

Thoughts on Incivility: A Preliminary Study to Identify Uncivil Behavior in Indonesian Higher Education

Ani Cahyadi¹

Universitas Islam Negeri Antasari, Banjarmasin, Indonesia

Hendryadi Hendryadi

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

Suryani Suryani

Islamic State Institute of Lhokseumawe, Aceh, Indonesia

Abstract: This preliminary study aims to identify an item list of uncivil behaviors in the Indonesian educational environment. The study comprises three phases: first, a panel of experts assessed each item to ensure their content validity for items pool. The second phase used a cross-sectional design and convenience sampling to recruit 524 students and faculty members in seven provinces in Indonesia using an online survey. The third phase involved ten students from the second phase and several faculty representatives were randomly selected to complete the open-ended questionnaire. Principal component analysis (PCA) identified four factors, including disregard for instructors/annoyances, disrespect for others (verbal and non-verbal), misconduct and integrity violation, and use of cell phones. Furthermore, the results indicate that "getting up during a class, leaving and returning," "arriving late and/or leaving early," "not paying attention in the class," "texting," "packing books before the class is dismissed," "cheating during an exam," and "sleeping during the class" were the top seven highest recurring behaviors. This study provides tentative support for a preliminary scale in identifying uncivil behavior among college populations in Indonesia.

Keywords: classroom incivility, Indonesia, preliminary research, uncivil behavior.

The decline in civility is seen as a salient issue that has been noticed in many college faculties across countries. This lack of civility has also made many academics deeply anxious about the uncivil behavior occurring in their classrooms (Segrist et al., 2018). Discussions about classroom incivility in higher education most often focus on the need to curb and decrease incivility because it can interfere with classroom learning and harm the learning environment (Feldmann, 2001). For instance, short-term consequences include low learning engagement and wellbeing (Vuolo, 2018), burnout (Al-Jubouri et al., 2020; Bai et al., 2019), sleep disorders (Fritz et al., 2019), and emotional exhaustion (Welbourne et al., 2020). Long-term outcomes include decreased academic achievement and failure to reach educational goals (Al-Jubouri et al., 2020). Therefore,

¹Correspondent Author E-Mail: anicahyadi@uin-antasari.ac.id

researchers may want to address classroom incivility to reduce its negative effect on academic and personal development (Marini, 2009; Spadafora et al., 2020).

Classroom incivility is much more than disrespectful speech or action, disregard, and insolence for others (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). It also involves “any action that interferes with a harmonious and cooperative learning atmosphere in the classroom” (Feldmann, 2001, p.137). From this perspective, experiencing and promoting civility in the university context has a twofold purpose: 1) achieving the learning effectiveness intended to develop competencies and skills, and 2) more importantly, helping to build a character from an ethical perspective.

Despite the emerging attention on uncivil behavior in the classroom over the past twenty years, limitations require clarification. First, social and cultural contexts influence uncivil behavior (Connelly, 2009; Eka & Chambers, 2019). This also means that uncivil behavior can be perceived differently based on social values and norms in a particular society (Eka & Chambers, 2019; Segrist et al., 2018). For example, people in the United States may have different perspectives on categorizing uncivil behavior than their Asian counterparts. Conversely, Asian people may perceive what is acceptable in American society as uncivil behavior. Moradi and Ghabanchi (2019) explain that intercultural communication and sensitivity are cultural barriers between people interacting from different cultures. In line with these assumptions, a recent study by Al-Jubouri et al. (2020) was conducted in several countries (i.e., Chile, Iraq, Italy, Nigeria, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Thailand, Turkey, and Kenya), which indicated that levels of incivility among participants in different countries were significantly different.

Second, a call has been made to expand the subject to different types of institutions (private colleges and community colleges) for comparisons and drawing further conclusions regarding uncivil behavior. Although it is an important topic, incivility has received limited attention in non-nursing education research, despite Bjorklund and Rehling's (2009) call for scholars to consider it. The nursing education environment has largely been the primary focus of studies such as (Al-Jubouri et al., 2020; McCarthy et al., 2020; Mohammadipour et al., 2018; Natarajan et al., 2017; Sauer et al., 2018; Ziefle, 2018), with only a few studies considering public universities (see Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009; Chory & Offstein, 2016, 2017; Farrel et al., 2016; Segrist et al., 2018). To the best of our knowledge, there has been no research conducted in the Asian education sector, particularly in non-nursing settings. Therefore, there is a need for more studies in the Asian region to document the extent, source, and nature of classroom incivility. Despite the successful identification of uncivil behavior in students at a Midwestern public university, Bjorklund and Rehling (2009) suggested that studies in other areas of the country and different types of institutions were needed. Furthermore, future research needs to design prevention policies and interventions to reduce the negative impact of classroom incivility (Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009; Weger, 2017).

