NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI®

The development and validation of a customer incivility scale

By

Nicole L. Wilson

A thesis submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree of Master of Science in Applied Psychology

August, 2010, Halifax, Nova Scotia

© Nicole L. Wilson, 2010

Approved: Camilla M. Holmvall, Ph.D.
Primary Supervisor

Approved: Lori Francis, Ph.D.
Supervisory Committee Member

Approved: E. Kevin Kelloway, Ph.D.
Supervisory Committee Member

Approved: Margaret McKee, Ph.D.
External Examiner

Date: August 13, 2010

Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-
exclusive license allowing Library and
Archives Canada to reproduce,
publish, archive, preserve, conserve,
communicate to the public by
telecommunication or on the Internet,
loan, distribute and sell theses
worldwide, for commercial or non-
commercial purposes, in microform,
paper, electronic and/or any other
formats.

The author retains copyright
ownership and moral rights in this
thesis. Neither the thesis nor
substantial extracts from it may be
printed or otherwise reproduced
without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive
permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives
Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver,
sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public
par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter,
distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le
monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur
support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou
autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur
et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni
la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci
ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement
reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian
Privacy Act some supporting forms
may have been removed from this
thesis.

While these forms may be included
in the document page count, their
removal does not represent any loss
of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la
protection de la vie privée, quelques
formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de
cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans
la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu
manquant.

Canada

The development and validation of a customer incivility scale

By Nicole L. Wilson

Abstract

Little research has examined sources of workplace incivility outside of the organization. Customer-employee interactions are important to study, however, because most employees interact with customers more than with supervisors and coworkers (Dormann & Zapf, 2004) and evidence suggests that deviance is more common from those outside (vs. inside) the organization (Grandey, Kern, & Frone, 2007; Schat & Kelloway, 2005). Employee-customer interactions are governed by different policies, and are often short term and non-reoccurring. The purpose of these encounters also differs from employee-employee interactions. Given these differences, current workplace incivility scales— designed to assess intra-organizational incivility—may not be appropriate to assess customer incivility. Thus, I conducted two studies to develop and initially validate a customer incivility scale. Study 1 used focus groups of retail and restaurant employees (N = 30) to elicit a list of uncivil customer behaviours, based on which 27 initial scale items were written. Study 2 used a correlational survey approach (N = 92) to garner initial evidence for the scale's psychometric properties. The scale demonstrated high internal consistency. Weak to moderate correlations with other customer deviance measures (i.e., justice, aggression, violence) provided evidence for discriminant validity. Significant relationships between the scale and employee job satisfaction, turnover intentions, job-related strain, and general psychological strain provided evidence for criterion-related validity. The scale thus demonstrates promising psychometric qualities, although it needs further validation and refinement.

August 13, 2010

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

The development and validation of a customer incivility scale

Workplace incivility is prevalent in organizations (Barker-Caza & Cortina, 2007; Cortina, Magley, Hunter-Williams, & Day-Langhout, 2001; Johnson & Indvik, 2001) and has been linked to a host of negative consequences, including potential spirals into aggression and violence (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). To date, incivility research has primarily considered the nature and effects of incivility from those inside the organization, such as from coworkers and supervisors. However, for those who work in sales and service roles (e.g., retail sales, food and beverage service)—who represent almost 24% of the Canadian working population (Statistics Canada, 2010)—treatment from customers may also have serious implications (Dormann & Zapf, 2004; Kern & Grandey, 2009). Employees working in customer service roles interact with customers considerably more than with their coworkers or supervisors (Dormann & Zapf, 2004). Moreover, in many organizations, rules for preventing customer incivility do not exist, as organizations often require employees to provide "service with a smile" even when faced with disrespectful or rude treatment (Ben-Zur & Yagil, 2005). As such, employees likely receive less civil treatment from their customers than from intra-organizational members (Grandey, Kern, & Frone, 2007; LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002).

Currently, measures to assess coworker and supervisor incivility exist; however, to my knowledge, no validated scale exists to measure customer incivility. In addition to uncivil behaviours that may apply broadly across sources and contexts, there may be important behaviours that are specific to employee-customer interactions, as will be elaborated in subsequent sections. As an important step in understanding the nature and effects of customer incivility, I argue that the development and validation of a customer

incivility measure is needed. Thus, using a two-study mixed-methods approach, the

current research seeks to fill this gap in the literature.

Workplace Deviance

There are a number of terms used to describe deviant customer behaviour,

including incivility, injustice, aggression, and violence. Although there is considerable

overlap between these constructs (Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001), it was

important to distinguish them to ensure that the correct construct was assessed in the

current study. In their seminal article, Andersson and Pearson (1999) defined workplace

incivility as low-grade deviant behaviours that violate norms for how to treat others and

have an ambiguous intent to harm. Uncivil behaviours are "rude and discourteous" and

show a "lack of regard for others" (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p. 457). Concerning the

notion of ambiguity, the intent to harm may not be clear to the instigator, the target, or to

observers (Pearson et al., 2001). For example, the instigator may behave uncivilly with

the intent to harm the target (e.g., intentionally failing to pass on information that the

target should have been made aware of; Martin & Hine, 2005) or their actions may be the

result of ignorance or oversight (e.g., forgetting to pass on the required information). The

instigator's true intent might not be apparent to the target (Pearson, Andersson, & Porath,

2000). Given this ambiguity, the target may be left wondering what the instigator

intended by their behaviour. Further, when confronted, instigators can deny or cover up

their intent by claiming that the target misinterpreted their behaviour or that the target is

being oversensitive (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Thus, uncivil behaviours are

distinguishable from other types of workplace deviance as they involve low-intensity

behaviours, the intent of which are ambiguous.

Aggressive behaviour, on the other hand, is thought to be higher in intensity (Andersson & Pearson, 1999) and is intended to physically or psychological harm the target (Schat & Kelloway, 2005). As noted, aggression can be psychological in nature or physical (i.e., violence). Indeed, workplace violence is a type of aggression that involves the threat or enactment of behaviours that may cause physical harm to individuals (Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, 2008; Schat & Kelloway, 2005). Workplace aggression and violence then, unlike incivility, involve a clear intent to harm the target. Typical behaviours that fall into the realm of psychological aggression include swearing, name-calling, and verbal attacks (Greenberg & Barling, 1999). Behaviours that fall into the realm of violence include threats of physical harm, shoving, and kicking the target (Rogers & Kelloway, 1997).

Interpersonal injustice reflects behaviours that violate societal norms (e.g., politeness, consideration) for how to interact with others (Bies & Moag, 1986). For example, customers who treat employees with unprovoked rudeness and disrespect are likely to be perceived as treating the employee unfairly (Rupp & Spencer, 2006; Skarlicki, Van Jaarsveld, & Walker, 2008). As Andersson and Pearson (1999) note, if people feel an act of incivility is unfair, they may be more likely to escalate the encounter (e.g., by retaliating against the instigator of the injustice; Bies & Tripp, 1996; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Whereas researchers typically conceptualize and measure incivility and aggression as behaviours (e.g., Cortina et al., 2001; Greenberg & Barling, 1999), injustice (or justice) judgements involve an evaluation of these uncivil or aggressive behaviours (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Employees may not perceive some acts of incivility as unfair, such as when an employee takes out their bad mood on a customer and the

customer responds in turn with a rude tone. However, following an uncivil encounter, if the target perceives that they have been treated unfairly (i.e., with interpersonal injustice), they may experience feelings of negative affect and the desire to retaliate. Should recipients of this behaviour choose to react negatively, the interaction may escalate (i.e., via an incivility spiral), potentially resulting in aggression or violence (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

Customer Service Context

Customers are likely an important, yet understudied, source of uncivil interactions at work. Indeed, due to the nature of customer service work, employees probably interact with customers more often than they do with their coworkers or supervisors (Dormann & Zapf, 2004). Moreover, in the course of a day, customer service employees may interact with dozens of customers, but only interact with a small group of coworkers and their supervisor. Further, research on customer aggression suggests that aggression from organizational outsiders (e.g., customers) is more common than aggression from coworkers or supervisors (Grandey et al., 2007; LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002). Similarly, the majority, 43%, of anger inducing interactions in customer service jobs stemmed from encounters with customers (Grandey, Tam, & Brauburger, 2002). Thus, including customer behaviour in the study of workplace deviance appears necessary and important.

In addition to the high frequency of customer encounters, the nature of interactions with customers is different from those with supervisors and coworkers. In particular, many customer service jobs (e.g., fast food server, grocery store cashier) involve encounters where employees and customers do not have a shared history or are unlikely to interact again in the future (Gutek, Bhappu, Liao-Troth, & Cherry, 1999). In

contrast, employees hold continuous relationships with a limited number of coworkers and supervisors (Dormann & Zapf, 2004). Grandey and colleagues (2007) argued that there is a level of customer anonymity in encounter-type interactions that may be associated with an increased likelihood that customers will mistreat employees. That is, customers may mistreat employees because they are unlikely to interact with them again, or, in some cases, customers can choose alternative organizations (Ben-Zur & Yagil, 2005).

Customers also do not have an explicit obligation to be civil to employees (Ben-Zur & Yagil, 2005; Gutek, 1995). Employees, on the other hand, are likely to face sanctions if they are not civil to each other and to their customers (Gutek, 1995; Grandey et al., 2007). Further, when faced with mistreatment from customers, many organizations expect employees to follow emotional display rules by remaining polite during the encounter (Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983). Consequently, employees may mask their emotions (i.e., surface acting) to provide "service with a smile" (Ben-Zur & Yagil, 2005; Grandey et al., 2007). In contrast, when employees interact with coworkers and supervisors, there is likely no policy requiring employees to appease their coworkers or supervisors, as is commonly present in employee-customer interactions (e.g., "the customer is always right"). Overall then, the frequency, nature, and organizational policies governing customer encounters suggest that customer incivility is likely to be a serious problem in customer service organizations.

Employee-employee interactions and employee-customer interactions are further differentiated by the purpose of the encounter. Employee-customer encounters primarily take place during the exchange of the organization's goods or services for money, under

the organizational requirements of how these commodities should be delivered (e.g.,

organizational policies for returning merchandise or cancelling ongoing services, costs of

products and services). As such, employees are the point of contact for customers.

Customers may express their dissatisfaction to employees about goods, services, and

organizational policies. Further, employees often have little control over how they can

deal with customer complaints (e.g., they must follow organizational policy or call a

manager). Employee-employee interactions, on the other hand, involve collaboration

between employees to deliver goods and services to customers. For example, one

employee may process the customer's purchases on the cash register, while another puts

the purchases in a bag. Thus, the nature and purpose of employee-employee interactions

differs from that of employee-customer interactions. Indeed, the specific behaviours that

constitute these interactions likely differ markedly between these pairs of parties.

Arguably, there are important uncivil customer behaviours that current coworker and

supervisor incivility measures do not capture.

