

## Article

# Behind the Curtain: Workplace Incivility—Individual Actors in Cultural Settings

Sanda Rašić Jelavić , Ana Aleksić  and Ivana Načinović Braje \* 

Faculty of Economics & Business, University of Zagreb, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia; srsasic@efzg.hr (S.R.J.); aaleksic@efzg.hr (A.A.)

\* Correspondence: ivana.nacinovic@efzg.hr

**Abstract:** Uncivil behavior at work can have numerous consequences for individuals and the organization. This paper examines the interplay of personality traits and organizational culture as antecedents of workplace incivility. Empirical research on a sample of 251 employees has shown that the perceptions and occurrence of workplace incivility can be significantly related to personality traits and features of organizational culture. When looking at the combined effect of personality and organizational culture, culture determines one's perception and experience of incivility stronger than personality traits alone. The research showed that personality trait agreeableness and emphasizing values related to clan, market or adhocracy culture could reduce the odds of workplace incivility.

**Keywords:** workplace incivility; personality traits; corporate culture



**Citation:** Jelavić, S.R.; Aleksić, A.; Braje, I.N. Behind the Curtain: Workplace Incivility—Individual Actors in Cultural Settings. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 1249. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031249>

Academic Editor: Ioannis Nikolaou  
Received: 28 December 2020  
Accepted: 21 January 2021  
Published: 25 January 2021

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

During the past 20 years, workplace incivility has evolved as a popular research topic in the area of organizational behavior. Andersson and Pearson [1] defined workplace incivility as low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target and violation of mutually respected workplace norms, which is considered “rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others in the workplace”. This early work of Andersson and Pearson [1] created a new research avenue within the area of deviant workplace behavior and work mistreatment, previously dominated by the workplace deviance concept of Robinson and Bennett [2]. As opposed to incivility, workplace civility involves politeness and regard for others and respect for workplace norms [1].

Uncivil behavior might take various forms such as ignoring, exclusion, demeaning, hostile looks [3], eye-rolling, interruptions, gossiping [4], disrespecting and insulting [5], etc. Such acts may look like a drama scene that takes place behind a closed door or just in front of an employee audience. However, unlike a drama play, incivility at work has serious negative consequences for those who experienced it, for those who witnessed it, but also for the organization and beyond. Therefore, diminishing incivility while encouraging politeness and good conduct could help in shaping sustainable and desirable work environments.

Incivility distinguishes from other types of workplace deviance because of its low intensity and required lower energy in comparison with more intensive types of workplace deviance (e.g., workplace aggression or violence). Furthermore, the nature of workplace incivility regarding the intention to harm the target is ambiguous—it is not obvious if it is intentionally negative or mean [6,7]. Although organizations may overlook incidence of workplace incivility due to perceptual differences, uncivil behavior should not be considered as a minor problem as it might turn into more aggressive types of behavior [7] and endanger long-term organizational sustainability.

The number of studies investigating workplace incivility has been increasing due to understanding that such behaviors have relatively frequent incidence and negative

consequences for employees, organization and other stakeholders. Consequences of workplace incivility include lower level of job satisfaction [8], lower life satisfaction [9], lower energy and motivation [10], reduced commitment, moral and engagement [11,12], absenteeism [13], employee turnover [8], lower level of confidence, reduced efficiency and creativity [14], negative emotions [15], worse mental and physical health and created burnout [13,16], deterioration of the target's family relationships [17], reduction of financial results, deterioration of the work environment [1], lower productivity [18], poor social reputation and image [11], weakening of teamwork process [19], etc.

Antecedents of workplace incivility are various and can be classified into several groups. Schilpzand et al. [20] distinguish between dispositional, behavioral and situational antecedents. Similarly, Cortina et al. [21] categorize antecedents into individual differences that are connected with perception/experience of incivility (personality traits or behavior), stigmatized identities connected with experienced incivility (gender, ethnicity, weight, motherhood status, etc.) and job related/situational factors that might cause incivility.

Dispositional antecedents emphasize personal characteristics as determinants of workplace incivility. The target's dispositional antecedents might include minority status, female gender [3,22], younger age [23], obesity [24], generational differences [25], low competence and knowledge level [26], certain personality traits [24,27], etc. The instigator's characteristics that affect workplace incivility might be power status [8], beliefs such as attitude about job insecurity, job dissatisfaction [28], low perceived cost for inappropriate behaviors [29], anger or rage trait [30], and other personality traits [31].

Target-related behavioral antecedents of workplace incivility might include counterproductive work behavior [32], provocative or annoying behavior associated with certain personality traits [27], conflict management style [33], workaholism [34], etc.

Situational antecedents that facilitate workplace incivility can be classified into organization-related variables and work-related variables. Organizational factors include downsizing, reengineering, part-time employment, pressure for productivity, organizational change [1,15,29], emphasis on hierarchy [35], inadequate organizational culture [36,37], insufficient norms for civility [38], climate of informality [1], distributive injustice [39], lack of reciprocity [30], low social support [37], etc. Work-related antecedents might include high role ambiguity or role conflict [40], high job demand [41], work load [42], performance pressure [43], etc.