Overall, the present study aims to identify uncivil behavior in the classroom and determine whether the relevant items would be revealed in the Indonesian context. As far as we know, the research on exploring uncivil behavior in Asian non-nursing educational setting is lacking and Indonesia is no exception. It is a multi-cultural country, which also has the largest Muslim population in the world. Thus, this study can provide a new perspective for understanding incivility in Asian and Muslim communities. Second, the study determined the dominant uncivil behavior compared to existing studies. Finally, the study sought effective ways to handle classroom incivility. Due to the wide-ranging negative effects of classroom incivility on students and faculty members, it is important to consider how universities can address incivility in their organizations. The data from the present study may benefit not only cross-national comparisons regarding classroom incivility but also provide new insights into uncivil behavior in a higher education setting, especially in Indonesia.

Classroom Incivility

Incivility is distinct from aggression, bullying, and abusive supervision, which victims more easily recognize are because it is intentional. Furthermore, due to the ambiguous nature of incivility, organizations sometimes ignore their forms at work because they only have different perceptions of various behaviors that are considered appropriate and dangerous (Rahim & Cosby, 2016; Schilpzand et al., 2016). Along the same lines, classroom incivility is any speech or action capable of disrupting a harmonious learning environment (Feldmann, 2001). Some of the most common uncivil behaviors in college classrooms include text messaging, packing up books before class is over, yawning, eating and drinking, nodding and smiling in response to others' comments, arriving late and/or leaving early, using a palm pilot, iPod or computer for non-class activities, and displaying inattentive posture or facial expressions. More severe uncivil behaviors are less common but do occur, including continuing to talk after being asked to stop and coming to class under the influence of alcohol (Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009).

Noting the dearth of research exploring college students' perceptions of classroom incivility, Farrell et al. (2016) described the following two dimensions: intentional and unintentional actions. Intentionally uncivil actions include posting nasty notes, spreading rumors, calling classmate names, and fighting with peers. On the opposing side, unintentional actions include packing up books, eating during class, sending a text, surfing the internet during a lesson, sleeping in class (Farrell et al., 2016). A more recent study by Chory and Offstein (2017) divides classroom incivility into four factors: disregard for the instructor (i.e., leave the class early without instructor permission, move around the room/change seats, sleep), offensive communication (i.e., use vulgarity in the presence of the instructor, use vulgarity during open class discussions), aggressive communication (i.e., continue to talk to other students after being asked by the instructor to stop, use vulgarity toward the instructor), and illicit behavior (i.e., come to class under the influence of alcohol). Al-Jubouri et al. (2019) investigated the psychometric properties of the Arabic version of the classroom incivility in nursing education. Their study validated the 24 items of uncivil behaviors in the nursing environment. For example, making threatening statements about weapons, threats of physical harm against others, and sending inappropriate or rude e-mails to others were identified as some of the most uncivil behaviors.

Researchers recognize student incivility as a growing problem and have called for future research to design prevention policies (Weger, 2017). There is evidence to suggest that incivility has become a growing concern in last decade, especially within educational settings (Al-Jubouri et al., 2020; Bai et al., 2019; Ibrahim & Qalawa, 2016; Spadafora et al., 2019; Vuolo, 2018). Incivility in the classroom not only makes it difficult for students to learn but it may also disrupt the classroom learning environment (Feldmann, 2001; Ibrahim & Qalawa, 2016). More specifically, disruptive incivility associates with lower levels of student engagement, wellbeing, and reduced energy for critical thinking in class (Segrist et al., 2018; Vuolo, 2018); it is also linked to academic burnout (Bai et al., 2019). Students who experienced high levels of peer incivility had lower mental health scores, lower physical health, and higher stress levels (Sauer et al., 2018). Furthermore, the results of student incivility can lower feelings of confidence, career satisfaction, and longevity in the faculty (Narajan et al., 2017). Thus, classroom incivility can have deleterious consequences for individuals (students and faculty members) and the overall learning climate.