Existing Workplace Incivility Measures

There are a number of scales to measure coworker and supervisor incivility in the

existing literature (e.g., Cortina et al., 2001; Martin & Hine, 2005). As alluded to above,

many items on these instruments, however, do not appear to be applicable to interactions

between employees and customers. Indeed, many of the items in existing scales are more

relevant to an office context. For example, Martin and Hine's (2005) measure asks if

others have "read communications addressed to you, such as emails or faxes", "failed to

inform you of a meeting you should have been informed about", and "took items from

your desk without prior permission" (p. 481). Such behaviours would likely not occur in

customer-employee interactions. One coworker and supervisor incivility scale, the Workplace Incivility Scale (Cortina et al., 2001), has been adapted via slight wording modifications (A. A. Grandey, personal communication, December 1, 2009) to measure customer incivility (Kern & Grandey, 2009). Although this scale appears more broadly applicable, some items on this scale (e.g., "Ignored or excluded you from social interactions at work?" and "Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal matters?") may also be less applicable to interactions with customers than to interactions with coworkers and supervisors. Notably, however, there are items on existing workplace incivility scales that may be broad enough to apply to customer-employee interactions, such as "Doubted your judgement on a matter over which you have responsibility" and "Made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you" (Cortina et al., 2001, p. 70). Nevertheless, existing scales likely fail to capture important behaviours that are central to customer incivility. Considering this gap in the measurement of customer incivility, the current studies sought to develop and validate an instrument that would likely include these broad behaviours but would also include context-specific items.

The current research focussed on retail sales and restaurant service workers to develop and validate items for the customer incivility scale. These industries employ 33% of Canadians working in sales and service occupations according to Canada's 2006 census (Statistics Canada, 2010).[1] Further, in previous studies of customer service

---

[1] "Retail sales persons and sales clerks", "cashiers", and "occupations in food and beverage service" are the occupations that make up 33% of Canadians working in sales and service occupations.

employees, these industries have constituted the majority of the customer service jobs held among participants (Diefendorff & Croyle, 2008; Frone, 2000). Although I focussed on these industries to develop and initially validate the scale, I expected an instrument measuring the construct of customer incivility would likely apply to a larger number of customer service contexts.

Linking Customer Incivility With Outcome Variables

To establish criterion-related validity evidence for the scale developed in Study 1, the scale must be linked to variables it should theoretically be associated with (Crocker & Algina, 2006). To develop hypotheses for these relationships, I drew on the stress–stressor–strain model (e.g., Pratt & Barling, 1988). This model defines stressors as objective events that occur in one's environment that have the potential to cause stress (e.g., uncivil customer behaviour), stress as the subjective experience of the event, and strain as the psychological or physiological response to stress (e.g., trouble sleeping due to worry, not being able to concentrate). In a work context, strain can manifest itself in a number of ways, including those that affect the organization (e.g., job dissatisfaction, turnover intentions) and those that affect the individual (e.g., general psychological strain, job-related strain; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010). Considering that workplace deviance is a stressor and that over 70% of employees have experienced incivility from their coworkers or supervisors (Barker-Caza & Cortina, 2007; Cortina et al., 2001), it is likely that incivility from customers is also a significant stressor for employees.

In addition to the stressor-stress-strain model, I drew on Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory (Hobfoll, 1988; 2001) to provide insight into why workplace deviance is a stressor that can lead to strain. Specifically, COR theory (Hobfoll, 1988;

2001) suggests that individuals strive to maintain, gather, and protect that which they value (called resources). In a customer service context, employees gain resources (e.g., feelings of accomplishment) by solving problems for customers and fulfilling customers' needs (Dormann & Zapf, 2004). However, certain events (i.e., stressors) may result in employees perceiving that important resources (e.g., self-efficacy, social support) may be threatened or lost (Hobfoll, 1988; 2001). For example, if a customer went to a manager even when the employee's decision or explanation was correct, the employee's self-efficacy might be threatened. As a result, the uncivil customer behaviour becomes a stressor for the employee. Thus, in the current study I applied these theories of stress to customer incivility, arguing that customer incivility is a stressor that can lead to negative personal and organizational outcomes including lower job satisfaction, increased turnover intentions, higher job-related strain, and higher general psychological strain. To make this argument, I also examined the empirical literatures on the consequences of workplace incivility broadly speaking, as well as the literatures on the consequences of related constructs, including customer aggression, violence, and injustice.

Workplace deviance, job satisfaction, and turnover intent. Stress theories and empirical research suggest that deviant workplace behaviours are stressors that can cause organizational strain, such as job dissatisfaction and turnover intentions (Cortina et al., 2001; Holmvall & Sidhu, 2007; Lim, Cortina, & Magely, 2008). Specifically, higher levels of incivility (from coworkers and supervisors) have been linked to lower levels of job satisfaction and greater turnover intentions among public sector employees (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim et al., 2008) and healthcare workers (Spense-Laschinger, Leiter, Day, Gilin, 2009). Moreover, Miner-Rubino and Cortina (2007) reported that even the

vicarious experience of uncivil behaviour could result in lower levels of job satisfaction, which lead to greater turnover intentions. Another study reported that 12% of employees actually quit their jobs because of incivility from their coworkers or supervisors (Pearson, 1999).

Deviant behaviours from customers specifically, have also been associated with lower job satisfaction and greater turnover intentions among employees. For example, a higher level of customer injustice has been associated with lower job satisfaction and greater intent to turnover (Holmvall & Sidhu, 2007). In other research, customer sexual harassment was positively related to turnover, as well as negatively related to job satisfaction, even when organizational sexual harassment was statistically controlled (Gettman & Gelfand, 2007). Barling, Rogers, and Kelloway (2001) also found that workplace violence and sexual harassment (although more extreme than incivility) predicted fear of re-occurrence, which in turn was associated with greater turnover intentions. Hershcovis and Barling (2010) also supported the associations between organizational outsider deviance, job satisfaction, and turnover in their meta-analysis. Moreover, Grandey et al. (2002) found that participants who reported negative emotions associated with customer encounters also reported greater turnover intentions, although there was not a significant relationship between negative emotions and job satisfaction. Overall then, research on intra-organizational incivility and customer deviance suggests that customer incivility may lead to lower job satisfaction and increased turnover intentions among employees. Hypotheses 1 and 2 capture these predictions.

Hypothesis 1. Customer incivility will be negatively associated with job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2. Customer incivility will be positively associated with turnover

intentions.

Workplace deviance and personal strain. Researchers have proposed that

customer deviance is a stressor that can lead to personal strain (Hershcovis & Barling,

2010). Chronic exposure to stress leads to burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981), a specific

type of strain. Thus, stress theories, including COR theory (Hobfoll, 1988; 2001) and the

stress–stressor–strain model (e.g., Pratt & Barling, 1988), suggest that customer incivility

can be a stressor than can result in personal strain. Furthermore, research suggests that

uncivil, abusive, and aggressive customer behaviours show a positive association with

strain (Dormann & Zapf, 2004; Grandey et al., 2007; Kern & Grandey, 2009). For

example, a recent study found a positive correlation between customer incivility and

emotional exhaustion (Kern & Grandey, 2009). Similarly, research reported that

customer-related stressors (e.g., being shouted at by customers, customers who argue with

employees) accounted for 51% of the variance in strain (Dormann & Zapf, 2004).

Another study reported a positive association between customer verbal aggression and

emotional exhaustion (Grandey, Dickter, & Sin, 2004). Moreover, employees who felt

particularly stressed because of customer verbal aggression were more likely to feel

emotionally exhausted (Grandey et al., 2004). In addition, verbal abuse from

organizational outsiders predicted emotional exhaustion over and above verbal abuse

from those within the organization (Grandey et al., 2004). Meta-analytic evidence also

supports the relationship between deviance from organizational outsiders and employee

well being measures, including emotional exhaustion (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010).

Of particular relevance to organizations, research on emotionally exhausted customer service employees suggests that these employees deliver lower quality service than do employees who are not emotionally exhausted (Tsai & Huang, 2002). Lower quality service has detrimental effects on the organization, including decreased customer satisfaction and revenue (Tsai & Huang, 2002). Overall then, deviant customer behaviour is a stressor that may lead to strain (e.g., psychological strain, job-induced tension) among customer service employees.

Strain may manifest itself in life in general (i.e., context free well-being) and/or in a particular context (i.e., context specific well-being). Warr (1994) describes context free well-being as an individual's well-being in life in general, which is captured by indices such as life satisfaction, depression, anxiety, and general distress (Warr, 1994). Context specific well-being, on the other hand, occurs in a single setting, such as in a person's job (Warr, 1994). Job-related well-being can include job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job-related strain, and job-related burnout (Warr, 1994). Thus, as well-being levels may differ depending on the level of focus (i.e., general well-being versus job-related well-being) and little research has been conducted on the well-being outcomes of customer incivility, I assessed both context-free (general psychological strain) and context-specific (job-related strain) well-being. I expected that participants experiencing higher levels of customer incivility would experience higher levels of strain on the job and higher levels of general psychological strain, as stipulated in the hypotheses below.

Hypothesis 3a. Customer incivility will be positively associated with job-related strain.

Hypothesis 3b. Customer incivility will be positively associated with general psychological strain.

Study 1

To develop the items for the customer incivility scale, I followed four steps as recommended by Hinken (1995; 1998) and Vogt, King, and King (2004). First, I reviewed the relevant literature to define the construct (i.e., workplace incivility) and gain an understanding of its theoretical interrelations with other constructs (e.g., aggression, violence, justice). Second, to operationalize the construct (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955), I identified characteristic behaviours using a focus group method with customer service employees as participants. In doing so, I elicited the language that these employees use to describe uncivil customer behaviours to aid in the wording of scale items (Hinken, 1998; Vogt et al., 2004). Third, I organized the focus group data into themes and wrote initial items. Fourth, others reviewed the items based on a number of guidelines (e.g., grammar, clarity, representation of the construct) and indicated whether the items reflected the construct definition (versus definitions of other, similar constructs).

Method

Participants. Participants for the focus groups were 30 undergraduate students (12 Male, 18 female) enrolled in psychology courses at Saint Mary's University and currently working in the retail sales ($n = 15$) or restaurant service ($n = 15$) industries. I recruited participants through the Saint Mary's University Psychology Department's online research participation system. Participants received partial credit (i.e., two bonus points toward their final grade) in a psychology course for taking part in the study. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 25 ($M = 20.72$, $SD = 1.87$); one participant did not

report their age. Participants worked between 4 to 40 hours per week ($M = 17.18$, $SD = 9.73$) and 90% of them primarily interacted face-to-face with customers. Participants interacted with customers between 50% and 100% ($M = 84.31$, $SD = 13.54$) of their time at work. Written informed consent was obtained from participants prior to their participation in the study (see Appendix A).

Procedure. To ensure homogeneity of the focus groups (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990), sessions consisted of either retail sales or restaurant service employees. At the beginning of the focus group sessions, I (acting as the moderator) provided participants with a brief outline of the study and how the session was structured. Next, to provide a description of the target construct for the scale (Clark & Watson, 1995), I reviewed Andersson and Pearson's (1999) workplace incivility definition. Namely, that workplace incivility involves low-intensity deviant behaviour (as opposed to high intensity), has ambiguous harmful intent, and violates norms for how to treat others. I then asked participants to individually write down examples of uncivil customer behaviours they had encountered (see Appendix B). During the group discussion that followed, I asked participants to share their examples of customer incivility with the group. I wrote the examples on flip chart paper and the group discussed whether each behaviour was in line with the incivility definition. In addition, I audio taped focus group discussions, took notes during the sessions, and collected the participants' written responses. Due to time constraints, we did not discuss all of the participants' written responses in the focus group session; thus, I examined participants' individual responses and added the behaviours that clearly fit the incivility definition to the behaviours noted on the flip chart paper. Individual responses that were not included in the behaviour pool were those that

constituted violence, had a clear intent to harm, were clearly directed at the organization, were illegal (e.g., stealing), or reflected a statement on the topic rather than a behaviour (e.g., Not all of my customers are difficult, but the ones that are difficult make up for the ones that are not). This procedure resulted in a pool of behaviours that informed the item writing process. I included items that may have been on the cusp of the incivility construct as researchers suggest "erring on the side of caution" and allowing subsequent psychometric evaluation to identify weak and unrelated items (as opposed to limiting the content of the scale by not including these items at all; Clark & Watson, 1995, p. 6).