Given the relatively high prevalence and numerous negative consequences, it is necessary to examine the antecedents of workplace incivility. As workplace incivility depends on the individual who receives it or perceives it [1,8], this paper will explore the role of personality traits as micro-level antecedents of incivility. On the other side, individual and contextual factors combined influence behavior. An organization's culture is a powerful situational force that guides employee workplace behavior [44] and as such can facilitate or inhibit the spread of incivility [45,46]. Leiter [47] argued that workplace incivility is rather a part of organizational climate or culture than an individual phenomenon. The purpose of this paper is to examine the interplay of organization-related situational antecedents (organizational culture) and dispositional antecedents (target's personality traits) as antecedents for the occurrence of workplace incivility. In order to test such relationships, empirical research has been conducted.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Personality Traits as Dispositional Antecedents of Workplace Incivility

The relationship between personality traits and workplace incivility can be explained through the lens of trait activation theory (TAT) [48,49]. According to TAT, the interaction between personality traits and the work situation may explain reactions to events and resulting behavior, cognition and emotions. In other words, depending on personality, a certain event may initiate a unique reaction for some people that will not be the case for others, both instigators and targets of workplace incivility. Most researches used the Five-Factor Model of personality traits (agreeableness, emotional stability/neuroticism,

openness, extroversion, conscientiousness) to examine their connection with workplace incivility [27,40,50], although other personality trait frameworks were used as well. Instigators' individual traits found to be related to workplace incivility were type A personality, aggression trait, hostility, power, ego, internal competition [8,29,51], lack of assertiveness [52], low agreeableness, psychopathy and narcissism [53] and emotional intelligence [54]. With respect to instigators, Batista and Reio [55] found that conscientiousness and agreeableness weakened the connection between stress and instigator workplace incivility, while neuroticism and extraversion strengthened this relationship.

However, some scholars pointed out that it is important to investigate characteristics of the target to enable better understanding of the nature of uncivil acts [27,56]. By investigating characteristics of the target, Milam et al. [27] faced a dilemma whether individuals that possess certain personal traits were the victims of uncivil behavior (i.e., through their behavior that could be annoying or provocative) or they just perceive certain types of neutral behaviors as uncivil.

Personality trait with consistent proved relationship to incivility is agreeableness [57]. Low agreeableness was positively related to experienced workplace incivility, indicating that people low on agreeableness draw attention to become a target [27,40,57]. A low level of agreeableness is associated with mistrustfulness, suspicion, non-cooperation, rudeness and stubbornness [58,59]. Individuals high in agreeableness perceive less interpersonal workplace deviance, even in undesirable social surroundings [60].

Emotional stability is the personal trait that includes appropriate emotional reactions and calmness, while neuroticism includes nervousness, worrying, insecurity and impulsivity [61]. Perceived workplace incivility has been proven positively related with high neuroticism by several researchers [27,31,40,50]. Behavior of a neurotic person might be perceived as irritating and may draw attention to that person to become a target of incivility [27].

Openness to experience is characterized by imagination, open-mindedness, liberalism, creativity, introspection [58], curiosity, originality and intellect [62]. Open people might be more inclined to ascribe the behavior of others as externally caused, and not a priori negative or uncivil because of absence of full evidence [50]. Still, researchers do not unanimously confirm the relationship between openness and workplace incivility [57].

Extraversion refers to sociability, activeness, self-confidence, persistence and assertiveness. Extraversion is associated with positive affectivity that refers to temperamental emotions of joy, confidence and alertness [63]. It is assumed that extraverted people more often notice positive events, even if these events are neutral, therefore they are less inclined to assign a negative meaning to uncivil behavior [27,60]. Sociability and connections of extravert people make them better accepted by other employees and enable them to draw less attention as a target of incivility, although research by Sliter et al. [13] or Naimon et al. [57] did not confirm that extraversion is a relevant antecedent of incivility. Nevertheless, analysis of personal traits in the combined model showed that significant predictors of incivility perception were trait anger, positive affect and extraversion [31].

Conscientiousness is characterized by good organization skills, diligence, persistence, determination to accomplish tasks and obligations, and thoroughness [62]. Conscientious people may be more likely to observe breaching of civil norms and to appraise incivility in ambiguous situations, hence conscientiousness is expected to be positively interrelated with perceived incivility [50], although Taylor and Kluemper [40] report on perceived incivility having stronger effects among lower levels of conscientiousness. Nevertheless, as argued by Naimon et al. [57], except for agreeableness, the role of other personality traits on incivility is ambiguous and requires for replication studies.

## 2.2. Culture as a Situational Antecedent of Workplace Incivility

Due to the multilayered nature of culture, workplace incivility could be impacted simultaneously by national culture, industry culture and organizational culture. Based on the assumption that national cultures influence the social construct of workplace incivility

and how people perceive and respond to it [23], Rousseau et al. [64] found that in high power distance countries, incivility in the form of ignoring is less likely to be perceived as uncivil than in low power distance countries. Liu et al. [46] show that individualism orientation increases workplace incivility, although negative effects of incivility can be perceived by employees from collectivistic countries as well [9,23]. Still, collectivistic cultures can be more resilient to the negative impacts of incivility [65]. In addition to national culture, in a masculine-dominated industry or organizational culture (e.g., security services, court, army or sport organizations), raising your voice, making jokes on someone's expense or giving a restrained look might be acceptable in comparison to feminine occupations (e.g., kindergarten, child hospital or nursing home) where such behavior would be perceived as a very rude [9,20].

Organizational culture includes important organizational values, norms, beliefs and responding employee reactions that could provoke or diminish deviant behavior [66], including workplace incivility [67]. Culture is the conveyer of behavioral expectations [45], and especially with strong cultures, any disrespect will be seen as workplace disrespect. Furthermore, culture celebrates certain behaviors, and it can happen that those behaviors that become part of culture actually belong to the incivility spectrum and occur unpunished, as normalized practice [37,68]. Examinations of workplace incivility in different cultural settings based on the Cameron and Quinn [44] Competing Values Framework reveal that workplace incivility was least observed among employees from clan cultures, whereby employees that work in market cultures showed the greatest odds of incivility [69]. In order to discontinue incivility spirals, it is imperative to develop a culture of zero-tolerance towards incivility [15] and promote acceptable behaviors and norms [45].