Material and Methods

Participants and Procedure

This study used convenience sampling through various groups and community networks to obtain an adequate sample size. First, faculty members from universities/colleges who were willing to be involved in the survey identified, and they, in turn, asked other groups and faculty communities if they wanted to be involved in this online survey. The survey was conducted over from July to August 2020 and received 553 responses. Incentives for taking part in this survey included Internet credit prizes to 20 randomly selected participants.

After checking whether the questionnaires were filled correctly, 29 (5.2%) participants were eliminated, leaving 524 participants consisting of 423 students and 101 faculty members as the final sample size. This survey involved nine colleges/universities from seven provinces in Indonesia (Aceh, Jakarta, East Java, West Sumatra, Lampung, West Nusa Tenggara, and South Kalimantan). There were 64 percent of females (287 students and 47 faculty members) and 36 percent of males (136 students and 54 faculty members). There were 350 respondents (64 percent) from state universities (287 students and 63 faculty members) and 174 (33 percent) from private universities (136 students and 38 faculty members). Moreover, there were 376 respondents (72 percent) from Islamic universities (298 students and 77 faculty members) and 149 participants (29 percent) from public universities (125 students and 24 faculty members).

The next phase of the study was a qualitative endeavor, involving a follow-up qualitative short answer questionnaire sent to undergraduate faculties and students. Five faculty members and ten students participated in this second phase. The faculty members were selected based on their expertise and experience, while the undergraduate students were randomly selected from the first-stage survey. The two groups gave their consent to complete the open-ended questionnaire survey about effective ways to handle classroom incivility.

Measurement

Exploring incivility requires data from several major studies that have specifically developed the incivility scale. The survey of academic incivility that Indiana University developed is widely adapted for assessing college students' perceptions of incivility (e.g., Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009; McKinne & Martin, 2010). This scale includes 25 items, such as eating, sleeping, allowing the cell phone to ring, making sarcastic remarks, and students not paying attention in class. Similarly, researchers have developed scales on student perception of classroom incivility based on 10 items (Farrell et al., 2016) to more than 25 items (Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009) compiled from existing research (e.g., Feldmann, 2001; Marini, 2009). Chory and Offstein (2017) developed a more recent measurement model that divides 17 items into 4 factors: disregard for the instructor (6 items), offensive communication (4 items), aggressive communication (4 items), and illicit behavior (2 items).

This study compiles and adjusts items from existing research (Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009; Chory & Offstein, 2017). Three additional items related to academic violations, such as plagiarism and cheating during examinations, were included because they are considered uncivil behavior in higher education (McKinne & Martin, 2010; Osinski, 2003). Thirty items were submitted to the behavior list for the expert panel to assess. For content validity, five experts in the field of education were asked to evaluate the appropriateness and relevance of the items to the Indonesian culture. Experts were asked to answer "relevant = 1" and "irrelevant = 0" on the item list. The content validity index (CVI) was used to assess the feasibility of an item, producing 25 relevant items based

on a CVI value > 0.80 (Polit & Beck, 2006; Hendryadi, 2017). Furthermore, participants were asked to answer 25 questions regarding how frequently they observed each of the 25 uncivil behaviors in classrooms using a 6-point Likert-type scale (0 = never to 5 = frequently).

Analysis and Results

Principal Component Analysis and Descriptive Statistics

In answering the first question, which was to identify the uncivil behavior in the classroom and determining whether relevant items would reveal to the Indonesian setting, principal component analysis (PCA) was used to evaluate the factor structure. This study conducted a PCA first because it is exploratory, and the relevant factor structure should be obtained in the Indonesian context. After PCA, descriptive analysis techniques were used to observe the average score of the respondents' answers; it would help answer the second research question regarding the highest frequency of the respondents' answers on the uncivil behavior list.

Phase two analysis involved the qualitative data analysis of follow-up questionnaires to obtain opinions on the results of the first phase study. The follow-up questionnaire consisted of five open-ended questions, allowing respondents to expand their answers regarding policies that universities could take regarding the online survey results. All qualitative data were reviewed and analyzed to identify emerging themes and patterns. These policies were analyzed to triangulate the data gathered for research questions (Creswell & Clark, 2017).

