2015

BLACK AMERICANS’ EXPERIENCES OF INCIVILITY IN THE WORKPLACE: AN EXTENSION AND RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE WORKPLACE INCIVILITY SCALE

Kimberly E. Sherman
University of Massachusetts - Amherst, ksherman7@charter.net

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2

Recommended Citation

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 2014-current by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.
BLACK AMERICANS’ EXPERIENCES OF INCIVILITY IN THE WORKPLACE: AN EXTENSION AND RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE WORKPLACE INCIVILITY SCALE

A Dissertation Defense
By
KIMBERLY SHERMAN

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

MAY 2015

ISENBERG SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION STUDIES
BLACK AMERICANS’ EXPERIENCES OF INCIVILITY IN THE WORKPLACE: AN EXTENSION AND RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE WORKPLACE INCIVILITY SCALE

A Dissertation Presented

By

KIMBERLY SHERMAN

Approved as to style and content by:

________________________________________
Ronald Karren, Chair

________________________________________
Kerrita K. Mayfield, Member

________________________________________
Melissa S. Woodard, Member

________________________________________
Lawrence S. Zacharias, Member

George Milne, Director
Ph.D. Program
Isenberg School of Management
DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family. I know my mother and father would be proud of this work. The values they instilled in me in childhood have served me well throughout my life. I owe so much of my success to them. They provided strong roots for me to grow from.

My husband, Ken and son, Jack have given me the wings with which to fly. They kept me going with their support and inspiration. We earned this degree as a family. I will always be grateful.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks are extended to my dissertation chair, Dr. Ronald Karren for his guidance, patience, and humor during this process. I started on this journey a long time ago and he has supported me through it all. I am truly grateful that he allowed me to take my own path, even when the path may have seemed a bit circuitous. Sometimes it is what isn’t said that means the most. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Kerrita Mayfield, Dr. Melissa Woodard and Larry Zacharias for their unique insights and skills. You have all been great mentors to me in very different ways. I am a better scholar, teacher, and colleague because of your guidance.

I thank all my colleagues and friends for helping me through this entire process. I feel lucky to have such great support in so many areas of my life. It really is about the journey and you have all made it an enjoyable one. I hope that I can repay the favor someday.
ABSTRACT

BLACK AMERICANS’ EXPERIENCES OF INCIVILITY IN THE WORKPLACE: AN EXTENSION AND RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE WORKPLACE INCIVILITY SCALE

MAY 2015
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Ph.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
Directed by: Professor Ronald Karren

Over the last decade there has been increasing interest in incivility in the workplace. Workplace incivility has been defined as low-level, ambiguous, negative behaviors which are rude and discourteous and display a lack of regard for others (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). It has been suggested that incivility may, in some instances, be a manifestation of racism in the workplace (Cortina, 2008). However, research on the relationship between race and incivility has produced equivocal findings. One explanation for the lack of support may stem from the manner in which incivility has been conceptualized. To date, most research on incivility has been conducted using samples predominately comprised of white Americans. Few studies have specifically explored how Black Americans conceptualize and experience incivility. This omission may contribute to a conceptualization of incivility that is incomplete.

In order to address this gap, I conducted a mixed-methods study. The primary goals of this study were: (1) explore the domain of race-based incivility, with a specific focus on Black Americans; (2) create a race-based incivility scale that captures uncivil behavior that may be specific to the experiences of Black Americans; and (3) conduct
preliminary testing of the new scale to extend past research on incivility. In phase 1, seventeen interviews were conducted. The purpose of these interviews was to expand and refine the conceptualization of incivility to better reflect the experiences of Black Americans. Using data from these interviews an expanded workplace incivility scale was created. Phase 2 involved administering the survey and testing the scale’s reliability and validity. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted and resulted in a six-factor scale. Regression analyses results indicate that stress is positively correlated to incivility. Career satisfaction was also tested with mixed results. Finally, gender was found to be significantly correlated with incivility with female respondents reporting a higher frequency of incivility.

Findings from this research provide an important first step towards better understanding incivility as a potential manifestation of contemporary racism. Further, the results from this study contribute to the management literature by expanding our understanding of the experiences of Black Americans in the workplace.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

“Civility is basically respect for the dignity and the desire for dignity of other persons” (Shils, 1997, p. 338).

Civility is one of the ways in which we communicate respect for others (Boyd, 2006) and refers to the way in which we handle the encounter between self and others (Sypher, 2004). Civility involves tolerance and consideration for one another (Calhoun, 2000). Yet there seems to be a general decline in civility as rudeness increasingly becomes the norm (Putnam, 2000). This decline of civility has increasingly become the subject of lament both in popular media and in daily conversation (Calhoun, 2000). Perhaps one of the most notorious recent events that called civility into question for scholars and the general public alike was Congressman Joe Willson’s outburst of “You Lie!” during President Obama’s address to a joint session of Congress on September 9, 2009. This outburst set off a debate on issues of civility in the 21st Century (Robinson, 2011).

Civility, or rather incivility, has emerged as an area of interest in the workplace environment. Workplace incivility as a management construct to be examined was introduced by Andersson & Pearson (1999) and is defined as low-level, ambiguous, negative behaviors. Uncivil behaviors are “characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for the other” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; 457). A number of scholars have taken up the task of better understanding incivility – how it is manifest, patterns of behaviors, causes, and consequences. Recently, it has been suggested that incivility may not always be “general” but instead may represent contemporary manifestations of gender and racial bias in the workplace (Cortina, 2008). That is,
“selective” incivility may be a form of bias that is subtle and hard to identify and which may be unconscious even to the offender (Cortina, 2008). In such cases, individuals can mask discrimination behind the everyday acts of incivility. This notion of incivility as a form of subtle racism aligns closely with definitions of contemporary racism.

While evidence suggests that women do experience greater frequency of incivility than men (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta & Magley, 2011), thus supporting the argument that incivility may be a form of sexism, research on minorities and incivility has produced mixed results. These mixed findings are surprising since a number of other areas of study would seem to support the argument that minorities experience bias that manifests in low-level, negative, ambiguous interactions. Why then, have incivility studies found differences between genders but have not consistently shown differences between majority/minority group status when testing incivility? One possibility is that the domain covered by the most widely used survey of workplace incivility, the workplace incivility scale (WIS) is not broad enough to capture the incivility experienced by racial minorities in the workplace. Development of the WIS did not specifically include data from minority group members. This can create a methodological gap as research developed primarily based on majority group subjects should not be assumed to be reflective of the experiences of minority group members. Indeed, the manner in which white and Black Americans experience potentially negative workplace interactions may be different. This difference has yet to be explored in depth in the literature.

In order to address this gap and extend our understanding of workplace incivility, the present dissertation research will undertake a mixed-method study to develop and
validate a race-based incivility scale (RBIS). The primary goals of the research are to a) explore the broader domain of race-based incivility – specifically as Black Americans may experience incivility in the workplace, b) create an expanded workplace incivility scale that is inclusive of experiences that Black Americans would identify as incivility (i.e. a race-based incivility scale {RBIS}), and c) test/compare results from the WIS and RBIS to determine if the RBIS can more accurately measure the incivility experienced by Black Americans and, therefore, support the assertion that incivility may be a form of modern racism. In the first stage of the research, qualitative interviews will be conducted to develop an understanding of the ways in which Black Americans have experienced incivility in the workplace. Subsequent to the interviews, a focus group will be conducted to provide additional input and insight on workplace incivility and to assist in the creation of the RBIS. Once completed, the RBIS will be tested and validated as an improved scale for assessing the incivility experienced by Black Americans.

The current research will contribute to the management literature by expanding our understanding of the workplace incivility construct to better capture the lived-experiences of minorities, specifically Black Americans. If, as anticipated, the RBIS demonstrates that minorities experience a higher frequency of incivility than majority group members typically have reported, this research will also contribute to a more generalized discussion of workplace incivility as a possible form of subtle racism in the workplace. Finally, the design of this research is based on the belief that adopting the dominant/majority-group perspective on workplace experiences is neither necessary nor sufficient. Additional value is generated by incorporating the perspective of non-majority group members into the discussion and into the research practice itself.
In the next chapter, I will provide a review of the general incivility literature as well as the limited research that has included race as a variable of interest. I will then explore relevant research from a number of other fields, including social psychology, sociology, and counseling psychology. Findings from these areas would seem to support the assertion that Black Americans are likely to experience subtle, ambiguous and negative interactions that are predicated on racial bias. Following this, I will examine some of the potential reasons why incivility research has not been successful in identifying race (or racial bias) as one factor in predicting incivility. The final chapter in this proposal presents the specifics of my research plan.
CHAPTER 2
THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

Introduction
Acts of incivility have recently gained a lot of attention in our popular press and media. At the societal level, Putnam (2000) suggests that a rudeness epidemic has emerged as we become social isolates. At the same time, our world has become more challenging as a result of a greater reliance on high-tech, asynchronous, global interactions (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). These behaviors have been shown to have an impact on those who are the targets, bystanders, and even the instigators. Further, incivility may have negative impacts on organizations as a whole.

Workplace Incivility
What is Incivility?
Workplace incivility, as a construct to be studied, was first introduced by Andersson & Pearson (1999). They describe incivility as “low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p. 455). As described by Andersson & Pearson (1999), incivility comprises three distinguishing characteristics: low-level negative behavior, ambiguous intent, and a violation of workplace norms. Low-level negative behavior generally refers to rude and discourteous behaviors that demonstrate a disregard for others (Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000). In general, these behaviors are verbal rather than physical, passive rather than active, and indirect rather than direct (Baron &
Neuman, 1996). Kern & Grandey (2009, p. 47) describe incivility as a “daily hassle” – individual events that, when repeated over time, can become stressful and unpleasant.

The second characteristic of incivility is the ambiguous intent behind the actions (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000; Pearson, Andersson & Wegner, 2001). The ambiguous nature of incivility usually results in the instigator, target and/or observers being unsure of the actual motivation behind the behavior (Pearson, Andersson & Wegner, 2001). As a result, the instigator can deny intent (e.g., “it wasn’t meant as an attack,” “it was an accident”), suggest that the behavior was misinterpreted by the target (e.g., “I didn’t mean to be rude; I was just in a hurry,” “you misunderstood”) or imply a hypersensitivity on the part of the target (e.g., “don’t take it so personally”) (Bies, Tripp & Kramer, 1997; Vickers, 2006).

The final characteristic used to define incivility relates to norms of behavior. Workplace incivility is a violation of norms for respect in interpersonal relations (Brown & Levinson, 1987). While there is generally a common understanding that workplace incivility is a behavior that disrupts mutual respect in the workplace (Andersson & Pearson, 1999) and disregards expectations of how one should act (Kerr, 1983), it is hard to distinguish which behaviors, exactly, constitute absolute acts of incivility. What is uncivil in one organization may not be considered uncivil in another. Incivility may be defined differently in different settings or by different subcultures (Pearson, Andersson & Wegner, 2001). Individuals in the same workplace can have different expectations and personal norms of mutual respect (Montgomery, Kane, & Vance, 2004).

Uncivil behaviors can differ both in terms of the target of the incivility as well as the severity of the actions. Incivility can be directed at the organization (e.g., stealing
stationary, taking breaks that are too long, speaking about the company in unflattering terms) (Reio & Ghosh, 2009), coworkers in general (e.g., not turning off a cell phone in meetings, leaving a jammed printer for someone else to fix), or specific individuals. This last category, individuals, has been the focus of the majority of the incivility research. Researchers have defined this form of incivility using a broad range of both verbal and nonverbal behaviors. Some of the specific examples provided include the use of demeaning language and voice tone, making implicit threats against someone, ignoring requests from a co-worker, and demonstrating general disregard for another (Pearson et al., 2001).

**Antecedents to Incivility**

It has been suggested that incivility is on the rise because of the changing nature of work at the turn of the new millennium (Farkas & Johnson, 2002; Pearson et al., 2000; Putnam, 2000). Stability in the workplace has been replaced with downsizing, reengineering, budget cuts, temporary workers, and disrespectful and demeaning treatment (Gonthier, 2002). As organizations have flattened and gone casual, there are fewer obvious cues as to what constitutes “proper” business behavior (Martin, 1996; Morand, 1998). This can result in an increase in anti-social behaviors, including incivility.

While there has been a fair amount of speculation regarding the causes of incivility within organizations, the antecedents of incivility have received limited empirical investigation (Liu, Chi, Friedman, & Tsai, 2009). Only a few studies have specifically tested the relationship between incivility and its potential antecedents. Instead, much of
the speculation about what may precipitate incivility is derived from studies that examine related constructs such as bullying, harassment, etc. Research in these areas provides information regarding individual and organizational variables associated with anti-social behaviors and may suggest clues for similar antecedents to incivility.

Corporate initiatives such as employee diversity, reengineering, downsizing, and budget cuts are potential triggers for uncivil behavior as these changes often result in overwork -individuals forced to work to a state of exhaustion - and stress which can cause poor behavior (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000). One of the most cited organizational antecedents for incivility in the workplace is downsizing (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Blau & Andersson, 2005; Buhler, 2003; Vickers, 2006). Downsizing leads to the elimination of layers and positions, usually leading to fewer opportunities for promotions, increasing workloads and internal competition and increased pressure on employees to be more productive (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Gardner & Johnson, 2001; Salin, 2003). Downsizing may also increase general feelings of uncertainty and powerlessness. Ashforth (1989) and Bennett (1998) argue that employees who feel powerless are more likely to engage in destructive or interpersonally deviant behaviors in an attempt to restore justice or a sense of control. Further, downsizing may result in decreasing feelings of job security, which can increase incivility (Blau & Andersson, 2005; Buhler, 2003; Muir, 2000; Roscigno, Hodson, & Lopez, 2009). Just the fear of downsizing or corporate restructuring can cause undue stress on employees and increase workplace incivility (Roscigno et al. 2009).

Anecdotal and experimental evidence indicates that work and information overload leads to intensified feelings of time pressure and stress and can leave little time for being
polite (Pearson et al., 2000). In one survey, 40% of the respondents indicated that time pressure fuels uncivil behavior and that civility takes too much time (Pearson & Porath, 2004). In another study, when individuals were asked why they might be uncivil to a coworker, one of the justifications provided was the demand to get a lot done (Leiter et al., 2010). Work exhaustion was also found to be positively related to instigated workplace incivility (Blau & Andersson, 2005).

The overall culture of an organization may also play an important role in either enabling or inhibiting uncivil conduct (Cortina, 2008). Organizations that emphasize competition may be creating an aggressive environment that condones uncivil behaviors between colleagues (Preston, 2007). Employees who have competing goals or perceive that resources are limited are likely to experience a high degree of conflict. Further, instigators have justified their uncivil treatment of coworkers by positioning their actions as a “tough leadership style” which is used to motivate others (Preston, 2007).

Management philosophy is an important variable as organizational members often look to their leaders for clues about what constitutes acceptable behavior (Cortina, 2008). If management encourages efficiency, cost cutting and beating the competition at all costs, this may unintentionally encourage incivility as it creates a “siege mentality,” in which employees are pressured to produce more with fewer resources, which has been found to be a contributing factor to supervisor-subordinate incivility (Hornstein, 1996, p. 26).

Finally, factors unique to today’s work environment -- the shift to more casual work environments and increased use of technology -- have the potential to influence employees’ behaviors and enable increased incivility (Buhler, 2003; Gardner, 2001; Johnson & Indvik, 2001; Muir, 2000; Pearson et al., 2000; Vickers, 2006). Casual
workplaces provide fewer cues for what is appropriate interpersonal behavior (Gonthier, 2002; Pearson & Porath, 2005). As work environments have become informal, some of the long-standing cues about respect and politeness have vanished, making it more difficult for employees to discern acceptable behavior from unacceptable behavior (Pearson et al., 2000). Employees can be confused and ultimately conclude that “anything goes” (Gonthier, 2002, p. 7). This climate of informality may inadvertently encourage employees to behave in ways that are disrespectful to coworkers (Morand, 1998) and may contribute to an environment of incivility (Gardner & Johnson, 2001; Muir, 2000; Rau-Foster, 2004).

Increases in technology take a toll in two ways. First, the increased use of technology can make employees feel like they never get a break from work since they can, and sometimes must, be reachable and working (Buhler, 2003; Johnson & Indvik, 2001; Vickers, 2006), which can contribute to the levels of stress felt by individuals. Second, technology has changed the social dynamics in the workplace. The increased use of technology – voice mail, e-mail, and teleconferencing -- takes away the human element in interactions while at the same time increasing the number, complexity, and fragmentation of workplace relationships (Pearson et al., 2000). The lack of face-to-face contact allows for responses that would likely not occur in person, can contribute to misunderstandings, and may provide an excuse for inappropriate behavior (Gardner & Johnson, 2001; Muir, 2000; Vickers, 2006).

While more research is needed to provide a complete picture regarding the relationship between organizational variables and incivility, it seems reasonable to expect that all of the stresses and changes that are being experienced in the workplace are likely
to instigate negative workplace interactions. Downsizing, increased workloads, technology, and a more casual work environment have become common practices in many organizations and may contribute to feelings of threat, stress, and disempowerment. For some individuals, these stressors may be associated with the desire to maintain the status quo and current power hierarchy as a means of trying to better control their environment.

Consequences of Incivility

A large number of studies have examined the consequences of incivility (e.g., Cortina et al., 2001; Lim et al., 2008; Pearson & Porath, 2005). Although incivility is, by definition, a collection of low-level, often subtle, negative behaviors, the impact of such behaviors is not insignificant. The consequences of incivility in the workplace can be far-reaching and can impact employees’ physical and mental health, job attitudes, and work behaviors. Incivility can erode an organizational culture and contribute to creating an environment that is unfriendly, rude, paranoid, cliquey and stressful (Vickers, 2006). Individuals on the receiving end may respond in ways that are costly to the organization by reducing productivity, performance, motivation, creativity and helping behaviors (Pearson & Porath, 2005). Even bystanders of uncivil actions have been shown to experience some of these negative outcomes (Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007). Incivility may be subtle, but the effects can be pervasive and long-lasting (Pearson et al., 2001; Vickers, 2006).

Incivility can foster a negative work environment (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Pearson, Andersson & Wegner, 2001) and has been shown to impact a large number of
job attitudes including satisfaction with one’s job, supervisor, coworkers, pay, benefits, and promotional opportunities (Cortina et al., 2001; Cortina et al., 2002; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Lim & Teo, 2009; Martin & Hine, 2005; Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007; Penney & Spector, 2005; Taylor, 2010), commitment (Lim & Teo, 2009; Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000; Taylor, 2010), turnover/withdrawal intentions (Buhler, 2003; Cortina et al., 2001; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008; Lim & Teo, 2009; Martin & Hine, 2005; Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000; Pearson, Andersson & Wegner, 2001; Taylor, 2010), interpersonal trust (Taylor, 2010), and perceptions of justice (Taylor, 2010). Incivility has also been associated with a number of physical and mental health outcomes. Incivility has been found to be positively related to job burnout (Taylor, 2010), job stress (Cortina et al., 2002; Lim & Cortina, 2005), and psychological distress (Cortina et al., 2001; Martin & Hine, 2005) and negatively related to mental health (Gardner & Johnson, 2001; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008; Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000; Pearson, Andersson & Wegner, 2001), and physical well-being (Lim & Cortina, 2005; Martin & Hine, 2005). In general, employees’ feelings of general psychological distress increase as incivility becomes more frequent (Cortina et al., 2001).

Work behaviors and performance may also be impacted by workplace incivility. Employees do not simply experience incivility as an annoyance to be internalized. Incivility has been found to be related to a decrease in productivity (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Buhler, 2003; Cortina et al., 2002; Muir, 2000; Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000; Pearson & Porath, 2005), an increase in absenteeism (Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000), negative work behaviors (Lim & Teo, 2009; Penney & Spector, 2005),
and turnover (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Cortina et al., 2001; Cortina et al., 2002; Glendinning, 2001; Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000; Pearson, Andersson and Wegner, 2001; Pearson & Porath, 2005). Pearson et al., (2000) found that more than half of the employees on the receiving end of incivility reported lost work time because they were worrying about the incivility that occurred and about future interactions with the instigator. Further, targeted employees reported decreasing their time and commitment at work and/or reducing or stopping their voluntary efforts. The cost of incivility to an organization can further be accrued through lost profits (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Gardner & Johnson, 2001) and increases in disability claims, medical costs, lawsuits and workers compensation claims (Gardner & Johnson, 2001).

It is notable that even employees who have simply observed uncivil treatment towards their coworkers report a number of negative outcomes including lower job satisfaction and commitment and greater job burnout and turnover intentions (Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007; Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008). The mental health of individuals who work alongside coworkers who are targets of incivility appears to be impacted negatively (Lim et al., 2008). Coworkers who witnessed hostility directed at a colleague reported lower job satisfaction which was then linked to higher job burnout, lower organizational commitment and greater turnover intentions (Miner-Rubin & Cortina, 2007). Further, those who witnessed incivility also reported lower psychological well-being which impacted their physical well-being which ultimately increased their level of job burnout and thoughts of quitting (Miner-Rubin & Cortina, 2007).

Overall, the impact of incivility is similar to those described by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) who conclude that ordinary “daily hassles” can have an impact that is as
great, or greater than major life stressors in predicting outcomes such as damaged morale, impaired social and work functioning, and psychosomatic symptoms. The impact of uncivil behavior may be greater than one would expect from interactions that are, by definition, subtle and low-level. The ambiguity that is created may exacerbate the stress of the situation (Caza & Cortina, 2007). Employees have a hard time developing effective coping mechanisms when facing such ambiguous phenomena. As such, ongoing incivility may act as a chronic stressor (Lim et al., 2008).

**Targets of Incivility**

Since workplace incivility is still a relatively new area of inquiry, the empirical data on how and why it may occur, and whom it is targeted at, is somewhat limited (Cortina, 2008). However, a number of scholars have raised the possibility that there may be group and demographic differences with respect to initiating or experiencing uncivil behavior. Specifically, a number of studies have begun to explore the relationship between incivility and various demographic characteristics – e.g., gender, race, age, etc. It has been suggested that some incidents of incivility may represent a form of contemporary sexism and racism and that there exists a form of “selective incivility” which is a covert manifestation of gender and racial bias against women and people of color (Cortina, 2008). To date, the relationship between gender and incivility has received the most attention although a number of studies have also examined the impact of race. Following is a review of this research.