Organizational culture could inhibit workplace deviance in case values it promotes could create a desirable work environment and the feeling of mutual moral obligations. In order to do so, organizational culture should include values such as openness, justice, fairness, trustfulness [70] consideration, cooperation [21] as well as spirituality, patience, resiliency, psychological capital [71], etc.

Previous empirical research did not analyze mutual effects of various antecedents of workplace incivility. Therefore, more information is needed to overcome this literature gap. Present study is based on a multilevel perspective that investigates the interaction of personality traits and organizational culture, and their relationship with workplace incivility. Furthermore, the effects of personal demographic variables are taken into account.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Study Design and Procedure

In order to empirically test for effects of personality and organizational culture as antecedents of workplace incivility, a quantitative research study was designed. Often used in social sciences, and with focus on quantifying behavior, this approach allows for a sufficiently comprehensive generalization of results [72].

Based on previously developed measures to assess personality, organizational culture and workplace incivility, a self-reported survey questionnaire was used as a research instrument. The on-line version of the survey, together with explanation of the study and its research objectives, was distributed among the sampled individuals. Respondent's anonymity was secured, as well as confidentiality of their responses.

Research was done on a sample of 251 individuals from 11 heterogeneous organizations. By using authors' personal and professional connections, we contacted representatives of these organizations and they agreed to participate in the study by distributing the questionnaire within their organizations, using a snowball sampling as a non-probability sampling technique. As opposed to probability sampling, this type of sampling in management research lately has been noticeable [73], especially using snowball sampling technique in measuring delicate aspects of individual behavior, such as incivility [74].

### 3.2. Research Instrument

The self-reported questionnaire used in this study was based on previously developed, well-established scales measuring organizational culture, personality traits and workplace incivility. Originally in English, in order to ensure questionnaire reliability and validity, these scales were translated by language experts as well as experts in the field into the Croatian and back-translated into English.

The workplace incivility scale is a 7-item measure constructed by Cortina et al. [8] measuring experienced workplace incivility. Respondents were asked to indicate how often they were the target of certain uncivil behavior in the last year, either from their supervisor or their colleagues (Likert five-point scale from 1 to 5; 1—never, 5—always).

Personality traits were measured using a 10-item Big Five Inventory scale developed by Rammstedt and John [75], assessing one's level of big five personality traits, namely extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, openness, and conscientiousness.

The FOCUS questionnaire [76], based on the Competing values framework, was utilized for the assessment of the dominant type of organizational culture, that is either adhocracy, clan, market, or hierarchy culture [44]. The dominant type of culture is dependent on the perception whether the organization is perceived to have internal or external focus and stability or flexibility. For this purpose, a Croatian version of the questionnaire that has been previously validated by Sušanĳ [77] was used. Through this 16-item scale, respondents expressed their level of agreement regarding the presence of different values and behaviors in their organization. Based on their level of agreement (Likert five-point scale from 1 to 5; 1—not at all, 5—a lot), it was possible to identify the dominant type of organizational culture.

Age, gender, educational level, tenure as individual characteristics, as well as size, ownership, and industry sector as organizational characteristics were included as control variables in this study.

The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients were computed as a measure of internal consistency for the variables and measurement items used.

From Table 1, it can be observed that the reliability coefficient for all items is higher than 0.7, which was the cut-off value proposed by Feldt and Kim [78], thus indicating the internal consistency of the items used.

**Table 1.** Reliability Statistics (Cronbach's Alpha) for Instruments.

Scale	$\alpha$	No. of Items
Workplace incivility	0.898	7
Personality traits	0.808	10
Organizational culture	0.937	16

Source: Authors' work.

### 3.3. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique

As previously mentioned, this research was done on a sample of 251 individuals from 11 heterogeneous organizations. As it can be seen from the Table 2 below, respondents are mostly female, middle aged with higher educational level, working mostly in large, public organizations in the production and construction sector.

Different ownership, size or industry-type of organizations, can significantly affect the type of culture in organizations, so in this way it was possible to ensure that potentially different types of organizational culture emerged and are present in the sample. This allowed testing for effects of different cultures on incivility, together with different personality traits and different demographic variables.

**Table 2.** Sample characteristics.

Gender		
Male	Female	
35.5%	64.5%	
Age		
M = 40.6 years	SD = 10.3	
Tenure		
M = 16.3 years	SD = 10.1	
Education		
High school degree	Bachelor degree	Master or PhD degree
5.6%	65.7%	28.7%
Organization size		
Large	Medium	Small
57.8%	25.9%	16.3%
Organizational ownership		
Public	Private	Mixed ownership structures
68.9%	23.5%	7.6%
Industry sector		
Production and construction	Service and commerce	Education and public administration
45.4%	27.3%	27.3%

Source: Authors' work.

### 3.4. Statistical Methods and Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation were used to assess basic characteristics of data in our study.

A non-parametric Spearman correlation analysis was done after descriptive statistics, with the purpose to provide additional test of data validity, deeper insight into data and emphasize the connection between examined items. The exception is variable gender, where a point-serial correlation coefficient was used. To test for the effects of analyzed variables on workplace incivility, we performed several linear hierarchical regression models.

The statistical analyses were conducted using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.

### 3.5. Research Results

When it comes to experienced workplace incivility, research results reveal respondents to a certain extent had experienced some form of workplace incivility ( $x = 2.019$ ,  $SD = 0.850$ ). More detailed analysis shows women experienced incivility more often than men ( $x = 2.043$  as opposed to  $x = 1.974$ ). Incivility is more experienced during middle age (between 31 and 50 years of age  $x = 2.082$ ) and among employees with the highest level of education (Master or PhD degree  $x = 2.141$ ). Results also reveal that incivility is more experienced in large organizations (those with more than 250 employees  $x = 2.074$ ), and more in companies with public or majority public ownership ( $X = 2.099$ ).