The classroom incivility items were subjected to a PCA with varimax rotation, resulting in four factors, with 62.24% of the variance. Three items, namely "conversing loudly with others," "ignore other opinions in discussion sessions," and "discarding trash after the class has begun," had a loading factor of <0.50; thus, they were dropped. The PCA was re-run, producing a four-factor solution accounting for 65.67% of the variance. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test measure of sampling adequacy were used to determine the appropriate data set for this study. The analysis results presented in Table 1 show that the KMO value was 0.905, with a significant Bartlett's test ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, the data analysis met the requirements for PCA (Hair et al., 2010). The first factor (disregard for instructors/annoyances) amounted to seven items, with a percent variance of 38.42% ($\alpha = 0.912$). The second factor (disrespect for others/verbal and nonverbally) consisted of seven items, with a percent variance of 12.2% ($\alpha = 0.838$). The third factor (misconduct and integrity violation) consisted of 4 items with a percent variance of 6.62% ($\alpha = 0.717$), and the fourth factor (use of cell phones) consisted of 3 items with a percent variance of 8.40% ($\alpha = 0.868$). Cronbach's alpha ranges from 0.717 to 0.912, indicating that the subscale already has adequate internal consistency ($\alpha > 0.70$; Hair et al., 2010).

Given that all of our measures were written self-reports taken from one source and reported by respondents through the cross-sectional method (Podsakoff et al., 2012; Tehseen et al., 2017), a Harman single factor test approach was used to guard against common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2012). The results show that no single dominant subscale factor explained more than 50% of the total variance, as shown in Table 1. Therefore, CMV was not a severe problem.

The second research question focused on the frequency of the behaviors. The mean rating of the frequency by which each behavior was observed in student classrooms was calculated. The behaviors were then ranked in order of frequency from the most frequent to least frequent (see Table 2). Only "getting up during a class, leaving, and returning," "arriving late and/or leaving early," "not paying attention in the class," "texting," "packing up books before the class is over,"

"cheating during an exam," and "sleeping" received a mean rating of 2.00 or more. Of the 22 listed behaviors, 19 received mean ratings of less than 2. The two behaviors that were rated the lowest were "opening bags/lockers without permission" and "coming to the class under the influence of alcohol."

Table 1

Factor Loadings, Communalities, and Percentage of Variance for PCA with Varimax Rotation on Final Classroom Incivility Items

		Component			
		1	2	3	4
1	Arriving late or leaving early	.70	.44	.18	.31
2	Eating and drinking during the class	.79	.40	.22	.31
3	Sleeping	.84	.38	.22	.27
4	Getting up during class, leaving and returning	.75	.41	.20	.30
5	Spreading rumors/gossip	.75	.64	.44	.22
6	Not paying attention in class	.77	.53	.29	.20
7	Packing up books before the class is over	.74	.51	.31	.28
8	Making disparaging remarks	.51	.78	.28	.17
9	Nonverbally showing disrespect for others	.48	.83	.34	.20
10	Opening bags/lockers without permission	.33	.76	.25	.25
11	Fidgeting that distracts others	.57	.73	.30	.25
12	Swearing	.66	.68	.39	.24
13	Doing homework for other classes	.52	.56	.34	.25
14	Nonverbally flirting	.43	.74	.39	.27
15	Coming to the class under the influence of alcohol	.11	.17	.81	.07
16	Fighting in the class	.21	.40	.89	.17
17	Wearing immodest attire	.31	.38	.90	.14
18	Plagiarizing	.38	.40	.83	.21
19	Cheating on exam	.62	.47	.77	.23
20	Allowing cell phone to ring	.30	.29	.16	.92
21	Texting	.58	.39	.24	.83
22	Answering a phone call	.27	.22	.18	.91
Eigenvalue		8.45	2.69	1.85	1.46
Percent Variance Explained		38.42	12.25	8.39	6.62
Cronbach Alpha		.88	.86	.89	.87

Open responses in surveys and follow-up questionnaires revealed more in-depth information for answering the third research question. Several student respondents stated that the instructor's behavior might inadvertently facilitate classroom incivility. The tendency of "allowing" or "ignoring" the students' uncivil behavior inside the classroom can trigger repeated actions from other students. In particular, the students mentioned that relatively younger instructors tended to act indifferently to uncivil behavior. In line with students' opinions, a senior lecturer highlighted that the communication between lecturers and students on social media sometimes becomes unethical, where there are no clear boundaries between students and teachers.