I held nine focus group sessions with two to five participants each and three one-on-one interviews, with each session or interview lasting a maximum of one and a half hours.[2] Prior to data collection, I established a guideline sample size of thirty participants as recommended for exploratory focus group designs (Nassar-McMillan & Borders, 2002). In addition to this guideline, I examined the flip chart paper and written responses after each focus group for reoccurring behaviours. As I reviewed the responses after each session, I had a sense of the general themes that were emerging. When reoccurring behaviours began to emerge and few new behaviours were materializing, I stopped scheduling sessions (Byers, Zeller, & Byers, 2002).

---

[2] Although I aimed to have the suggested number of participants (i.e., four to eight) per session (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990), due to the recruitment procedures used, it was difficult to control the number of participants who showed up to each session. As a result, some sessions included only one participant and thus I refer to them as interviews.

Results

I organized the uncivil customer behaviours into themes by reading through the behaviours and placing them together based on their similarity (Vogt et al., 2004). For example, behaviours such as "customers talk to their friends and do not pay attention to you" and "customers talking on their cell phone or reading the newspaper while you are trying to help them" were included in the theme "customers do not give you their full attention when you were trying to talk to them". When necessary, I referred to written notes and audiotapes for clarification. I used the themes to write items based on Crocker and Algina's (2006) guidelines for item development (e.g., items should be relatively short, grammatical, and unambiguous). I aimed to write items that reflected negative customer behaviours employees have encountered (i.e., uncivil customer behaviours). As such, some of the guidelines were difficult, if not inappropriate, to follow (e.g., using the present tense).

To refine the items and establish initial evidence of construct validity, I sought the assistance of two groups of Saint Mary's University students. First, a group of psychology undergraduate honours and graduate students ($n = 4$) with work experience in the restaurant or retail industries reviewed the items. I asked the reviewers to indicate if the items were examples of incivility, if they had personally experienced the behaviour while working in these industries, and if the items were behavioural in nature (as opposed to affective responses to [Harrison & McLaughlin, 1993], or interpretations of, customers' behaviour). In addition, as some behaviours were only identified by one industry group (i.e., retail sales focus groups or restaurant service focus groups), I asked students to indicate whether these items were plausible in both industries. I retained only

those items that were plausible in both contexts. For example, a theme that constituted customers not tipping or tipping less than 15% did not apply to retail employees and thus an item related to this theme was not included in the scale. Students also assessed the items for technical flaws (e.g., items with more than one interpretation, items that included universals), grammar, spelling, bias towards any one group, and level of readability (Crocker & Algina, 2006). I then revised the items and consulted the student(s) who recommended item revision to see if the revised item met the item review criteria discussed previously. If the student(s) identified further item flaws, I revised the item and consulted the students in an iterative review process recommended by Clark and Watson (1995).

I used the revised items in a second session of testing. To establish initial evidence for construct validity, the second group of Saint Mary's University students ($n = 6$) were given a randomly ordered list of customer aggression (including violence) items (Kelloway, personal communication, January 11, 2010; Rogers & Kelloway, 1997) and the incivility items created in the current study. Armed with definitions of workplace incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999) and workplace aggression (Schat & Kelloway, 2005), student raters were asked to sort each item as either "uncivil", "aggressive", or "unsure". Seven incivility items were rated as "aggressive" and "unsure" more than 25% of the time (see Table 1), the maximum cut off recommended by Hinken (1998). As a result, I revised three of these items to reflect incivility more clearly. For example one item said, "...made insulting remarks to you about your organization". Some students indicated that the word "insulting" could reflect aggressive behaviour. Thus, the item was revised to say, "...made negative remarks to you about your organization". Using the

same iterative review process as the previous task, I contacted the student raters to see if they thought that the revised items were more fitting of the incivility definition. As well, I inquired as to why the student(s) who rated the other four items as unsure did so. These students indicated that they primarily thought these items were bordering between uncivil and aggressive. To avoid narrowing the content of the scale too conservatively (Clark & Watson, 1995; Vogt et al., 2004), I included these items in the scale for Study 2. I noted to myself, however, that they might be problematic given the qualitative evaluations. Moreover, after receiving student feedback I made some additional minor wording edits to improve item grammar and clarity for a number of items in the scale.

Table 1

Percentage of Respondents who Rated Items as Assessing Incivility, Aggression, or Unsure on the Construct Validity Sorting Task

Variable	Item Name	Uncivil	Aggressive	Unsure
	How often have customers…			
CIS1	…brushed you off when you were trying to talk to them.	100	-	-
CIS2*	…not given you their full attention.	100	-	-
CIS3	…grumbled to you that there were too few employees working.	67	-	33
CIS4*	…failed to follow societal norms for appropriate behaviour in public (e.g., butting in line). Revised item: …failed	100	-	-

to follow societal norms for

appropriate behaviour in public (e.g.,

butting in line, excessive loudness).

CIS5*	...complained about the value of goods and services. Revised item: ...complained to you about the value of goods and services.	83	-	17
CIS6	...been irritated with you because your company was out of a product.	67	-	33
CIS7*	...made an unnecessary mess for you to deal with.	100	-	-
CIS8*	...used an inappropriate manner of addressing you (e.g., "Hey you").	100	-	-
CIS9*	...made inappropriate gestures to get your attention (e.g., snapping fingers).	100	-	-
CIS10*	...failed to say "please" or "thank-you" to you.	100	-	-
CIS11*	...conveyed that they expected freebees, discounts, or better service because of their perceived status (e.g., friends, "regulars").	100	-	-
CIS12*	...pestered you to make exceptions to	100	-	-

company policy.

CIS13*	...failed to acknowledge your efforts when you have gone out of your way to help them.	100	-	-
CIS14	...expressed their dissatisfaction with slow service during busy times. [a] Revised item: ...grumbled to you about slow service during busy times.	50	-	50
CIS15*	...not been mindful of their children's actions (e.g., potentially breaking something).[a] Revised item: ...not been mindful of their children's actions (e.g., children break something).	100	-	-
CIS16*	...become annoyed when you would not stop what you were doing to help them.	100	-	-
CIS17	...blamed you for a problem you did not cause.	50	50	-
CIS18*	...tried to scam returns, discounts, or free products from you.	100	-	-
CIS19	...tried to tell you how to do your job.	67	17	17
CIS20	...gone above your head when you	83	-	17

know your decision or explanation was correct. [a] Revised item: ...gone above your head when you followed appropriate procedures or protocols.

CIS21	...made inappropriate comments about your appearance. [a] Revised item: ...given you compliments about your appearance that were inappropriate.	50	33	17
CIS22*	...made gestures (e.g., eye rolling, sighing) to express their impatience.	83	17	-
CIS23*	...continued to complain despite your efforts to assist them.	83	-	17
CIS24	...made insulting remarks to you about your organization.[a] Revised item: ...made negative remarks to you about your organization.	67	17	17
CIS25	...become irritated when you would not "bend the rules" for them. [b]	100	-	-
CIS26	...cut you off mid-sentence. [b]	100	-	-
CIS27	...knowingly disregarded company policies or rules. [b]	100	-	-

Aggression Items

CA1	...sworn at you.	-	100	-
CA2	...yelled at you.	-	100	-
CA3	...called you insulting names.	-	100	-
CA4	...been condescending to you.	50	33	17
CA5	...personally attacked you (i.e., insulted your intelligence).	-	100	-
CV1	...verbally abused you.	-	100	-
CV2	...thrown an object at you.	-	100	-
CV3	...hit, kicked, grabbed, shoved, or pushed you.	-	100	-
CV4	...damaged your personal property.	-	100	-
CV5	...spat on or bitten you.	-	100	-
CV6	...threatened you with property damage.	-	100	-
CV7	...threatened you with physical violence.	-	100	-
CV8	...threatened you with a weapon.	-	100	-

Note. $N = 6$. [a] Items that were revised for the version of the scale used in Study 2. [b] Items that were inadvertently not included in Study 2. * Items included in the final version of the scale.

Discussion

The purpose of Study 1 was to obtain a list of uncivil customer behaviours from subject matter experts and to write items based on these behaviours for a customer incivility scale. Some scale items were similar to those of other workplace incivility instruments. For example, one of Martin and Hine's (2005) items states, "Rolled their eyes at you" (p. 481) and I included a similar, but more context specific item that stated, "made gestures (e.g., eye rolling, sighing) to express their impatience". Some items were quite dissimilar to those found in other workplace incivility measures, such as "made inappropriate gestures to get your attention (e.g., snapping fingers)" and "not been mindful of their children's actions (e.g., children break something)". These findings suggest that there may be some uncivil behaviours that occur in interactions with coworkers, supervisors, and customers. These findings also suggest, however, that there are uncivil behaviours that are specific to customer interactions.

Study 2

Using a correlational research design, Study 2 aimed to provide initial evidence for the validity and reliability of the scale developed in Study 1. Through reliability analyses on the Study 2 data, and based on the sorting task conducted in Study 1, the number of scale items was reduced. Following item reduction, Study 2 assessed the dimensionality of the measure and established some evidence for its convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related (concurrent) validity.

The strength of the scale's correlation with the customer-adapted workplace incivility scale (Kern & Grandey, 2009) assessed convergent validity. Ideally, one would assess convergent validity by examining the strength of the correlation between measures

of the same construct using different measurement methods (Crocker & Algina, 2006).

However, the only other measure of customer incivility (to my knowledge) used the same

measurement method, and thus, this measure was used. The strength of the correlation

between the new scale and measures of psychological aggression, violence, and justice

(i.e., measures of different constructs using the same measurement method) assessed the

discriminant validity of the scale (Crocker & Algina, 2006). Moreover, the relationships

between the scale and outcome variables that it should theoretically be associated with

(Crocker & Algina, 2006)—job satisfaction, turnover intentions, job-related strain, and

general psychological strain—assessed concurrent validity (i.e., a type of criterion-related

validity).

Method

      Participants and recruitment procedure. Participants were recruited through a

number of means, including the Saint Mary's University Psychology Department's online

research participation system, flyers posted on bulletin boards in Halifax, Nova Scotia

(i.e., on the Saint Mary's University campus, Dalhousie University campus, and

community bulletin boards), and a newspaper advertisement in a local paper (i.e., The

Coast). Participants were also recruited by snowball sampling via emails to the

researchers' contacts and postings on social networking sites (i.e., Facebook). Participants

were required to be currently working in retail sales (e.g., sales associate, cashier) or

restaurant service (e.g., server, bartender) in Canada to participate in the study. They also

had to be at least eighteen years of age, have been working in their organization for a

minimum of six months,[3] and work at least 10 hours per week.[4] Students who registered

to participate through the Saint Mary's University Psychology Department's online

research participation system received one bonus point toward their final grade in a

psychology course. Other participants received their choice of $10 cash or an electronic

gift certificate to Chapters-Indigo Stores valued at $10.