Incivility varies depending on different types of dominant culture, being most experienced in hierarchy ( $x = 3.610$ ,  $SD = 0.875$ ) and market culture ( $x = 3.454$ ,  $SD = 0.865$ ), and least in adhocracy ( $x = 3.093$ ,  $SD = 0.893$ ) and clan culture ( $x = 3.324$ ,  $SD = 0.960$ ).

Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, and correlations of studied variables.

Table 3. Means, standard deviations, and correlations.

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Incivility	2.0188	0.85058	1													
2. Extraversion	3.7809	0.92076	<b>-0.130 *</b>	1.000												
3. Agreeableness	4.1972	0.71130	<b>-0.177 **</b>	<b>0.138 *</b>	1.000											
4. Conscientiousness	4.1135	0.77592	-0.012	<b>0.205 **</b>	<b>0.359 **</b>	1.000										
5. Neuroticism	2.5677	0.92704	<b>0.214 **</b>	<b>-0.217 **</b>	<b>-0.298 **</b>	<b>-0.157 *</b>	1.000									
6. Openness	3.1554	0.91201	0.089	0.069	-0.045	-0.075	-0.022	1.000								
7. Clan culture	3.3237	0.96023	<b>-0.496 **</b>	<b>0.172 **</b>	0.002	-0.040	-0.091	-0.035	1.000							
8. Adhocracy culture	3.0929	0.89269	<b>-0.462 **</b>	<b>0.133 *</b>	-0.081	-0.035	-0.087	-0.005	<b>0.619 **</b>	1.000						
9. Market culture	3.4542	0.86510	<b>-0.495 **</b>	<b>0.145 *</b>	0.111	0.033	<b>-0.154 *</b>	-0.088	<b>0.673 **</b>	0.591 **	1.000					
10. Hierarchy culture	3.6102	0.87503	<b>-0.369 **</b>	0.057	0.115	0.056	-0.073	-0.084	<b>0.480 **</b>	<b>0.303 **</b>	<b>0.716 **</b>	1.000				
11. Gender	—	—	0.039	-0.082	0.100	<b>0.275 **</b>	0.023	0.095	-0.080	-0.094	0.028	0.105	1.000			
12. Age	40.80	10.088	<b>0.148 *</b>	-0.053	<b>0.195 **</b>	<b>0.144 *</b>	0.104	-0.019	-0.104	-0.144 *	-0.039	0.035	0.125	1.000		
13. Education	—	—	0.075	-0.077	-0.010	-0.063	0.021	-0.114	<b>-0.224 **</b>	<b>-0.168 **</b>	<b>-0.190 **</b>	<b>-0.183 **</b>	-0.035	-0.045	10.000	
14. Tenure	16.32	10.080	<b>0.155 *</b>	-0.055	<b>0.173 **</b>	0.120	0.127 *	-0.020	-0.093	<b>-0.160 *</b>	-0.022	0.031	0.094	<b>0.959 **</b>	-0.034	1.000
15. Company size	—	—	<b>0.150 *</b>	0.097	0.019	0.041	-0.046	-0.075	-0.141 *	-0.104	-0.123	-0.045	0.064	0.074	<b>0.269 **</b>	0.101

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). N = 251. All statistically significant correlations are marked in bold. Source: Authors' work.

An examination of the zero-order correlations, although only moderately, indicate a connection between different antecedents and incivility at work. There is a moderate correlation between workplace incivility and most of the items at individual level of analysis, except the items measuring one's trait of consciousness and openness. Results also reveal age and tenure to be positively connected with experienced incivility. With items at organizational level of analysis, results showed significant negative correlation between each organizational culture type and incivility, as well as within company size and incivility, thus indicating possible effects of culture on reduction of uncivil behavior at work.

We further used hierarchical regression analysis to test for the significance of study variables in predicting incivility at work. Three models were developed with a sequential process oriented towards introducing predictor variables into the analysis in steps [79]. The first model (Model 1) included demographic variables. The second model (Model 2) included personality traits as individual level variables, while in the third model (Model 3), we introduced organizational culture type as organizational level predictors. This allowed multilevel perspective in our analysis, and provided the possibility to incorporate heterogeneous variables at the aggregate level into one model [80]. In addition, it allowed for insight into change in variance after each variable is entered into the regression model [81].

Table 4 shows results of linear hierarchical regression analyses. The first regression model (Model 1), including demographic characteristics, explains only a small portion of workplace incivility, with no statistically significant influence of gender, age, education and tenure. The second regression model (Model 2), that includes personality traits as individual level predictors, explains 8.4% of workplace incivility variance, with the significant negative influence of personality traits of agreeableness, and positive influence of neuroticism and openness on experienced incivility. The third model that includes organizational culture type as an organization level predictor has contributed with an increase in the explanation of the variance over the previous models ( $\Delta R^2$  0.300 at significance  $p < 0.001$ ), explaining 38.4% of workplace incivility variance. Model 3 as opposed to Model 2 indicates the significant negative influence of personality traits of agreeableness but no statistically significant influence of neuroticism and openness on experienced incivility at work. Model 3 also indicates that clan, adhocracy and market culture negatively predict occurrence of workplace incivility at work.

Results confirm the assumption that both personality traits as well as organizational culture can be seen as possible predictors of workplace incivility.

**Table 4.** Hierarchical linear regression modelling.

		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
		Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Demographic variables	(Constant)	1.847	0.000	1.660	0.025	4.577	0.000
	Age	0.048	0.678	0.030	0.801	0.016	0.875
	Gender	−0.011	0.511	−0.004	0.817	−0.008	0.553
	Education	0.070	0.355	0.093	0.211	−0.047	0.459
	Tenure	0.019	0.272	0.012	0.490	0.013	0.364
Personality traits	Extraversion			−0.031	0.609	0.021	0.674
	Agreeableness			−0.169	0.049	−0.182	0.011
	Consciousness			0.028	0.718	0.022	0.736
	Neuroticism			0.132	0.034	0.071	0.168
	Openness			0.105	0.076	0.044	0.373

Table 4. Cont.