Usually, uncivil behavior is influenced by culture and technological advances, such as the case of conversations between students and lecturers on social media. Technology makes no distance between lecturers and students, which in eastern customs, there are boundaries of communication and behavior that must be maintained.

Table 2

Mean Ratings of the Frequency of Student Classroom Behaviors Ranked From Most Frequently to Least Frequently Observed

No	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Getting up during class, leaving and returning	2.55	1.20
2	Arriving late and/or leaving early	2.32	1.15
3	Not paying attention in class	2.24	1.28
4	Texting	2.24	1.33
5	Packing up books before class is over	2.22	1.33
6	Cheating on exam	2.09	1.27
7	Sleeping	2.01	1.18
8	Eating and drinking during class	1.99	1.15
9	Allowing a cell phone to ring	1.81	1.17
10	Plagiarism	1.81	1.22
11	Spreading rumors / gossip	1.77	1.16
12	Making disparaging remarks	1.70	1.07
13	Nonverbally showing disrespect for others	1.66	.98
14	Answer a phone call	1.57	1.05
15	Fidgeting that distracts others	1.56	.92
16	Swearing	1.56	1.00
17	Doing homework for other classes	1.55	.92
18	Nonverbally flirting	1.46	.89
19	Wearing immodest attire	1.43	.94
20	Fights in class	1.34	.84
21	Opening bags / lockers without permission	1.25	.65
22	Coming to class under the influence of alcohol or drugs	1.21	.76

Another lecturer noted:

In my opinion, many factors cause uncivil behavior among students, both internal (such as lifestyle) and external (influence of family and peer environment). External factors from the social environment are the most dominant in shaping student behavior. Some students behave well in the family, but outside they behave the opposite.

A culture of civility appeared important for both teachers and students. Most student respondents talked about mutual respect. One student emphasized, "sometimes the teacher treats us as if we are stupid, liars, and lazy. In some cases, we receive penalties for other student's mistakes." Another student noted, "some of the instructors acted superiorly, anti-criticism, and could not accept our opinion, even though some of us were practitioners, there was no academic climate that was open to space for discussion."

Finally, the interview responses about the policy show that the responses from the faculty and the students can be divided into three themes. One theme indicated that there are no policies that prohibit certain behavior in the class, or there is a lack of knowledge about the existence of such policies. One student noted that "I never knew there was a prohibition policy on certain behavior in the classroom, or I forgot, I don't know."

The second theme refers to the ineffectiveness of policies regarding uncivil behavior in schools. One instructor noted, "the policy already exists, but it seems that it is not massively socialized so that it is often forgotten, even by the teaching staff themselves."

The third theme indicates that the campus already has a code of conduct policy, but it does not cover all the behaviors on the list. A student noted that "turning off the cellphone, plagiarism, cheating during the exam, using rude words, leaving, or entering class with the instructor's permission are some of the behaviors that are already in the code of conduct posted in all classes."

Discussion and Conclusion

The first objective of this study was to identify the uncivil behavior using PCA, which indicated that classroom incivility is multi-dimensional, with 22 items that were successfully validated. This study supports the majority of the uncivil behavior items from previous studies (e.g., Al-Jubouri et al., 2019; Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009; Chory & Offstein, 2017; Farrell et al., 2016; Mohammadipour et al., 2018), thus, confirming that general agreement exists regarding disrespectful behavior between the Western and Eastern worlds, especially in Indonesia. In addition to the dimensions of integrity violation (Osinski, 2003), the current study's scale supports a new dimension as an extension of the previous scale (e.g., Bjorklund & Rehling, 2010; Chory & Offstein, 2017; Farrell et al., 2016). Cheating during exams, plagiarism, and opening bags/lockers without permission are additional items based on their content validity and proved to have sufficient internal consistency and the PCA procedure. Thus, this study theoretically can provide new insights regarding uncivil behavior in the context of Indonesian higher education.