In total, 92 participants took part in the study (55 were granted bonus points and

37 received $10 cash or a $10 gift certificate). Of the participants, (70 females, 20 males,

and 2 participants that did not report their sex), 50 were currently employed in retail sales

and 42 were currently employed in restaurant service. Participants worked between 10 to

50 hours per week ($M = 24.36$, $SD = 10.35$) and their ages ranged from 18 to 54 ($M =

22.68$, $SD = 4.65$). In addition, 96% of participants primarily interacted with customers on

a face-to-face basis and participants interacted with customers between 10% and 100%

($M = 79.86$, $SD = 22.08$) of their time at work. The majority of participants were

employed in the province of Nova Scotia ($n = 77$), although some participants reported

being employed in Alberta ($n = 6$), British Columbia ($n = 3$), Manitoba ($n = 1$),

Newfoundland ($n = 1$), Ontario ($n = 3$), and Saskatchewan ($n = 1$).

Measures.

Customer incivility scale. The scale developed in Study 1 measured the frequency

of participants' experiences with uncivil customer behaviour. Respondents indicated how

---

[3] I required participants to be employed for at least six months prior to participating because the timeframe for many of the scales was six months.

[4] Participants were required to work a minimum of 10 hours per week to increase the likelihood that they experienced the behaviours of interest.

often they experienced each of the behaviours while at their job over the past six months,

on a seven-point Likert-type scale, with labels of: "never", "once or twice", "monthly",

"weekly", "daily", "2-3 times per day", and "more than 3 times per day". For example,

participants were asked how often customers "...failed to say 'please' or 'thank-you' to

you." Higher scores on the scale indicated higher levels of experienced customer

incivility.

   Customer-adapted workplace incivility scale. A customer-adapted version (Kern

& Grandey, 2009) of the workplace incivility scale, originally created by Cortina and

colleagues (2001), assessed the convergent validity of the customer incivility scale. The

customer-adapted workplace incivility scale (Kern & Grandey, 2009) consisted of seven

items that inquired about the frequency of uncivil customer behaviours over the past six

months. For example, items asked if a customer had, "Made demeaning or derogatory

remarks about you" (A. A. Grandey, personal communication, December 1, 2009). The

timeframe of the scale was changed from the past two weeks to the past six months so

that all frequency-based scales measured behaviours over the same time period. As a

result, the scale anchors used by Kern and Grandey (0 = less than once/week, 1 = once or

twice/week, 2 = once or twice/day, 3 = several times each day, 4 = once or twice/hour, 5

= several times each hour) were not appropriate. Instead, the five-point scale from

Cortina and colleagues' (2001) measure, with anchors of "never", "once or twice",

"sometimes", "often", and "most of the time" was used. Higher scores on this scale

indicated a higher frequency of experienced customer incivility. This measure was

internally consistent (α = .90), with all item-total correlations above r = .61.

Customer psychological aggression. The aggression subscale from an unpublished scale assessed psychological aggression from customers (E. K. Kelloway, personal communication, January 11, 2010). This subscale included six items that inquired about the frequency of aggressive customer behaviours (i.e., psychological aggression) within the last six months on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Frequently). A sample item is "Customers yelled at me". Higher scores on this scale indicated a higher frequency of experienced customer aggression. I deleted one item ("Customers were condescending") from the scale as 33% of sorting task participants rated it as assessing aggression and 50% rated it as assessing incivility. The remaining five-item scale was internally consistent ($\alpha = .93$), with all item-total correlations above $r = .73$.

Customer violence. The Violence at Work Scale (Rogers & Kelloway, 1997) was adapted to measure violence from customers. This scale asked respondents to indicate the frequency of violent events that they experienced at work in the past six months on a four point scale with labels of "never", "once", "two or three times", and "four or more times". For example, one item asked, "Have you been spat on or bitten by customers while you've been at work?" In addition, one item (i.e., "have you been sworn at while you've been at work?") was removed because it overlapped with an item on the customer aggression scale. Higher scores on the scale indicated a higher frequency of violence from customers. The measure was internally consistent ($\alpha = .90$), with all item-total correlations above $r = .63$.

Customer justice. Interpersonal justice from customers was measured using an adapted version of the interpersonal justice subscale from the Organizational Justice

Measure (Colquitt, 2001). This subscale included four items that were measured on a five-point scale with labels of "to a very small extent", "to a small extent", to a moderate extent", "to a large extent", and "to a very large extent". I modified the instructions to reflect justice from customers over the last six months. One sample item asked, [To what extent] "Have customers treated you with dignity?" Higher scores on this scale reflected greater perceptions of interpersonal justice from customers. The measure was internally consistent ($\alpha = .90$), with all item-total correlations above $r = .68$.

Job-related strain. Participants completed the six-item Job Induced Tension Scale to assess job-related strain (House & Rizzo, 1972). This scale measured strain on a seven-point Likert type scale, with anchors ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Participants indicated their level of agreement with items such as, "Problems associated with work have kept me up at night". Higher scores on this scale indicated a higher level of job-induced tension. The measure was internally consistent ($\alpha = .94$) and all item-total correlations were higher than $r = .61$.

General psychological strain. The 12-item version of the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) assessed global strain (Banks, Clegg, Jackson, Kemp, Stafford, & Wall, 1980). This scale can identify minor levels of psychological disorders (e.g., depression) in the general population. Items were measured on a seven-point scale with labels of "not at all", "rarely", "once in a while", "some of the time", "fairly often", "often", and "all of the time". A sample item asked, "Have you recently been feeling reasonably happy all things considered?" (Reverse-keyed). Higher scores on the GHQ indicated higher levels of minor psychological disorders. The scale was internally consistent ($\alpha = .91$) and all item-total correlations were above $r = .41$.

Job satisfaction. The Index of Job Satisfaction by Brayfield and Rothe (1951) assessed job satisfaction. Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed with 18 statements such as "My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored". Items were rated on a five point Likert type scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" where higher scores indicated higher job satisfaction. The scale was internally consistent ($\alpha = .94$) and all item-total correlations were higher than $r = .23$.

Turnover intentions. Participants' turnover intentions were measured with four items taken from Camman, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1983) and Barling, Rogers, and Kelloway (2001). These items inquired about participants' current intentions to quit their job. For example, one item stated, "I have discussed the possibility of leaving my current job with a friend or family member". Participants rated items on a seven point Likert type scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". The scale was internally consistent ($\alpha = .91$) and all item-total correlations were higher than $r = .76$.

Procedure. Potential participants obtained the website address for the study from the recruitment materials (e.g., posters, emails, newspaper advertisement). The website re-directed participants to one of two versions of the survey. One version had the outcome measures (i.e., strain, job satisfaction, and turnover intent) prior to the workplace deviance measures (e.g., incivility, aggression, and justice scales). The second version of the survey had the workplace deviance measures prior to the outcome measures. I counterbalanced order to reduce possible priming effects. Prior to beginning the survey, informed consent was obtained electronically (see Appendix C).

Results

Data cleaning and screening. Prior to any statistical analysis, I examined the

demographic responses of all cases to ensure that participants met the study inclusion

criteria. I excluded three participants because they had not worked in their current job for

at least six months and eight participants because they were not employed in the retail

sales or restaurant industries (e.g., one participant worked as a security guard and another

worked as a receptionist in a salon). I excluded two additional cases because the

participants appeared to have stopped completing the survey and fully completed the

survey later (as indicated by similar answers to the demographic questions). These

thirteen cases were not included in the sample size of 92 for the study. In addition, I

conducted the main analyses with and without two possibly problematic cases to

determine if their inclusion made a significant difference to the results. Specifically, it

was unclear whether one participant's job was truly customer service as they reported

being a fast food restaurant cook, but interacted with customers 25% of their time at

work. In addition, I suspected an entry error on the part of a second participant as they

reported working in their current job for 1 year, 8 months, but reported only working in

their current organization for 4 months. As the participant left the "years" box empty, I

suspect that they intended to enter '4' into the "years" box.[5] Prior to testing the

hypotheses, all variables were screened for out of range values, outliers, non-random

missing data, linearity, normality, independence of observations, and multicollinearity

---

[5] The significance levels of the correlation analyses conducted excluding these cases did
not change from when the cases were retained. Thus, these cases were left in the analyses.

following the procedures recommended by Meyers, Gamst, and Guarino (2009). I

conducted all procedures using SPSS 16.0.

Missing data. I conducted an SPSS Missing Values Analysis to test the pattern of

missing data at the item level. Little's MCAR test was not significant (χ^2 = 2149.30, df =

2121, p = .33), indicating that the data points were missing completely at random. This

analysis revealed less than 5% missing data for each of the variables, except for one item

(i.e., how often have your customers ignored or excluded you from social interactions at

work?) on the customer-adapted workplace incivility scale (Kern & Grandey, 2009) that

had 13% missing data. Participants may not have responded to this item because of

confusion over what the item meant. Often times, retail and restaurant industry employees

interact with their customers on an encounter basis (Gutek et al., 1999), and as a result,

there may have been some confusion over what "social interaction" with customers

meant. In addition, this is a double-barrelled item; if participants experienced only one of

the behaviours (e.g., been excluded but not ignored) they may have been confused as to

how they should respond (Clark & Watson, 1995). I examined the correlation between the

new customer incivility scale and the customer-adapted workplace incivility scale with

and without this item included. The magnitude and significance of the relationships were

the same and thus, I retained the item.

Concerning case wise missing data, four cases showed substantial missing data

(i.e., over 10%) at the item level. Since there are currently no adequate empirical

guidelines for dealing with item level and case wise missing data (Tabachnick & Fidell,

2007; Roth, Switzer, & Switzer, 1999), I formed composite (scale) variables by

calculating the mean of the participants' responses, allowing for one missing value (or 2

missing values if there were over 15 items) on each scale. I conducted all further analyses

using listwise deletion, a conservative method of dealing with missing values (Meyers et

al., 2009). As a result, these four cases (with significant missing data) and six additional

cases (with between two to three missing values at the item level) were excluded from the

reliability, factor, and correlation analyses, reducing the N to 82.

Outliers. There were four univariate outliers (i.e., cases with scores greater than

four standard deviations from the mean on any one item) on the customer violence scale.[6]

Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2002) suggest that outliers are best left alone if they are

in small numbers (less than 1% to 2% of N) and non-extreme. Although the four outlier

cases constitute five percent of N, the violence scale scores were not extreme (scores were

between 1.43 and 1.57 on the composite scale, where 0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = two or

three times, and 3 = four or more times) and thus, they were retained in the analyses. I

also screened for multivariate outliers using two approaches. First, I computed

Mahalanobis distance for each case on the nine study variables (Meyers et al., 2008). The

results showed that there were no multivariate outliers ($p < .001$). Second, I computed

Cook's distance for each case on the study variables. This statistic revealed four

multivariate outliers. I ran the correlation analyses with and without these four cases. The

correlation between general psychological strain and customer incivility was significant

with the outliers included in the analysis, ($r = .22, p < .05, n = 82$), and was only

---

[6] I conducted the proposed correlation analyses examining the relationship between
customer violence and customer incivility with and without these cases. The magnitude of
the correlation was stronger when the outliers were excluded ($r = .48, p < .001, n = 78$)
than when they were included ($r = .21, p = .06, n = 82$) in the analysis.

marginally significant when the outliers were excluded ($r = .21$, $p = .06$, $n = 78$). Since

the outliers did not appear to affect the results substantially, I included the outliers in the

analyses.