**Gender and Incivility**
Some of the earliest incivility studies were specifically designed to explore women’s experiences with incivility in their workplace. In fact, the Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS), which is one of the predominant scales used to measure incivility, was initially created using focus groups of women working in the federal court systems. Since that study, there have been a handful of studies that have examined the relationship between gender and incivility (Cortina et al. 2001; Richman et al., 1999). A number of studies have found that women experienced higher frequency of incivility as compared to their male counterparts (Cortina, 2001; 2011; Hutton, 2008). In one study, sixty-five percent of women described a recent experience of incivility as compared to forty-seven percent of men (Cortina et al., 2002). In addition to differences in the frequency with which men and women experience or instigate incivility, it appears that there are also differences in the types of uncivil behavior that are experienced. Cortina and her colleagues (2002) examined the extent of incivility in the Federal Court system and found that males usually only experienced general incivility while women often experienced general incivility plus incivility explicitly tied to their gender. The most frequent forms of gendered incivility included gender disparagement, unprofessional forms of address, comments on appearance, and mistaken identity (e.g., mistaken for administrative staff rather than an attorney). Further, Cortina et al., (2002) found gender differences were particularly large for the most ambiguous behaviors. Ambiguous behaviors included: “ignored you or failed to speak to you,” “doubted your judgment on a matter over which you had responsibility,” “withheld information that you needed to do your job correctly,” and “failed to give you an award or recognition you deserved”. However, there were no gender differences in the experiences of more blatant or overtly disrespectful behavior.
such as “made jokes at your expense,” “refused to work with you,” and “targeted you with angry outbursts or temper tantrums” (p.246).

In a related study, gender harassment correlated strongly with both general incivility and sexualized harassment, and a moderate correlation emerged between incivility and sexualized harassment (Lim & Cortina, 2005). In fact, almost all women who had been subjected to gender or sexualized harassment also reported experiencing general incivility but not vice versa. The authors suggest that “aggressors may instigate multiple forms of mistreatment – both sexualized and generalized in efforts to debase women and reinforce or raise their own social advantage” (Lim & Cortina, 2005, p. 492).

There also appears to be a significant association between gender and instigator position (Cortina et al., 2002). In surveying attorneys, female targets were more likely than male targets (75% vs. 44%) to report experiencing general incivility from other attorneys who are their peers. In contrast, male attorneys were somewhat more likely to identify judges as the source of incivility (66% vs. 56%). The authors suggest that this may stem from societal gender hierarchies in which men believe they are of higher status than women. This perception differs from the situation in which judges are, indeed, situated above attorneys in the organizational hierarchy. These findings are consistent with other research that men were more likely to be instigators of incivility and much more likely to instigate incivility on someone of lower status (Pearson et al., 2000; Reio & Ghosh, 2009).

**Race and Incivility**
Research on minorities’ experiences with incivility has been somewhat equivocal. A number of studies have not found a significant positive correlation between race and incivility (e.g., Cortina et al., 2001; Cortina et al., 2002; Kern & Grandey, 2009; Milam, 2010). In fact, in his first study, Milam (2010) found that African Americans experienced less incivility than whites – a finding that the author attributes to the norm of “political correctness” within the work environment. However, in his second study he found no differences in workplace incivility between white and African American participants.

The potential for selective incivility against minorities was supported in a recent study by Cortina et al. (2011). In a survey of over 600 law enforcement personnel minority members’ reports of incivility were, on average, significantly higher than that of their white colleagues. The authors conclude that minorities are at an “increased risk for rude treatment in an organization” (p. 16). The same authors found no direct effect of race in another study conducted in the U.S. Military (Cortina et al., 2011). What they did find, however, is that gender and race interacted to predict incivility. African American women in this study faced higher risk for incivility than African American men or whites of either gender.

The differences in findings between gender and race and the relationship with incivility raise some interesting questions. If, as suggested by Cortina (2008), incivility may serve as a means to enact subtle racism and sexism, why is there a dearth of findings when race is examined? If power dynamics contribute to incivility, why would this not

---

1 The authors of this study note that minority status was found to be a significant predictor of interpersonal mistreatment. However the beta coefficient for minority status was very small and therefore they suggest that the result is likely a methodological artifact of the large sample size (Cortina et al., 2002). As such, the authors did not attempt to interpret it.
influence incivility against minorities? In the next section, I will explore some literature that would suggest that minority status is as likely to result in increased experiences of incivility as is gender. Evidence from the social psychology and contemporary racism literature along with research from the fields of counseling, and sociology, provide strong evidence that discrimination and bias against Black Americans does exist and is, in fact, experienced on a regular basis. Research in each of these fields provides a slightly different perspective on how racism is enacted between majority and minority group members. Together, research from these fields suggests that racism has not been eliminated from the thoughts and behaviors of white Americans – whether they directly perceive it as racism or not. Below, I provide a review of each of these areas of research.

**Contemporary Racism**

**Does Racism Still Exist?**

The mixed findings on the relationship between race and incivility are curious given the evidence from other fields that suggests that racism is deeply embedded in the fabric of this country (Jones, 1997). Black Americans may experience almost daily forms of racism (Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003). Racial discrimination can take the form of both blatant and subtle behaviors that permeate the daily lives of individuals (Essed, 1991; Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994). Research suggests that 60% or more of African American adults typically encounter racial discrimination in their lives (Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999). This would suggest that racial bias is a common occurrence for racial minorities, particularly African Americans.
While the existence of discrimination is evident in many areas, a particularly relevant and detrimental consequence of bias can be seen in employment statistics. Data indicate that many minorities (most specifically, people of color) have different experiences in the marketplace and workplace than do majority group members. For example, the unemployment rate for African Americans and Hispanics in May 2011 was 16.2 and 11.9 percent respectively compared to 8.0 percent for whites (United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011). High rates of unemployment hold across nearly all levels of education for African Americans and Hispanics (www.bls.gov). African Americans with a 4-year college degree have an unemployment rate of 8.2 percent, almost double the unemployment rate for white workers (4.5 percent) with a similar level of education (Joint Economic Committee U.S. Congress, 2010). Although African American workers make up only 11.5 percent of the labor force, they account for more than 20 percent of the long-term unemployed (Joint Economic Committee U.S. Congress, 2010).

While there may be a number of factors influencing these disparate labor market experiences, race discrimination is likely to be one of them (United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commissions (EEOC), race discrimination charges accounted for almost 36 percent of the total discrimination charges filed in 2010. In a press release, EEOC Chair Jacqueline A. Berrien comments that “intentional discrimination in hiring remains a significant problem” (United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2011). The report from the EEOC further suggests that discriminatory hiring practices such as “conformity to discriminatory customer preferences, employing prohibited stereotypes
about jobs, and targeted recruitment procedures aimed at only attracting a certain racial or national origin group member applicants continues to exist” (para. 4).

As suggested by the above statistics, there are clearly significant discrepancies in the experiences of majority and minority group workers. While some of the actions leading to the differences may entail illegal discrimination, more covert forms of racism may also play a pronounced role in creating disparities in employment, specifically in the recruitment, retention, and promotion of minorities (Hinton, 2004; Rubin, 2008; Sue, Lin, & Rivera, 2009).

**Theories of Modern/Contemporary Racism**

While overt, public expressions of racism have declined, racial attitudes have shifted from being blatant and hostile to being more ambiguous and subtle (Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000; Dovidio, 2001; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Quillian, 2006). Today’s racism entails behaviors that often occur outside the awareness of “progressive” and well-meaning white individuals (Constantine & Sue, 2007). It is manifest in cultural assumptions, beliefs and values, and institutional policies and practices as well as in implicit individual cognitions. This form of racism often exists outside the level of awareness of majority group members (DeVos & Banaji, 2005; Dovidio et al., 2002; Nelson, 2006; Sue, 2010; Sue et al., 2008,). White Americans are socialized to internalize the biases, stereotypes, and prejudices of society (Sue, 2003). Although overt and explicit forms of bias and discrimination have been reduced, covert or implicit forms still exist (Baron & Banaji, 2006; Boysen & Vogel, 2008).
The notion that socialization and cultural conditioning imbues within people unconscious and biased attitudes and beliefs that are directed toward specific groups and which appear in unintentional biased behaviors has been the focus of research on contemporary racism (Sue, 2010). This shift in the nature of racist attitudes has prompted researchers to create new theories that are aimed at understanding the current forms of racism. These theories include aversive racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) modern racism (Brief et al., 2000; McConahay, 1986; McConahay & Hough, 1976), symbolic racism (Sears, 1988), and implicit racism (Banaji et al., 1993).

Although each conceptualization of contemporary racism is slightly different, the common theme is the conflict between the denial of personal prejudice (i.e., explicit attitudes) and the underlying, often unconscious, negative feelings and beliefs about Blacks. Modern racists believe that discrimination is a thing of the past (McConahay, 1986) yet may still experience anger or moral outrage due to their feelings that Blacks are getting too much compared to whites who are getting too little (Sears & Jessor, 1996). Further, modern racists agree that old-fashioned racism -- which reinforces negative beliefs about Black intelligence, ambition, honesty and other stereotyped characteristics and also supports segregation and open acts of discrimination -- is bad. Therefore, they do not consider themselves to be racist. However, they may still hold negative attitudes towards Americans which are indirect and are masked with nonracial reasons in an attempt to preserve a non-prejudicial self-image (Ziegert & Hanges, 2005). Aversive racism theory illuminates the manner in which individuals may behave in subtly biased ways against minorities. This research is described below.
Aversive Racism

Aversive Racism examines the discrepancy between people’s behaviors and attitudes (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). Aversive racists possess a strong egalitarian value system that supports the American’ ideals of equality, justice, and fair treatment for all (Nail, Decker, & Harton, 2003). Aversive racists: sympathize with victims of past injustice; support public policies that promote racial equality and address the consequences of racism; identify more generally with the liberal political agenda; and regard themselves as nonprejudiced and nondiscriminatory (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). The egalitarian beliefs of most whites generally operate on a conscious level where deliberate and careful thought can be used to guide their actions in race-related situations. However, these same individuals possess negative feelings and beliefs about Black Americans (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). What results is an emotional conflict between a) the desire to be nonprejudiced and b) their anxiety and discomfort when they are around people of color (Nail et al., 2003). Since these individuals consciously endorse egalitarian values which are important to their self-concept the negative feelings and beliefs that they hold are often excluded from their awareness, and they will not discriminate directly and openly in ways that can be attributed to racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986).

Studies testing aversive racism have indicated a pattern of discrimination which occurred only when decision-makers can justify differential treatment based upon non-race-related factors. For example, in one laboratory experiment, participants were asked to evaluate application materials for white and Black candidates for a job as a peer counselor (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000). Black candidates were rated lower than
comparable white candidates only in situations in which their qualifications were ambiguous. Specifically, when the decision was fairly clear cut – the candidate was either strongly qualified for the job or not qualified – discrimination did not occur. However, when the decision was more ambiguous, thus requiring greater interpretation of the candidate’s qualifications, white applicants with the same qualifications as the Black applicants were recommended almost twice as often (76% to 45%). In a similar study, participants compared college applications for Black or white students whose qualifications were either very consistent or conflicting across the measures used to make the decision (Hodson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2002). The qualifications were either a) consistently strong Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores and high school performance, b) consistently weak SAT scores and high school record; or c) mixed qualifications that had strong SAT tests and a weak high school record in some instances and weak SAT scores and a strong high school record in others. Black applicants in the consistently weak or strong categories were not discriminated against relative to whites. However, Black applicants in the mixed category were. When participants were asked to provide rankings for the criteria they considered in making their decisions, students who had been measured as high-prejudice on a prior test applied the selection criteria in ways that systematically rationalized discrimination against the Black applicants. Absent a strict quantitative formula, recruiters, admissions personnel and hiring managers were faced with the task of applying their own subjective criteria for determining the best candidate. This ambiguity allowed subjects to discriminate without necessarily appearing to be biased.
Adverse selection decisions have also been demonstrated when directed to do so based on what was “best” for the organization. Brief et al., (2000) found that when subjects were told by an “authority” figure that they should favor the white applicants over the Black applicants as a way to maintain harmony in the department, evaluations of the resumes of the Black applicants were lower than those of the whites. These lower ratings occurred despite the fact that the information contained in both was identical. The authors of this study found that participants who had (modern) racist attitudes would indeed discriminate against the Black candidates when they were given a business justification to do so.

Other scenarios that have tested the aversive racism theory include pro-social (helping) behaviors (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1981; Frey & Gaertner, 1986; Gaertner, 1973), response to an emergency situation (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1977), willingness to ask for assistance (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1983 as cited in Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), perceptions of competence (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1981), support for affirmative action (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1981; Murrell, Dietz-Uhler, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Drout, 1994), and interracial-interaction outcomes (Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002; Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson, & Howard, 1997). These experimental studies all explored the existence and nature of aversive racism. The results seem to indicate that racist attitudes and beliefs do still exist, but may only get enacted when the “rules” of the situation are ambiguous enough that acting in a biased manner can be justified in a non-racial way. That is, aversive racists may allow their negative affect to come out in ambiguous ways so that their own sense of being egalitarian is not questioned.
The majority of the studies discussed above were made with laboratory experiments in which individuals were tasked with making a decision such as whether or not to help someone, who was qualified for a job, etc. How do these findings extrapolate to daily interactions between individuals? Are there reasons to believe that these contemporary forms of racism would be manifest in interpersonal interactions? That is, what evidence do we have that individual interactions between people of different races or ethnicities will result in the covert expression of bias or discrimination? This is a critical question for the research being proposed. As discussed earlier, workplace incivility often occurs as part of the everyday interactions experienced between and among individuals in the workplace.

It has been suggested that incivility is one manner in which contemporary racism may be manifest in interactions between individuals (Cortina, 2008). The low-level, ambiguous nature of incivility creates the scenario in which it is difficult to attribute negative comments, behaviors, and interactions specifically to racist attitudes or beliefs. There are a number of additional areas of research that provide similar examples of low-level, sometimes negative interactions between majority and minority group members that provide further support for the argument that such behavior may indeed be an outlet for subtle racism. Below, I review a number of other areas of research that examine constructs that are similar to incivility and provide further evidence that minorities do, indeed, experience interpersonal interactions that are influenced by racial stereotypes and prejudice.

**Microaggressions**
Microaggressions are defined as “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory or negative racial slights and insults toward people of color” (Sue, Capodilup, Torino, Bucceri, Holder, Nadal, & Esquilin, 2007). The term “microaggression” was first introduced by Pierce and colleagues (1978) as “subtle, stunning, often automatic, and nonverbal exchanges which are ‘put downs’ of Blacks by offenders” (p. 66). In general, microaggressions convey rudeness and insensitivity and may serve to exclude, negate, or nullify the thoughts, feelings, experiences, and identity of a person of color (Sue et al., 2007; Sue et al., 2008).

People of color experience microaggressions on an ongoing, constant basis (Sue, 2010; Sue et al., 2007; Sue et al., 2008; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). Some scholars have asserted that nearly all interracial encounters are “prone to manifestation of racial microaggressions” (Sue et al., 2007, p. 284). Yet these interactions are often ignored or minimized. Often the perpetrators and sometimes even the recipients of microaggressions may not even be aware that they have engaged in negative communications (Sue, 2005; Sue et al., 2007). That is, negative feelings may be unconsciously expressed by the perpetuator, yet they communicate a hidden demeaning message to the person of color.

Three forms of racial microaggressions have been identified: microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations (Sue et al., 2007). Sue et al., (2007) developed this taxonomy based on literature on aversive racism, personal narratives, and other literature on everyday racism. Thus, there is a strong connection between the experiences that are included in the taxonomy and other contemporary racism literature. Microassaults are
most similar to “old fashioned” racism conducted on an individual level. Microassaults are derogatory verbal or nonverbal attacks meant to hurt the intended victim through name-calling, avoidant behavior, or purposeful discriminatory acts. As these acts are often conscious and deliberate, they are generally not the main focus of microaggression studies (Sue et al., 2007). Microinsults are behavioral and verbal expressions that convey rudeness and insensitivity and demean an individual’s racial heritage or identity (Sue et al., 2008). They may take the form of subtle snubs intended to convey the message that the target does not belong, is not qualified, etc. A statement that a Black American is “very articulate,” when accompanied by a tone of surprise is an example of a microinsult. Microinsults can also be nonverbal, such as a teacher failing to notice a Black student (Sue et al., 2008; Sue et al., 2007). Finally, microinvalidations represent communications that invalidate, negate, or diminish the psychological thoughts, feelings, and racial reality of individuals of color (Sue et al., 2008). For example, when African Americans are told by majority-group members that we are all simply human beings, the inherent message is that their experiences as racial beings are not valid (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000).

Results from the microaggression research have provided other examples of the types of behaviors or interactions that people of color experience. Students in the classroom have reported experiencing verbal and nonverbal microaggressions that included assumptions about, and lowered expectations for, African American students and a general belief that the students had benefited from affirmative action (Solorzano et al., 2001). The African American students further reported feeling both invisible and feeling watched all the time in a way in which they were expected to abide by a whole set
of rules that majority group members were not (Solorzano et al., 2001). When compared to the experiences of white students, minority students have perceived a less encouraging atmosphere than the white students (Schnellmann & Gibbons, 1984). For example, more minority students felt that the instructors knew their names, but perceived that they were called on significantly less than the white students. Further, the minority students felt that they were encouraged verbally more often but encouraged nonverbally less. Thus, a pattern emerges in which it seems that conscious and deliberate efforts to affirm and encourage the minority student are negated by non-conscious behaviors (Schnellmann & Gibbons, 1984).

Beyond the classroom, a good deal of the microaggression literature has explored the interactions between therapeutic counselors and their trainees and/or patients. Perceived racial microaggressions were negatively associated with African American clients’ perceptions of the therapeutic working alliance and white therapists’ general and multicultural counseling competence (Solorzano et al., 2001). When working with white supervisor-counselors, Black supervisees reported experiencing microaggressions that included having their supervisor invalidate the racial-cultural issues that their clients were dealing with, making stereotypical assumptions about Black clients and the Black supervisees, withholding performance feedback for fear of being viewed as racist, focusing primarily on the supervisee’s weaknesses, and blaming clients for problems that resulted from oppression (Constantine & Sue, 2007). Overall, these Black supervisees felt that their white supervisors minimized, dismissed, or avoided discussions involving racial-cultural issues and that many harbored racially stereotypical assumptions about the supervisees and their clients of color. These results highlight the notion that racial
hostility toward African Americans by white counselors, whether conscious or subconscious, may have undue effects on the working relationships they have.

A similar construct, “microinequities,” has been used in a business context. Rowe (1970) defined microinequities as any disparaging comment, behavioral act or oversight which affects only members of a given group. This includes instances in which individuals are either singled out or ignored due to race, sex or age. The term microinequities describes a “pattern of being overlooked, under respected, and devalued because of one’s race or gender” (Sue et al., 2007, p. 273). Microinequities occur whenever people are perceived to be “different” – such as African-Americans in a predominantly white firm (Rowe, 1970).

While many of the incidents that are identified as a microaggression (and microinequity) may be viewed as subtle manifestations of bias, it is clear that the cumulative effects can be significant (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Sue, Capodilup, & Holder, 2008). Microaggressions and microinequities exclude the person who is viewed as “different” and make that person less self-confident and less productive (Rowe, 1990). A lot of time and energy can be spent trying to process and cope with microaggressions (Constantine & Sue, 2007). Individuals report emotions such as anger, stress, anxiety, self-doubt, marginalization, frustration, and isolation (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Franklin, 1999; Pierce, 1988; Sin et al. 2009; Solorzano et al., 2001). Subjects also report a general feeling of exhaustion at having to continually deal with microaggressions (Solorzano et al., 2001).

As with incivility, the power of racial microaggressions is that they are often invisible to the perpetrator and are therefore hard to address (Sue, 2005, Sue et al., 2007).
Often, the individual involved may try, if confronted, to explain away an incident with seemingly unbiased, valid reasons for the behavior (Sue et al., 2007). Yet the messages that are conveyed to the recipients of microaggressions are that they do not belong, they are abnormal (e.g., the “White” way is the “right” way), they are intellectually inferior, are not trustworthy, and that they are all the same (Sue et al., 2008).

The studies on microaggressions provide useful examples of the types of behaviors that minorities may experience which are perceived to be racially biased. However, the majority of the studies that have been conducted have been qualitative studies with fairly small samples. Further, solicitation for subjects has specifically focused on people of color who have experienced “subtle racism”. While this has provided a fruitful mechanism for identifying specific types of negative behaviors and incidents, it has not allowed for a true exploration into the frequency (i.e., how often) or generalizability (i.e., how common) of microaggressions.

**Racial Discourse and the White Racial Frame**

While the microaggression literature primarily has focused on the lived experiences of people of color, there is other research that provides insight into when and how white Americans *enact* racism. Contrary to the theories that assert that racism is often an unconscious attitude for many whites, scholars who have explored racial discourse and the white racial frame assert that individuals are very conscious about when and where they enact racism, and specifically when they convey anti-Black sentiments (Picca & Feagin, 2007). Findings from studies on racial discourse suggest our society has not achieved the “colorblind” ideal that is often viewed as the desired goal.
(Myers & Williamson, 2001; Picca & Feagin, 2007). Most people are very aware that overt expressions of racism are unacceptable. As a result, racism is now expressed in ways that are not openly antagonistic to minorities (Bobo, Kluegel, & Smith, 1997). whites are very cautious when expressing their thoughts, ideas or opinions about race or race-related situations.

A number of studies have explored the race-related dialogue/interactions that occur when the participants feel free to talk uncensored (e.g. Myers, 2005; Myers & Williamson, 2001; Picca & Feagin, 2007). These studies reveal a great deal of racism that occurs at a micro-level. Prevalent in these interactions are the use of slurs and racial epithets, reinforcement of old and new stereotypes, attempts to draw boundaries between groups (e.g., “us” and “them”), and actions intended to (re)assert racial inequality. However, white Americans who manifest any racist beliefs have learned clear boundaries regarding when it is safe to assert their racist cognitions, attitudes, and emotions (Picca & Feagin, 2007).

