considerable decrease at the Cronbach alpha values when items deleted. In this manner, outcomes obviously showed that the adapted scale is strongly reliable.

Table 6. Reliability Analysis Results

Dimensions	SPSS	Factor	McDonald's Omega
	Cronbach's alpha	Cronbach's alpha	
Malicious Interruption	0.95	0.94	0.94
Ignorant Interruption	0.93	0.94	0.94
Intentional Disrespect	0.90	0.88	0.89

Lastly, the findings of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, which were performed by Factor and SPSS software programs, concluded the scale to be comprised of 39 items within three dimensions (CFI = 0.93, AGFI = 0.82, GFI = 0.85, RMSEA = 0.07, $p = .000$). Thus, it can be concluded that new version of the incivility scale is reliable, valid and can be used to measure and assess incivility in the context of healthy workplace (Ziegler, 2014; Afthanorhan, 2013). Higher score indicates higher levels of workplace incivility.

4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research aimed to adapt and apply a scale of incivility by using four different questionnaires, referring to the techniques of the 2016 International Test Commission (ITC) Guidelines. A qualitative research approach was applied to collect data from local large corporate firms in Türkiye that are ranked on the BIST 100 list. These companies were chosen for their corporate organizational structure, diversified large number of employees and their dedication to be the best place to work, for the analysis of validity and reliability of the scale.

These companies were chosen for their corporate organizational structure, diversified large number of employees and their dedication to be the best place to work. Data obtained from number of 61 workers from 11 different firms. Following the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, which were performed by Factor and SPSS software, the findings concluded the scale to be comprised of 39 items within 3 dimensions (each dimension consists of 11 items separately). Thus, it can be concluded that new version of the incivility scale is reliable, valid and can be used to measure and assess incivility in the context of healthy workplace at different sectors both locally and internationally.

The study at hands will contribute to the organizational behavior and management literature for measuring the incivility accurately and its outcomes are going to have crucial implications for organizations with more incivility cases. Companies can form a better and healthier workplace, which endorses employee performance by solving incivility problems.

After literature search, it had been recognized that the study at hands validates to be the only study that adapts incivility scale by using four distinct questionnaires, referring to the techniques of the 2016 International Test Commission (ITC) Guidelines from Türkiye's BIST 100 list. The outcomes of this research are subject to some limitations: (a) the data was gathered from a specific list of corporate enterprises with a limited number of employees (b) pilot research could be applied to a limited number of workers, (c) time-varying organization and employee culture and features were disregarded, (d) there is a possibility of impact due to social communication among interviewees working at the same office.

Lastly, for the future research it is advised to (a) diversify and extend the population both for the pilot and ultimate study, (b) include an irrelevant marker variable for preventing common method variance, (c) use quantitative methods as well besides qualitative, (d) maintain to explore at the future as well to be able to catch its updates and see the way of evolution, (e) perform longer-term research including public sector as well, despite being methodologically challenging.

REFERENCES

- Afthanorhan, W. M. A. (2013). A comparison of partial least square structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) and covariance based structural equation modeling (CB-SEM) for confirmatory factor analysis. *International Journal of Engineering Science and Innovative Technology*, 2(5), 198-205. ISSN: 2319-5967.
- Akella, D., & Lewis, V. J. (2019). The modern face of workplace incivility. *Organization Management Journal*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2019.1604202>.
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine*, 25, 3186-3191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014>.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349>.
- Bhandari, P. (2023). *What is qualitative research? Methods & examples*. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/qualitative-research/>

- Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G., & Heerden, J. (2004). The concept of validity. *Psychological review*, *111*(4), 1061-1071. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.111.4.1061.
- Bunk, J. A., & Magley, V. J. (2013). The role of appraisals and emotions in understanding experiences of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*(1), 87-105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030987>.
- Burdick, R. K. et al. (2017). Analytical comparability and similarity. In: statistical applications for chemistry, manufacturing and controls (CMC) in the pharmaceutical industry. Statistics for Biology and Health. *Springer*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50186-4_9.
- Byrne, B. M. (2016). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, application, and programming* (3rd edition.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9*(2), 219-260. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5.
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *6*, 64–80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64>.
- Cortina L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*, 55-75. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159376>.
- Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management*, *39*(6), 1579-1605. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311418835>.
- Crede, M., & Harms, P. (2019). Questionable research practices when using confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *34*(1), 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2018-0272>.
- De Vet, H., Mokkink, L., Mosmuller, D. & Terwee, C. (2017). Spearman-Brown prophecy formula and Cronbach's alpha: Different faces of reliability and opportunities for new applications. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. *85*. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.01.013.
- Dikko, M. (2016). Establishing Construct Validity and Reliability: Pilot Testing of a Qualitative Interview for Research in Takaful (Islamic Insurance). *The Qualitative Report*, *21*(3), 521-528. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2016.2243>.
- Doshy, P. V., & Wang, J. (2014). Workplace incivility: what do targets say about it? *American Journal of Management*, *14*(1-2), 30-42.
- Edwards, A. A., Joyner, K. J., & Schatschneider, C. (2021). A simulation study on the performance of different reliability estimation methods. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *81*(6), 1089-1117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164421994184>.
- Eid, R. (2012). Successful customer relationship management programs and technologies: Issues and trends. *Business Science Reference*. IGI Global.
- Estes, B., & Wang, J. (2008). Integrative literature review: Workplace incivility: Impacts on individual and organizational performance. *Human Resource Development Review*, *7*(2), 218-240. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484308315565>.
- Etymology Dictionary. (2020). *Incivility*. www.dictionary.references.com/browse/incivility. Google Scholar
- Febriana, S. K. T., & Fajrianti, F. (2022). Adaptation of cyber incivility scale Indonesia version, *Jurnal Psikologi*, *21*(1), 35-50.
- Gillespie, G., Grubb, P., Brown, K., Boesch, M., & Ulrich, D. (2017). Nurses eat their young: A novel bullying educational program for student nurses. *Journal of Nursing Education Practice*, *7*(7), 11-21. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jnep.v7n7P11>.
- Giumetti, G. W., Saunders, L. A., Brunette, J. P., Di Francesco, F. M., & Graham, P. G. (2016). Linking cyber incivility with job performance through job satisfaction: The buffering role of positive affect. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research*, *21*(4), 230-240. <https://doi.org/10.24839/2164-8204.JN21.4.230>.
- Gjersing, L., Caplehorn, J. R. M., & Clausen, T. (2010). Cross-cultural adaptation of research instruments language, setting, time and statistical considerations. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *10*(13), 1-10. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2288-10-13.

- Heale, R., & Twycross, A. (2015). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence Based Nursing, 18*(3), 66-67. <https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102129>.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*, 115-135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>.
- International Test Commission. (2017). ITC guidelines for translating and adapting tests international (second edition). *International Journal of Testing*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15305058.2017.1398166>.
- İşıkay, Ç., & Taslak, S. (2021). İşyeri nezaketsizliği: Ulusal literatür üzerine bir içerik analizi. *OPUS–Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 18*(39), 521-552. DOI: 10.26466/opus.839745.
- Kalkbrenner, M. T. (2023). Alpha, omega, and h internal consistency reliability estimates: Reviewing these options and when to use them. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 14*(1), 77-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21501378.2021.1940118>.
- Kane, M. T. (2006). Validation in R. Brennan (Ed), Educational Measurement (4 b.). *American council on education*. Praeger.
- Keçeci, M., & Turgut, T. (2018). Workplace incivility: Scale development and validation. *Third Sector Social Economic Review, 53*(2), 450-462 DOI: 10.15659/3.sektor-sosyal-ekonomi.18.06.949.
- Kent Business School. (2021). Can sustainability action improve employee wellbeing? <https://blogs.kent.ac.uk/kbs-news-events/2021/11/can-sustainability-action-improve-employee-wellbeing>
- Kline, B. (2005). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling. *Guilford Publications*.
- Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 95-107. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95.
- Lim, V. K. G., & Teo, T. S. H. (2009). Mind our E-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. *Journal Information & Management, 46*, 419-425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2009.06.006>.
- Liu, W., Chi, SCS., Friedman, R., & Tsai, MH. (2009) Explaining incivility in the workplace: the effects of personality and culture. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 2*, 164-184. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2009.00035>.
- Logan, T. R. (2016). Influence of teamwork behaviours on workplace incivility as it applies to nurses. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership, 2*(1), 47-53. DOI: 10.17062/cjil.v2i1.28.
- Loh, J. M. I., Thorsteinsson, E. B., & Loi, N. M. (2021). Workplace incivility and work outcomes: Cross-cultural comparison between Australian and Singaporean employees. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 59*(2), 305–329. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12233>.
- Mostert, M. (2022). Face validity. In Frey B. (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of research design* (Vol. 1, pp. 558-561). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071812082.n207>.
- Mueller, R. O., & Hancock G. R. (2001). Factor analysis and latent structure, confirmatory, Editor(s): Neil J. Smelser, Paul B. Baltes, *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, Pergamon, 5239-5244. ISBN 9780080430768, <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/00426-5>.
- Ophoff, J., Machaka, T., & Stander, A. (2015). *Exploring the impact of cyber incivility in the workplace. Proceedings of Informing Science & IT Education Conference (InSITE), 493-504.* <http://Proceedings.InformingScience.org/InSITE2015/InSITE15p493504Ophoff1565.pdf>
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M. & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics, 29*(2), 123-137. DOI:10.1016/S0090-2616(00)00019-X.
- Porath, C., & Pearson, C. (2013). The price of incivility. *Harvard Business Review, 91*, 114-146. <https://hbr.org/2013/01/the-price-of-incivility>.
- Rahman, A., Iqbal, Z., Waheed, W., & Hussain, N. (2003). Translation and cultural adaptation of health questionnaires. JPMA. *The Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association, 53*(4), 142-7. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12776898>.
- Raykov, T., & Marcoulides, G. (2011). Introduction to item response theory. *Introduction to psychometric theory*. Routledge, 247-268. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203841624>.