The 22 items are divided into 4 factors: disregard for instructors/annoyances (7 items), disrespect for others (7 items), misconduct and integrity violation (5 items), and use of cell phones (3 items). This result is different from Chory and Offstein (2017), who have divided 17 items into 4 factors: disregard for the instructor (6 items), offensive communication (4 items), aggressive communication (4 items), and illicit behavior (2 items). This study also differs from the two-dimensional model that Farrell et al. (2016) produced. However, several factors from the scale in this study overlap with Chory and Offstein (2017) and have similarities with the scale that Farrell et al. (2016) developed to some extent.

In line with Chory and Offstein (2017), the first factor, disregard for instructors/annoyances, is marked by arriving late and/or leaving early, eating and drinking during the class, sleeping, getting up during a class, leaving and returning, spreading rumors/gossip, not paying attention in the class, and packing up books before the class is over. This subscale overlaps with Chory and Offstein's (2017) dimension: disregard factors for instructors. The second factor, disrespect for others, refers to verbal and nonverbal behavior characterized by making disparaging remarks, nonverbally showing disrespect for others, opening bags/lockers without permission,

fidgiting that distracts others, swearing, doing homework for other classes, and nonverbally flirting. This subscale is in line with the offensive communication and aggressive communication factors of Chory and Offstein (2017). The third factor, misconduct and integrity violation, refer to coming to class under the influence of alcohol or drugs, fights inside the classroom, wearing immodest attire, plagiarism, and cheating during an exam. This third factor is a special addition to the violation of student integrity during the learning process in the classroom. Finally, the fourth factor, cell phone usage behavior, allowing a cell phone to ring, texting, and answer a phone call, is similar to the unintentional incivility factor of Farrell et al. (2016). As shown, the current study's measurement model has differences and similarities with other measures. It may help provide a better understanding of how this construct can be conceptualized in different cultural contexts (Halpern, 2017).

Students and faculty members in this study gave nine behaviors the highest ratings. Leaving and returning, arriving late and/or leaving early, not paying attention in the class, texting, packing up books before the class is over, cheating during an exam, and sleeping were found to be the seven most frequent behaviors based on the students' perspectives. Most of these behaviors were classified by Bjorklund and Rehling (2009), Al-Jubouri et al. (2019), Khairuddin et al (2019) and Mohammadipour et al. (2018) as the higher level of incivility that was marked by American public universities and Asian nursing students in those studies, respectively. This designates that some uncivil behaviors among students are common regardless of their nationalities and culture.

The third question regarding effective policy is explored through qualitative data to obtain another lens to view the problem. We have noted several important points regarding the causes of uncivil behavior in the classroom from the perspective of students and faculty. First, it may be due to a lack of attention to ethics education in the family environment or previous educational levels. Also, technology plays a role in changing communication styles between students and teachers. In contrast to Western culture, in Asia, especially in Indonesia, some rules or ethics must be obeyed by a student when interacting with teachers. However, this formal rule seems to be ignored by younger teachers/instructors who tend to be more "relaxed" in applying formal rules of communication. A senior lecturer stated:

I think younger lecturers tend to be permissive, and if they do this, then students will take chances on them. For example, allowing students to eat and drink in class deliberately or use cell phones for purposes outside the classroom. Students usually act on responses, and when allowed to do so, they will repeat the behavior.

Another concern in this study is that no consensus regarding uncivil behavior exists. In this case, uncivil behaviors, such as "texting," "packing up books before the class is over," "sleeping," "eating and drinking during the class," and "allowing a cell phone to ring," are relatively common and "appropriate" among lecturers. The condition, then, becomes a tendency for students to assume that most other lecturers also permit these behaviors. This finding is in line with McKinne and Martin (2010), who concluded that permissive actions by teaching staff for uncivil behavior that occurs in class could cause a high frequency of incidents. Furthermore, regarding faculty policies related to uncivil behavior, in general, written rules regarding ethics in the campus environment already exist, but they are not socialized and, thus, are ignored by the students and even the teaching staff. This finding is in line with Segrist et al. (2018) that having formal policies about appropriate classroom behavior may not be sufficient to protect the learning environment of the classroom.

The main purpose of the study has been achieved by identifying 22 relevant behaviors that were grouped into four factors, such as disregard for instructors/annoyances, disrespect for others, misconduct and integrity violation, and use of cell phones. The findings also reveal a similar form of uncivil behavior between Indonesian and Western contexts as well as represent a contribution to reducing the classroom incivility literature gap in Asia, particularly in a non-nursing education context. Of equal importance, the results showed that the real occurrence of uncivil behavior across multiple ethnicities and Islamic-public university groups in Indonesia. Finally, the culture of civility in the educational environment will be achieved when uncivil behaviors are addressed and this requires administrators to design preventive policies through dialogues among lecturers to properly reduce classroom incivility.