Research exploring the ongoing bias towards minorities has revealed that some white Americans still have difficulty recognizing Black Americans as people like themselves. Instead, Black Americans continue to be viewed as dangerous or strange which reflect long-standing cultural stereotypes and are part of the white-racist framing that helps to reproduce ongoing social patterns of white privilege (Feagin & Sikes, 1994). white privilege is further reinforced through the use of racial slurs which are an important mechanism for marking the boundaries between “us” and “the other” (Myers & Willamson, 2001). These private racial events take on a ritualized character that serves to engender a sense of group solidarity among whites through the production of a “shared
reality” (Picca & Feagin, 2007, p. 3). It would appear that much of how Americans think and feel about race has not changed – it has simply moved to more private settings (Myers & Williamson, 2001).

Taken together, the research on contemporary racism (aversive, microaggressions) and white racial framing, suggest that racism against minorities is enacted on a regular basis. At times these acts may be conscious, other times not. In many cases, the bias that is experienced is subtle and may be hard to clearly identify as racism. This concept of ongoing, everyday encounters with racism has been explored called “everyday racism” (Essed, 1991; 2002). However, these experiences of “everyday” racism are often overlooked in organizational research (Deitch et al., 2003).

In an effort to better understand the actual experiences of minorities in the workplace, Deitch and her colleagues (2003) studied the range of discriminatory events that are experienced from more blatant to subtle and “minor”. Findings from their three studies indicate that research that focuses solely on major discriminatory events in the workplace does not adequately capture the totality of Black American’s experiences. They found that everyday discrimination, such as being set up for failure, being treated as if they didn’t exist, not getting the privileges that others are getting, is occurring regularly with negative outcomes for the targets. Others research has found similar examples of low-level discrimination against minorities in interpersonal encounters (Van Laer & Janssen, 2011). Qualitative interviews revealed that minorities experienced situations in which they were subtly disempowered by being called out for their differences. At times this entailed being included primarily because of their diversity rather than their professional
credentials or personal interests. It also manifests in being exposed to intolerant attitudes towards their group as a whole (Van Laer & Janssen, 2011).

**Rethinking Race and Incivility**

Given all of the above evidence, it is clear that racism still exists today both in and out of the workplace. Whether it is manifested in unconscious behaviors or in less public, more covert ways, there is evidence that minorities, particularly Black Americans, are on the receiving end of differential treatment by whites. Given the ambiguous nature of incivility, it is easy to justify the negative interaction as unrelated to the target’s race (e.g., the target is too sensitive, he/she misconstrued what was said, etc.), thus providing a non-race related rationale for the behavior. Incivility against minorities can also act as a subtle reinforcement of the white racial frame by asserting dominance in the form of a joke, an oversight, etc. Further, given the prevalence of racist discourse that exists among some whites when they feel they are in a safe, non-public environment, it seems likely that some of these beliefs and attitudes will be carried into the work environment. If negative stereotypes, biases, and emotions are so easily evoked in private, are they far from one’s conscience in an intergroup setting? Add to this a workplace climate that may be characterized by a competitive culture or one in which employees may feel disempowered and the environment may be primed for negative intergroup interactions. Incivility in the workplace may provide the outlet for expressing subtle bias against minorities.

**Measuring Incivility**
The most frequently used scale for measuring incivility is the workplace incivility scale (WIS) developed by Cortina, Magley, Williams and Langhout (2001). The seven-item scale was generated from focus group interviews with employees working at all levels of the U.S. Eighth Circuit federal court system. Participants were asked to think about a time in the previous five years in which they felt a superior or coworker: was condescending, ignored their opinion, made demeaning remarks, was unprofessional, doubted their judgment, and/or made unwanted attempts to draw them into a discussion of personal matters. Survey participants involved in the development of the WIS were primarily European/white (88%) and female (71%). Half of the employees worked in environments in which women were in the majority.

Over the last decade researchers have both expanded the WIS and created their own incivility scales (e.g., Burnfield, Clark, Devendorf, and Jex, 2004; Hutton, 2008; Lim & Teo, 2009; Martin & Hine, 2005; Taylor, 2010). In some instances the new scale was intended to focus on a specific field, such as the health care industry (Hutton, 2008), a new medium for incivility, such as cyberspace (e.g., Lim & Teo, 2009), a broader pool of instigators such as customers (Burnfield et al., 2004), and/or a broader set of items describing various uncivil behaviors (Burnfield et al., 2004; Martin & Hine, 2005; Taylor, 2010). Martin & Hine (2005) wanted to determine if a more comprehensive set of items could be used to develop a multi-dimensional measure of workplace incivility. Their scale, the Uncivil Workplace Behavior Questionnaire (UWBQ) contained four dimensions that group items under the categories of hostility, privacy invasion, exclusionary behavior, and gossiping. Their sample population for scale development was primarily Australian adults, and 76% were female. No specific racial demographics
were reported. Burnfield et al. (2004) suggested that the most notable problem with existing scales is a failure to sufficiently span the construct space. In response, they developed a multi-dimensional scale consisting of eight internal incivility factors, including inconsiderate behavior, abusive supervision, social exclusion, inappropriate jokes, interruptions, social loafing/free-riding, gossip and rumors, and a climate of hostility.

It would appear that incivility in the workplace is a relatively new construct that is still being developed. As the examples above suggest, there is room for continued clarification and exploration of the construct itself. This continued examination should include the potential expansion of the types of experiences represented in the incivility domain.

**Incivility and Anti-Social Behaviors**

Yet to be discussed is the relationship between general incivility and other anti-social behaviors. Understanding the relationships is useful both for situating incivility within the larger domain of anti-social behaviors and also for assessing the validity of the new RBIS. Showing discriminant validity is one of the critical steps in scale development.

Incivility is considered to be in the general domain of anti-social workplace behaviors (Blau & Andersson, 2005; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Pearson et al., 2001). Anti-social behavior is defined as behavior that harms organizations and/or their members (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997). Using this definition, incivility is both related to and distinct from a number of other antisocial work behaviors (Cortina & Magley, 2009),
including workplace deviance, bullying, workplace aggression, interactional injustice, harassment, social undermining, and counter-productive work behaviors. Incivility can generally be distinguished from these other constructs based on the intent, the intended target (individual versus organizational), and, in the case of bullying, its primary perpetrator.

As defined earlier, workplace incivility usually involves low-intensity negative behaviors that are ambiguous in their intent to harm and are a violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. These factors provide a useful framework for understanding incivility relative to other negative workplace behaviors. For example, incivility may be considered a form of deviant behavior (Blau & Andersson, 2005). Deviant workplace behavior has been defined by Robinson and Bennett (1995, p. 556) as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms, and in doing so threatens the well-being of the organization or its members or both.” Since uncivil behavior is defined as behavior that is in violation of workplace norms of respect (Andersson & Pearson, 1999) incivility falls within the domain of deviant workplace behaviors.

Bullying has been conceptualized as both broader than incivility (Fox & Stallworth, 2005) and more narrow (Cortina & Magley, 2009). Fox and Stallworth (2005) suggested that “bullying is the umbrella concept for various conceptualizations of ill-treatment and hostile behavior toward people at work, including incivility” (p. 439). As defined by Einarsen (2000, p. 381) bullying focused on repeated and systematic attempts by an individual or group, to harm someone and where victims find it difficult to defend themselves and a power imbalance exists between the victim and perpetrator (be it actual or perceived). Workplace bullying often involves verbal abuse, offensive
conduct/behaviors (including nonverbal), which are threatening, humiliating, or intimidating and/or behaviors that interfere with one’s ability to get work done (e.g., sabotage) (Namie, 2003). Workplace bullying is often driven by an individual’s need to control another person (Namie, 2003). Within the workplace, a large number of bullies are bosses. One study found that seventy-one percent of bullies in the workplace outrank their targets (workplacebullying.org). While incivility may be instigated by a manager or supervisor, it does not necessarily involve an imbalance of power (Burnfield et al., unpublished). Incivility can occur between co-workers, an employee and a customer, a supervisor and his/her employee, etc. Further, unlike bullying, it is not always clear that the uncivil behavior was intended to harm the target. Similarly, incivility is viewed to be broader than interactional injustice (Cortina & Magley, 2009; Penney & Spector, 2005), which focuses mainly on unfairness or insensitivity displayed by supervisors or others in authority during the implementation of organizational procedures and policies (Bies & Moag, 1986; Colquitt, 2001).

Incivility can often be distinguished from workplace aggression, social undermining, and counter-productive work behaviors (CWB) based on the intention behind the acts. Although general incivility may occasionally involve an act that is specifically intended to harm its target(s), it is often attributed to other factors, such as the instigator’s ignorance, oversight, or personality. Even incivility that targets minorities, “selective incivility” (Cortina, 2008), is proposed to be primarily unconscious and ambiguous. Contrast this with workplace aggression, defined by Baron (1996, p. 27) as “any form of behavior directed by one or more persons in a workplace toward the goal of harming one or more others in that workplace (or the entire organization) in ways that the
intended targets are motivated to avoid.” Thus, only in instances in which the behavior is intended to harm the target, would incivility fall into the category of workplace aggression. Social undermining refers to behavior that, over time is intended to hamper the ability to establish and maintain positive interpersonal relationships, work-related success, and a favorable reputation (Duffy, Ganster & Pagon, 2002). It is viewed from the lens of a victim’s perspective in that the behavior must be perceived as intentionally harmful. In addition, the effects are considered to accumulate over time, such that one or two instances do not constitute undermining. CWB refers to behavior by employees that harms an organization or its members (Spector & Fox, 2002) and includes acts such as theft, sabotage, verbal abuse, withholding of effort, lying, refusing to cooperate, and physical assault (Penney & Spector, 2005). While incivility and CWB overlap in some instances (particularly counter-productive behaviors that are targeted at other individuals rather than the organization), incivility, by definition, does not necessarily need to be intentional or malicious.

Based on these comparisons it appears that incivility may overlap with a number of other forms of negative workplace behavior yet it neither subsumes nor is subsumed by them. As such, the unique contribution made by including incivility alongside these other constructs is that it raises the notion that behaviors do not have to be clear and deliberately hostile to negatively impact an individual or an organization (Penney and Spector, 2005; p. 780). Indeed, a number of scholars suggest that the “intent” to harm an individual is a personal motive and is not particularly relevant when/if the primary research interest is in the impact of the negative behaviors.
It is clear from previous research that workplace incivility is similar to, yet different from, a number of other anti-social behaviors. Therefore, it is predicted that:

**H1a:** There will be a positive correlation between the RBIS and workplace aggression and bullying.

Further, it is important to assess the relationship between the RBIS and the WIS. The goal of creating the RBIS is to better understand the incivility experienced by Black Americans. This will likely result in an expansion of the domain of incivility so that a broader range of experiences are represented. Given the relationship between the RBIS and WIS, it expected that:

**H1b:** There will be a positive correlation between the RBIS and the WIS, but it should be a stronger correlation than RBIS and workplace aggression and RBIS and bullying.

**The Outcomes of Racism**

As discussed earlier, there are a number of negative outcomes associated with incivility. Incivility can foster a negative work environment (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Pearson, Andersson and Wegner, 2001) and has been shown to impact a large number of job attitudes including satisfaction with one’s job, supervisor, coworkers, pay, benefits, and promotional opportunities (Cortina et al., 2001; Cortina et al., 2002; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Lim & Teo, 2009; Martin & Hine, 2005; Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007; Penney & Spector, 2005; Taylor, 2010). It has also been associated with a number of physical and mental health outcomes including job stress (Cortina et al., 2002; Lim & Cortina, 2005).

Similarly, research had demonstrated that people of color are stressed by experiences of racism (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; Utsey, 1999). Race-based stressors
are found to have an impact on an individual’s psychological and physical health (Carter, Forsyth, Mazzula & Williams, 2005; Clark, Anderson, Clark & Williams, 1999; Harrell, 2000). Particularly relevant for race-based incivility is the finding that stress increases if an event is ambiguous, negative, unpredictable, and uncontrollable (Carter, 2007). Thus, the ambiguity of intent that characterizes incivility creates an even more stressful situation. Therefore, it is predicted that:

**H2:** RBI will have a positive relationship with stress.

Over the last few decades, researchers have suggested that there is a need for more research examining the impact of race on career experiences (Bartol, Evans, & Stith, 1978; Cox & Nkomo, 1991; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986). Yet, research in this area has still been limited. This is a critical omission considering the important organizational outcomes that have been associated with career satisfaction, such as turnover intentions (Igbaria, 1993) turnover (Arnold & Feldman, 1982) and organizational commitment (e.g., Carson, Carson, Phillips, & Roe, 1996; Igbaria, 1991).

A few researchers have taken up the call to better understand the career-experiences of minorities. Cox and Nkomo (1991) examined the career satisfaction of early-career MBAs. Their results showed that Black MBAs had lower overall career satisfaction and lower satisfaction with rates of advancement as compared to white MBAs of comparable age, experience, and performance. More recently, Fouad and Byars-Winston (2005) explored some of the career barriers experienced by minorities. They found that racial minorities were more likely to encounter career barriers. These barriers included racism or racial-related stress, which could inhibit racial minorities from
obtaining their career goals (Tovar-Murray, Jenifer, Andrusky, D’Angelo, & King, 2012). Experiences of workplace discrimination, even the knowledge of such discrimination, may influence career decisions (Robinsons & Ginter, 1999). Thus, there seems to be some evidence that race and the experience of discrimination will be related to career satisfaction and success. Therefore, it is predicted that

**H3: RBL will have a negative relationship with career satisfaction.**

Examining the specific experiences of Black Americans in the workplace will allow for an expanded understanding of the incivility domain and the consequences of experiencing incivility. To develop a greater awareness of the experiences of Black Americans their input must be intentionally solicited. Incorporating minorities’ experiences into main-stream academic research rarely happens (Nkomo, 1992). Instead, it has often been “the norm in the social sciences to assume that Eurocentric empirical realities can be generalized to explain the realities of people of color” (Stanfield, 1993, p. 27). By placing the focus on Black Americans and seeking out their specific experiences of incivility, I expect that the new scale (RBIS) will add important content to the general workplace incivility scale. Further, it is anticipated that the RBIS may be able to better predict the outcomes for Americans than the WIS. To explore this relationship, the following research question is included in the proposed study:

**Research Question 1:** The RBIS will be a better predictor of career satisfaction and stress than the WIS.

**Gender and Incivility**
The question of how, and if, gender moderates the relationship between race and incivility is unclear. Within the incivility research, there has been evidence of a moderated and mediated relationship between race and gender (Cortina et al., 2011). Theories of “intersectionality” and “double jeopardy” combine the gender and race effects implied by work on modern discrimination and acknowledges the impact that multiple identities may have on the individuals’ experiences. Intersectionality work has informed our understanding of the ways in which women of color face different realities than men of color or white women, especially in the labor force (e.g., Browne & Misra, 2003; Greenman & Xie, 2008). Theories of double jeopardy focus on the downside of holding two undervalued social identities. This theory suggests that women of color should encounter a “double whammy of discrimination” (Berdahl & Moore, 2006, p. 427), driven by both gender and race-based biases (e.g., Beal, 1970; Buchanan, et al., 2008; Greenman & Xie, 2008). That is, they are disadvantaged due to both their female gender and minority race. Berdahl and Moore (2006) found support for the double jeopardy hypothesis, such that women of color reported the most harassment on the job – more than men of color, white women, or white men. This work on intersectionality and double jeopardy suggests that individuals with multiple stigmatized identities, such as women of color, may be uniquely targeted with incivility in the workplace. In contrast, many of the stereotypes of Black men are particularly negative. Black men may be stereotyped to be particularly aggressive, dangerous, and untrustworthy. These negative perceptions are likely to trigger racial bias, particularly in modern racists who may feel threatened by a perceived shift in the status hierarchy.
It is difficult to predict a priori how gender may moderate the relationship between race and incivility. Yet understanding the possible influence will be useful for future race-based incivility research. Therefore, included in the proposed study is the following research question:

**Research Question 2:** Is there a main effect for gender such that Black women will experience more incivility than Black men?
CHAPTER 3
PHASE 1: PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

Over the last decade there has been increasing focus in incivility in the workplace (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Rude and discourteous behaviors at work can have detrimental effects on the individuals who are the targets of such interactions (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim et al., 2008; Pearson & Porath, 2005). The current conceptualization of workplace incivility is the result of both qualitative and quantitative studies. In one of the early studies of incivility Pearson and colleagues (2001) collected data from managers, attorneys, law enforcement officers and emergency medical professionals using focus groups, a brief questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, and a two-day learning forum. Cortina and her colleagues (2001) created the Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS) for use in a study of the U.S. Eighth Circuit federal court system. Respondents for this study were 71% women and 88% white/European Americans. The WIS measures the degree to which individuals have been the target of disrespectful, rude, or condescending behavior from co-workers (Cortina et al., 2001). This scale has been shown to be highly reliable ($\alpha = .89$) (Cortina et al., 2001).

Recently, there has been an interest in exploring incivility as a possible manifestation of racism in the workplace (Cortina, 2008). Research on contemporary racism supports the notion that ambiguous, negative behaviors that target minorities may indeed be related to subtle racism. However, race-based incivility is an under-theorized and under-researched construct. While there has been interest in exploring the impact of race on incivility, much of this research has, to date, failed to elicit the knowledge and experiences of individuals from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Rather, there
has been an implicit assumption that majority-centered data will generalize to non-majority group members. To date, little or no attempt has been made to specifically explore how Black Americans conceptualize and experience incivility in the workplace. This omission may contribute to a conceptualization of incivility that is incomplete. Cortina and her colleagues (Cortina et al., 2011) appear to recognize this gap and have recently “supplemented the WIS with new items, to assess the construct domain more fully” (p. 8). When using the expanded instrument (first expanded to 12 and then 20 items), women and people of color reported significantly more experiences of incivility than did men and whites.

This goal of this research is to address this gap in the literature. As noted in the introduction, the study objectives are: (1) explore the domain of race-based incivility, with a specific focus on Black Americans; (2) create a race-based incivility scale that captures uncivil behavior that may be specific to the experiences of Black Americans; and (3) conduct preliminary testing of the new scale to extend past research on incivility and to create a reliable and valid measure of race-based incivility. To achieve these goals, a mixed-method approach was used. Stage 1 of my study involved one-on-one interviews. The purpose of these interviews was to expand and refine the conceptualization of incivility to better reflect the experiences of Black Americans. Using data obtained through the interviews an expanded workplace incivility scale was created. Below, I provide detailed descriptions of the interview methodology, results, and a discussion of the key findings. Phase 2 of the research involved the process of developing the RBI survey, assessing its psychometric properties (e.g. reliability and
factor structure), and testing the validity of the measure. These are reported in Chapter IV.

**Interview Methodology**

**Sample**

Interviewees for phase I of the study were solicited through referrals of friends and colleagues, as well as through the use of the UMass Social Justice Educators (SJE) list-serve group. A number of individuals on that list-serve also forwarded the note asking for participants, thus broadening the reach of my request. The final panel of interviewees was thus a result of both a convenience sample (using the initial SJE list and referrals) and a snowball technique (asking interviewees to forward my request to their own networks, friends, etc.). Snowball sampling may be defined as an approach for gathering research subjects through the identification of an initial subject who is used to provide the names of other potential subjects. These subjects help to open possibilities for an expanding web of contact and inquiry (Lewis-Beck, Bryman, & Liao, 2004). Once an individual expressed interest in the research a note was sent providing some additional details on the topic, interview logistics, and a link to demographic survey which asked each individual to identify their gender, racial background, etc.

Seventeen interviews were completed over a 3 month time frame (June - August). Eleven Black females and six Black males were interviewed. The ages of the interviewees ranged from late twenties to mid-seventies. Participants were located in six different states (MA, NJ, NY, PA, CA, FL). Due to snowball-procedure used in obtaining interviewees, the sample was skewed toward individuals working in the field of education. However, even within the educational setting, the actual profession of many of
the interviewees varied. The range of occupations included professor (3), financial services (3), information technology (2), university admissions (2), insurance sales, human resources, program director for diversity & inclusion, special education teacher, program administrator for professional education, therapist and a nurse practitioner/supervisor. Two of the interviewees had a prior association with the principle investigator, another three were acquaintances. The remaining twelve interviewees were not previously acquainted with the investigator.

**Procedures**

Interviews were conducted using a primarily inductive approach. Following an inductive method is appropriate when there is very little theory involved at the outset as one attempts to identify constructs and generate measures from individual responses (Hinkin, 1995). Items are generated inductively by asking a sample of respondents to provide a description of their feelings about their organization or to describe some aspect of behavior.

The Critical Incident Technique (CIT) (Flanagan, 1954) was used to help frame the interview discussions. The CIT consists of systematic and sequential procedures for collecting detailed accounts recalled from memory about human behavior and classifying the behavior in useful ways to solve problems and develop broad psychological principles (Ellinger & Bostrom, 2002). The critical incident technique has its roots in industrial and organizational psychology, having been developed during World War II as an outgrowth of the Aviation Psychology Program of the US Army Air Forces (USAAF) for selecting and classifying aircrews (Flanagan, 1954). In its early years, the CIT was primarily used
to determine the job requirements needed for success in a variety of jobs across a number of different occupations (Butterfield, Borgen, Amundson, & Maglio, 2005). It has since grown beyond its original application and is now a qualitative research method used across a diverse number of disciplines including communications, nursing, job analysis, counseling, education and teaching, medicine, marketing, organizational learning, performance appraisal, psychology, and social work (Butterfield et al., 2005). Today, the CIT is recognized as an effective exploratory and investigative tool (Chell, 1998).

Similar to an unstructured interview, the CIT explores a respondent’s thought processes, frame of reference, and feelings about an incident (Chell, 1998). The CIT is intended to focus on an incident from the perspective of the individual (Chell, 1998). It provides a rich source of data by allowing respondents to select for themselves the incidents that are most relevant to them for the phenomena being investigated without being constrained by any preexisting framework or set of variables (Gremler, 2004). Consequently, the CIT is especially useful as an exploratory method to increase knowledge about a little-known phenomenon (Bitner, Booms, & Tetreault, 1990), which is currently the case with race-based incivility.

The goal for using the CIT in this study was to allow my informants to fully describe their experiences of incivility in a manner that captures what was important and meaningful to them about the interaction. The use of this grounded approach allows for a deeper exploration into how the components of incivility (low-level, negative, ambiguous, breech of norms) are interpreted and experienced by the Black interviewees.

Prior to the interview, I contacted each respondent via phone or email to briefly describe the incivility construct as it is currently conceptualized. I further explained that
the interview was intended to explore specific situations in which the interviewee experienced a low-level, negative interaction with an individual at work. Since the CIT uses specific incidents that can be fully explored, this preliminary description allowed the interviewees time to reflect on their experiences. Prior to the interview, each interviewee was sent a consent form and a brief demographic questionnaire.