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.	Coeff.	Sig.
Organizational culture features	Clan				−0.155	0.030
	Adhocracy				−0.169	0.017
	Market				−0.230	0.027
	Hierarchy				−0.059	0.480
R <sup>2</sup>	0.015		0.084		0.384	
R <sup>2</sup> change (significance)	0.015 (0.465)		0.069 (0.005)		0.300 (0.000)	

Source: Authors' work.

#### 4. Discussion

Many papers investigate the outcomes of workplace incivility rather than its antecedents; thus, further analyses of this field are needed. This paper takes a multilevel approach by analyzing both organization-related situational antecedents (organizational culture) and dispositional antecedents (target's personality traits) as antecedents for the occurrence of workplace incivility. Results of empirical research indicate these elements can be seen as relevant predictors of workplace incivility.

Research results indicate that depending on the type of organizational culture, values and behavior it promotes, individuals will perceive wavering levels of incivility. Research has for instance confirmed previous findings that incivility will be lower in clan culture [69], as this is a collaborative culture with values similar to those of an extended family, including teamwork, participation and consensus [44]. Therefore, organizations that promote a friendly working environment with extensive collaboration and co-ordination as well as a flexible attitude to changing circumstances will generally be characterized with lower levels of workplace incivility. Research has also shown that adhocracy culture can negatively predict occurrence of workplace incivility, similar to its influence on other forms of deviant workplace behavior [66]. This is a stress-tolerant culture, offering a high degree of flexibility, open system for employees, supports individual creativity, empowerment and trust [66,81], thus creating an environment that can inhibit incivility. Contrary to previous findings where market culture is seen as a predictor of various forms of deviant workplace behavior, including incivility [69], this research indicates that emphasizing market culture negatively affects the occurrence of workplace incivility. In the context of workplace incivility, we consider that such findings could possibly be the consequence of national culture. Research respondents come from national culture background with high power distance, and as shown by Rousseau et al. [64], in the case of high-power distance cultures, there might be higher tolerance for some forms of behavior that can be attributed to workplace incivility.

In line with previous research [27,57,60], at the individual level, the personality trait of agreeableness has a negative effect on occurrence of workplace incivility, with results indicating that highly agreeable individuals are likely to experience less workplace incivility, regardless the situational context. This research has also indicated a positive relationship between neuroticism and experienced incivility, confirming previous research findings [27,31,50]. In spite of previous research results that do not unanimously confirm the relationship between openness and perceptions of workplace incivility, this research has indicated a positive relationship. Still, when examining joint effects of personality and culture, it seems that the effects of neuroticism and openness are minimized depending upon the context and values promoted by organizational culture. In other words, cultural settings have a significant role in predicting workplace incivility.

Results of hierarchical regression analysis indicated that when combined, both organizational culture and personality traits have significant effects on the occurrence of workplace incivility. Almost 40% of variance in workplace incivility is explained when mu-

tual effects of personality and organizational culture are taken into consideration. Adding organizational culture to the regression model significantly increased the proportion of explained variance, indicating that culture should be given ever more attention in predicting and preventing workplace deviance. Such a finding is especially relevant in the context of a Miner et al. [82] remark about incivility norms usually being generalized across organizations, whereas norms of civil behavior, and what is considered uncivil behavior, can vary across organizations and different organizational cultures.

## 5. Conclusions

In spite of diverse studies of workplace incivility, there is still no unanimous answer on how to diminish this low-intensity deviant behavior occurring inside most organizations and endangering its sustainability. Many authors call for additional research that will capture not only outcomes of such behavior, but also antecedents at various organizational levels and especially seek for studies of workplace incivility in cultural settings other than US that still dominates the research on workplace incivility [71]. The aim of this paper was to test for the effects of interplay of organizational culture as organization-related situational antecedents and target's personality traits as dispositional antecedents for the occurrence of workplace incivility. Research has been additionally motivated by the fact that there has been a limited amount of research regarding organizational culture as the antecedent of workplace incivility.

Given the relatively high incidence and various deteriorating consequences, it is necessary to understand the antecedents of workplace incivility. With regard to theoretical implications of the study, empirical research has shown that personality traits have significant effects on the perceptions and occurrence of workplace incivility, but this influence is much stronger when the effects of organizational culture are combined. This research confirms previous findings on the strong negative connection between the trait of agreeableness and levels of experienced incivility, indicating the importance of personality traits as antecedents of uncivil behavior. Hierarchical regression analysis showed strong support for the role of organizational culture in one's perception and experience of incivility at work. When joint effects of personality traits and culture are analyzed, research showed how a larger portion of variance in incivility at work can be explained. In that sense, this research can confirm Leiter's [47] thesis of workplace incivility being not just an individual phenomenon but part of values and behaviors that are promoted through organizational culture. Organizational culture should therefore be given more attention in the context of organizational factors contributing to workplace incivility.

Workplace incivility has numerous negative consequences for the individuals and organizations involved and therefore it is in the management's best interest to minimize its occurrence. Managers need to be aware of these consequences and realize that incivility can threaten long-term organizational sustainability if this type of behavior is not properly addressed within the organization. This study has several practical implications for managers. In order to diminish uncivil behavior, employee personality traits should be considered within organizational human resource management policy and practice, such as employee selection, training, promotion and development. As shown by this research, incivility is strongly related with organizational culture. Still, as our research has indicated, a stronger push towards lower levels of incivility can be achieved by promoting values of clan, adhocracy and market culture. Moreover, considering that company leaders have an important role in sustaining and shaping organizational culture, they should use their position to raise awareness about uncivil behaviors being unacceptable and should act to prevent rudeness, ignoring, insulting, gossiping and similar uncivil behaviors to become part of organizational culture. It is worthy to conduct various types of civility interventions among employees such as civility promotion training programs aiming to diminish incivility and improve employee resistance and resilience.