Assumptions. Variables did not have major violations of the assumptions of

linearity, normality, independence of observations, and multicollinearity, with the

exception of the normality of the customer violence scale. The skewness and kurtosis of

the customer violence scale were high, 3.11 ($SE = .25$) and 9.23 ($SE = .50$), respectively.[7]

As the occurrence of workplace violence is uncommon in many studies (e.g., Rogers and

Kelloway, 1997, used the same violence measure; their scale mean was .86, $SD = .37$),

the analyses were conducted without any corrections for non-normality.[8]

Potential survey version (order) and reward effects. I conducted four hierarchical

moderated multiple regression analyses to test for order effects for the two different

versions of the survey (predictors before criteria and vice versa). The four regressions

each included the same predictor variables (i.e., customer incivility, order, and the

incivility x order interaction) and a different dependent variable (i.e., job satisfaction,

turnover intentions, job-related strain, and general psychological strain). I entered the

---

[7] For data analyses, I recoded items on the violence scale from 0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = two or three times, and 3 = four or more times to 1 = never, 2 = once, 3 = two or three times, and 4 = three or more times.

[8] To assess the possible effects of violating the assumption of normality on the violence scale, I dichotomized the variable by recoding responses of never to 0, and once, two or three times, and four or more times to 1. The correlations between the customer incivility scale and the dichotomized violence scale, $r (82) = .24$, $p < .05$, and the customer incivility scale and the continuous violence scale, $r (82) = .21$, $p = .06$, differed in terms of significance but were very similar in magnitude.

main effects of customer incivility (centred) and order (dummy-coded) on Step 1. On

Step 2, I added the customer incivility x order interaction to the model. Aiken and West

(1991) suggest that interactions that account for greater than 1% of criterion variance

should be taken seriously.

The customer incivility x order interaction accounted for more than 1% of the

variance in job satisfaction, $\beta = .21$, $p = .14$, $\Delta R^2 = .02$. The correlation between customer

incivility and job satisfaction in the survey version with the outcome measures (i.e., job

satisfaction, turnover intentions, job-induced tension, and general psychological strain)

prior to the customer deviance measures (i.e., incivility, aggression, justice, and violence)

was higher and was significant, r (37)= -.52, $p < .01$, compared to the survey with the

customer deviance measures prior to the outcome measures, r (45)= -.16, $p = .30$. The

customer incivility x order interaction also accounted for more than 1% of the variance in

turnover intentions, $\beta = -.17$, $p = .26$, $\Delta R^2 = .02$. The correlation between customer

incivility and turnover intentions in the survey version with the outcome measures prior

to the customer deviance measures was higher and was significant, r (37) = .44, $p < .05$,

compared to the survey with the customer deviance measures prior to the outcome

measures, r (45) = .19, $p = .21$. However, the correlations (between customer incivility

and the outcome measures) within each survey version were in the expected direction

(i.e., for customer incivility and job satisfaction both correlations were negative and for

customer incivility and turnover intent both correlations were positive). With a larger

sample, the correlations between the customer incivility measure and the outcome

variables for the survey with the customer deviance measures prior to the outcome

measures would likely become significant. The customer incivility x order interaction did

not account for more than 1% of the variance in job-related strain, $\beta = .10$, $p = .55$, $\Delta R^2 =$ .004, or general psychological strain, $\beta = -.07$, $p = .66$, $\Delta R^2 = .002$. There were also no main effects of order ($ps > .05$) on any of the dependent variables.

I also conducted four hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses to test for differences between the two types of compensation offered to participants (1 bonus point in a psychology course versus $10). Similar to testing for order effects, the four regressions each included the same predictor variables (i.e., customer incivility, compensation, and the incivility x compensation interaction) and a different dependent variable (i.e., job satisfaction, turnover intentions, job-related strain, and general psychological strain). I entered the main effects of customer incivility (centred) and compensation (dummy-coded) on Step 1. On Step 2, I added the customer incivility X compensation interaction to the model. There were no main effects of compensation ($ps > .05$) nor any incivility x compensation interactions ($ps > 05$). Further, all interactions accounted for less than one percent of the criterion variance (Aiken & West, 1991). These findings suggest that no effects of type of reward were present.

Refinement of the customer incivility scale. Factor analysis is the most commonly used statistical technique for refining constructs (Ford, McCallum, & Tait, 1986). However, in the current study the sample size was not sufficiently large to conduct this analysis. For example, Hoelter (1983) has recommended a conservative sample size of at least 200 participants. Other researchers recommend between four participants (Rummel, 1970) and ten participants (Schwab, 1980) per scale item. As the customer incivility scale has 24 items, I would need at least 96 to 240 cases, respectfully, to proceed with a factor analysis. Adequate sample sizes are necessary to ensure that the

estimates of the standard errors are stable and as a result, that the factor loadings are

accurate reflections of the true population values (Hinken, 1998). Thus, following more

conservative sample size estimates (Hoelter, 1983; Schwab, 1980), I reduced the number

of items in the scale prior to proceeding with a factor analysis.

There is no generally accepted number of items to measure a construct (Hinken,

1998). Thurstone (1947) recommended that scales should include the fewest number of

items that adequately measure the construct (as cited in Hinken, 1998). Also arguing for

simple structure, Cortina (1993) reported that scales with many items might have high

internal consistency reliabilities even when inter-item correlations are low. Thus,

reducing the 24-item scale would likely cause minimal impact on scale reliability.

On the sorting task discussed in Study 1 (see Table 1), students rated seven items

as "uncivil" less than 75% of the time (Hinken, 1998). These items were included in

Study 2 with the intent of determining scale dimensionality using factor analysis.

However, due to the sample size, unstable results were possible if I would have conducted

a factor analysis with 24 items. As a result, I deleted these seven items from the scale.

Next, I conducted a reliability analysis on the remaining 17 items. The Cronbach's

alpha for the scale was .96 and all item-total correlations were greater than $r = .61$. In

addition, all inter-item correlations were between .30 and .87. Based on Hinken's (1995;

1998) recommendations, I examined the item-total correlations, inter-item correlations (if

one item correlates less than .4 with all other items Kim and Mueller,1978, recommend

deleting the item from the scale), and the change in Cronbach's alpha if individual items

were deleted. This procedure identified two items that were candidates for deletion. The

first item showed inter-item correlations less than .4 with five other items, had the lowest

item-total correlation ($r = .61$), and would not decrease the Cronbach's alpha reliability if deleted. The second item correlated less than .4 with three other items, showed one of the lowest item-total correlations ($r = .66$), and would not decrease the Cronbach's alpha reliability if deleted. Thus, I dropped these two items from the scale, leaving 15 items in the final scale.

The 15-item scale had a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .96, indicating very good scale reliability. Corrected item-total correlations ranged from $r = .65$ to $r = .83$. Cronbach's coefficient alpha and corrected item-total correlations did not differ substantially between the retail sales employees ($\alpha = .96$ and item-total correlations were all above $r = .66$) and the restaurant service employees ($\alpha = .96$ and item-total correlations were all above $r = .63$), suggesting that both groups had similar response patterns to the items. This finding suggests that the items are relevant to both contexts and that the items tap a similar construct.

With 15 items (versus the original 24 items), the sample size was sufficient for factor analysis according to estimates that are more liberal (Rummel, 1970). I thus conducted an exploratory factor analysis using a principal components extraction method and a varimax rotation on the 15 remaining customer incivility items. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .93, indicating that the data were suitable for principal components analysis. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < .001$), indicating sufficient correlation between the variables to proceed with the analysis. Using the Kaiser-Guttman retention criterion of eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and by examining the scree plot, a one-factor solution provided the clearest extraction. The one-factor solution suggests that the customer incivility scale measures a homogeneous construct.

The single factor accounted for 61.56% of the total variance. Table 2 presents the fifteen

items, item names, means, standard deviations, factor loadings, and communality

estimates. Communalities were moderate for each of the fifteen items, with a range of .48

to .74.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Factor Loadings and Communalities (h^2) of the

Customer Incivility Items from the Principal Components Analysis with Varimax

Rotation

Variable	Item Name	Mean	Standard Deviation	Component Loading	h^2
CIS2	...not given you their full attention.	3.90	1.83	.70	.49
CIS4	...failed to follow societal norms for appropriate behaviour in public (e.g., butting in line, excessive loudness).	3.55	1.63	.76	.59
CIS5	...complained to you about the value of goods and services.	3.52	1.49	.74	.54
CIS7	...made an unnecessary mess for you to deal with.	3.88	1.73	.77	.59

CIS8	...used an inappropriate manner of addressing you (e.g., "Hey you").	3.61	1.75	.86	.74
CIS9	...made inappropriate gestures to get your attention (e.g., snapping fingers).	3.33	1.53	.82	.67
CIS10	...failed to say "please" or "thank-you" to you.	4.60	1.77	.78	.61
CIS11	...conveyed that they expected freebees, discounts, or better service because of their perceived status (e.g., friends, "regulars").	3.66	1.51	.70	.49
CIS12	...pestered you to make exceptions to company policy.	3.64	1.65	.82	.67
CIS13	...failed to acknowledge your efforts when you have gone out of your way to help them.	3.98	1.54	.86	.74
CIS15	...not been mindful of their children's actions (e.g., children break something).	3.46	1.53	.69	.48

CIS16	...become annoyed when you would not stop what you were doing to help them.	3.14	1.59	.82	.67
CIS18	...tried to scam returns, discounts, or free products from you.	3.23	1.61	.81	.66
CIS22	...made gestures (e.g., eye rolling, sighing) to express their impatience.	3.34	1.48	.81	.65
CIS23	...continued to complain despite your efforts to assist them.	3.14	1.42	.80	.65

Convergent and discriminant validity. Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among all study variables. In regards to convergent and discriminant validity, I conducted correlation analyses to determine the relationships between the customer incivility scale and the customer-adapted workplace incivility scale, psychological aggression scale, workplace violence scale, and interpersonal justice scale. Showing some support for the convergent validity of the scale, there was a significant positive relationship between the customer incivility scale and the customer-adapted workplace incivility scale, $r(82) = .69, p < .001, r^2 = .48$.

With respect to discriminant validity, the customer incivility scale showed a significant positive relationship, $r(82) = .58, p < .001, r^2 = .34$ with the customer

aggression scale. The customer incivility scale was also positively related to customer violence, however, this relationship was only marginally significant, r (82) = .21, p = .06, r^2 = .04. The customer incivility scale was also significantly related to the interpersonal justice measure, r (82) = -.41, p < .01, r^2 = .17. Providing some support for the discriminant validity of the scale, discriminant validity coefficients were less than the internal consistencies of the measures and the convergent validity coefficient (Crocker & Algina, 2006).