All interviews were conducted by the principle investigator. Five interviews were conducted in-person, with the remainder being conducted over the phone (12). The interviews lasted from 25 minutes to just under two hours. At the start of each interview a verbal description of the research project was provided, including a general description of how incivility is currently conceptualized. For most discussions, interviewees were prompted with the question “can you describe a situation in which you felt that you were treated in an uncivil manner in the workplace?” An interview guide was used in a very general manner to help direct the discussion (see Appendix A). However, the questions were not specifically provided to the interviewees unless they requested a copy. This allowed for an open-ended discussion that was directed by the individual interviewee and the experiences that he/she believed were relevant to the topic of incivility.

Reactions to the interview and the topic were varied. Two of the interviewees, both female, had only a few very specific examples to share. Both of these interviews were conducted over the phone and were the shortest duration. One participant (male) had prepared notes before the call so that he could clearly recount some of the experiences he believed could be considered examples of incivility. Many of the individuals provided examples from years ago as well as more recent examples. Clearly, some of the interactions they have had resonate for a long time. For many of the
interviewees, the process of discussing their experiences with incivility triggered additional recollections and examples. All of the individuals interviewed expressed the sentiment that these experiences of incivility are so ambiguous that you can never really know why they are occurring. There was a general hesitancy to attribute any of the experiences to racism. In fact, two of the female interviewees indicated that gender may be more relevant to their experiences of incivility than race. This belief that their experiences could be attributed, at least in part, to their race was almost always stated with the caveat that it is always “hard to know for sure” (male participant).

All of the interviews were transcribed using a professional transcription service. Each transcript was then reviewed and edited by the principle investigator. All edited transcripts were downloaded into the NVivo software program and served as the basis for coding and analyzing the interviews.

**Coding the Data**

An inductive approach was used to code the interview data. Each of the seventeen transcripts was reviewed and incidents or descriptions that seemed relevant to the experience of incivility were summarized and labeled. The initial round of coding involved identifying descriptive codes to summarize the primary topic of each relevant passage of the transcript (Saldana, 2013). No preset codes or categories were used, other than actively trying to identify examples of interactions that described current WIS items. As suggested by Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw (2011), coding was guided by questions including; how do the individuals talk about, characterize, and understand what is going
on? What assumptions are they making? What do I see going on here? What did I learn from this interview? What is worth noting? (p. 177).

New codes were added as needed throughout the transcript review process. In instances in which descriptions from one respondent appeared similar to another respondent’s experience, the same codes were assigned. In instances where the experience described was new or different, new codes were added. In total, the first cycle of coding yielded 93 different codes/descriptors that were used as “buckets” to capture and categorize the experiences presented by the interviewees. In total, approximately 390 pages of transcripts were analyzed.

The next step was to begin to analyze each of the codes to better understand the kinds of experiences that were contained within this coding schema. This required going back to the actual text (interviewee descriptions) to better understand the nature of the experience being described and to determine if a) each of the items coded still belonged in that code, 2) if the relationship between the description and code was clear, and 3) if the description should be moved to another existing code (i.e., re-categorized) or warranted a new code.

After confirming the proper classification of each of the items in each code, the list of codes was reviewed to reveal larger patterns. This second-cycle of coding is intended to begin categorizing the codes. Patterns can be characterized by similarity, predictable differences, frequency, causation, etc. (Hatch, 2002). The process of categorizing allows for groups of codes to be put into categories that help explain the patterns. As suggested by Charmaz (2006) coding “generates the bones of your analysis…”(Integration will assemble those bones into a working skeleton” (p. 45). The
act of clustering the codes into categories began to reveal a more complex picture for explicating the incivility experienced by Black Americans. Some of these themes are described below.

**Interview Findings**

Once the coding process was complete, each category was reviewed to better understand the exact nature of the experiences described. These categories were then organized into themes. General themes as well as specific examples were identified to begin to develop the domain of race-based incivility.

Some of the main themes that emerged are discussed below. Three main themes are discussed. The current definition describes incivility as: “low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p. 455). The first theme explores aspects of this definition to identify how the experiences of the respondents inform and challenge the current definition. The second theme focuses on some of the antecedents of incivility and the ways in which the target responded to the incivility. The final theme explores a number of the consequences of encountering incivility in the workplace.

One of my goals for the presentation of these experiences is to allow the respondents to tell their own stories. While I have synthesized and aggregated the information to provide a coherent and relevant summary, I have also tried to preserve the spirit and intent of the experiences they shared. Quotes have not been revised unless such a change was critical for understanding the points being made.

**Theme 1: Exploring the (re)Definition of Incivility**
**Ambiguity**

Ambiguity is central to the incivility construct, both in terms of its enactment and its impact. The definition of incivility requires that any harmful intent is ambiguous to one or more of the individuals involved (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, Pearson et al., 2001). Cortina (2008) suggests that this ambiguity is particularly relevant for "selective incivility" when it is a form of modern racism or sexism. That is, the instigator may be unaware that his or her behaviors are a reflection of unconscious bias or attitudes that are influenced by culturally ingrained stereotypes.

All seventeen informants discussed the ambiguity they experienced when encountering incivility. It is clear from the interviews that the ambiguous nature of incivility complicates their ability to make sense of the experience. The following quotes illustrate this general lack of clarity and demonstrate the extent to which the individuals attempt to make sense of the experience. In numerous instances informants discussed trying to identify other reasons, besides race, that might be causing the incivility they were experiencing.

*Josephine:* “I don’t immediately go towards you know, thinking that something is a racist issue, unless someone says something specific. I mean, having to do with race but I don’t immediately think that unless it’s blatant, you’ll never know.”

*Jenine:* “It was just that there was a lot of disrespectful behavior. I was never sure how much of it was because I was Black and how much of it was because they were just rude people and how much of it was because I was a permit holder”

*Ray:* “You’re always questioning "why." It is really easy to –it is easy to point the finger and say, "That is why,” but it is also –to be very honest, the confusing part is you never really know why.”
The lack of clear intent or motivation behind the behavior can impact the recipient in multiple ways. First, people of color may need to make a decision - consciously or unconsciously - as to how much they will want to consider the incivility they experience as a manifestation of subtle racism. For some, the potential for this connection may be viewed as an exercise in negative thinking that serves no constructive purpose. Further, making attributions to racial bias may misrepresent the reality of the situation:

Keene: “You never –as a Black person it would be really easy to walk with lenses trying to figure out if someone is racist or not but it's counter to me, I feel it's counterproductive. If someone is being –and forgive my language –if they're being an asshole it's tricky to figure out well okay, are they being an asshole because that's just who they are or are they–it could be any myriad of combinations. So I don't really give it too much credence until I feel that there’s really evidence to make me scratch my head and think twice.”

Josephine: “I’ve had friends who work at a university who say that in their department they have a lot of that problem. And it definitely.. I'm not the type of person who automatically thinks that something is racial and I know that there are people who do. Whether it is or isn't because in conversation with them, they start off saying that something was because of their race but then as they continue the conversation you kind of think, "Well that might have been because you're late all the time, or I don't know, you know what I mean  ”So, it might just be that I'm not the type of person who automatically goes there in my mind”

Individuals also indicated that attributing an act of incivility to racial bias or negative stereotyping can have a huge downside for them and their relationships. They risk the potential of being accused of playing the "race card" or being overly sensitive. In general, as Dorothy suggests, it is difficult to bring up:

"I feel like in this day and age it's really hard to talk about racism. Like nobody wants to listen to if you have an issue with it or are experiencing something."

One of the informants discussed the isolation that she feels around the experiences she has as part of the motivation for participating in this study:
Lena: “I was forwarded your request for participants. I read it and I thought, “Wow! This is wonderful that someone is doing some research about the experiences that I and others like me, especially on (West Coast University) campus, have experienced. I thought it would be interesting to participate in a study that focused on those daily mundane interactions that we have individually. But, when we come together we can express it in a way where I thought that it was just me that I was going crazy that this was a bit off.”

Note the phrase she used was, "going crazy" to describe the way she feels sometimes as she tries to make sense of her experiences.

Based on the definition of incivility, the motivation behind the uncivil experience is never clear. However, it is important to recognize that people of color may experience additional uncertainty since there is the possibility that the behavior of the instigator could be a manifestation of racial bias. Whereas majority group members may contemplate if the instigator has something against them, dislikes them, etc., issues of group bias are likely not part of the equation. This is not always true for a person of color who may consider bias as a possible motivation. This uncertainty can result in ongoing stress as there never really is an "answer" that recipients can arrive at. A few of the informants discussed their response to the ongoing ambiguity:

Keene: "I'm a very, very open guy. I talk about -- I try to make people feel racially not just conscious but at ease in discussing things that many people may not be at ease to discuss and I think because of that it allows people that might have had a little more of their guard up to put their guard down a little bit and I invite that. I really do because I think some of the whole PC thing has just gotten out of control and people aren't real. And I would just as soon people be real. And I really don't care that someone has something against me. I mean ignorance abounds regardless of whether it is masked or it's overt. So I almost just as soon know where people stand rather than being polite and getting a dagger in the back."

Dorothy: “Overall, I take away some real struggling to not have to be thinking about these issues. Almost a searching to just have things be without having the issue of race constantly in the background. Yet incidents at work and even just shopping present themselves in a way that makes it hard to pretend issues don't still exist.”
This lack of clarity around intent may contribute to higher levels of stress when incivility is experienced. Stress is one of the outcomes that has been associated with incivility (Beattie & Griffin, 2014; Keashly & Harvey, 2005) and is one of the variables that will be explored further in this study. The next section explores stress and other emotions described by the informants as well as some of the coping mechanisms they may use.

Violation of Workplace Norms of Respect

The definition of incivility asserts that uncivil behavior "violates workplace norms for mutual respect" (Andersson & Pearson, 1999: 457). Two of the informants specifically addressed the impact that the organization's positive stance on diversity had on their experiences.

Dorothy describes her organization's focus on diversity and the optimism she felt when she decided to take the job there:

"They are conscious about diversity. They are making real efforts to, you know, with ethnic diversity, sexual identity diversity, transgender identity. And, in fact, the two books they assigned that summer were about white privilege and there was another book about racial awareness all the faculty were assigned this reading. And the (job) interview that I had with the dean of students, you know, was really. It made me really hopeful that this was a, would be a better workplace environment and I was really excited."

"There was some history at the school around things that they needed to do to make the whole faculty aware of what their issues were and I was coming right at that time where that conversation had taken place and now we were kind of going through the walk of what it meant to be a person of color at that school. And so I felt really lucky to be there".
Dorothy describes the relationship she now has with her supervisor. Dorothy worked with the same woman in another organization and she was happy to have the chance to work with her again. However, the new environment has impacted their interactions:

"You know, like it's really important this relationship. Before, we worked great together when she wasn't in this supervisor role, when we were just colleagues. She was an MD. I was a nurse practitioner. We worked great. We never talked about race. All the sudden, we're in this environment where people are consciously talking about race and she is like having these uncomfortable conversations with me about privilege and, you know, in a way that. Someone coined the term "pocket negro" and I feel like, you know, sometimes she puts me in her pocket and talks about me like I'm her best friend now in a way that I don't. Like I feel more distance with her now, with this level of racial consciousness on campus than I did when we were just colleagues and we had a great relationship."

She also acknowledges that the initial optimism that she felt when hired for the job may have been premature:

". As I dig deeper under that first initial infatuation of, 'Oh this is going to be such a great place to work. They've got all their ducks in a row. They know what they're talking about with race. They're saying the right things.' You know, I realize there's still tension. There are still issues."

Langston described his organization's positive messaging around diversity, yet also raises some questions about the extent to which individuals truly espouse the values of equity and justice. He provides a few examples, including a reference he makes below to a policy that he believes has a negative impact on students who come from less privileged backgrounds but is not recognized as such:

“And if you value, if you claim what my institution does -- definitely we have a huge claim about social justice and diversity -- if you claim that you value that, you also have to think of equity in terms of if we want to keep that kind of diverse population. If we treat everyone equal then people with more privilege are going
Langston also referred to a situation in which "open dialogues" were implemented as a way in which to create more communication in his department. However, these interventions left some individuals feeling as if they were not really "heard" or really "trusted." Langston also describes interactions with colleagues who have made comments marginalizing certain communities. Like the response from Dorothy, Langston indicates his disappointment which seems to stem, at least in part, from having higher expectations for the workplace based on the positive rhetoric around diversity. Ultimately, Langston has plans to leave his current job:

“I am in the process of working on resumes and thinking about moving on. This was the place that I came to, a very prestigious place, and I wanted to work here probably for lot a longer. I have been here for three years this summer. I don’t know if it’s my department or the school at large but at this point the culture is just very suffocating and very negative.”

These examples raise some interesting questions around the impact of workplace norms. Specifically, does adopting a pro-active position on diversity create greater expectations for respectful treatment? Does this make it more likely that employees will identify negative behaviors or interactions as a violation of workplace norms of respect? This would suggest that acts of incivility might be identified more often in an environment that has a greater focus on diversity. It also suggests that individuals may feel a greater sense of betrayal when they experience race-based incivility in such an environment.

“Negative” or “Deviant” Behavior
The definition of incivility includes the condition that the experienced behavior is deviant rude, or discourteous (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). These describe distinctly negative behaviors. A number of the experiences described by informants did not appear to specifically fit into this category. To an outside observer some of the interactions might be viewed as neutral, some even positive in their intent. However, they were not experienced as neutral by the target. This is particularly true when the behavior they experienced is part of a pattern of experiences that occur multiple times across different situations or when the interaction closely appears to mirror the experiences that have been commonly described by other people of color.

**When Neutral is Negative**

One theme that emerged was having organizational policies invoked in a manner that appeared to be inconsistent with the way in which they may have been applied in more general situations. Specifically, policies were suddenly strictly adhered to when the individual, a Black man or woman, was part of the interaction. Dorothy provides an example of having such an experience in Home Depot recently:

“We've been spending all of our money at the box stores thinking we were getting a good deal and I had that thought in my head, 'I'm at Home Depot. They see me all the time now. Everybody sees me.' I walk in. I say, hello, I do a return. I give my license because I don't have my receipt. I can't keep any receipts. The woman is like, you know, well, takes all my information. I leave. I'm like, Okay. With my little credit, I'm going to go buy a trash can and trash bags. Again, you think you're doing something mundane.”

“I go to the counter, customer service and I purchase these things. Actually, this guy came out of nowhere and said, 'Can I help you carry the trash can out?' I thought, Oh, this is great. I love this. You know, when I purchase it and the people are nice at customer service, I'm walking out and the woman at returns says, 'I'd like to check your receipt.' I'm like, 'Really? You think I'm stealing this?' 'Well, I need to check your receipt.' I pull my receipt out and I say, 'Okay.' And I go and I
sit in my car, you know, shaking. And I sit there for a minute. Then I go back and in I say, 'I want to talk to your manager.' 'You know, this woman'. I point to her. 'She stopped me and wanted to know'. You know, if this is your practice to stop people like they do in Springfield stores, you know, or at Costco, tell me to have my receipt out so I know. But this has never happened to me before.' I've been going to Home Depot for so long. The woman started arguing with me. She's like, 'Well, I have a right to pull you over, you know. My manager's watching me,' which he wasn't because then the manager came. 'You know, I'm sorry if your feelings got hurt.' I'm like, 'You know, I think we don't need to talk about this anymore. I have a right to complain about this and about customer service and, you know, if you're going to do this one time, do it every single time.' He's like, '"Well, did the alarms go off?" I'm like, "No." I said, "I come in here all the time." She's like, "I know. I see you in here all the time." I'm like, "Why would I take a fucking trash can?"

This exchange is informative on multiple levels. First, it is a good example of how the enactment of a policy can be a mechanism for incivility. The store clerk was within her right to ask for a receipt to demonstrate that the garbage can had been paid for. Checking receipts is, no doubt, a legitimate policy at Home Depot. The policy itself is quite neutral. As Dorothy points out, however, she had never before been asked to show a receipt. What triggered the store clerk to ask to see the receipt this time? Dorothy considers that her race had something to do with getting stopped. It is interesting to note the phrase that the clerk used (or that Dorothy recollected she used) of "being pulled over" to describe the incident -- reinforcing the connection to illegal behavior.

The emotions that are expressed are also worth noting. Dorothy describes sitting in her car "shaking" as she processes the incident and deciding if she wants to go back in to confront the clerk. Once she does confront the employee, Dorothy describes the clerk as getting very defensive about her actions and insisting that she had a "right" to ask for the receipt. It is likely that even if the clerk's actions were racially motivated, she is unaware of her own biases. From the clerk's perspective she may feel as if she was the
Finally, Dorothy indicates her hesitancy to suggest that her race contributed to the incident. She describes the exchange with the manager who has been called in:

"it wasn't the first thing I mentioned, race. First I mentioned consistency. Me, being a loyal customer having dropped thousands of dollars getting cabinets there. And then I said, "Maybe she just didn't like how I looked." I couldn't even say the word 'race'. You know? He goes, "We believe . We absolutely believe in diversity and, you know ." And there is diversity there. But it only takes one person."

A few other informants described similar situations in which a policy was applied that did not appear to be consistently used for all individuals. One informant (male) described the embarrassment and anger he felt when a bank clerk, at the bank to which he was a member, refused to accept a check for deposit from a major out-of-state University because it didn't "look" legitimate. This same individual had an experience of being stopped at the entrance of the local YMCA when taking his son for swimming lessons. He was asked to show proof of their registration in the class. This was never requested when the son was accompanied by his white mother. Similar to Dorothy's experience, the organizational policies described are probably legitimate. The decision for when to implement the policy - at certain times, but not others -- makes the intent behind its application ambiguous and may be perceived as a negative interaction by the target.

While some of the examples given by the informants were from experiences they had outside of their own workplaces, they still provide insight on some of the challenging interactions Black Americans may have within organizations. While negative stereotypes about Black Americans have been changing, with more extreme negative
characterizations becoming more moderate (Fiske, Bergsicker, Russell, & Williams, 2009), there is a history of Black Americans being perceived as criminals (Welch, 2007). This negative stereotype might suggest that such individuals should be treated with suspicion. How might this manifest within a professional environment? Eight of the informants described feeling as if they have had to "prove" their worth and demonstrate their credentials in a manner that sometimes seemed to go beyond that of their white colleagues. Keene provides an example of a request he made when he was trying to arrange an educational trip to China as part of his MBA program:

“This was actually when I was getting my MBA. I was trying to take time off from work to go to China for a few weeks for a remarkable work/study program there. I was trying to first take it as a sabbatical which I couldn't do—they wouldn't allow me to do. Then I was trying to take a short term leave of absence where I wouldn't get paid for it but I would at least still be able to retain my vacation days and I would have thought that either a sabbatical or leave of absence, particularly because a younger woman—both of these women are white that I'm going to refer to—one took a sabbatical just to go away for a vacation. It was a three month vacation but she managed to call it a sabbatical and go away to Asia for three months and I'm like I don't get it. Like I'm in school and I was getting fought on that one. The other person took a leave of absence for her honeymoon. So I didn't really—these are all—these are really two different women that I'm referring to but my manager is directly over those females as well, so my thing is that I don't know if this is more sexist maybe versus racist. And at that point I wasn't in the best position at work. I was having kind of a tricky time juggling school and work but certainly nothing to the point where it was—I was in a negative, adverse situation.”

“...So I was so flustered. And we finally kind of came to a soft compromise. I think it still wasn't exactly what I was looking for but it was enough...But it was one of those things—like there were two standards. And again, they were both white females. But again, it could have just as well have been sexist.”

Keene acknowledges that there are reasons other than being Black that might have caused his requests to be denied. The pattern of having policies enacted in a manner that
appears to be inconsistent with how others are treated creates a degree of ambiguity that, at times, may provoke questions about the role that race played in the interaction.

**When "Positive" Becomes a Negative**

As suggested earlier, some informants also described interactions in which their colleague or manager behaved in what was likely a well-intentioned manner, but resulted in creating a negative experience. These situations may be viewed as instances of benevolent racism. Acts of benevolence may be manifest in feelings of sympathy toward out-groups (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Glick & Fiske, 2011). Benevolent racism is characterized by a sense of racial superiority and a desire to help the "other" in a manner that is a form of racial paternalism (Mazrui, 1991).

Rosa described an experience she had when she had just started her new job. She was new to the area and was living in a predominately white, fairly affluent town. Her father-in-law was visiting from Africa and became ill. Rosa asked her manager for a recommendation to a physician. This seemed appropriate particularly since her manager's wife was a physician.

"So I asked (my manager) and he said, "My wife can recommend some place." So he gave us the name of this clinic and we don't know the area at all. So we start to drive to the clinic and it's really far away. Living now, the area that we live in XXX town, going into XXX city, going into like inner city XXXX we get to a low income clinic with all people of color and it was horrible. I had never been to a place like that. We go and we sit in cracked plastic chairs. The care was really crappy. They took his blood pressure. They hooked him to an EKG and they sent us a bill for almost $3,000."

"I knew that (my manager) would never have sent a white person or colleague to this clinic, not in a million years would he have sent a white colleague to a low income clinic half an hour from our house and it was very uncomfortable. I wish he would have just said what it was and we could have chosen whether we wanted to take that option or not but he was like, "No, no. This is a great place. You
should go here." I was like, "Really?" He probably thinks they are Black and most people using this clinic are Black, so they are going to be fine. Like I said, I had never been to a place like that. I know that he sent us there because we were Black. He wouldn't have sent white colleagues to this place. So my husband was kind of livid."

Rosa adds that when she started her job (her manager) "seemed really nice. He is still there. He is a nice guy. He is well meaning".

In another example, Percy tells a story of asking his colleague about joining one of the important associations in his field:

"So, one day, I asked him about, 'How do you get to be a member of the National Academy?' And he told me, 'Oh, you don't have to worry about it. You don't want to be a part of that. That is just an organization for a bunch of old men.'"

Both these examples, as well as others told by Jenine and Ray, describe a manager or colleague who did not actively behave in a negative or deviant manner. Their intentions may have been positive - trying to help the informant. However, the resulting message may reinforce the belief that Black Americans don't belong in the same spaces as whites -- that they themselves may be uncomfortable or unsuccessful in such an environment.