Implications of the Present Study

The findings of this study present several implications. From a theoretical perspective, it is argued that perceived incivility is mainly related to the social and cultural contexts and can be perceived differently based on social values and norms (Eka & Chambers, 2019; Segrist et al., 2018). However, the findings of 22 items in the current study found a similar pattern that was consistent with the previous studies (e.g., Al-Jubouri et al., 2019; Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009; Chory & Offstein, 2017; Farrell et al., 2016). Although there is an extension of a new dimension from the previous studies (e.g., Bjorklund & Rehling, 2010; Chory & Offstein, 2017; Farrell et al., 2016), the distinction and perspectives of Indonesian versus western learning environment are relatively similar in identifying students' uncivil behavior in class. This suggests that there are core characteristics of classroom incivility that can be observed across cultures and countries.

The multi-ethnic findings of uncivil behavior present several practical implications. Aside from the implementation of compulsory university policies, such as discipline and student behavior in class, those promoting “incivility in the classroom” awareness or delivering effective incivility intervention in Indonesian Islamic and public universities also require communication skills and multicultural sensitivity. One can no longer assume uncivil behavior to be an exclusive experience of a specific ethnic or community group—it is a fairly universal experience in both Islamic and public universities in Indonesia. Furthermore, the importance of opening dialogues among lecturers to properly redefine classroom incivility is implied. However, these conversations to reformulate an agreement among the lecturer need to be at the “local” level (McKinne & Martin, 2010), meaning the dialogue would not be very effective in a campus-wide workshop. Additionally, the findings of this study argue that the faculty is responsible for handling uncivil behavior, which is in line with previous empirical studies (Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009; McKinne & Martin, 2010).

Another implication for practice underscores the importance of a lecturer's pedagogy, personality, and competencies. In line with McKinne and Martin (2010), perceived classroom incidence is related to a teacher's level of immediacy; a lecturer should have adequate knowledge and be competent in the subject to get the students' respect. In addition, a lecturer must become a role model in behaving and avoid words that denigrate students, which, then, become triggers for students to behave well. The pattern of interaction between lecturers and students is still based on Eastern culture, which may have a different meaning from Western culture. Thus, communication between students and lecturers is active but is still limited to eastern ethics, which provides clear boundaries between lecturers and students in their interaction. The final implication for practice involves the proper creation, implementation, and dissemination of policies to address classroom incivility. The current study agrees with the interventions that Segrist et al. (2018) recommended, which utilize peer students to respond to acceptable and non-acceptable classroom behaviors. This

can help shape student perceptions of their peers' views on acceptable classroom behavior (Segrist et al., 2018).

Limitations and Future Research Directions

The present study has several limitations. First, this study is preliminary research aimed at identifying relevant uncivil behavior in education institutions, especially in Indonesia. Although the uncivil behavior list obtained based on the survey results has some patterns and structures similar to previous studies (e.g., Bjorklund & Rehling, 2009; Chory & Offstein, 2017; Farrell et al., 2016), the current study did not find general agreement regarding uncivil behavior among faculty members. Future research needs to examine other differences in perceptions among faculty members and between students to gain a broader understanding of this field.

Second, the convenience sampling method also led to some restrictions to generalize; thus, future studies must be modified with other sophisticated sampling procedures (e.g., stratified cluster random sampling). Third, this study is the first on classroom incivility in the context of Indonesian culture. Future research needs to complete a series of tests based on psychometric evaluation standards to develop new scales. Future studies can replicate this exploratory study with other samples and other constructs (e.g., antisocial beliefs and prosocial behavior; Marini, 2009; Chory & Offstein, 2017) to complete the testing of concurrent validity.

Finally, this study only identifies uncivil behavior that students performed in class. This results in a one-sided focus on student behavior, even though other studies (e.g., Segrist et al., 2018) show that the faculty also contributes to a climate of disrespect. Future studies should explore this measure in the context of faculty to thoroughly identify the exploration of classroom incivility.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Dr. Zainal Arifin (Islamic State University Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta), Dr. Iksan Kamil Sahri (Islamic College of Al Fithrah); Dr. M. Nur Arifin (Islamic State University Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten); Dr. Edi Sugiono (Universitas Nasional), and Dr. Irsan Tricahyadinata (Universitas Mulawarman) for suggestions about items pool regarding the initial phases of the research. The authors also thank EDITAGE for language editing of the manuscript.