Several research limitations have to be considered in the evaluation of the presented research results. The proportion of explained variance explained by this research is still

limited, so it is necessary to explore other possible antecedents. This research investigated target's personality traits, but it must be emphasized that instigators' personality traits and other features can determine the level of workplace incivility. Other situational and work-related factors, such as autonomy, job demands and resources, structural and process design elements, that can all affect one's personal perception and behavior, need to be taken into consideration. As per the multilevel approach in the analysis it would be interesting to conduct a joint analysis of other personality traits (such as dark triad) and cultural context regarding their connection with workplace incivility, or to investigate the importance of the impact of the organizational leader in promoting positive and assertive behaviors in the organizational culture. The research sample is relatively small and heterogeneous which can also impact overall findings. The measures used in the questionnaire are all well developed and previously validated, however the use of a self-reported research instrument leaves space for respondent's subjectivity and personal bias, especially regarding measurement of a delicate issue such as workplace incivility. Therefore, future research should strive not only to include more study variables in the research, but also try to use additional research methods, for instance in-depth interviews, that can help gain deeper understanding of this nuanced phenomenon.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, S.R.J., A.A. and I.N.B.; methodology, A.A.; resources, S.R.J., A.A. and I.N.B.; writing—original draft preparation, S.R.J.; writing—review and editing, I.N.B. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Data Availability Statement:** Data available on request.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. Andersson, L.M.; Pearson, C.M. Tit for tat? The spiralling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1999**, *24*, 452–471. [[CrossRef](#)]
2. Robinson, S.L.; Bennett, R.J. A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Acad. Manag. J.* **1995**, *38*, 555–572.
3. Cortina, L.; Kabat-Farr, D.; Leskinen, E.; Magley, V. Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *J. Manag.* **2013**, *39*, 1579–1605. [[CrossRef](#)]
4. Martin, R.; Hine, D. Development and validation of the uncivil workplace behaviour questionnaire. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2005**, *10*, 477–490. [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Porath, C.L.; Pearson, C.M. Emotional and behavioral responses to workplace incivility and the impact of hierarchical status. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* **2012**, *42*, E326–E357. [[CrossRef](#)]
6. Neuman, J.H.; Baron, R.A. Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *J. Manag.* **1998**, *24*, 14–19. [[CrossRef](#)]
7. Pearson, C.M.; Andersson, L.M.; Porath, C.I. Assessing and attaching workplace incivility. *Organ. Dyn.* **2000**, *29*, 123–137. [[CrossRef](#)]
8. Cortina, L.M.; Magley, V.J.; Williams, J.H.; Langhout, R.D. Incivility in the Workplace: Incidence and impact. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2001**, *6*, 64–80. [[CrossRef](#)]
9. Miner, K.N.; Settles, I.H.; Pratt-Hyatt, J.S.; Brady, C.C. Experiencing incivility in organizations: The buffering effects of emotional and organizational support. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* **2012**, *42*, 340–372. [[CrossRef](#)]
10. Sakurai, K.; Jex, S.M. Coworker incivility and incivility targets' work effort and counterproductive work behaviors: The moderating role of supervisor social support. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2012**, *17*, 150–161. [[CrossRef](#)]
11. Guo, J.; Qiu, Y.; Gan, Y. Workplace incivility and work engagement: The chain mediating effects of perceived insider status, affective organizational commitment and organizational identification. *Curr. Psychol.* **2020**. [[CrossRef](#)]
12. Lim, V.K.; Teo, T.S. Mind your e-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. *Inf. Manag.* **2009**, *46*, 419–425. [[CrossRef](#)]
13. Sliter, M.T.; Boyd, E.M. But we're here to help! Positive buffers of the relationship between outsider incivility and employee outcomes. *Eur. J. Work. Organ. Psychol.* **2015**, *24*, 225–238. [[CrossRef](#)]