A final example provides a good illustration of how a paternalistic attitude can convey negative messages. Dorothy describes her relationship with her supervisor who at one time was a peer of hers. Overall, Dorothy indicates they have a good relationship and her supervisor has been attempting to become more conscious and open on issues around equity and diversity:

"I think she has the heart and intention to want to understand. But doesn't have, you know, she'll framing things as, 'This is my white privilege'" She becomes defensive actually if I talk about how she might be treating me in a way that's too
paternalistic. Or if I'm unhappy, she gets immediately defensive and I really have to talk around, talk her down. 'Hey, (Supervisor) ' Whatever. I'll try and break it down so it's not threatening to her. But she has some sensitivity around her being in this position and people criticizing her. But she is open to it which I appreciate because I've never had anyone else want to talk about it."

"Like she says a lot, 'I want to take care of you." She's in this white privilege (discussion) group, white faculty of privilege group. She talks to me often like, 'You're the only person of color that I know and I talk about you at my group.'"

Dorothy acknowledges that her supervisor is acting with good intentions. However, the impact is not positive. Earlier in the interview Dorothy uses the term "pocket negro" to describe the way she feels at times. The interactions Dorothy has with her supervisor are further complicated when her attempts at addressing the problem result in the supervisor getting upset and defensive, leaving Dorothy to feel as if she needs to withhold the negative feedback.

The experiences described above raise some interesting questions about the current definition of incivility. Specifically, how do we determine what is a "negative" behavior? Who decides if the behavior is deviant, rude or discourteous? As illustrated above, well-intentioned actions and seemingly-neutral organizational policies can be experienced in a negative manner by the recipient. The intent may be ambiguous but the impact is not. Should the determination of what constitutes incivility be made on the face-value of the act itself or on the impact? In addition, some of the informants described actively trying to defuse the situation by assuring the other(s) involved that their actions were not offensive or possibly racially motivated. This care-taking role has the potential for magnifying the initial negative impact by asking the target to assuage the feelings of the instigator.
Theme 2: Antecedents & Responses to Incivility

Maintaining Power and the Status Quo through Incivility

Another category that emerged from the interview data relates to issues of power and maintaining the status quo. Power issues were described in a number of different ways. A few of the interviewees described interactions in which they felt they were being told they should be happy with what they had and not push for more. This attitude has been explored in the literature on modern racism. Modern racists believe that discrimination is a thing of the past (McConahay, 1986) yet may still experience anger or moral outrage due to their feelings that Blacks are getting too much compared to whites who are getting too little (Sears & Jessors, 1996). The attitude that Blacks have gotten what they deserve and should stop "pushing for more" was reflected in the comments of six of the interviewees who specifically mentioned having experiences in which others suggested, in words or by deeds, that they should be satisfied or grateful for what they had. The six discussed issues related to salary, benefits, career advancement, and recognition. Both Rhonda and Jenine recounted situations in which these attitudes were experienced:

Rhonda: "But for minorities, the attitude is almost as though, 'We gave you a job. You work for [prestigious West Coast University]. You should be satisfied with that.'"

Jenine: (referring to her supervisor), she "said some really nasty stuff that I couldn't even believe. I don't really know if she would have treated a white woman like that. She was so off the hook in terms of (her attitude) that I was supposed to be grateful to her."

Catherine described her experience of asking for a raise and getting push back:
"I knew what the job commanded for money. He asked me, when we were talking, "Why do you need so much money?" I was like what? I was in shock. He would never have asked a guy that. I don't care if he was single or married. He would never ask that. He was a kind of man who would be thrilled with a man if he was asking for more money. That's good for him. For me, it's like, "Why?" I go, "Because that's what I am worth."

Ray discusses a recent incident related to a service award that was commonly given in this particular Association of which he was a member. He notes that his service to the organization had spanned 10 years and that often this would result in a formal acknowledgment of the work. However, he had not been nominated for the award. He raised the question with a colleague who was currently serving on the executive committee for the organization. This colleague reported back that the response to whether he should be nominated for an award was, "Well, Ray really didn't do all the stuff that he said he did, and he is making up stuff,"

In our interview Ray strongly disagreed with that statement and felt that he was basically being told: "Thanks for the service. You should be happy that you have the plaque on the wall that says you were a past Chair." He went on to explain:

"if you look at the list of people that have gotten Distinguished Service Awards over the past –most of the past chairs and especially any –there is nobody that had worked for that division for the 10 years –straight years that I did, that didn't get some special recognition"

Other experiences related to supervisors or subordinates asserting their own knowledge and expertise over the informants, even in situations in which the informant is supposed to know more or have more expertise:

Josephine: "we had a new director .and the director that came in was someone who was a researcher previously. So we knew each other and worked together on some things. I think that even then my knowledge about what my job was' was kind of questioned. I was just like, 'I've been doing this for a long, long time."
thought that because he didn't really, he didn't have the answer that he just didn't accept that I did. I don't know what that is and you know he has been in place for 3 years now, and now he understands, "Oh she kind of knows what she's talking about."

Pearl describes a similar experience of being questioned by her supervisor on matters over which she had more knowledge. The specific incident she describes relates to some decisions around students in her classroom. Without having the same amount of information, he asserts his opinion and makes it clear that her decision is wrong:

"There is aggression. There is aggression because I think –and this is just speculation-- it is not like anyone has ever been honest enough to have the conversation with me –but there is aggression in such a way that they want to make sure that they can assert their authority over me. There is a disconnect in that I'm Black so I'm not capable and as smart, and that is just --that is --it is just – it is the general tone in which they talk to you. It is the tasks in which you're asked to complete, or a way that you're evaluated on any given task or partnership, or any of that stuff. If I make any decisions and behave competently, then it is --I've overstepped my bounds and the Principal actually said to me, "Well, maybe you did this in your old school, but this is not how we do things here.""

These examples appear to reflect one of the existing items in the current workplace incivility scale which asks if the respondent has experienced others who "doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility?" In instances of cross-racial interactions, concerns over maintaining a higher status than the target may reinforce this behavior. Rhonda specifically references the issue of race and hierarchy in her description of her workplace experiences:

"Sometimes they just don't want to report to a Black. I don't care how you look at it. I have a PhD. The guy I used to work with had an undergraduate degree. They would much rather report to him or have him to give them instructions on what needs to be done as opposed to a Black female, with a PhD. They think, 'She knows more than I know.' Or what their point is, 'you might have multiple degrees, but I am will still show you how much you don't know.'"
This idea that one's ambition could be seen as a threat to the status quo was also reflected in Kris's comments which appear to reflect an understanding that some whites may harbor the belief that minorities are getting ahead and getting more than they deserve - a fear articulated in the modern racism literature (Brief et al., 2000):

Kris: "When I try to help it can be perceived as threatening to other people, like I want their job or I want their position. Whereas I am a supportive type of individual. but, some people are like, "Why are you doing this? What's your angle?" They think sometimes that it is for something that is I don't know. to remove them or to prove that you're better than that individual as opposed to earning the merit to be promoted." "But, it's never perceived that way. It's like, "Oh ok. You are after my job." It's like "they are taking our jobs!" and I'm like, "oh no., here we go again."

According to social dominance theory, dominant social groups look to sustain inequality between themselves and subordinate groups to ensure continued access to finite resources, an inflated social status, and greater decision-making power in social and organizational institutions (Levin, Federico, Sidanius, & Rabinowitz, 2002; Pratto & Shih, 2000). This desire to maintain the status quo that confers a dominant position to white Americans may also reflected in some of the incidents that questioned the recipient’s right to be in a particular space:

Thomas: I used to teach at XXX University and I was playing basketball in the gym with some students one time and this older white man who was probably in his 60s –and I can't remember the full incident but he was questioning my credentials about being there or something but he did it in an inappropriate manner, right? It wasn't caring and supportive of whoever was there I was like, this guy has really crossed the line, but I had to use credentials as a faculty member there to kind of push him back in some way and felt some anger. And I think I had -there was another white guy here at (current University) who was in like audio-visual services and he was questioning something about –and I was like, 'you can't talk to me that way, like who are you talking to?'
Thomas's description of having individuals challenge his right to be in the University space can provide an example of maintaining the status quo by creating boundaries that attempt to clearly delineate in-group and outgroup members.

Experiencing these boundaries as impenetrable is illustrated in the narrative provided by Kris and Rhonda:

**Kris:** "I just felt like I was overlooked very often for promotion, for pay raises and it just wasn't like across the board. I kept coming back to having to go a little bit further or extra in order to just get the same as everyone else. It feels like you have to struggle harder to prove in various groups that you are as interested, curious and worthy to, kind of, be there in that position. You always have to go after it. It's not something that has ever just fallen into my lap."

"Like I have to work extra hard just to be recognized where for other people it just seems to be a bit more passive. I would say that there are a lot of social undertones that causes almost like, "Well, you know. I know that you are not good at this, this and this." I don't know if it is subconscious or not, but it seems that I always, in my whole life, have to fight to prove myself beyond that of my colleagues."

"But, in the back of your mind you're always thinking, the undertone of it all is that - if I work just as hard or harder than person A or B or whatever then I must be able to achieve at least what they are achieving. That is what you don't see happening. It's like, "Oh my goodness what do I have to do? Like fricking juggle tigers, lions and bears in order to get a freaking promotion." But that is what it makes you feel that you have to do something extraordinary, not extra-ordinary but extraordinary. You can never. That's the thing. You almost end up. I think that's why, maybe, there is an issue with turnover sometimes because if you don't feel like you are in the right group, you are like, "Guess what? They are never going to get me. ."

**Rhonda:** "all of us are facing the same thing. It doesn't matter who you are, where you are. I have been an entrepreneur. I've been public, private, it doesn't change. It is all the same. There is always that challenge and it always comes down to whether or not you meet their criteria. If you have that look. If you are overweight they are not going to take you. If you have a dark complexion, they are not going to take you. If you don't have the hair they want, they are not going to take you. So you have to look like them. You have to look like them, talk like them. If you come in with any vernacular or slang or the "axed" like a lot of minorities have, they will turn you away. Denied. So anyway, it doesn't change."
Both of the descriptions above express frustration at the difficulty, or perhaps perceived impossibility, of actually being accepted into the majority-group. Kris opines that it might take an act that is "extraordinary" to gain acceptance and recognition. In total, five of the informants discussed the challenges of "fitting" into majority-group spaces.

**Navigating Incivility**

One additional theme emerged from the interview data that may help expand our conceptualization of race-related incivility. Many of the informants discussed very specific ways in which they responded to incivility or to the potential for incivility to occur. Their descriptions of navigating through the interactions that were uncivil or could become uncivil generally fit into two categories: preemptive actions to try and avoid the incivility from happening and reactions that were intended to lessen the impact of an uncivil encounter.

Thomas, who is deeply involved in diversity work at a high level in his organization reflects on his own concerns about how he is viewed by whites and how this impacts his own behavior:

"I do worry, even myself, and I'm better at it than I was before, but I know so worrying about am I being articulate enough for white people, right? Am I sounding smart enough when I'm around them? I think that was something that I experienced when I was younger that I don't experience the same way now, but maybe it depends on the group I'm with, you know, the level of how relaxed I am and where I'm going —you know, I present to a lot of different groups. I'm conscious of it when I'm being too conscious of communicating with white people in large groups —particularly about these issues, right? So maybe it all depends. Yeah."
Issues around language came up a number of times. As Thomas illustrates above, there are concerns around the language or dialect that one uses. Pearl describes the experience she has when viewed as not fitting the stereotype of how an African American "should" sound:

Pearl: "Most of my experiences –not all but most, a lot revolve around my speaking voice, because people always, because they speak to me on the phone and they don't see me in person, they don't—they're surprised that I'm African American. But in the upper-middle class environment (versus the more urban environment), people are much more intrigued and then they suddenly value my—what I have to say and my opinions or whatever my contributions are, more so because, 'Oh, she doesn't have that stereotypical intonation in her voice or dialect,' or whatever you want to call it, and so, now, they want to—they're interested in what I have to say"

"It feels badly. It is—I have to sort of—I think what I've done is I just try to ignore it because it is stupid. And I had a good point before I started, before I even opened my mouth, but you weren't really interested because what you thought is a Black person and you had—already had this expected response or stereotype, or attitude beforehand."

A couple of the other informants (Rhonda; Dorothy) described how they consciously had to work through an uncomfortable interaction when they did not match the stereotype that the other individual(s) appeared to expect. Serena described the effort she felt she had to put into her interactions to compensate for her appearance:

Serena: “One added dimension for me -- I think I need to mention is that I happen to have dreadlocks. So, I'm in a minority even in the Black community. Particularly in corporate, the corporate environment, and it's tough to tell, but when I come into an environment and I'm Black, plus I have dreads, I often wonder and I don't know if I've picked up on micro-messages per se but I often feel like I might be sort of perceived at the bottom end of the spectrum when they're thinking about professionalism and aptitude and things like that and plus I have to really act super XY or Z to kind of dispute that early on –whatever preconceived notions folks may have.”
Serena describes the choice she had made to have dreadlocks and acknowledges that her appearance may impact how others perceive her and her professionalism. She discusses compensating for that choice by working harder to refute the negative perceptions she may engender because of her hair. Thomas also describes making choices about his appearance related to the clothes he chooses to wear:

_Thomas: “I play basketball with a racially mixed group of men, you know, primarily European-American, African-American and you might have a Latino or Asian mixed in sometimes and one day I walked into the locker room wearing traditional African garb –at least my top was –and the guy asked a really, you know, innocent question about like, 'whoa, Thomas, what's up? You've really got to explain that, right? I mean what you're doing.' And I just thought it was, you know, quizzical, you know, he was just curious and didn’t understand so like some people might take that as a micro-aggression. Maybe it is. It happens all the time. Well, no –but you know what? Maybe that is symbolic of why I don’t wear African garb often. (Laughs) You know I used wear African garb much more often but I felt like an object in some ways, so I choose not to wear it at the level that I used to as a statement of cultural affinity and comfort. I mean that's a good example of how I very consciously don't want to be in that role while I'm still advocating for people to be. You know, to wear and to be culturally affirming in the way they present themselves and talk about themselves. But right, that's a particular choice I make. So that might be one small example but it's interesting –I didn't think about it –so you know, how connected it is to what you're studying, right?”_ 

This was a particularly informative moment in the interview. Thomas works in a role in which he is advocating for diversity and, as he indicates, he encourages other people to wear "culturally affirming" clothing. Yet, as he describes the change he has made to his own style of dress he begins to reflect on the meaning behind his choices. His conclusion is that his decision to avoid drawing attention to his African heritage stems from, at least in part, the reaction it might engender from colleagues whom he is trying to make feel comfortable while at the same time, pushing them to change.

_Kris alludes to the manner in which he manages his presentation of his own ambitions so that others will be comfortable with him:
"As long as long as I am this color I am not going to advance unless I work even harder than everyone else. Then there is also something else that you have to do. You have to, almost, illustrate that in a way that doesn't come across as challenging. Like, I have had so many people, bosses in the past that would think. Or I guess I would come across as if I was coming after their jobs. Where they don't understand, I'm content in what I am doing, I just want the 5% raise. I don't want 3% cost-of-living increase.”

This description of overcompensating was touched on in many different ways. As Catherine expresses, "I am in the habit of making sure that I am uber-prepared. So I take nothing for granted. I can't do certain things. I have to make sure that I am super prepared with everything."

When a negative interaction does occur and has the potential to escalate, some respondents described their attempts to assuage the concerns of the other individual or to eliminate the potential that negative stereotypes would be triggered, lessening the impact:

Langston: “I have a colleague here who is a white female and I won't say we don't get along personally but our professional understanding is not aligned. I talked to my supervisor several times about it where I just feel like she is a roadblock for a lot of my other colleagues. A lot of us have the same issue with her. One of my concerns is that they have talked to me a lot about, 'You need to bring this up with her individually.' When I bring up her she is very defensive. She kind of gets emotionally charged up and I can feel myself resisting that because I know that in my real life I would totally probably, kind of, get a bit more, and this would probably be some male privilege involved, I would puff my chest and get a little bigger and louder but I am so scared of what that would do in a workplace. I would never do that. If anything, I would more gear towards passive. I don't necessarily want to go to the other extreme either but it's just an interesting thing where I can feel myself actually controlling myself. So there is some of that that comes into play.”

Dorothy also describes a similar, but more passive response, when she has a conflict with her supervisor. Dorothy actively tries to keep the relationship positive:

“She becomes defensive actually if I talk about how she might be treating me in a way that's too paternalistic. Or if I'm unhappy, she gets immediately defensive
and I really have to talk around, talk her down. "Hey, Jules." Whatever. I'll try and break it down so it's not threatening to her."

In contrast, Lena describes the impact of her response when she did not try to temper her reaction. Similar to Serena's, her experience revolves around her hair.

*Lena:* "I wear my hair natural, curly and sometimes I will come into the office with it straight. In those instances I feel like I am the office pet because hands come flying out of nowhere to touch my hair. On the one hand it's like, if you're comfortable with me, if we are friendly, if we are close friends touching me is not a problem. But in most instances in a work environment you are my colleagues, we're not that close, we are not necessarily friends, we may be friendly. And it's not a behavior that I observe readily happens with other people. So it always makes me question, 'What makes you feel that I am comfortable enough with you to reach out and touch my hair and be so intimate?'

"I have had some instance where I have had to just straight out say, 'That's not ok. Please don't touch me again.' And, (they say) 'Oh, I didn't mean anything by it.' You may not mean anything by it, but I always say, "I am not your pet." Then I get the weird look and the walk way, 'Oh, she is grumpy' or 'she is mean.' And I just say, "Whatever. I am going to draw that line so that it doesn't happen again."

Lena chooses to respond in a manner that she knows will probably result in a negative response. Because of this, Lena may experience incivility twice in this interaction - first she is touched in a manner that is inappropriately personal and that makes her feel like an office pet. Second, when she objects, she is negatively labeled as grumpy or mean, which can serve to intensify or exacerbate the original incivility. This appears to be part of the challenge associated with race-based incivility. Decisions on how to respond may have a lasting impact to the individual but also to reinforce some of the existing stereotypes or biases held by the instigator. The potential for this larger impact to be an outcome does not seem to go unnoticed by the informants.

**Impact of Gender on Experiences of Incivility**
As part of the interview process informants were asked to comment on gender differences in incivility experiences. Informants were asked to reflect both on their own experiences as well as what they have observed or heard from friends, family, and colleagues of the opposite gender. This question was raised to begin to answer the research question posed in my study. Specifically, the question of interest was: Does gender act as a moderator of race and incivility such that Black women will experience more incivility than Black men?

The intent behind the question was to better understand potential differences in the types of incivility experienced, frequency, and/or the position of the instigator. As discussed in Chapter 2, there are theoretical bases for suggesting that Black women might experience more incivility. Within the incivility research there has been evidence of a moderated and mediated relationship between race and gender (Cortina, et al., 2011). Further, theories of "intersectionality" and "double jeopardy" assert that multiple under-valued identities may be associated with increased experiences of discrimination (Berdahl & Moore, 2006). However, the preponderance of negative stereotypes of Black men, including images of Black men as aggressive, dangerous, and untrustworthy, could trigger racial bias resulting in greater experiences of incivility. Analysis of the interview data strongly suggests that Black women may be exposed to more incidents of incivility. A number of female informants specifically discussed gender as the driver of uncivil encounters. For some, gender was assessed to be the relevant factor when attempting to understand the reasons behind the incivility they experienced. Catherine provides an example of this:

"Over time, since I had always, usually, been the only woman and usually the only women of color. There were other men of color but usually the only woman was
me. I found that in my business, there was, necessarily, nothing to do with color so to speak, but gender because it is very male-oriented. When they would see a woman in that position, they were like, a little taken-aback and I had to kind of jump through hoops to prove myself. So I had to be two and three times better than my male counterparts."

Dorothy echoes the same sentiment in discussing the advice she got in her graduate program:

"And I remember I started my PhD program at (Major University) at the same time I was starting this new job. And Dr. "Advisor" said to me, 'You're never going to get any respect as a woman of color as a rule.'"

A number of informants, both men and women, discussed the manner in which the stereotype of an "angry Black woman" may influence women's behavior. There was a belief that this stereotype is easily triggered and that this leads to an interaction in which white individuals will immediately use the stereotype to assess the interaction in a negative manner.

Pearl: “If I am at all insistent or aggressive with my response, or even passionate about my response, I'm suddenly an angry Black woman.”

Langston (male) acknowledges the double-jeopardy experienced by Black women, and also identifies a similar challenge for Black men who may be considered threatening based on their physical characteristics. He discusses the mindfulness that he and some of his male colleagues bring to cross-race interactions:

“One thing I will say, in life for sure overall women of color have it harder but there are those weird moments where being a man of color because of some of the stereotypes especially around us being a physical threat come into play. If I come in too strong as a Black male, I am also viewed in this way. People kind of just shut down. So by being more gentler intentionally, I kind of open up space, not only for people to communicate with me and enter that space with me but also for what they think about Black men in general. I have a Black male colleague who has talked about that pretty extensively. He feels like he has to always counter
that kind of myth. So he is intentionally a lot gentler at work than he would be in his real life. So I definitely feel some of that.”

It appears that both men and women of color may adjust their behaviors based on the recognition of negative racial stereotypes and the impact that triggering these stereotypes might have on both the present interaction as well as future ones.

**Theme 3: Consequences of Experiencing Incivility**

**Stress & Coping**

Research had demonstrated that people of color are stressed by experiences of racism (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; Utsey, 1999). Further, it has been found that stress increases if an event is ambiguous, negative, unpredictable, and uncontrollable (Carter, 2007). Given the nature of incivility as ambiguous and negative, it was hypothesized that experiences of incivility would be associated with increased stress.

Only one informant specifically characterized her experiences with incivility as causing her stress. Rosa described a number of interactions she had with a co-worker who continually questioned her expertise both implicitly and explicitly, and interacted with her in an openly hostile manner at times. Her response at the time was the following:

"At that point I felt like I didn't want to come in. I would go in the building and I could feel my stress level rise as soon as I walked in the door. If I saw him coming down the hallway, I went a different way. I still don't like to see the guy. He is still there. He is still a jerk.”

However, a number of other informants described a range of negative emotions as a result of their negative interactions and experiences. Some of the descriptors include
feeling resentful, humiliated, irritated, and frustrated. Others describe the interactions as emotionally challenging and exhausting. Below are illustrations of some of these experiences.