Concurrent validity: Tests of Hypotheses 1-3b. I conducted correlation analyses to evaluate the hypothesized relationships between the customer incivility scale and the criterion variables: job satisfaction, turnover intentions, job-related strain, and general psychological strain. In line with Hypothesis 1, there was a significant negative correlation between customer incivility and employees' job satisfaction, r (82) = -.31, p < .01, r^2 = .10. Employees who experienced greater customer incivility reported lower job satisfaction. Supporting Hypothesis 2, there was a significant positive association between customer incivility and turnover intentions, r (82) = .31, p < .01, r^2 = .10. Employees who experienced greater customer incivility reported greater intentions to leave their current job. In line with Hypothesis 3a, customer incivility was significantly and positively correlated with job-induced tension, r (82) = .32, p < .01, r^2 = .10. Supporting Hypothesis 3b, there was also a significant positive relationship between customer incivility and general psychological strain, r (82) = .22, p < .05, r^2 = .05. Thus, employees who reported greater customer incivility showed greater job-induced tension and greater minor psychological disorders (e.g., depression, anxiety).

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among the Study Variables

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Customer incivility scale	3.59	1.26	(.96)								
2. Customer-adapted workplace incivility scale	2.21	.84	.69**	(.90)							
3. Customer justice	3.72	.81	-.41**	-.49**	(.90)						
4. Customer psychological aggression	1.94	1.07	.58**	.63**	-.56**	(.92)					
5. Customer violence	1.15	.35	.21†	.31**	-.25*	.52**	(.90)				
6. Job satisfaction	4.29	1.16	-.31**	-.30**	.56**	-.53**	-.17	(.94)			
7. General psychological strain	3.00	1.12	.22*	.23*	-.45**	.32**	.31**	-.62**	(.91)		
8. Job-related strain	3.30	1.12	.32**	.29**	-.50**	.35**	.28*	-.62**	.79**	(.91)	
9. Turnover Intentions	4.51	1.82	.31**	.27*	-.26*	.33**	.08	-.68**	.48**	-.51**	(.91)

Notes. N = 82. Internal consistency reliabilities (via Cronbach's coefficient alphas) are reported in parentheses on the diagonal. For the job satisfaction, general psychological strain, job-related strain, turnover intentions, customer aggression, and customer incivility (developed in Study 1) scales, items were measured on seven-point scales. For the customer-adapted workplace incivility and customer justice measures, items were measured on five-point scales. Customer violence items were measured on a four-point scale. All scales were coded such that higher values indicate more of the construct.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, † marginal significance ($p = .06$).

Discussion

Study 2 reduced the number of items in the customer incivility scale using the results of a sorting task (from Study 1) and reliability analyses, and assessed the psychometric properties of the shortened scale. Evidence of convergent validity was not as strong as expected; the correlation between the two measures of customer incivility was only moderate. Providing evidence of discriminant validity, the relationships between the customer incivility scale and three related constructs—customer justice, customer aggression, and customer violence—were lower than the scales' reliability indices (i.e., Cronbach's coefficient alphas) and the convergent validity correlation coefficient (Crocker & Algina, 2006). In addition, evidence for concurrent validity was indicated by significant correlations between the customer incivility scale and four work and health related variables: job satisfaction, turnover intentions, job-related strain, and general psychological strain.

General Discussion

There has been much research examining workplace incivility from intra-organizational sources, including coworkers and supervisors. There is little research, however, on incivility from those outside of the organization, such as from customers. Research on more serious forms of customer deviance (e.g., customer aggression) suggests that there are significant organizational and employee consequences of customers mistreating employees (Grandey et al., 2007; LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002). As a first step to examining customer incivility, I developed and conducted preliminary validity and reliability assessments of a customer incivility scale.

Item Reduction and Scale Unidimensionality

Initially, there were 24 items in the customer incivility scale. I used the results of

the sorting task and examined the reliability analysis to reduce the scale to 15 items.

Researchers suggest that a measure with too few items might not sample the domain of

interest, but that scales should have as few items as possible to minimize response bias

and for parsimony (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). An exploratory factor analysis provided

evidence of simple structure as the 15-item scale is unidimensional. In line with these

findings, Cortina and colleagues (2001) also report that their workplace incivility scale is

unidimensional.

Convergent Validity

Due to the moderate correlation between the customer incivility scale and the

customer-adapted workplace incivility scale, and its similar correlation with the

discriminant validity measure, customer aggression, evidence of convergent validity was

not fully established. As the two customer incivility scales intend to measure the same

construct using the same measurement method, the correlation between these scales

should be very strong. The weaker than expected correlation between these scales may be

due to a number of factors. For example, the customer incivility scale includes some

context-specific items (e.g., customers conveyed that they expected freebees, discounts,

or better service because of their perceived status) that may be particular to customer-

employee interactions. The customer-adapted workplace incivility scale, on the other

hand, includes only items that appear to measure incivility more broadly as similar items

are also included on the coworker and supervisor incivility scale by Cortina and

colleagues (2001). As a result of the differences in the context specificity of the items,

one might expect a lower correlation with the customer incivility scale developed in the

current study.

Discriminant Validity

Relationships between the customer incivility scale and three related constructs—

customer justice, customer aggression, and customer violence—were lower than the

scales' reliability indices and the convergent validity correlation coefficient, providing

evidence for discriminant validity (Crocker & Algina, 2006). Concerning the relationship

between incivility and aggression, researchers have noted that these constructs are closely

related and in some cases (e.g., when the instigator intends to harm the target) may

overlap (Schat & Kelloway, 2005). In the current study, the customer incivility scale and

the customer aggression scale were moderately correlated and their shared variance was

34%, suggesting that these two constructs overlap yet are likely distinguishable.

Researchers also suggest that uncivil behaviour can lead to feelings of interactional

injustice if the target feels they have been treated unfairly (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

If the target retaliates with further unfairness, an incivility spiral may begin potentially

resulting in aggression or violence (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). In the current study, the

association between customer incivility and customer justice was moderate, suggesting

that incivility and judgments of justice are related, but distinguishable constructs. That is,

the moderate correlation found in the current study suggests that there may be times when

individuals do not perceive incivility as unfair, supporting the differentiation of the

constructs as done in Andersson and Pearson's incivility spiral model. More research is

needed to understand further the relationships between incivility, justice, and aggression. For example, using methods similar to those used by Glomb (2002), it would be fruitful to examine specific incivility incidents to gain an understanding of when uncivil interactions are perceived as unjust. In addition, to gain a better understanding the process of incivility spirals proposed by Andersson and Pearson (1999), future research could examine how uncivil incidents can lead to more serious forms of workplace deviance (e.g., aggression, violence).

Concurrent Validity

Supporting Hypothesis 1, employees who experienced greater customer incivility reported lower job satisfaction. This finding is in line with previous research on workplace incivility from coworkers and supervisors (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim et al., 2008; Spense-Laschinger et al., 2009) and on customer deviance constructs, including injustice and aggression (Getman & Gelfand, 2007; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Holmvall & Sidhu, 2007). The current findings extend previous research to suggest that low-grade disrespectful behaviours from customers (in addition to coworkers and supervisors) are associated with employees' affective reactions to their jobs.

Supporting Hypothesis 2, employees who experienced greater customer incivility reported greater turnover intentions. This finding is also consistent with previous research on incivility from coworkers and supervisors (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim et al., 2008; Spense-Laschinger et al., 2009) and on customer deviance (Gettman & Gefland, 2007; Grandey et al., 2002; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Holmvall & Sidhu, 2007; LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002). This finding extends previous work by suggesting that customer

incivility may lead employees to want to exit their organizations. This finding also suggests that battling incivility not only from those inside the organization, but also from those outside the organization, might prove fruitful for organizations interested in lowering employee turnover.

In line with Hypotheses 3a and 3b, employees who experienced greater customer incivility reported greater job-related strain and general psychological strain. These findings suggest that customer incivility influences feelings of strain induced by the job and employee well-being more broadly in the form of depression and anxiety. These findings are similar to studies reporting a positive relationship between emotional exhaustion and customer incivility (Kern & Grandey, 2006) and aggression (Grandey et al., 2004). The current research findings suggest that customer incivility is likely an important and impactful stressor for employees.

Limitations

The small sample size in Study 2 limited the types of statistical analyses that I could conduct. With more data, I could use more conventional item reduction and construct validity assessment techniques (i.e., exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses) on the entire set of items. I used the results of a sorting task and reliability indices to reduce the number of items on the scale. Some scale validation studies use only reliability indices to reduce the number of scale items; however, Hinken (1998) recommends exploratory or confirmatory factor analytic techniques to assess the dimensionality and construct validity of new scales. Thus, future research employing

these statistical techniques with a sufficiently large sample would aid in establishing

evidence for the psychometric properties of the customer incivility scale further.

Study 2 used a cross-sectional, self-report survey methodology. As such, there is a

possibility of monomethod bias inflating or deflating the correlations found in the study;

method variance is the variance attributable to the measurement methods as opposed to

the target construct (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Lee, 2003). Method variance can have a

substantial effect on observed relationships, potentially leading to misleading conclusions

(Campbell & Fiske, 1959). As such, Podsakoff and colleagues suggest designing studies

to limit the effect of method variance. For example, measuring predictor and criterion

variables from different sources or from the same source at different times,

counterbalancing question order, and protecting respondent anonymity are among the

suggested techniques. Following Podsakoff and colleagues' recommendations, I

counterbalanced the workplace deviance variables (i.e., customer incivility, aggression,

violence, and justice) and the outcome variables (i.e., job satisfaction, turnover intentions,

general psychological strain, job-related strain) to minimize common method biases, such

as priming and order effects (Podsakoff et al., 2003). However, the results are still

susceptible to monomethod bias as predictor and criterion variables were measured at the

same time, and all scales used the same measurement method. In addition to procedural

methods, there are also statistical methods to indicate the presence of monomethod bias,

including Harman's single-factor test (Podsakoff et al., 2003). This test involves entering

all of the study variables into a factor analysis (Podsakoff et al., 2003), which due to an

insufficient sample size, was not conducted. Future research using larger samples and

multiple methods of measurement is needed to further support the findings of the current study.

Another potential limitation to the current research pertains to the convenience sample that primarily consisted of students (In study 1, 97%; In study 2, 81%) who were part-time workers. As part-time employees work fewer hours per week, it is possible that the sample in Studies 1 and 2 experienced a lower frequency of uncivil customer behaviours compared to full-time employees. However, these employees were likely to have experienced similar uncivil customer behaviours to full-time employees. As such, it is likely that the list of uncivil customer behaviours generated in Study 1 were similar to those that I would have obtained from a sample of full-time workers.

The findings of Study 2 may lack generalizability (Gordon, Slade, & Schmitt, 1986) as this study investigated behavioural and attitudinal measures primarily among young employees. Many of the participants in Study 2 were 24 years of age and under (i.e., 86%), a population that researchers consider young workers (Loughlin & Barling, 1999). Researchers suggest that there may be differences between young and older workers. For example, Frone (2000) argued that young workers (i.e., those aged 16 to 21) are still developing interpersonal skills and thus, interpersonal conflict may be a significant stressor for these individuals. Frone's argument may mean that younger workers are more affected by customer incivility and as a result, might experience more stress. However, in a study by Statistics Canada (2003; as cited in Loughlin & Lang, 2004), young workers were reported to perceive less work stress in general compared to older workers. Thus, findings regarding older versus younger workers appear to be

inconclusive at this time. Future research should replicate the findings of Study 2 using a

broader age range and full-time employees to ensure generalizability and to assess

possible age and work status (full time vs. part time) differences.