14. Porath, C.L.; Erez, A. Does rudeness matter? The effects of rude behavior on task performance and helpfulness. *Acad. Manag. J.* **2007**, *50*, 1181–1197.
15. Pearson, C.M.; Porath, C.L. On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for “nice”? Think again. *Acad. Manag. Perspect.* **2005**, *19*, 7–18. [[CrossRef](#)]
16. Lim, S.; Cortina, L.M.; Magley, V.J. Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2008**, *93*, 95–107. [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Lim, S.; Ilies, R.; Koopman, J.; Christoforou, P.; Arvey, R.D. Emotional mechanisms linking incivility at work to aggression and withdrawal at home: An experience-sampling study. *J. Manag.* **2018**, *44*, 2888–2908. [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Hutton, S.S.; Gates, D. Workplace incivility and productivity losses among direct care staff. *AAOHN J.* **2008**, *56*, 168–175. [[CrossRef](#)]
19. Yang, J. Thriving organizational sustainability through innovation: Incivility climate and teamwork. *Sustainability* **2016**, *8*, 860. [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Schilpzand, P.; De Pater, I.E.; Erez, A. Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2016**, *37*, 57–88. [[CrossRef](#)]
21. Cortina, L.M.; Kabat-Farr, D.; Magley, V.J.; Nelson, K. Researching rudeness: The past, present, and future of the science of incivility. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2017**, *22*, 299. [[CrossRef](#)]
22. Cameron, A.F.; Webster, J. Relational outcomes of multicommuting: Integrating incivility and social exchange perspectives. *Organ. Sci.* **2011**, *22*, 754–771. [[CrossRef](#)]
23. Lim, S.; Lee, A. Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: Does family support help? *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2011**, *16*, 95–111. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
24. Sliter, K.A.; Sliter, M.T.; Withrow, S.A.; Jex, S.M. Employee adiposity and incivility: Establishing a link and identifying demographic moderators and negative consequences. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2012**, *17*, 409–424. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
25. Leiter, M.P.; Price, S.L.; Spence Laschinger, H.K. Generational differences in distress, attitudes and incivility among nurses. *J. Nurs. Manag.* **2010**, *18*, 970–980. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
26. Berger, B.A. Incivility. *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.* **2000**, *64*, 445–450.
27. Milam, A.C.; Spitzmueller, C.; Penney, L.M. Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2009**, *14*, 58–69. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
28. Koon, V.Y.; Pun, P.Y. The mediating role of emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction on the relationship between job demands and instigated workplace incivility. *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.* **2018**, *54*, 187–207. [[CrossRef](#)]
29. Salin, D. Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Hum. Relat.* **2003**, *56*, 1213–1232. [[CrossRef](#)]
30. Meier, L.L.; Semmer, N.K. Lack of reciprocity, narcissism, anger, and instigated workplace incivility: A moderated mediation model. *Eur. J. Work. Organ. Psychol.* **2013**, *22*, 461–475. [[CrossRef](#)]
31. Mazuritsky, S. Perceptions of workplace Incivility Based on Personality Characteristics: A Replication. Master’s Thesis, The University of Guelph, Guelph, ON, Canada, 2018.
32. Meier, L.L.; Spector, P. Reciprocal effects of work stressors and counterproductive work behavior: A five-wave longitudinal study. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2013**, *98*, 529–539. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
33. Trudel, J.; Reio, T.G. Managing workplace incivility: The role of conflict management styles—Antecedent or antidote? *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.* **2011**, *22*, 395–423. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Lanzo, L.; Aziz, S.; Wuensch, K. Workaholism and incivility: Stress and psychological capital’s role. *Int. J. Workplace Health Manag.* **2016**, *9*, 165–183. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Muir, C. Can we all get along? The interpersonal challenge at work. *Acad. Manag. Exec.* **2000**, *14*, 143–144. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Cosby-Simmons, D. Organizational Culture, Workplace Incivility, and Turnover: The Impact of Human Resources Practices. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA, 2008.
37. Torkelson, E.; Holm, K.; Bäckström, M.; Schad, E. Factors contributing to the perpetration of workplace incivility: The importance of organizational aspects and experiencing incivility from others. *Work Stress* **2016**, *30*, 115–131. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Walsh, B.M.; Magley, V.J.; Reeves, D.W.; Davies-Schriels, K.A.; Marmet, M.D.; Gallus, J.A. Assessing workgroup norms for civility: The development of the Civility Norms Questionnaire-Brief. *J. Bus. Psychol.* **2012**, *27*, 407–420. [[CrossRef](#)]
39. Blau, G.; Andersson, L. Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* **2005**, *78*, 595–614. [[CrossRef](#)]
40. Taylor, S.G.; Kluemper, D.H. Linking perceptions of role stress and incivility to workplace aggression: The moderating role of personality. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2012**, *17*, 316–329. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Van Jaarsveld, D.D.; Walker, D.D.; Skarlicki, D.P. The role of job demands and emotional exhaustion in the relationship between customer and employee incivility. *J. Manag.* **2010**, *36*, 1486–1504. [[CrossRef](#)]
42. Ferris, A.L. Studying and measuring civility: A framework, trends, and scale. *Sociol. Inq.* **2002**, *72*, 376–392. [[CrossRef](#)]
43. Jensen, J.M.; Cole, M.S.; Rubin, R.S. Predicting retail shrink from performance pressure, ethical leader behavior, and store-level incivility. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2019**, *40*, 723–739. [[CrossRef](#)]
44. Cameron, K.S.; Quinn, R.E. *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture Based on the Competing Values Framework*; Addison-Wesley Publishing: Boston, MA, USA, 2006.