Serena describes her interactions with a manager, particularly when meeting one-on-one:

“(he was) very critical and I think that might have been part of his nature but I couldn’t help but feel like there was something wrong with me – something wrong with my sort of methodology, something with my use of common sense in decision making and communications and so every encounter we had was tense and it wasn’t necessarily outright but his body language, his expression showed me – again, micro-messages that he just wasn’t I wasn’t a good place with him.”

Jenine described some of her interactions with her supervisor as hostile, disrespectful and non-collaborative. I asked her how she felt after some of the negative interactions with her supervisor and she responded:

"I was pretty enraged. I felt like I had been unjustly treated .” “It would often make me very angry. I would often leave there very, very angry.”

Rosa also described her experience related to larger-group interactions in which she felt as though she was put on the spot and viewed negatively for raising questions around equity and fairness. Her description of their exchanges appear to convey a good deal of frustration.

"My colleagues will ask 'Rosa are you ok with this?’ looking at me like, 'We know you got a chip on your shoulder. So we are going the check in with you.' I felt like it was an act of hostility, like "We remember that you are over sensitive about issues around race. So we want to make sure that you are ok. Are you ok with this?” It was so irritating. I am like, "Really, am I the only person who is concerned with fairness and equity? Are you ok with it? Can I ask you that? Have you thought about it? Are you ok with it?”
Serena describes the experience more in terms of getting ready to do battle in order to prove herself and be recognized:

"In instances where I might be the only Black woman in a sea of white men on any given day and it's tough and I don't even know necessarily if there were micro-messages from all the men in the room but I come into that situation feeling like it's going to be a battle to sort of get air time and sort of prove myself. It just feels like I'm at a disadvantage when perhaps I'm not."

One theme that came up often is the impact of the ambiguity that is associated with incivility. As discussed the potential for incivility to have some basis in racism can be particularly challenging for individuals to make sense of. On the one hand, attributing the incivility to some form of racism might help make sense of the negative interactions in a way that alleviates stress. However, the idea of attributing negative treatment to racism raised concerns about being viewed as playing the "race card". This leaves individuals in a precarious position of questioning the motivation for the negative interaction but not always wanting to consider that their race played any role in it. Many of the informants discussed this issue and the challenge presented because there is no way to ever know if racism was a factor.

Ray: "A lot of this incivility stuff and racism can drive you crazy because you never know if you're making up stuff or if it is real - because it is well hidden".

Given this ambiguity, many of the informants seem to cope by consciously avoiding spending too much time thinking about it.

Kris: “you won't be able to persist or thrive in this environment if you are thinking, ‘Oh my goodness. How uncivil!’ It will just destroy you. So what happens is that you just become almost blind to it. So it causes it to exist even more because then the feedback you are giving is that it's fine for the individual to act that way. Sometimes you're just so tired. So you will never win because you won't be able to get that point across because it's innocent in the person's mind.”
A few of the interviewees expressed being able to find humor in some of the situations they faced. One informant (Lena) specifically described a work-around to her manager's unwillingness to acknowledge her contributions as "playing games" with him by actively engaging coworkers to promote her ideas. Patricia described her sarcastic response to some of the negative interactions in the following manner:

"Sarcasm is us and its fun. I will torture people. I figure if you are dumb enough to get into the conversation with me, I am just going to let you hang. Everybody I know does it just because it's something that we can laugh at."

**Career Satisfaction**

One unexpected topic that emerged during the interviews was a focus on career decisions and how experiences with incivility have shaped informants' career choices. Ray describes how some of the career choices he made were influenced by the lack of support he experienced. His experience occurred while working for a large organization that, in general, had strong culture norms around treating individuals with respect and valuing diversity. However, he worked for a manager that had behaved in an uncivil manner on a number of occasions, including one instance in which the manager appeared to discuss Ray as a product of the organization's affirmative action program. This negative relationship contributed to Ray's decision to change positions:

"But, in general - again, that company, in general, was pretty well run. I can't think of any other things other than not trusting that particular person again and actually volunteering for an assignment so I could get out of his group, and never going back to working for him again, that was a good career move for me."

However, he goes on later to describe the outcome of taking that new role. That assignment moved him out of his technical role into a more corporate job, linked to the whole technical division. Traditionally, this role was a stepping stone from an
individual-contributor role, to a managerial position. Yet, in his case, there was no offer of a managerial job at the end of the two-year corporate assignment. He reflects his disappointment and the impact it ultimately had on his thoughts about his future career in that organization:

"So, yeah, my upwardly mobile thing was a wash. And that is when I realized that—and, again, I don't—I don't know why. Maybe I just wasn't what they wanted. Who knows? All I know is that, from that point on, I was no longer very interested in climbing the corporate ladder (and it was) only, two or three years after that that I decided to leave the company."

Ray's experience with his manager labeling him as an affirmative action hire represents an uncivil interaction. The feeling that this manager was not going to be supportive in the future, and had a negative perception of Ray, influenced his decision to move into another job. However, the general lack of support that he received at the end of his next role, may suggest a slightly different way in which incivility should be conceptualized. There appears to be a multiplicative effect that may influence individuals' overall assessment of their career options. As individuals feel a lack of support, and as it becomes more and more prevalent, it may impact the hope they have for future success within the organization and impact their overall decisions about their career and cause them to consider where success might be more attainable. Kris reflects this in his description of his decision to change careers:

Kris: “This has even guided my profession where I kind of moved away from something that requires so much of a subjective determination. Now, I am in insurance. That, because of the laws of the state, governs your compensation and not your boss or your boss', boss. The state. So if I sell this product, my commission is exactly the same as any other human who sells that exact same product in the state of Florida. I mean I didn’t do this on purpose but I kind of found myself in that profession just as a result of all of my attempts to thrive in an environment that was a little bit loosely regulated. Therefore, it was all subjective. I mean I can quantify why I deserve this promotion, why I deserve the
pay raise, why I deserve whatever it is that I am seeking -- the advancement -- but never would get. They would never have to give an excuse. You can either make a big stink out of it but once again, you don’t want to be classified as the angry Black person. So you make a decision. Do you make a big deal out of it or do you just clap along with everyone else and say "congratulations" to the person just to show that you are a good sport?"

Note that both Ray and Kris comment on the ambiguity of their situations. They both acknowledge that it is impossible to know why they didn't get the promotions they were working towards. However, they consider that subtle bias could have been a factor and both ultimately make the decision to change careers. A few of the respondents discussed moving to a new organization in hopes of finding more success. Catherine discussed starting her own business as a way to gain more control over her future and to avoid having to be "so grateful" for the rewards that she has earned through her own hard work. She does not attribute her future aspirations as a response to incivility specifically, but she does discuss the desire to have her rewards more directly related to her contributions.

Some of the experiences described are perhaps better identified as examples of possible discrimination. A number of studies have explored the impact of subtle bias on hiring decisions (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Ziegert & Hanges, 2005). Keene references one such study when describing his own current job search. It should be noted that during our interview Keene was very cautious about attributing any of his experiences to racism. Overall, he does not feel that he has experienced much race-based incivility. However, when discussing his job search, he indicates that he has adjusted his behavior based on the possibility that race might have a negative influence on hiring decisions:

"Now, right now, and again I'm not sure. Right today I'm frustrated as I'm looking for new work. I think the job that I've been in sort of pigeon-holes me because it's
a very, it's hard to transition this role into other opportunities. There's a lot of work if I want to stay doing the kind of work I'm doing but moving out of it I'm finding is being difficult. And again, is it because I'm a 40-year old Black man or is it because I haven't done my resume well enough and I'm going after the wrong opportunities? I have noticed –I was reading something –it was one of those articles, I forget who put it out there, by someone who, I think it was a woman, an African American woman who changed her name on her resume (and) didn't check off "African American" (on applications) and that resonated strongly with me and I didn't –I noticed that I started not checking off African-American because I feel like my name could certainly go either way."

In total, seven of the individuals interviewed specifically described experiences that have shaped their careers and influenced choices that they have made.

These discussions provided new insights regarding the potential impact of incivility. While some of the studies on incivility have explored job satisfaction (e.g., Miner, Pesonen, Smittick, Siegel, & Clark, 2004; Reio & Ghosh, 2009; Wilson & Holmvall, 2013), to my knowledge none have specifically tested the impact incivility can have on overall career satisfaction.

**Review of Interview Findings**

As these findings suggest, the current conceptualization of incivility may not be broad enough to fully capture the experiences that Black Americans have with incivility in the workplace. Some aspects of the current definition certainly apply. The ambiguous nature of incivility was paramount in the experiences the interviewees described. Many of the interactions were perceived as low-level and many clearly involved negative behaviors. However, other aspects of the incivility they experienced would suggest that the domain of incivility is different for them. Many of the situations presented by the
interviewees were not necessarily negative or deviant. Some were more neutral or even positive.

Many of the interviewees discussed the intent or motivation they believed was behind the incivility. While the individuals did not specifically state that the instigators were trying to maintain power or the status quo (which benefits majority group members), the actions described appear to reflect social dominance theory (Levin et al., 2002). Perhaps one of the more surprising themes that emerged was the efforts that were exerted trying to navigate the uncivil interactions. It was apparent how much time and energy was spent anticipating, preempting, and managing the incivilities they experienced, or expected to experience. This effort, combined with the work of trying to make sense of the interactions that occurred, appears to take a toll on the emotions and attitudes of the interviewees.

The second part of this research involves creating a race-based incivility measure. The following chapter describes this process and the ways in which the interview findings informed the creation of that instrument.
CHAPTER 4

PHASE 2: SCALE DEVELOPMENT

Survey Creation

Findings from the interviews, along with other relevant theory (microaggressions, daily hassles, etc.), provided data for the development of the survey tool. To create a reliable and valid measure of race-based incivility I followed steps outlined in some of the measurement development literature (e.g., Hinkin, 1998). All of the steps involved in creating survey items, refining the items, implementing, and analyzing the survey are described in this chapter.

Item Generation and Refinement

Scale items were generated using a combination of a deductive and inductive approach. Items were primarily developed using the interview findings as a guide (an inductive approach). A few additions and changes were based on existing research (a deductive approach) as well as additional conversations on the topic of incivility. Transforming the data from the interviews into meaningful survey items required that many of the experiences be translated into more generalizable descriptions. In addition, certain examples provided by the interviewees were synthesized to try to capture a range of similar experiences within one item.

The initial development of scale items resulted in 106 unique items. These items were then organized into 22 different categories. These items and categories were analyzed for redundancy, conceptual clarity, and consistency with the concept of race-based incivility. The number of items was reduced to 83 and the number of categories
was reduced to 10. The scale and items were then reviewed by a subject-matter expert for further refinement and editing. The number of items was reduced to 68 at the conclusion of this round of refinement.

In the next step, two of the interviewees were utilized as content-knowledge editors. The purpose of this step was to provide an initial assessment on the extent to which the remaining items represented the domain of race-based incivility. They provided additional input on the 68 items in the survey to ensure that the meaning of all items was clear and there was no overlap across items. One more round of editing occurred with a knowledgeable faculty member to identify items that were redundant, poorly worded, or unrelated to the content domain. Following this round of refinement, the items on the survey were finalized.

The final number of items on the RBIS-portion of the scale was 63. One of the primary goals for this survey was to learn about the domain of race-based incivility. This required a broad sampling of items to ensure that adequate coverage was achieved. Although the length of the survey was quite long, the intent was to allow Black/African American’s who have experienced race-based incivility to help guide the selection of items that would be the most meaningful. Therefore, a large number of items were included in the survey so that the results from survey participants could drive the final determination of which items to retain.

**Survey Sample and Procedures**

Survey participants were solicited primarily through a snowball sample. Initial participants were obtained through referrals of friends and colleagues as well as solicitation through relevant list-serves. All seventeen interviewees were encouraged to
participate. Each contact included a request to forward the survey link to other friends, colleagues, and family members who identified as Black/African American. In a number of instances individuals posted the link on their social networking sites.

Surveys were completed using an on-line survey software tool (Qualtrics). Participation was voluntary and respondents were able to quit the survey at any time. To ensure that respondents were individuals who identified as Black or African American the first two questions reiterated the focal population:

Q. I identify as an individual who has experienced life as a Black or African American-person
   • Yes
   • No

Those who answered “no” were directed to an open-ended question that asked them how they identified. Those who answered “yes” were directed to the following question:

Q. Specifically, how do you identify your race/ethnicity?
   • Black -- from the African Continent
   • African-American
   • Afro-Hispanic
   • Afro-Caribbean
   • From multiple races
   • Other (please specify)

In total, 219 individuals initiated the survey. Of these, 87% identified as Black or African American. The total number of responses for the first incivility-related question was 192, indicating that almost all of the non-Black African-American identifying participants did not continue with the survey. The total number of completed responses was 131. This represents a 68% completion rate. The completion rate was likely to be impacted by two factors. First, there may have been a few respondents who did not identify as Black/African American who began the questionnaire but then realized the
specificity of the questions and subsequently dropped out of the survey. Alternatively, there may have been some respondents who were simply interested in understanding what incivility experienced by Black/African Americans would entail. After responding to a few questions these individuals may have dropped out. Second, the total survey was comprised of just over 100 items. Response duration varied widely but the median response time was approximately forty minutes. The length of the survey may have resulted in survey fatigue leading some participants to exit before responding to all of the questions.

Among the participants who completed the survey, 68% were female. Age was distributed such that 58% of respondents were over 40 years old. Education levels were quite high with 74% of respondents having a Master’s degree or higher. Almost 40% of the respondents had a combined annual household income over $100,000, with 24% indicating their household income was over $150,000. The percentage of participants who were employed in “education, training, or library” was 37%, 16% indicated they were in management occupations. Participants came from across the United States with the majority located in New England (29%), the Mid-Atlantic (27%), and the Southeast (20%).

**Scale Evaluation**

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

The psychometric properties of the RBIS were evaluated with respect to the instrument’s reliability and factor structure. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted with principle components and varimax rotation on the survey data. Both Eigenvalues and a scree plot were examined. This data suggests three-highly explanatory components.
However, it was determined that a three-factor model might not adequately represent the domain of race-based incivility. Further analysis of the results of the EFA revealed seven components with an Eigenvalue greater than 1.5. A review of the additional four components revealed items that were frequently discussed in the interviews. These items appear to represent the broad-range of experiences that Black Americans’ have with incivility. Expanding the number of components retained in the final model provided greater confidence that important aspects of the experience of incivility were not eliminated too soon in the scale development process. Rationale for retaining a greater number of components was further reinforced by Burnfield et al. (2004) who have suggested that the most notable problem with existing scales of incivility is the failure to sufficiently span the construct space. The scale developed by Burnfield and colleagues (2009), which is a scale to measure general incivility, consisted of eight incivility factors.

It was determined that the seventh component was not theoretically robust so that component was dropped and a six-factor model was retained.

The initial six-factor EFA resulted in the following:

Table 1: Coefficient Alpha for the six-factor model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component #</th>
<th>Coefficient alpha</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item Analysis**
All items for each component were reviewed and judgments were made regarding the theoretical meaning of each group. Minor item adjustments were made to improve the clarity of meaning for each component. An item analysis was then conducted by calculating coefficient alphas for the reliabilities of each factor. A goal of five items per component, which yields a manageable 30-item survey, was achieved by dropping the items with the lowest loading while still maintaining reliabilities of .80 or greater.

Table 2: Item Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component #</th>
<th>Coefficient alpha</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty items were retained as a result of the analyses. The final set of items is presented in Appendix B which show the pattern matrix from the principal component analysis (with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization).

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

To validate the construct domain of race-based incivility a CFA was performed to test the factor structure obtained from the EFA. Goodness-of-fit statistics such as RMSEA, CFI, TLI and SRMR were also obtained. These measures suggest an adequate fit. The comparative fit index (CFI) is 0.872 and the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) is 0.857. An acceptable fit is indicated by values higher than 0.900 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The 90 CI Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) value is 0.063 to 0.083. Values of .05 or less indicate a close fit, values between .05 and .08 indicate a reasonable fit, and
values between .08 and .10 indicate a mediocre fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1992). Thus, the fit of this model is reasonable. Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR) is an absolute fit indicator. Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested .08 or smaller as a guideline for good fit. SRMR obtained for our data is 0.073.

**Final Race-Based Incivility Scale (RBIS)**

The final race-based incivility scale comprised six factors. These factors were retained to ensure broad coverage of the domain of race-based incivility. Each factor contained five items which made the final scale (30 total items) a manageable length while maintaining high reliability within each factor (see Table 2 below). Following is a discussion of each of the 5 factors. A sample of the survey findings for each dimension is also discussed.

Table 3: Final Scale Items with Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR 1: LACK OF SUPPORT &amp; INCLUSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a white co-worker, manager, or customer withhold information from you, which made it harder to be effective in your job?</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a manager who didn’t advocate for you despite your good performance?</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been excluded from important work networks?</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been excluded from an important meeting despite having the credentials to be included?</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a hard time getting assignments that were considered high-visibility or mission-critical?</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR 2: IGNORING BOUNDARIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had your privacy invaded because an individual was curious about something they viewed as “different” (e.g., hair, sex life, relationships)?</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed a co-worker or supervisor use your relationship to demonstrate that he/she has no racial bias or prejudice?</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had someone ask “what are you?” or “where did you come from?”</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had an individual freely comment on, and make judgments about, your appearance as it relates to your racial identity?</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had individuals express negative, race-related views in your presence but assume that you will not be offended because you are exceptional or different?</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR 3: MINIMIZING YOUR VALUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had a manager or supervisor suggest that you should be grateful for receiving an outcome even though you were entitled to or had earned it?</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been accused, blatantly or subtly, of exaggerating your accomplishments or taking credit for something that you didn’t do on your own?</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had co-workers minimize your accomplishment(s) when you exceeded their level of achievement?</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been required to “verify” your credentials to a degree that others have not?</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a client/customer by-pass you for information and go to a white co-worker instead, even though were qualified to answer?</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACTOR 4: ENACTING PRIVILEGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Been treated in a paternalistic or patronizing manner in an attempt to protect/help you?</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had someone ask questions about your background in a manner that calls into question your right to be in the position you are?</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had your input rejected until it was validated by a white person?</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a suggestion that was ignored until a white person made the same suggestion which he/she was then praised for?</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a white co-worker or manager express surprise at the high-quality of your credentials?</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACTOR 5: CURTAILING INCIVILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have compromised on my values/beliefs in order to “fit in” with the majority group members in my organization</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have minimized my accomplishments or aspirations to make my white co-workers or supervisors feel more comfortable with me</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have decided to minimize some aspect of my racial identity that I like in order to avoid attention</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have tempered my expression of frustration or anger to avoid triggering the “angry Black woman” or “threatening” Black man stereotype</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have chosen to use language that makes me more acceptable to my white co-workers and customers.</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACTOR 6: MAINTAINING POWER & THE STATUS QUO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had a co-worker or manager become overly aggressive with you in a manner that seemed not typical of their interactions with others?</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had your actions or in-actions receive much more attention than they would have if you were white?</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received push-back or negative feedback when you tried to advocate for fairness and equity in the workplace?</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had your shortcomings carry more weight in the assessment of your performance than your successes?</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been held to a standard of performance that was higher than whites performing a similar job?</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 1: Lack of Support and Inclusion**

Items in this factor represent the lack of work and career support individuals’ experience in the workplace, including ways in which they may be excluded from important work-related meetings and social networks. The overall mean for Factor 1 was 2.66, with a standard deviation of 1.14.
All of the items in this factor, if experienced by a Black Professional (or any employee) in the workplace, could have had a negative impact on his/her career. In addition to exploring inclusion in/exclusion from work meetings and work networks, the factor focused on access to high-visibility assignments, management support, and cooperation.

The following two questions had the highest means within this factor (2.81 and 2.74 respectively)

Table 4: Factor 1 question results: exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Have you) been excluded from important work networks?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Factor 1 question results: Manager’s advocacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Have you) had a manager who didn’t advocate for you despite your good performance?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pattern of responses on these two questions was fairly similar: between 58% - 61% of respondents reported they experience these behaviors “sometimes” to “very often”, while 40% - 42% reported they “never” or “rarely” encountered these situations.

**Factor 2: Ignoring Boundaries**

This factor represented experiences when the instigator oversteps personal boundaries by asking inappropriate or personal/insensitive questions. The questions may reveal stereotypes held by the instigator. While the actions or questions were likely not intended to be offensive, they invaded the privacy of the target and may have left the individual feeling as if he/she was viewed primarily as a token representative for Black/African-Americans. The overall mean for Factor 2 was 2.53, with a standard deviation of 1.31.

One question stood out with a higher frequency than the other four:

Table 6: Factor 2 question results: Negative race-related views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had individuals express negative, race-related views in your presence but assume that you will not be offended because you</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are exceptional or different?

As indicated in the graph below, over one-quarter of the respondents indicated they have experienced this type of behavior “often” or “very often”.

![Graph showing the percentage of respondents experiencing various levels of behavior](image)

**Factor 3: Minimizing Your Value**

This factor refers to behaviors that appear to question the target’s contributions and accomplishments. This may manifest in the target being bypassed when a colleague was looking for information or by having to take extra steps to verify his/her right to be in the current space. The overall mean for Factor 3 was 2.22, with a standard deviation of 1.18.

**Table 7: Factor 3 question results: Being by-passed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had a client/customer by-pass you for information and go to a white co-worker instead, even though you were qualified to answer</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question had a high frequency of affirmative responses. Sixty-six percent of the respondents indicated they had experienced being passed-by “sometimes” to “very often.”

The second-highest frequency response in this factor was for the question below. Note while one-third of the respondents indicated they have experienced being minimized by co-workers, over fifty percent indicated that this happened either “rarely” or “never”.

Table 8: Factor 3 question results: Minimizing accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had co-workers minimize your accomplishment(s) when you exceeded their level of achievement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 3 also contained the item with the lowest frequency rating in the survey (1.61).

Table 9: Factor 3 question results: Accused of exaggerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Been accused, blatantly or subtly, of exaggerating your accomplishments or taking credit for something that you didn’t do on your own?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two questions above both relate to how well an individual’s accomplishments are received. Almost two-thirds of the respondents indicated they had never been accused of exaggerating their accomplishments. However, note that almost fifty percent
responded that they had experienced a co-worker(s) who minimized their accomplishments. Taken together, these two questions reinforce the subtle nature of incivility. The majority of individuals were not directly challenged on their accomplishments. Neither are they able to actively promote their accomplishments if they exceed the levels achieved by their co-workers.