- Ricciotti, N. A. (2016). *Emotional intelligence and instigation of workplace incivility in a business organization*. (Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies), Walden University, USA.
- Rosen, C. C., Koopman, J., Gabriel, A. S., & Johnson, R. E. (2016). Who strikes back? A daily investigation of when and why incivility begets incivility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(11), 1620-1634. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000140>.
- Rutledge, P., & Hogg, J. L. (2020). In-Depth Interviews. *International Encyclopedia of Media Psychology*, 1-7. DOI: 10.1002/9781119011071.iemp0019.
- Samman, E. (2021). The Origins of Incivility in Nursing: How Reconstruction-Era Policies and Organizations Impacted Social Behavior Within the Nursing Profession. *Creative Nursing*, 27(1), 66-70. <https://doi.org/10.1891/CRNR-D-20-00085>.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research methods for business students* (7th Edition). Pearson.
- Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(4). DOI:10.1002/job.1976.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage.
- Schumaker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Seidman I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences* (3rd edition). Teachers College Press.
- Shaheen, M., & Pradhan, S. (2019). Sampling in qualitative research. In *Qualitative techniques for workplace data analysis* (pp. 25-51). IGI Global. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-5366-3.ch002>.
- Tiberius, R., & Flak, E. (1999). Incivility in dyadic teaching and learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 77, 3-12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.7701>.
- Vagharseyyedin, A. S. (2015). Workplace incivility: a concept analysis. *Contemporary Nurse*, 50(1), 115–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10376178.2015.1010262>
- Vogel, R. M., Mitchell, M. S., Tepper, B. J., Restubog, S. L., Hu, C., Hua, W., & Huang, J. C. (2015). A cross-cultural examination of subordinates' perceptions of and reactions to abusive supervision. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36, 720-745. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1984>.
- Yanmaz Arpacı, O., & Gulel, F. E. (2023). Scale adaptation of innovation-outsourcing in companies. *Istanbul Business Research. Advanced Online Publication*. <http://doi.org/10.26650/ibr.2023.52.870245>.
- Yuniasanti, R., & Abas, N. A. H. (2019). Translation and Adaptation Culture: Experience Workplace Incivility Scale in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*, 9(1), 1-15. ISSN2232-1926/eISSN 2600-870X. DOI:10.37134/ajatel.vol9.no1.1.2019.
- Ziegler, M. (2014). Stop and state your intentions!: Let's not forget the ABC of test construction. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 30, 239–242. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000228>.