45. Estes, B.; Wang, J. Workplace incivility: Impacts on individual and organizational performance. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.* **2008**, *7*, 218–240. [[CrossRef](#)]
46. Liu, W.; Friedman, R.; Chi, S.-C.; Tsai, M.-H. Explaining incivility in the workplace: The effects of personality and culture. *Negot. Confl. Manag. Res.* **2009**, *2*, 164–184. [[CrossRef](#)]
47. Leiter, M.P. *Analyzing and Theorizing the Dynamics of the Workplace Incivility Crisis*; Springer Science + Business Media: New York, NY, USA, 2013.
48. Tett, R.P.; Burnett, D.D. A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2003**, *88*, 500–517. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
49. Tett, R.P.; Guterman, H.A. Situation trait relevance, trait expression, and cross-situational consistency: Testing a principle of trait activation. *J. Res. Pers.* **2000**, *34*, 397–423. [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Sliter, M.; Withow, S.; Jex, S.M. It happened, or you thought it happened? Examining the perception of workplace incivility based on personality characteristics. *Int. J. Stress Manag.* **2015**, *22*, 1–23. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Glendinning, P.M. Workplace bullying: Curing the cancer of the American workplace. *Public Pers. Manag.* **2001**, *30*, 269–286. [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Alexander-Snow, M. Dynamics of gender, ethnicity, and race in understanding classroom incivility. *New Dir. Teach. Learn.* **2004**, *99*, 21–31. [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Odermatt, I.; König, C.J.; Kleinmann, M.; Bachmann, M.; Röder, H.; Schmitz, P. Incivility in meetings: Predictors and outcomes. *J. Bus. Psychol.* **2018**, *33*, 263–282. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Ricciotti, N.A. Emotional Intelligence and Instigation of Workplace Incivility in a Business Organization. Ph.D. Thesis, Walden University, Minneapolis, MN, USA, 2016.
55. Batista, L.; Reio, G., Jr. Occupational stress and instigator workplace incivility as moderated by personality: A test of an occupational stress and workplace incivility model. *J. Organ. Psychol.* **2019**, *19*, 38–49.
56. Bowling, N.A.; Beehr, T.A. Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2006**, *91*, 998–1012. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
57. Naimon, E.C.; Mullins, M.; Osatuke, K. The effects of personality and spirituality on workplace incivility perceptions. *J. Manag. Spiritual. Relig.* **2013**, *10*, 1–20. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. McCrae, R.R.; Costa, P.T. Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **1987**, *52*, 81–90. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
59. Kamdar, D.; van Dyne, L. The joint effects of personality and workplace social exchange in predicting task performance and citizenship performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2007**, *92*, 1286–1298. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Berry, C.M.; Ones, D.S.; Sackett, P.R. Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and metaanalysis. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2007**, *92*, 410–424. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
61. Mount, M.K.; Barrick, M.R.; Strauss, J.P. Validity of observer ratings of the big five personality factors. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **1994**, *79*, 272–280. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Barrick, M.R.; Mount, M.K. The Big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Pers. Psychol.* **1991**, *44*, 1–26. [[CrossRef](#)]
63. Watson, D.; Clark, L.A. Affects separable and inseparable: On the hierarchical arrangement of the negative affects. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **1992**, *62*, 489–505. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Rousseau, D.M.; Manning, J.; Denyer, D. Evidence in management and organizational science: Assembling the field's full weight of scientific knowledge through syntheses. *Acad. Manag. Ann.* **2008**, *2*, 475–515. [[CrossRef](#)]
65. Welbourne, J.L.; Gangadharan, A.; Sariol, A.M. Ethnicity and cultural values as predictors of the occurrence and impact of experienced workplace incivility. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2015**, *20*, 205–217. [[CrossRef](#)]
66. Di Stefano, G.; Scrima, F.; Parry, E. The effect of organizational culture on deviant behaviors in the workplace. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* **2017**, *30*, 2482–2503. [[CrossRef](#)]
67. Pattani, R.; Ginsburg, S.; Johnson, A.M.; Moore, J.E.; Jassemi, S.; Straus, S.E. Organizational factors contributing to incivility at an academic medical center and systems-based solutions: A qualitative study. *Acad. Med.* **2018**, *93*, 1569–1575. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
68. Vickers, M.H. Writing what's relevant: Workplace incivility in public administration—A wolf in sheep's clothing. *Admin. Theor. Prax.* **2006**, *26*, 69–88. [[CrossRef](#)]
69. Cash, R.E.; White-Mills, K.; Crowe, R.P.; Rivard, M.K.; Panchal, A.R. Workplace incivility among nationally certified EMS professionals and associations with workforce-reducing factors and organizational culture. *Prehosp. Emerg. Care* **2019**, *23*, 346–355. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
70. Rechberg, I.; Syed, J. Ethical issues in knowledge management: Conflict of knowledge ownership. *J. Knowl. Manag.* **2013**, *17*, 828–847. [[CrossRef](#)]
71. Vasconcelos, F.A. Workplace incivility: A literature review. *Int. J. Workplace Health Manag.* **2020**, *33*, 513–542. [[CrossRef](#)]
72. Queirós, A.; Faria, D.; Almeida, F. Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods. *Eur. J. Educ. Stud.* **2017**, *3*, 369–387.
73. Bryman, A.; Bell, E. *Business Research Methods*, 4th ed.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2015.
74. Etikan, I.; Rukayya, A.; Sulaiman, A. Comparison of snowball sampling and sequential sampling technique. *Biom. Biostat. Int. J.* **2016**, *3*, 55–56.

75. Rammstedt, B.; John, O.P. Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *J. Res. Pers.* **2007**, *41*, 203–212. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Van Muijen, J.J.; Koopman, P.; De Witte, K.; De Cock, G.; Susanj, Z.; Lemoine, C.; Bourantas, D.; Papalexandris, N.; Branyicski, I.; Spaltro, E.; et al. Organizational culture: The focus questionnaire. *Eur. J. Work Organ. Psychol.* **1999**, *8*, 551–568. [[CrossRef](#)]
77. Sušan, Z. *Organizacijska Klima i Kultura*; Naklada Slap: Jastrebarsko, Croatia, 2005.
78. Feldt, L.S.; Kim, S. A comparison of tests for equality of two or more independent alpha coefficients. *J. Educ. Meas.* **2008**, *45*, 179–193.
79. Lewis, M. Stepwise Versus Hierarchical Regression: Pros and Cons. In Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, San Antonio, TX, USA, 7–10 February 2007. Available online: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED534385.pdf> (accessed on 15 December 2020).
80. Chi, G.; Voss, P. Migration decision-making: A hierarchical regression approach. *J. Reg. Anal. Policy* **2005**, *35*, 11–22.
81. Balaji, M.S.; Jiang, Y.; Singh, G.; Jha, S. Letting go or getting back: How organization culture shapes frontline employee response to customer incivility. *J. Bus. Res.* **2020**, *111*, 1–11. [[CrossRef](#)]
82. Miner, K.N.; Diaz, I.; Wooderson, R.L.; McDonald, J.N.; Smittick, A.L.; Lomeli, L.C. A workplace incivility roadmap: Identifying theoretical speedbumps and alternative routes for future research. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* **2018**, *23*, 320–337. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]