**Factor 4: Enacting Privilege**

Factor four represents behaviors that privilege white group members over other groups. The behaviors not only serve to disempower their target but also to question the individual’s right to be in their position. The overall mean for Factor 4 was 2.79, with a standard deviation of 1.23.

The two questions with the highest frequency of positive responses are listed below. Both of these experiences often get recounted by Black/African Americans. The high rates indicated in the charts below reinforce the prevalence of such behaviors.

Table 10: Factor 4 question results: Surprised by credentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had a white co-worker or manager express surprise at the high-quality of your credentials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Factor 4 question results: Having suggestions ignored

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Made a suggestion that was ignored until a white person made the same suggestion which he/she was then praised for</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 5: Curtailing Incivility

This factor represented actions and behaviors taken by Black/African-Americans who must navigate a majority-dominated environment. The choices that were made were rooted in knowledge about what will and will not be “acceptable” to the dominant group.
Individuals may adapt some aspect(s) of their identity to preempt or minimize the incivility they will experience if they do *not* conform to the majority norms and culture.

The overall mean for Factor 5 was 2.43, with a standard deviation of 1.39.

The question below had the highest level of agreement of all of the items in the survey. Twenty-five percent of respondents stated that they “very often” had to temper their frustration to avoid priming negative stereotypes.

Table 12: Factor 5 question results: Avoiding stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have tempered my expression of frustration or anger to avoid triggering the “angry Black woman” or “threatening” Black man stereotype.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty percent of the respondents reported that they very often chose to use language that made them more “acceptable” to majority-group co-workers or customers. Almost two-thirds of the total responses indicated that they make such adjustments “sometimes” to “very often”.
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Table 13: Factor 5 question results: Choosing acceptable language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have chosen to use language that makes me more acceptable to my white co-workers and customers.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 6: Maintaining Power & the Status Quo

The final factor represented actions that work to centralize power within the dominant group and reify notions of the inferiority of their targets. The overall mean for Factor 6 was 2.66, with a standard deviation of 1.23.

Table 14: Factor 6 question results: Your actions or inactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had your actions or in-actions receive much more attention than they would have if you were white</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Factor 6 question results: Pushback when advocating for fairness & equity

Received push-back or negative feedback when you tried to advocate for fairness and equity in the workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 contains the list of all scale items, including the means and standard deviation obtained.

**Scale Validation**
To provide further evidence of the construct validity of the RBI measure, SPSS 12.0 was used to examine discriminant and convergent validity. Correlations can be found in Appendix C.

### Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Given the ambiguous, low-level nature of incivility, it was expected that there would only be a weak relationship between incivility and other anti-social workplace behaviors that are more severe such as bullying, and workplace aggression. Workplace aggression and bullying scales were utilized to test discriminant validity. Workplace aggression was examined using a modified version of Glomb’s (2002) twenty-item Aggressive Experiences Scale (AES). A revised version of this scale, containing 10 items, was developed and validated by Jensen, Patel, & Raver (2014). Five of the items were identified as overt acts of aggression and were included in the present study. Bullying was measured using a single item which has been shown to be a valid measure of exposure to bullying at work (Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2001).

It was anticipated that there would be a positive correlation between workplace aggression and incivility as well as bullying and incivility. The results supported those assertions. Workplace aggression was positively correlated ($r=+.405; p<.01$) as was bullying ($bullying = r=+.373; p<.01$). The correlations were weak which is expected when testing discriminant validity. Therefore, Hypotheses 1a is supported.

Race-based incivility is conceptualized as a construct that is similar to, but broader and more nuanced than, general workplace incivility. Therefore, it was expected that the RBIS will have a strong, positive relationship with the more general – workplace
incivility measures. Workplace incivility was tested using the original Workplace Incivility Scale (Cortina, et al., 2001). The results indicate that there is a strong positive correlation between the RBIS and WIS (r= +.836; p < .01), providing support for Hypothesis 1b.

Hypothesis Testing and Exploration of the Research Questions

**Stress**

Hypothesis 2 proposed that RBI will have a positive relationship with stress. Stress was assessed using the four-item Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-4). The PSS is designed to explore the degree to which respondents find their lives unpredictable, uncontrollable, and overloading (Cohen & Lichtenstein, 1990). There was a significant correlation (r= +.310; p<.01) between RBI and stress. Hence, hypothesis 2 is supported.

**Career Satisfaction**

Hypothesis 3 proposed that RBI will have a negative relationship with career satisfaction. Career Satisfaction was measured using a five item scale developed by Grennhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley (1990) for their study on the effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance, evaluations, and career outcomes.

The relationship between the six-factor RBIS and career satisfaction was not significant. However, there was a significant relationship between career satisfaction and Factor 1 (r= -.256; p<.01). Factor 1 in the scale represents lack of career/job support as well as issues around inclusion/exclusion. As indicated earlier, the item with the highest mean rating in that Factor was “(I have been) excluded from important work networks.”
This, and other items in this factor, would appear to be closely tied to career success. This may explain the significant, although weak, correlation between Factor 1 and career satisfaction. Overall, however, Hypothesis 3 only receives partial support.

It is unclear why career satisfaction was not significantly associated with the six-factor model of RBI. These findings are somewhat surprising given that other studies have shown that incivility can impact satisfaction with one’s job, supervisor, coworkers, pay, benefits, and promotional opportunities (Cortina et al., 2001; Cortina et al., 2002; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Lim & Teo, 2009; Martin & Hine, 2005; Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007; Penney & Spector, 2005; Taylor, 2010). However, research on the factors that impact the career satisfaction of minorities is limited so it is possible that there are intervening variables that need to be considered. Further, the participants in this study appear to have already achieved a great deal of (monetary) career success which may have influenced their responses. More research will be needed to understand the relationship between incivility and career satisfaction.

**Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS)**

When developing a scale it is critical to assess whether the new measure will be able to predict key outcomes beyond other related scales (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005). Research Question 1 suggested that the RBIS would predict outcomes over the WIS. The WIS did have significant positive correlations with workplace aggression (WP aggression r=+.610; p<.01) and bullying (bullying r=+.573; p<.01). These were stronger correlations than those found for the RBIS. The relationship between WIS and career satisfaction was not significant. WIS did have a weak significant relationship with stress
(r= +.341; p<.01) which is similar to the correlation found between the RBIS and stress. Given these somewhat equivocal results, the answer to Research Question 1 is not clear. More research is needed to better understand these relationships.

**Gender**

Research Question 2 posited that gender would act as a moderator of race and incivility such that Black/African American women will experience more incivility than Black/African American men. A t-test was conducted and results indicate that gender has a significant correlation with incivility with females reporting more incivility than males: t(126)=2.20, p=.029.

Pronounced gender differences cluster in two factors. Responses on four of the five items in Factor 4 resulted in mean differences that are worth exploring. Factor 4 represents ways in which the instigator(s) assert their white privilege. It is likely that these items may also reflect the patriarchal nature of our culture. Correlations can be found in Appendix D.

Mean differences were examined to identify items that had at least .5 differences between female and male responses. However, means do not adequately represent the pattern differences that exist. Examining the range of responses can provide additional information. Respondents were asked how often they:

**Table 16: Factor 4 gender differences: Surprised by credentials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had a white co-worker or manager express surprise at the high-quality of your credentials?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean for females was 3.13 (SD = 1.26) for males it was 2.63 (SD = 1.30). The distribution of responses indicates that 70% of females have experienced this “sometimes,” “often,” or “very often” whereas only 54% of males have experienced this frequency. The graph below illustrates this difference.

Respondents were also asked if they had experienced a time in which their suggestion(s) were overlooked or ignored, but then had the same suggestion presented by a white person who was subsequently praised for it.

Table 17: Factor 4 gender differences: Having suggestions ignored

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Made a suggestion that was ignored until a white person made the same suggestion which he/she was then praised for?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average for females on the 5-point scale was 3.06 (SD= 1.23) for males it was 2.54 (SD= 1.21). Both females and males reported similar rates for “sometimes”
(females 34%; males 32%). More notable differences were exhibited in the extremes of the scale which can be seen in the graph below.

Notice that 27% of males respondent that they had never experienced this situation, compared to 12% females. This difference is even more extreme on the other end of the scale with 16% of females indicating that they have “very often” experienced this and only 5% of the males stating the same.

A similar response pattern is seen in a question that specifically asks about experiences with patronizing or paternalistic behaviors:

Table 18: Factor 4 gender differences: Treated in a paternalistic manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Been treated in a paternalistic or patronizing manner in an attempt to protect/help you?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the graph below, over one-quarter of the males responded that they had “never” experienced this. Only 8% of female respondents selected that response.
The mean for females was 2.97 (SD=1.11), for males it was 2.39 (SD = 1.18).

Three of the five items in Factor 2 showed some interesting differences in responses between females and males. This factor represents instances in which the respondent was subjected to personal scrutiny or had questions imposed on them that may constitute an invasion of privacy. In all three questions the largest differences occurred at the low end of the response scale. Meaning, males frequently responded that they had “never” had such interactions. The table below provides three of these questions with their means and standard deviations. Following the table are graphs illustrating the response distributions.

Table 19: Factor 2 gender differences in respondents answering “never”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Females (M, SD)</th>
<th>Males (M, SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 2: IGNORING BOUNDARIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had your privacy invaded because an individual was curious about something they viewed as “different” (e.g., hair, sex life, relationships)?</td>
<td>M=2.90 SD=1.37</td>
<td>M=1.83 SD=1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had someone ask “what are you?” or “where did you come from?”</td>
<td>M=2.73 SD=1.33</td>
<td>M=2.05 SD=1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had an individual freely comment on, and make judgments about, your appearance as it relates to your racial identity?</td>
<td>M=2.61 SD=1.28</td>
<td>M=1.73 SD=1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q: Had your privacy invaded because an individual was curious about something they viewed as “different” (e.g., hair, sex life, relationships)?

Q: Had someone ask “what are you?” or “where did you come from?”
Q: Had an individual freely comment on, and make judgments about, your appearance as it relates to your racial identity?

One of the items in the original survey that did not get retained after the EFA provides a perspective on how these experiences of personal invasion or curiosity may influence Black females’ presentation of their own professional identity. The question asked how often the respondent “needed to compensate for some of the personal choices (I) have made about my physical appearance such as my choice in hairstyle, dress, etc.” Thirty-one percent of females indicated that they needed to compensate for their choices “often” or “very often.” This compared to only 13% of males who answered “often.”
Table 20: Gender question regarding “the need to compensate for personal choices”

These results support much of the intersectionality work that asserts Women of Color face different realities than men of color (e.g., Browne & Misra, 2003; Greenman & Xie, 2008). Women who participated in this study reported greater incivility which is perhaps not surprising since it has been demonstrated that Women of Color encounter a “double whammy of discrimination” (Berdahl & Moore, 2006, p. 427), driven by both gender and race-based biases (e.g., Beal, 1970; Buchanan et al., 2008; Greenman & Xie, 2008). The types of incivility experienced more frequently by females – behaviors that reinforce the privilege held by other groups -- is worthy of continued study.

**Demographic Analysis**

Additional analyses were conducted to assess the relationships between incivility and other demographics. Income is negatively correlated with incivility. A logarithmic scale was used to test this: \( r = -.218; \ p < .05 \). Overall there were no significant relationships with age, education or organization size. However, age and education were
significantly related to individual factors. Age was significantly related to Factor 2: Ignoring Boundaries (t(126)=2.51, p=.013) and Factor 5: Curtailing Incivility (t(126)=2.08, p=.040). For these factors, younger respondents (under 40 years old) experienced significantly more incivility.

Factor 4: Enacting Privilege was significantly related to education (t(129)= -2.01, p=.047). Respondents who are more highly educated, holding a Master’s degree and above, reported significantly more incivility on this factor. The items in Factor 4 can be viewed as quite demeaning in nature: for example, “had your input rejected until it was validated by a white person”, “had a white co-worker or manager express surprise at the high-quality of your credentials.” Those who have attained the highest level of education may find such uncivil interactions particularly noteworthy and offensive. Demographic correlations can be found in Appendix D.

**Additional Findings: Racial Identity**

Further exploration of the survey data revealed some interesting findings that were not hypothesized and were not expected. These results relate to the experiences of Black respondents which appear to be more extreme in some instance than the experiences of African American respondents. As indicated earlier, respondents were asked to identify their race/ethnicity at the beginning of the survey. Choice selections included; Black -- from the African Continent, African American, Afro-Hispanic, Afro-Caribbean, from multiple races, and “other” (which they were asked to identify). Sixty-six percent of the 188 total respondents identify as African American. Respondents who selected “Black – from the African Continent” comprised 14% of the sample. Given the total sample size it is not possible to conduct meaningful analysis to determine significant
differences between these two groups. However, the data from the survey suggests that this may be an area for future research.

A few of the question show noteworthy differences in response patterns. For example, respondents were asked how often they had “received praise that revealed an assumption about your lack of skill or expertise?” The graph below shows responses by group.

Table 21: Racial identity differences: Assumptions about skills or expertise

![Graph showing response patterns by group.]

What most striking is that 40% of those individuals who identify as Black responded that they have experienced this type of incivility “often” or “very often” compared with only 11% of those who identify as African-American. In a similar pattern, 50% of Black respondents indicated that they have “often” or “very often” had their “actions or in-actions receive more attention than they would have if (they) were white” (Factor 6). Only 24% of those identifying as African-American responded “often” or “very often.”
Finally, even more notable are the responses to the question, how often have you “had a white co-worker or manager express surprise at the high-quality of your credentials?” (Factor 4). Forty-five percent of respondents who identify as Black indicated that they have experienced that incivility “very often.” Only 12% of those identifying as African-American indicated such a high frequency of that incivility.

Table 23: Racial identity differences: Surprised by credentials
These results suggest an area for further exploration in future studies. While a larger sample would be needed to draw significant conclusions, the current findings suggest that individuals who identify as Black may report different experiences with incivility than those who identify as African American.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The goal of this research was to explore the broader domain of race-based incivility – specifically as Black Americans may experience it. The mixed-methods approach used in this study provided a great deal of information that was both specific and nuanced at the same time. The incivilities that were shared provide a narrative that helps to explicate the complexity of incivility for Black Americans. The focus on Black Americans’ experiences of incivility is significant from the perspective of broadening our understanding of incivility from the ground up. Often research is conducted using Euro-American populations and the findings are extrapolated to all individuals with little regard for inter-group differences that may exist. This practice is viewed as normative and appropriate (Stansfield, 2003). One of the primary objectives for the study was to create the space for Black Americans’ to share their experiences from their perspective, using their voices.

Throughout this study I tried to ensure that the experiences of my informants and survey participants remained at the forefront. However, it is important to acknowledge the role that I, as the principle investigator, played in shaping this research. As a white woman who has experienced most of life from a middle- to upper-middle class socioeconomic status, there is no doubt that my identity influenced this work. Cross-race dialogue can be challenging. Issues of trust across racial groups can be significant (Nunally, 2009) and may impact individual’s willingness to participate in research on a topic that is both racially-charged and sensitive. During the interviews is it unknown how my racial-identity may have shaped the conversation and impacted the nature of the
information disclosed. One of the first interviewees I talked to was kind enough to do a follow up call to give me feedback on how the conversation felt to her. She explained that she was much more comfortable talking about her experiences once I had spent some time clearly explaining why I was interested in the topic and after I had communicated the fact that I had no preconceived ideas about what I wanted to hear. The act of legitimizing my interests and intentions and having others engage in referrals and verification were all critical to this work. Most of my interviewees were either individuals I already knew (2 interviewees), had loose connections to (3 interviewees), or were referred by an associate. When it came time to solicit survey participants one of my most active referees noted that she had made special efforts to vouch for both the quality and intentions behind my work. Her efforts, along with others who helped get the word out among their own social and work circles, played a large role in helping to build a trust-network that, I hope, encouraged deep-reflection and candor in their responses. Future researchers who are conducting work cross-racially should be aware of the importance of building relationships and allowing time for verification to occur.

While my racial-identity was different from my interviewees and survey participants, other aspects of my identity were quite similar to my participants. Two-thirds of my participant pools (interviews and survey) were female. Many of the participants shared the same economic-status as I do (40% indicated their household income was over $100,000) and a large percentage were affiliated with educational institutions. In this sense, I may be positioned as an “insider” of their social group. In addition, I considered my racial identity to include a border identity as I am married to an African American man and we are raising a bi-racial son. This provides an outsider-
within perspective that likely shaped my understanding and interpretation of the experiences that the interviewees and survey participants shared.

In my role as the principle investigator, however, there is a tacit expectation that I will translate the words and voice of my participants into the “language of the academic elite” (Stansfield & Dennis, 1993 p. 11). This suggests that I should make the findings more general and applicable to the field. All of my “translations” were made with the utmost care and attention. As suggested by Freire (2009), an act of allyship is achieved by allowing people of color to represent themselves. To the greatest extent possible I preserved the direct narratives of my interviewees and used those narratives both to drive the creation of the survey instrument and to provide a richer, textured representation of Black Americans’ experiences with incivility. The initial survey and the resulting six dimensions were specifically developed to represent a broad-range of experiences. While the length of the survey could have been an inhibitor to some participants (median time spent on the survey was 40 minutes), the intention was to allow the whole domain of Black Americans’ experiences with incivility to be represented so that decisions about refinement and focus were driven by other Black-identifying individuals. Further, the decision to retain six factors after the EFA was guided by the breadth of experiences presented throughout the interviews and related conversations. In these early stages of understanding the RBI-construct, forsaking brevity for the goals of presenting an inclusion domain of incivility was a reasonable trade-off.

The grounded-nature of the RBIS is a strong contribution to the field of incivility research. While further research is needed to extend our understanding of the relationship between the RBIS and the existing WIS, we now have a tool that has been
derived from the experiences of Black Americans. This will allow us to better understand the similarities and differences that may exist between these two groups with regards to incivility in the workplace. This survey instrument allows us to move away from simply making the assumption that Black Americans share the same experiences as white respondents – a practice that normalizes white-Americans’ experiences over those of minorities.

The findings from this study also inform our understanding of how incivility is experienced by Black Americans. The incivility described by Black Americans requires that we rethink aspects of the current definition of incivility. The definition of incivility includes the condition that the experienced behavior is deviant, rude, or discourteous (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). All of these are clearly negative behaviors. The data from this study suggests that RBI should not take the limited view that incivility manifests solely in negative interaction between two people. As the information indicates, incivility can be a lack of action or interaction. For employees who are often in the minority within their workspaces, acts of exclusion can be quite detrimental. The findings from this study suggest that RBI can manifest in the uneven application of what might otherwise be viewed as reasonable workplace policies and practices. However, when such policies are applied selectively, and sometimes aggressively toward primarily Black individuals or employees, those policies become tools for incivility. Further, some of the interactions were quite neutral on face-value. For example, simply asking to see a store receipt or membership card, having a co-worker inquire about a hair style, or getting a referral for a service. Others may even appear positive – having a supervisor indicate her desire to watch over and “protect” her employee. These neutral or positive acts were
not always experienced as such – particularly when the standard or code of behavior was not enacted consistently or appeared to be manifestations of racial stereotypes. These experiences suggest that a broadening of the definition of incivility may be in order.

The current definition of incivility does not capture the Black-individual’s preemptive work and interpersonal navigation that takes place to manage the uncivil interaction. Preemptive work includes actions that Black individuals undertake in an attempt to avoid or minimize uncivil interactions. This identity work was a strong, recurring theme in this study. Individuals talked about the frequent monitoring required to ensure they were perceived in the manner desired. Participants talked about conscious decisions about their speech, their hair, their clothing, and their emotional expressions. As a few of the participants put it, it can be a constant “dance”. The role of identity management is supported by identity research that suggests that minorities struggle with questions of whether or not to exclude aspects of their identity that are stigmatized in the workplace. This aspect of incivility is represented in Factor 5 in the RBIS. Inclusion of this factor allows for a more complete understanding of the incivility experienced by Black Americans.

The results of this research have a number of practical applications. First, the study adds additional support to the literature on incivility and stress. It is not surprising that there was a significant relationship between incivility and stress. Research had demonstrated that people of color are stressed by experiences of racism (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; Utsey, 1999), particularly when they are experiencing an event that is ambiguous, negative, unpredictable, and uncontrollable (Carter, 2007). Every single interviewee discussed the ambiguity they experience when confronted with an incivility.
As one interviewee stated “you could drive yourself crazy trying to figure it out.” The constant question of how much of the experience of incivility might be driven by racism is certain to create additional mental stress.

The findings from the interviews and the survey provide strong support for theories of intersectionality (Browne & Misra, 2003; Greenman & Xie, 2008). At the outset of this research it was not clear if gender would be associated with incivility and if it was, whether Black men or Black women were likely to experience greater frequencies of incivility. Intersectionality research informs that women of color face the double stigma of being Black and being in the racial minority. However, the negative stereotypes of Black Males are quite strong and can be viewed as very negative. It is for these reasons that Research Question 2 was posed.

The findings from both the interviews and the survey data clearly indicate that women report higher levels of incivility. Many of the examples provided through the narratives collected reinforce the strong patriarchal system that continues to exist in our country. The impact of this system appears to manifest in the incivility women experience. However, these results are not intended to negate the experiences that Black men have with incivility. Privileging one group’s experiences of inequity and injustice over another was not the goal of this study.

For managers and HR professionals the results of this study should provide insight into the experiences of Black employees in the workplace. As indicated, increased stress is one important negative outcome that these employees are likely to experience. As important is the knowledge that many Black employees may be spending a lot of mental time and energy trying to decode the incivility they are experiencing. It is
reasonable to expect this will take its toll on the employees. Further, there was some preliminary evidence to suggest that employees who work in more progressive organizations, where values around diversity and social justice are regularly communicated, may be more disillusioned and disappointed when they experience workplace incivility. Whether this is an example of hyper-awareness on the part of the impacted individual or “false advertising” on the part of the organization is unclear but the impact is worth noting.

**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

This investigation has several limitations. First, the survey sample obtained through the snowball process may not be generalizable to the population of Black Americans as a whole. As indicated in the demographic analysis, the sample was skewed towards individuals who work in the field of education. Although the jobs represented in that field may still be quite different, as was the case with the interview respondents, it is likely that the working environment in an educational institution is not the same as that of many other industries. However, it is possible that educational institutions may be more conscious of diversity and issues around social justice. Therefore, it is possible that the results from this sample underreport the actual frequency of RBI occurring in industries or organization that are less inclusive or focused on issues of fairness and equity. In addition, the potential limitations of the snowball sample were outweighed by the benefits that were incurred by using referrals to help obtain additional participants. As discussed above, the networking that occurred served as a means for verifying the
legitimacy and intent of the research. The verification process should not be overlooked as an important component in conducting “outsider” research.