Future Research

     The current study expands the research literature by providing initial reliability

and validity evidence for a measure of customer incivility. The results of the current study

are preliminary due to a small sample size. As noted earlier, future research should

include larger samples and broader statistical techniques (e.g., confirmatory factor

analysis) to provide further evidence for the validity of the scale.

     With respect to additional directions for future research, the customer incivility

scale was developed and validated with samples of restaurant and retail workers. To

evaluate whether these items adequately measure customer incivility in other service

contexts, the items need to be tested with other customer service employee samples, such

as in jobs where ongoing relationships between customers and employees are more likely

(e.g., bank tellers, insurance agents, and hairdressers).

     More research is also needed looking at the predictors (e.g., personality traits of

employees and customers) and outcomes (e.g., employees' organizational commitment)

of customer incivility to understand more about the nature and consequences of customer

mistreatment of service employees. As well, a multifoci approach, similar to that of

workplace aggression (Herschcovis & Barling, 2010) and justice research (Rupp &

Cropanzano, 2002), might provide insight into whether the predictors and outcomes of

workplace incivility differ by source. For example, Hershcovis and Barling (2010) report

that the strength of the relationships between aggression and outcome variables, including job satisfaction, intent to turnover, and affective commitment, differ by the source of the aggression (i.e., supervisors, coworkers, or organizational outsiders). Thus, the same may be true of incivility from different sources.

There may also be a difference between encounter-based and relationship-based employee-customer interactions. Gutek (1995) and Gutek and colleagues (1999) suggest that encounter and relationship type interactions differ in terms of the length of the interaction and the likelihood of the interaction reoccurring. It may be that outcomes (e.g., strain, job dissatisfaction) are different or are greater, depending on whether the interaction is relationship or encounter based, similar to the outcomes for different sources of aggression (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010). The participants in the current studies primarily interacted with customers on an encounter basis. As a result, these employees may experience more incivility than relationship-based interactions due to the anonymity in the employee-customer encounter. In Hershcovis and Barling's (2010) meta-analysis, aggression from those with whom employees had a relationship (i.e., supervisors and coworkers) was more strongly related to organizational strain (e.g., job dissatisfaction) than aggression from organizational outsiders (with whom employees, depending on their job, are less likely to have a relationship). This might suggest that employees feel more stress when experiencing deviant behaviour from customers with whom they have a relationship. More research is needed to investigate if the types of employee-customer interactions differentially relate to employee and organizational outcomes.

Conclusion

This research developed and established validity evidence for a customer incivility scale. To date, little research is available on customer incivility and thus, the results of the current study provide some insight into this phenomenon. Results provide evidence of the scale's discriminant and criterion-related validity as well as of its reliability. Findings also showed weak evidence for the scale's convergent validity. Further, significant associations between customer incivility and the outcome measures (i.e., job satisfaction, turnover intentions, job-related strain, and general psychological strain) suggest that incivility from customers is an important area of study for researchers and organizations.

References

Aiken L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Andersson, L., & Pearson, C. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiralling effect of incivility in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Review, 24*, 452-471.

Banks, M. H., Clegg, C. W., Jackson, P. R., Kemp, N. J., Stafford, E. M., & Wall, T. D. (1980). The use of the General Health Questionnaire as an indicator of mental health in occupational studies. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53*, 187-194.

Barker-Caza, B., & Cortina, L. (2007). From insult to injury: Explaining the impact of incivility. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 29*, 335-350.

Barling, J, Rogers, A. G., & Kelloway, E. K. (2001). Behind closed doors: In-home workers experience of sexual harassment and workplace violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(3), 255-269.

Ben-Zur, H., & Yagil, D. (2005). The relationship between empowerment, aggressive behaviours of customers, coping, and burnout. *European Journal of Work and Occupational Psychology, 14*, 81-89.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria for fairness. In B. Sheppard (Ed.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1996). Beyond distrust: "Getting even" and the need for revenge. In R. M. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations.* (pp. 246-260). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35*, 307-311.

Byers, P. Y., Zeller, R. A., Byers, B. D. (2002). Focus group method. In M. W. Wiederman & B. E. Whitley, Jr. (Eds.), *Handbook for conducting research on human sexuality* (pp. 173-193). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Camman, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G., & Klesh, J. (1983). Assessing attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. Seashore, E. Lawlor, P. Mirvis, & C. Camman (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices* (pp. 71-138). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*, 81-105.

Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety. (2008). *Violence in the workplace.* Retrieved from http://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/psychosocial/violence.html

Clark, L. A., Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 309-319.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioural sciences* (3rd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386-400.

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 98-104.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Hunter Williams, J., & Day Langhout, R. (2001). Incivility

in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,*

6(1), 64-80.

Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (2006). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory.*

Mason, OH: Thomson Wadsworth.

Cronbach, L. J. (1988). Internal consistency tests: Analyses old and new. *Psychometrika,*

53, 60-70.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. C. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests.

Psychological Bulletin, 52, 281-302.

Dormann, C., & Zapf, D. (2004). Customer-related social stressors and burnout. *Journal*

of Management, 9(1), 61-82.

Ford, J. K., MacCallum, R. C., & Tait, M. (1986). The application of exploratory factor

analysis in applied psychology: A critical review and analysis. *Personnel*

Psychology, 39, 291-314.

Frone, M. R. (2000). Interpersonal conflict at work and psychological outcomes: Testing

a model among young workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(2),

246-255.

Gettman, H. J., Gelfand, M. J. (2007). When the customer shouldn't be king: Antecedents

and consequences of sexual harassment by clients and customers. *Journal of Applied*

Psychology, 92(3), 757-770.

Glomb, T. M. (2002). Workplace anger and aggression: Informing conceptual models

with data from specific encounters. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,*

7(1), 20-36.

Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to

conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(1), 95-

110.

Grandey, A., Dickter, D., & Sin, H. (2004). The customer is not always right: Customer

aggression and emotion regulation of service employees. *Journal of*

Organizational Behaviour, 25, 397-418.

Grandey, A. A., Kern, J. H., & Frone, M. R. (2007). Verbal abuse from outsiders versus

insiders: Comparing frequency, impact on emotional exhaustion, and the role of

emotional labour. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(1), 63-79.

Grandey, A. A., Tam, A. P., & Brauburger, A. L. (2002). Affective states and traits in the

workplace: Diary and survey data from young workers. *Movitation and Emotion,*

26(1), 31-55.

Greenberg, L., & Barling J. (1999). Predicting employee aggression again coworkers,

subordinates, and supervisors: The roles of person behaviours and perceived

workplace factors. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 20,* 897-913.

Gordon, M. E., Slade, L. A., & Schmitt, N. (1986). The "science of the sophomore"

revisited: From conjecture to empiricism. *Academy of Management Review, 11,*

191-207.

Gutek, B. A. (1995). *The dynamics of service: Reflections on the changing nature of customer/provider interactions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gutek, B. A., Bhappu, A. D., Liao-Troth, M. A., & Cherry, B. (1999). Distinguishing between service relationships and encounters. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(2), 218-233.

Harrison, D. A., & McLaughlin, M. E. (1993). Cognitive processes in self-report responses: Tests of item context effects in work attitude measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(1), 129-140.

Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Towards a mulyi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 31*, 24-44.

Hinken, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*(1), 104-121.

Hinken, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management, 2*(5), 967-988.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1988). *The ecology of stress*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing Conservation of Resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50*(3), 337-421.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hoelter, J. W. (1983). The analysis of covariance structures: Goodness-of-fit indices. *Sociological Methods and Research, 11*, 325-344.

Holmvall, C., & Sidhu, J. (2007). Predicting customer service employees' job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The roles of customer interactional injustice and interdependent self-construal. *Social Justice Research, 20*, 479-496.

House, R. & Rizzo, J. (1972). Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 7*, 467-505.

Johnson, P. R., & Indvik, J. (2001). Rudeness at work: Impulse over restraint. *Public Personnel Management, 30*, 457-465.

Kern, J. H., & Grandey, A. A. (2009). Customer incivility as a social stressor: The role of race and racial identity for service employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*(1), 46-57.

Kim, J., & Mueller, C. W. (1978). *Introduction to factor analysis: What it is and how to do it.* Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.

LeBlanc, M., & Kelloway, K. (2002). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 444-453.

Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 95-107.

Loughlin, C. A., & Barling, J. (1999). The nature of youth employment quality. In J. Barling & K. Kelloway (Eds.), *Young workers: Varieties of experience* (pp. 17-36). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Loughlin, C., & Lang, K. (2005). Young workers. In J. Barling, K. Kelloway, & M. Frone

(Eds.), *Handbook of Work Stress* (pp. 405-430). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martin, R., & Hine, D. (2005). Development and validation of the uncivil workplace

behaviour questionnaire. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 10*, 477-490.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal

of Organizational Behaviour, 2*(2), 99-113.

Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G, & Guarino, A. J. (2006). *Applied multivariate research: Design

and interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miner-Rubino, K., & Cortina, L. M. (2007). Beyond targets: Consequences of vicarious

exposure to misogyny at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(5), 1254-1269.

Nassar-McMillan, S. C. & Borders, L. D. (2002). Use of focus groups in survey item

development. *The Qualitative Report, 7.* Retrieved February 26, 2009 from

http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR7-1/nassar.html

Pearson, C. M. (1999). Rude managers make for bad business. *Workforce, 78,* 18.

Pearson, C., Andersson, L., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace

incivility. *Organizational Dynamics, 29*(2), 123-137.

Pearson, C., Andersson, L., & Wegner, J. (2001). When workers flout convention: A

study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations, 54,* 1387-1419.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Lee, J-Y. (2003). Common method biases in

behavioural research: A critical review of the literature and recommended

remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-903.

Pratt, L. L., & Barling, J. (1999). Differentiating between daily events, acute, and chronic stressors: A framework and its implications. In J. Hurrell (Ed.), *Occupational stress: Issues and developments in research* (pp. 41-51). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Rogers, K., & Kelloway, E. K. (1997). Violence at work: Personal and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 2*(1), 63-71.

Roth, P. L. (1994). Missing data: A conceptual review for applied psychologists. *Personnel Psychology, 47*, 537-560.

Rummel, R. J. (1970). *Applied factor analysis.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 89*, 925-905.

Rupp, D. E., & Spencer, S. (2006). When customers lash out: The effects of customer interactional justice on emotional labor and the mediating role of discrete emotions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 971-978.

Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct validity in organizational behaviour. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behaviour* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Schat, A. C. H., & Kelloway, E. K. (2005). Workplace aggression. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace stress* (pp. 189-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of

distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology,*
82(3), 434-443.

Skarlicki, D. P., van Jaarsveld, D. D., Walker, D. D. (2008). Getting even for customer

mistreatment: The role of moral identity in the relationship between customer

interpersonal injustice and employee sabotage. *Journal of Applied Psychology,*
93(6), 1335-1347.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and*

consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Spence Laschinger, H. K., Leiter, M., Day, A., Gilin, D. (2009). Workplace

empowerment, incivility, and burnout: Impact on staff nurse recruitment and

retention outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Management, 17,* 302-311.

Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. N. (1990). *Focus groups: Theory and practice.*

Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Statistics Canada. (2010). Industry – North American Classification System 2002 (433A),

Sex and selected demographic, cultural, labour force, educational and income

characteristics for the population 15 years and over of Canada, provinces,

territories, census metropolitan areas and census agglomerations, 2006 Census –

20% sample data. Retrieved June 15, 2010, from

http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/tbt/Rp-

eng.cfm?LANG=E&APATH=3&DETAIL=0&DIM=0&FL=A&FREE=0&GC=0

&GID=0&GK=0&GRP=1&PID=97612&PRID=0&PTYPE=88971,97154&S=0&

SHOWALL=0&SUB=0&Temporal=2006&THEME=74&VID=0&VNAMEE=&

VNAMEF=

Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*(5th ed). Needham

Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tsai, W. C., & Huang, Y. M. (2002). Mechanisms linking employee affective delivery

and customer behavioural intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 1001-

1008.

Van Breukelen, W., Van der Vlist, R., & Steensma, H. (2004). Voluntary employee

turnover: Combining variables from the "traditional" turnover literature with the

theory of planned behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 25,* 893-914.

Vogt, D. S., King, D. W., King, L. A. (2004). Focus groups in psychological assessment:

Enhancing content validity by consulting members of the target population.

Psychological Assessment, 16(3), 231-243.

Warr, P. B. 1987, Work, Unemployment and Mental Health. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Appendix A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM – STUDY 1

Customer Experiences Study
Nicole Wilson
Department of Psychology, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, NS B3H 3C3
Phone 902-491-6219   Fax 902-496-8287   Nicole.Wilson1@smu.ca

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH

I am a Masters student in the Department of Psychology at Saint Mary's University. For my Master's thesis, I am conducting research under the supervision of Dr. Camilla Holmvall. I am inviting you to participate in my research study.

Low intensity deviant behaviours in the workplace, such as incivility, can affect psychological health and work performance. However, there is little research on incivility originating from customers. In the current study, we are seeking to learn more about uncivil customer behaviours with the intent of developing a scale to measure customer incivility.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE TO TAKE PART?

Students 18 years of age or older, who are currently employed in the retail sales (e.g., clothing sales assistant, cashier) or restaurant service (e.g., food or beverage server) are eligible to take part in this study.

WHAT DOES PARTICIPATING MEAN?

There are two parts to this study. First, you will be asked to complete a paper-and-pencil survey in which you will be asked to provide basic demographic information such as your age, gender, industry in which you work, and how many hours you work per week. You will also be provided with a definition of customer incivility and will be asked to provide a list of behaviours that are characteristic of customer incivility. Second, you will take part in a group discussion with your fellow participants. Each group member will be asked to share with the group the behaviours they came up with. We will then discuss whether the behaviour meets the three components of the definition of customer incivility. Additional questions pertaining to the definition of incivility and the outcomes of customer incivility will also be asked during the group discussion (e.g. how do you cope with customer incivility, how does your organization view customer incivility). I anticipate that the study will last no longer than 90 minutes.

WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF THIS RESEARCH?

You will benefit directly by receiving two bonus points for your participation in the study. In addition, the results of this study and subsequent studies will inform researchers and organizations about the behaviours that constitute customer incivility and the ways that customer incivility affects employees.

WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL RISKS FOR PARTICIPANTS?

There are minimal risks associated with participating in this study. Due to the focus group design of the study and the discussion of negative experiences you may have had with customers, you may feel uncomfortable, upset, or anxious during the study. If you require support in dealing with customer incivility, you may wish to talk to your work supervisor or your employee assistance program (if you have one). You may also wish to contact Ms. Sarah Morris, from Student Services (sarah.morris@smu.ca; 420-5601; Student Centre office 429) or the Metro Help Line, which provides information, counselling, crisis intervention, and referrals (421-1188).

HOW CAN I WITHDRAW FROM THIS STUDY?

Your participation is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. You may also choose not to answer any questions you do not feel comfortable answering (this pertains both to the survey and the focus group discussion). If you would like to withdraw from the study please let the researcher know. You will receive bonus marks, or a portion thereof, for the time you have spent in the study.

WHAT WILL BE DONE WITH MY INFORMATION? WHO WILL HAVE ACCESS TO IT?

Due to the focus group design of this study confidentiality and anonymity cannot be guaranteed. You will be involved in group discussions with 4 to 7 other participants. Please do not say your name, the name of other participants, or the name of the organization in which you work to ensure that your privacy is protect as much as possible. In addition, please do not share any information that is discussed during this session with any third parties.

Anonymity in the study is aided by assigning an identification number to the materials you complete during the study. By using identification numbers, your name will not be placed in the questionnaires. Also, this identification number will not be linked to your name in our files. The session will be tape recorded, although access to this information will be limited to myself and my research supervisor. Please do not write or say any identifying information on any of the forms, materials, or the tape recorder. Materials will be kept in boxes in a locked private data storage room. All questionnaires from this study will be destroyed in seven years post publication. This consent form will be sealed in an

envelope and stored separately from the forms, materials, and tapes. All data from this study will be presented as a group in any publication of this work, and no individual participants will be identified.

HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION OR FIND OUT MORE ABOUT THIS STUDY?

If you have any questions, contact Nicole Wilson at 902-491-6219 or Nicole.Wilson1@smu.ca, or the research supervisor, Dr. Camilla Holmvall at 902-491-6210 or Camilla.Holmvall@smu.ca

CERTIFICATION

This research has been reviewed and approved by the Saint Mary's University Research Ethics Board. If you have any questions or concerns about ethical matters, you may contact Dr. Jim Cameron, Chair of the Saint Mary's University Research Ethics Board at ethics@smu.ca or 420-5728.

I understand what this study is about and appreciate the risks and benefits. I have had adequate time to think about this and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can end my participation at any time.

Participant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Please keep one copy of this form for your own records.

Appendix B

PARTICIPANT RESPONSES FORM
Customer Service Experiences Study

Customer Incivility definition: "Workplace incivility is low-intensity deviant behaviour with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviours are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others" (Anderson & Pearson, 1999, p. 457).

Please write down any customer behaviours you have encountered that you believe fit this definition. As well, during the group discussion feel free to write down your thoughts. In case there is anything we may miss in the discussion, we will be collecting these sheets at the end of the study.

Appendix C

INFORMED CONSENT – STUDY 2
Employee Experiences Working in Customer Service Study
Saint Mary's University REB File Number 10-040

Nicole Wilson
Department of Psychology, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, NS B3H 3C3
Phone: 902-491-6219   Fax: 902-496-8287   Email: Nicole.Wilson1@smu.ca

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

I am a Master's student in the Department of Psychology at Saint Mary's University. For my Master's thesis, I am conducting research under the supervision of Dr. Camilla Holmvall and I am inviting you to participate in my research study. I am conducting this research to investigate employees' experiences working in customer service roles.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE TO TAKE PART?

Current employees in the retail sales (e.g., clothing sales assistant, cashier) or restaurant service (e.g., food or beverage server) sectors in Canada, who are 18 years of age or older, have been working in their current job for a minimum of six months, and work a minimum of 10 hours per week at their job, are eligible to take part in this study.

WHAT DOES PARTICIPATING MEAN?

You will be asked to complete an online survey in which you will be asked to provide basic demographic information such as your age, sex, industry in which you work, and how many hours you work per week. Next, you will be asked a series of questions related to your current job, your interactions with customers, coworkers, managers and supervisors on the job, your psychological and physical well being, and aspects of your personality. I anticipate that completing the survey will take no longer than 45 minutes. If you choose to participate, once you have clicked the *"Submit"* button at the end of the survey, you will receive an email confirmation that your responses have been received.

WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS FOR PARTICIPANTS?

If you registered for the study via the Saint Mary's University Psychology Department Sona Bonus Point System, you will benefit by receiving one bonus point in a psychology course of your choice. If you did not register via the Sona System, you will be offered the choice of $10 cash (to be picked up at Saint Mary's University, Halifax, NS), or an electronic gift certificate for Chapters-Indigo Stores valued at $10, for your participation in the study. This study will be ongoing until participation funds run out (on or before

July 31, 2010).

WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL RISKS FOR PARTICIPANTS?

There are minimal risks associated with participating in this study. Some of the survey questions may make you think of negative experiences that you may have had at work, including those with customers, and thus you may feel uncomfortable, upset, or anxious during the study. If you require support in dealing with any negative workplace experiences, you may wish to talk to your work supervisor or your employee assistance program (if you have one). You may also wish to contact the Halifax Metro Help Line, which provides information, counselling, crisis intervention, and referrals (421-1188), or your local Crisis or Help Line. If you are a Saint Mary's University student, you may also wish to contact Ms. Sarah Morris from Counselling Services (sarah.morris@smu.ca; 420-5601; Student Centre office 429). If you experience any negative reactions as a result of participating in this study, please contact the research supervisor (Dr. Camilla Holmvall, tel: 902-491-6210 or email: Camilla.Holmvall@smu.ca).

HOW CAN I WITHDRAW FROM THIS STUDY?

Your participation is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. You may also choose not to answer any questions you do not feel comfortable answering. If you would like to withdraw from the study, please click *"Next"* on the bottom of each page until you reach the *"Comments"* section. In the *"Comments"* box, please write that you would like to withdraw your participation from the study (please *do not* include your name), then click *"Submit"* so that your comment is logged. If you indicate that you would like to withdraw, any data you entered into the survey will be deleted and will not be included in the study results. You will still receive the bonus point or $10 (cash or gift certificate) for your participation in the study as your name and email address are stored in a database separate from your survey responses.

WHAT WILL BE DONE WITH MY INFORMATION? WHO WILL HAVE ACCESS TO IT?

In order to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of your data, Lime Survey stores your survey responses in a separate database from the contact information that you provided to obtain the survey link. Thus, your responses to the survey cannot be linked to your identity (i.e., your name and e-mail address). To this end, please *do not* include any identifying information (e.g., your name) in any part of the survey. Electronic data entered into Lime Survey is stored on a secure server hosted by Saint Mary's University. Printed materials will be kept in boxes in a locked private data storage room. All questionnaires from this study will be destroyed in seven years post publication. All data from this study will be presented as a group in any publication of this work, and no individual participants will be identified.

HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION OR FIND OUT MORE ABOUT THIS STUDY?

If you have any questions, contact Nicole Wilson at 902-491-6219 or Nicole.Wilson1@smu.ca, or the research supervisor, Dr. Camilla Holmvall at 902-491-6210 or Camilla.Holmvall@smu.ca.

CERTIFICATION

This research has been reviewed and approved by the Saint Mary's University Research Ethics Board (File number: 10-040). If you have any questions or concerns about ethical matters, you may contact Dr. Jim Cameron, Chair of the Saint Mary's University Research Ethics Board, at ethics@smu.ca or 902-420-5728.

Please read the statement below and check off the box if you agree to participate in this study.

I understand what this study is about and appreciate the risks and benefits. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can end my participation at any time.

SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY SINCE 1802
One University. One World. Yours.

PATRICK POWER LIBRARY

Department Office
T 902.420.5534
F 902.420.5561

Research Ethics Board Certificate Notice

The Saint Mary's University Research Ethics Board has issued an REB certificate related to this thesis. The certificate number is: _____09-231_____ .

A copy of the certificate is on file at:

Saint Mary's University, Archives
Patrick Power Library
Halifax, NS
B3H 3C3

Email: archives@smu.ca
Phone: 902-420-5508
Fax: 902-420-5561

For more information on the issuing of REB certificates, you can contact the Research Ethics Board at 902-420-5728/ ethics@smu.ca .