The design of this study did not allow for the investigation of any causal relationships among the variables of interest. A longitudinal design is needed to better understand the relationships between incivility and stress and career satisfaction. Further, the data is subject to single-source bias as the individual respondent provided all of the information. The outcome measures that were used are appropriately assessed by the individual respondent (career satisfaction and stress). However, it would be advantageous to administer the outcome scales prior to, or separated from, the administration of the RBIS. It is possible that the lack of significant results for career satisfaction reflects a desire on the part of the respondents to demonstrate that incivility has not been a debilitating force in their lives. This perspective might provide a measure of protection from any detrimental effects that are associated with experiencing RBI.

Results from this study provide lots of opportunities for future research. Further research on RBI would benefit from incorporating a few measures that were not included in this study. For example, job satisfaction and supervisor trust ratings would likely be of interest to managers.

The current study was specifically designed to explore race-based incivility that was instigated by white managers, co-workers or customers. Race-based incivility can occur across various racial groups. It was apparent from some of the interview and survey data that incivility exists in the form of horizontal-racism. A number of respondents discussed incivility that was instigated by an employee or customer who was also Black/African-American. To my knowledge no research exists that examines intra-
group incivility. To truly get a complete understanding of workplace incivility it will be necessary to explore a variety of racial interactions.

Finally, one surprise in the results of the survey was the higher frequency of incivility reported by those who identified as Black versus African-American. While this trend was only seen on some of the questions and the sample size was too small to draw any significant conclusions, this is a phenomenon worth exploring. There has been research that indicates that “Black” people are viewed more negatively than “African Americans” (Hall, Phillips, & Townsend, 2015). This might suggest that individuals who identify themselves as “Black” may experience more incivility as a result of the (even more) negative stereotype associated with being “Black”. It is also possible that individuals in the study who identified themselves as “Black-from the African Continent” may feel more highly identified with their racial identity and the common origin that they share. A strong identification with one’s group can impact perceptions of discrimination (Sellers & Shelton, 2003), suggesting that these individual may be more perceptive regarding incivility in the workplace. Future research will be needed to better understand how differences in identification influence the experience of incivility.

The goal of this research was to better understand workplace incivility by exploring the experiences of Black Americans. It is my hope that this study not only expands the incivility literature but also opens a dialogue to explore the subtle but significant ways in which the workplace experiences of white and Black employees may be significantly different at times. This dialogue, and a willingness to confront difficult, ambiguous issues, is critical for creating more inclusive and productive work environments in the future.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Opening probe
Please describe a situation in which you felt that you were treated in an uncivil manner in the workplace (Note: this probe can be used multiple times to explore different experiences of incivility)

Follow-up Probes/Questions:
1. Describe the instigator. For example, was the instigator male or female? What was his/her race? Was he/she a co-worker, superior, subordinate, customer?

2. What was your position (job, level)?

3. Describe the demographics of the work place in which this occurred. Specifically, how racially diverse was your workgroup?

4. When and where did this interaction occur?

5. What, in particular, was it about the interaction that made it feel negative?

6. Do you feel the instigator was specifically targeting you with this behavior? If yes, what do you think was the motivation?

7. Do you think that your race had any role in this interaction?

8. Do you think that the instigator’s race had any role in this interaction?

9. How did you respond to the interaction?

10. What did you feel after the interaction?

11. Can you describe the culture of the work environment in which this took place?

12. How did this interaction fit into, or go against, the workplace norms in place at the time?
### APPENDIX B

#### EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS:

#### STANDARDIZED FACTOR LOADING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had a white co-worker, manager, or customer withhold information from you, which made it harder to be effective in your job?</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a manager who didn’t advocate for you despite your good performance?</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been excluded from important work networks?</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been excluded from an important meeting despite having the credentials to be included?</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a hard time getting assignments that were considered high-visibility or mission-critical?</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had your privacy invaded because an individual was curious about something they viewed as “different” (e.g., hair, sex life, relationships)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed a co-worker or supervisor use your relationship to demonstrate that he/she has no racial bias or prejudice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had someone ask “what are you?” or “where did you come from?”?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had an individual freely comment on, and make judgments about, your appearance as it relates to your racial identity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had individuals express negative, race-related views in your presence but assume that you will not be offended because you are exceptional or different?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a manager or supervisor suggest that you should be grateful for receiving an outcome even though you were entitled to or had earned it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been accused, blatantly or subtly, of exaggerating your accomplishments or taking credit for something that you didn’t do on your own?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had co-workers minimize your accomplishment(s) when you exceeded their level of achievement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been required to “verify” your credentials to a degree that others have not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a client/customer by-pass you for information and go to a white co-worker instead, even though were qualified to answer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been treated in a paternalistic or patronizing manner in an attempt to protect/help you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had someone ask questions about your background in a manner that calls into question your right to be in the position you are?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had your input rejected until it was validated by a white person?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a suggestion that was ignored until a white person made the same suggestion which he/she was then praised for?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a white co-worker or manager express surprise at the high-quality of your credentials?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have compromised on my values/beliefs in order to “fit in” with the majority group members in my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have minimized my accomplishments or aspirations to make my white co-workers or supervisors feel more comfortable with me</td>
<td></td>
<td>.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have decided to minimize some aspect of my racial identity that I like in order to avoid attention</td>
<td></td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have tempered my expression of frustration or anger to avoid triggering the “angry Black woman” or “threatening” Black man stereotype</td>
<td></td>
<td>.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have chosen to use language that makes me more acceptable to my white co-workers and customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a co-worker or manager become overly aggressive with you in a manner that seemed not typical of their interactions with others?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had your actions or in-actions receive much more attention than they would have if you were white?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received push-back or negative feedback when you tried to advocate for fairness and equity in the workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had your shortcomings carry more weight in the assessment of your performance than your successes?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been held to a standard of performance that was higher than whites performing a similar job?</td>
<td></td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C

**PEARSON CORRELATIONS** (Cronbach’s α’s on the diagonal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Six_Factors</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
<th>Factor4</th>
<th>Factor5</th>
<th>Factor6</th>
<th>WIS_Scale</th>
<th>Workplace_Agression</th>
<th>Bullying</th>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Career_Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>-.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIS_Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace_Agression</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career_Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
## APPENDIX D

### PEARSON CORRELATIONS – DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six_Factors</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
<th>Factor4</th>
<th>Factor5</th>
<th>Factor6</th>
<th>Do you identify as (male)</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Ln_income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.776 *</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.360</td>
<td></td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.833 **</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.870 **</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.725 **</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.839 **</td>
<td>.711 **</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.190 *</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-.266</td>
<td>-.590</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.218</td>
<td></td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.371</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.190</td>
<td></td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
APPENDIX E

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Black Americans’ Experiences of Incivility in the Workplace Consent Form

PURPOSE & PROCEDURE Thank you for your interest in this research study titled: Black Americans’ experiences of incivility in the workplace. The purpose of this study is to explore the intersection between subtle racism or bias, and workplace incivility. For this study, workplace incivility can be defined as the subtle, sometimes ambiguous, negative behaviors which are experienced by Black Americans in the workplace. If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey/questionnaire. This survey/questionnaire asks about the experiences that Black Americans’ have in majority (white)-dominated organization. Specifically, I would like to learn about the interactions you have with white co-workers, managers, and clients/customers. Participants must be at least 18 years old. RISKS There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to this study outside of what you may encounter in everyday life. The terminology used in the survey was informed by the words/language used by interview participants. Some of the words chosen may be more or less acceptable to other individuals. As with any online related activity the risk of a breach of confidentiality is always possible. To the best of my ability your answers in this study will remain confidential. I will exercise all efforts to minimize any risks. All information will be presented in the aggregate so that no individual participant is identified.

BENEFITS You may not directly benefit from this research; however, I hope that your participation in the study will provide you with the opportunity to describe and share some of the experiences you have had as a Black professional and will help inform an important dialogue regarding race in the workplace.

PARTICIPATION Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. The survey may take you approximately 15 minutes to complete. You may decide to leave the study at any time without penalty. You may also leave the survey and resume at a later time (if using the same browser your answers will still be active when you return). After completing the questionnaire you will have the opportunity to indicate if you would like to receive a summary of the survey results. You may also choose to enter a drawing to win one of four $25 Amazon or Barnes & Noble gift cards.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RESEARCH If you have questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the researcher, Kim Sherman, at ksherman@isenberg.umass.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Isenberg Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (413) 545-5678 or email dabutter@isenberg.umass.edu. Clicking on the next box will indicate that you have read and understood the information above and agree to participate in this survey.
Q1a: I identify as an individual who has experienced life as a Black- or African American-person
○ Yes
○ No

Answer If I identify my race/ethnicity as: Click to write Choice 1 Is Selected

Q1.b: Specifically, how do you identify your race/ethnicity?
○ Black -- from the African Continent
○ African-American
○ Afro-Hispanic
○ Afro-Caribbean
○ From multiple races
○ Other (please specify) ____________________

Answer If I identify my race/ethnicity as:  Is Selected

Q1c: I identify my race/ethnicity as:

Q2.1 While performing the job that you are qualified for, have you......

Q2.2 Had your expertise challenged by an inexperienced co-worker or customer?
○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q2.3 Had a white manager or co-worker inappropriately take over your responsibility or role?
○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q2.4 Had your decisions challenged by a white subordinate?
○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
Q2.5 Had a client/customer by-pass you for information and go to a white co-worker instead, even though you were qualified to answer?
○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q2.6 Had someone ask questions about your background in a manner that calls into question your right to be in the position you are?
○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q2.7 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q3.1 Regarding your experiences with mentoring, sponsorship & professional camaraderie, have you....

Q3.2 Received career support from white supervisors?
○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q3.3 Been left to learn your job on your own with little or no help from co-workers?
○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q3.4 Had a hard time getting assignments that were considered high-visibility or mission-critical?
Q3.5 Had to prove your allegiance to your manager and/or the organization in order to gain their trust and support?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q3.6 Been excluded from important work networks?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q3.7 Been treated in a paternalistic or patronizing manner in an attempt to protect/help you?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q3.8 Had a white co-worker, manager or customer single you out by interacting with you in a stereotypically “Black” manner such as greeting you with the “brother” handshake, asking “Wassup!??” etc.?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q3.9 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q4.1 Regarding your rights at work, have you....
Q4.2 Had your request for a benefit that other co-workers have used (e.g., vacation time, sabbatical, sick time) denied or overly scrutinized?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q4.3 Had a rule or policy applied to you that did not appear to be uniformly applied to others?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q4.4 Interviewed for a job/position and never received feedback or follow up?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q4.5 Had a manager who didn’t advocate for you despite your good performance?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q4.6 Had a manager consistently give you work assignments that were beneath your skill set(s)?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q4.7 Experienced your manager/co-workers’ hesitancy to defend you when something went wrong?
Q4.8 Been excluded from an important meeting despite having the credentials to be included?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q4.9 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q5.1 In the past, when your performance has been evaluated, have you....

Q5.2 Been held to a standard of performance that was higher than whites performing a similar job?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q5.3 Been required to “verify” your credentials to a degree that others have not?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q5.4 Been accused, blatantly or subtly, of exaggerating your accomplishments or taking credit for something that you didn’t do on your own?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often
Q5.5 Had your shortcomings carry more weight in the assessment of your performance than your successes?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q5.6 Had a white co-worker or manager express surprise at the high-quality of your credentials?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q5.7 Had your contributions left out while white individuals were being recognized for an important project or assignment that you also worked on?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q5.8 Received praise that revealed an assumption about your lack of skill or expertise?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q5.9 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q6.1 Regarding others’ understandings & perceptions of your race, have you....

Q6.2 Had a manager give you misguided suggestions or advice based on their own stereotypes?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often
Q6.3 Had your actions or in-actions receive much more attention than they would have if you were white?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q6.4 Observed instances where other Black employees’ work was discussed in a space and a manner in which whites’ work is not?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q6.5 Been given more diversity/race-related tasks or issues to manage because you’re Black?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q6.6 Been regarded as having a “chip on your shoulder” around issues pertaining to race?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q6.7 Had your membership in a Black professional organization looked down upon?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q6.8 Been mistaken for another person of color who works in the organization?
- Never
Q6.9 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q7.1 Some individuals may try to resist change and/or maintain the status quo. In your experience, have you....

Q7.2 Had a manager or supervisor suggest that you should be grateful for receiving an outcome even though you were entitled to or had earned it?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q7.3 Had co-workers minimize your accomplishment(s) when you exceeded their level of achievement?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q7.4 Been accused of thinking you are “better” than others who you work with or for?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q7.5 Been discouraged from taking too much initiative by a co-worker or manager?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often
Q7.6 Received push-back or negative feedback when you tried to advocate for fairness and equity in the workplace?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q7.7 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q8.1 When sharing your ideas or opinions with managers or co-workers, have you...

Q8.2 Had your co-workers/manager “tune out” when you were contributing to a work group activity/discussion?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q8.3 Had co-workers or supervisors openly discount your ideas/opinions when offered?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q8.4 Made a suggestion that was ignored until a white person made the same suggestion which he/she was then praised for?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q8.5 Had your input rejected until it was validated by a white person?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
Q8.6 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q9.1 Regarding derogatory actions towards you, have you....

Q9.2 Had individuals express negative, race-related views in your presence but assume that you will not be offended because you are exceptional or different?

○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q9.3 Had a co-worker or manager become overly aggressive with you in a manner that seemed not typical of their interactions with others?

○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q9.4 Had a white co-worker, manager, or customer withhold information from you, which made it harder to be effective in your job?

○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q9.5 Had your activities viewed with suspicion?

○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Sometimes
○ Often
○ Very Often

Q9.6 Had a white co-worker make their contributions to your work a low-priority thereby slowing your progress?

○ Never
Q9.7 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q10.1 When others try to exert power & control over you and your identity, have you...

Q10.2 Had an individual freely comment on, and make judgments about, your appearance as it relates to your racial identity?

Q10.3 Had your privacy invaded because an individual was curious about something they viewed as “different” (e.g., hair, sex life, relationships)?

Q10.4 Observed a co-worker or supervisor use your relationship to demonstrate that he/she has no racial bias or prejudice?

Q10.5 Provided feedback to a co-worker about a racial-bias or insensitivity they exhibited yet had the individual continue to behave in the same manner?
Q10.6 Had to comfort a co-worker or supervisor after they made a racially insensitive comment so they would feel better about themselves?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q10.7 Been accused of being unapproachable, “grumpy” or unfriendly?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q10.8 Had someone ask “what are you?” or “where did you come from?”
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q10.9 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q11.1 Take a moment to think how you have responded in the past to some of the negative workplace interactions described in this survey. Answer the following questions with your own behaviors and actions in mind.

Q11.2 To be successful, I have needed to compensate for some of the personal choices I have made about my physical appearance such as my choice in hair style, dress, etc.
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q11.3 I have chosen to use language that makes me more acceptable to my white co-workers and customers.
- Never
Q11.4 I have decided to minimize some aspect of my racial identity that I like in order to avoid attention.
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q11.5 I have compromised on my values/beliefs in order to “fit in” with the majority group members in my organization.
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q11.6 I have monitored my out-of-work interactions with co-workers to ensure that I am not misrepresented in the workplace later.
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q11.7 I have tempered my expression of frustration or anger to avoid triggering the “angry Black woman” or “threatening” Black man stereotype.
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q11.8 I have minimized my accomplishments or aspirations to make my white co-workers or supervisors feel more comfortable with me.
- Never
Q11.9 I have developed cross-racial allies to support my work so that it was valued.
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q11.10 I have responded to exclusion by participating in external organizations created to support and recognize the achievements of Black professionals.
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q11.11 OPTIONAL: Use this space for comments related to the questions above.

Q12.1 How often have you been in a situation where any of your superiors or coworkers......

Q12.2 Put you down or was condescending to you?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q12.3 Paid little attention to your statement or showed little interest in your opinion?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q12.4 Made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you?
- Never
Q12.5 Addressed you in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q12.6 Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q12.7 Doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q12.8 Made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal matters?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q13.1 Some instances of incivility (rude, discourteous behaviors) are more significant than others. Are there any instances of incivility that you have experienced that were particularly memorable and had a significant impact on you and/or your experiences in the workplace? If so, please describe.
Q14.1 Sometimes individuals experience workplace behaviors that are more extreme or negative with a greater intent to harm their recipient. In your experience, how often has a co-worker or supervisor...

Q14.2 Swore at you?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q14.3 Yelled or raised their voice at you?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q14.4 Used hostile body language toward you?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q14.5 Made threats toward you?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q14.6 Gotten “in your face”?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often
Q14.7 Bullied you? Note: To label something as bullying it has to occur repeatedly over a period of time, and the person confronted has to have difficulties defending himself/herself. It is not bullying if two parties of approximately equal ‘strength’ are in conflict or the incident is an isolated event.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q15.1 In the last month, how often have you....

Q15.2 Felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q15.3 Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q15.4 Felt that things were going your way?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often

Q15.5 Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very Often
Q16.1 Reflecting on your overall career to this point, please answer the following questions: I am satisfied with........

Q16.2 The progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Q16.3 The progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Q16.4 The progress I have made toward meeting my goals for advancement.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Q16.5 The progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new skills.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

Q16.6 The success I have achieved in my career.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree
Q The following four questions are all OPTIONAL open-ended questions for you to provide additional information about your workplace experiences. Use the forward button at the bottom of this page if you would like to skip to the final survey section (demographic questions).

Q How does your race impact how well you do or do not fit into the culture of your organization?

Q How do stereotypes impact your interactions in the workplace?

Q Have you had comments on, or about, your work that indicate race may play a part in how you are assessed? Please describe...

Q155 Do you feel as though you need to create alternative work support systems in order to be successful at work? Please describe.

Q17.1 The following demographic information is collected to help identify trends in the data reported. The information will not be used to identify individual participants.

Q17.2 Do you identify as:
- Female
- Male
- Other (please specify) ____________________

Q17.3 Which category below includes your age?
- 18-20 years
- 21-29 years
- 30-39 years
- 40-49 years
- 50-59 years
- 60-69 years
- 70 years and older

Q17.4 What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
- Less than High School
- High School / GED
- Some College but no degree
- Trade/technical/vocational training
- 2-year College Degree
- 4-year College Degree
☐ Masters Degree
☐ Doctoral Degree
☐ Professional Degree (JD, MD)
☐ Other ______________________

Q17.5 Where do you currently reside?
☐ New England
☐ Mid-Atlantic
☐ Southeast
☐ South-Central
☐ Midwest
☐ Rocky Mountain West
☐ West Coast
☐ Southwest
☐ HI, Alaska, US Territories
☐ Outside of the US

Q17.6 Which of the following categories best describes your employment status?
☐ Employed for wages, working 30-40 or more hours per week
☐ Employed for wages, working 15-29 hours per week
☐ Employed for wages, working up to 14 hours per week
☐ Self-employed, working 30-40 or more hours per week
☐ Self-employed, working less than 30 hours per week
☐ Not currently employed, looking for work
☐ Not currently employed, not looking for work
☐ Retired
☐ Other ______________________

Q17.7 Which occupational category best describes your employment? (U.S. Census, 40 Categories)
☐ Management: professional or related occupations
☐ Management: business or financial operations occupations
☐ Management occupations, except farmers and farm managers
☐ Farmers and farm managers
☐ Business and financial operations
☐ Business operations specialists
☐ Financial specialists
☐ Computer or mathematical
☐ Architects, surveyors, cartographers, or engineers
☐ Drafters, engineering, or mapping technicians
- Life, physical, or social science
- Community and social services
- Legal
- Education, training, or library
- Arts, design, entertainment, sports, or media
- Health diagnosing or treating practitioners & technical occupations
- Health technologists or technicians
- Health care support
- Fire fighting, prevention or law enforcement workers, (including supervisors)
- Other protective service workers (including supervisors)
- Food preparation or serving-related
- Building, grounds cleaning or maintenance
- Personal care or service
- Sales or related occupations
- Office or administrative support
- Farming, fishing, or forestry
- Supervisors, construction or extraction
- Construction trades workers
- Extraction workers
- Installation, maintenance, or repair occupations
- Production
- Supervisors, transportation or material moving
- Aircraft or traffic control
- Motor vehicle operators
- Rail, water or other transportation
- Material moving

Q17.8 What is your combined annual household income?
- under $20,000
- 20,000-29,999
- 30,000-39,999
- 40,000-49,999
- 50,000-59,999
- 60,000-69,999
- 70,000-79,999
- 80,000-89,999
- 90,000-99,999
- 100,000-109,999
- 110,000-119,999
- 120,000-129,999
130,000-139,999
140,000-149,999
150,000+
I prefer not to answer this question

Q17.9 In what size organization has been the majority of your work experience?
Very small (10 or fewer employees)
Small (approximately 11 – 50 employees)
Medium (approximately 51 – 250 employees)
Large (approximately 251 – 1000 employees)
Very large (more than 1000 employees)

Q18.1 Would you like to receive a summary of the results of this survey when they are available?
Yes
No

Answer If Would you like to receive a summary of the results of this survey when they are available? Yes Is Selected
Q18.2 I have an email address that I would like you to use to send me a summary of the results.
Yes
No

Answer If I have an email address that I would like you to use to send me a summary of the results. Yes Is Selected

Q18.3 Please provide your email information below.
First Name
Last Name
Email

Answer If I have an email address that I would like you to use to send me a summary of the results. No Is Selected

Q18.4 I do not have an email address. Please send a summary to the following address:
Name
Address
Address 2
City
State
Q18.5 I would like to be entered into the drawing to win one of the four $25 Amazon or Barnes & Noble gift certificates that will be awarded as a token "thank you"?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Answer If I would like to be entered into the drawing to win one of the four $25 Amazon gift certificates that will be provided to survey respondents as a "thank you". Yes Is Selected

Q18.6 Please provide your name and email address (or phone number if you do not have email) below
First Name
Last Name
Email address
Phone # (if no email)

Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences. Your responses are critical to the continued development of this survey instrument and for providing an accurate description of some of the unique challenges Black Americans may face in the workplace.

If you have any additional comments, please feel free to provide them in the text box below.
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