Funding Details

The authors received no direct funding for this research.

References

- Al-Jubouri, M. B., Samson-Akpan, P., & Jaafar, S. A. (2019). Validity and reliability of the Arabic version of the incivility in nursing education-revised scale. *International journal of nursing education scholarship*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijnes-2019-0074>
- Al-Jubouri, M. B., Samson-Akpan, P., Al-Fayyadh, S., Contreras, F. A. M., Unim, B., Stefanovic, S. M., & Radabutr, M. (2020). Incivility among nursing faculty: A multi-country study. *Journal of Professional Nursing*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2020.04.002>

- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 74, 452–471. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202131>
- Bai, Q., Liu, S., & Kishimoto, T. (2019). School incivility and academic burnout: The mediating role of perceived peer support and the moderating role of future academic self-salience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Ffpsyg.2019.03016>
- Bjorklund, W. L., & Rehling, D. L. (2009). Student perceptions of classroom incivility. *College Teaching*, 58(1), 15-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550903252801>
- Chory, R. M., & Offstein, E. H. (2016). Too close for comfort? Faculty–student multiple relationships and their impact on student classroom conduct. *Ethics & Behavior*, 28(1), 23-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2016.1206475>
- Chory, R. M., & Offstein, E. H. (2017). Outside the classroom walls: Perceptions of professor inappropriate out-of-class conduct and student classroom incivility among American business students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 15(3), 197-214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-017-9290-1>
- Connelly, R. (2009). Introducing a culture of civility in first-year college classes. *The Journal of General Education*, 58(1), 47-64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27798121>
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. SAGE Publications.
- Eka, N. G., & Chambers, D. (2019). Incivility in nursing education: A systematic literature review. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 39, 45-54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2019.06.004>
- Farrell, A. H., Provenzano, D. A., Spadafora, N., Marini, Z. A., & Volk, A. A. (2016). Measuring adolescent attitudes toward classroom incivility: Exploring differences between intentional and unintentional incivility. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 34(6), 577-588. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0734282915623446>
- Feldmann, L. J. (2001). Classroom civility is another of our instructor responsibilities. *College Teaching*, 49(4), 137-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2001.10844595>
- Fritz, C., Park, Y., & Shepherd, B. R. (2019). Workplace incivility ruins my sleep and yours: The costs of being in a work-linked relationship. *Occupational Health Science*, 3(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-018-0030-8>
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Anderson, R.E. (2010), *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.) Prentice Hall.
- Halpern, C. (2017). Book Review: In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 1(1), 32-36. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/5790>
- Hendryadi, H. (2017). Validitas isi: Tahap awal pengembangan kuesioner [Content validity: The initial stage of questionnaire development]. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen dan Bisnis (JRMB) Fakultas Ekonomi UNIAT*, 2(2), 169-178. <https://doi.org/10.36226/jrmb.v2i2.47>
- Ibrahim, S. A. E. A., & Qalawa, S. A. (2016). Factors affecting nursing students' incivility: As perceived by students and faculty staff. *Nurse education today*, 36, 118-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2015.08.014>
- Khairuddin, A. Z., Abd Razak, A., Idrus, F., & Ismail, N. A. H. (2019). Challenges of Offering Peace Education among Educational Leaders: A Case Study of Malaysian Public Primary School. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 3(1), 57-71. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/5811>
- Marini, Z. (2009). 10. The thin line between civility and incivility: Fostering reflection and self-awareness to create a civil learning community. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching*, 2, 61-67. <https://doi.org/10.22329/celt.v2i0.3204>

- McCarthy, J. L., Giblin-Scanlon, L., Perry, K. R., Boyd, L. D., & Vineyard, J. (2020). Faculty perceptions of student incivility in dental hygiene education. *Journal of Dental Education*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jdd.12263>
- McKinne, M., & Martin, B. N. (2010). Higher education faculty and student perceptions of classroom incivility. *Journal of College and Character*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1249>
- Mohammadipour, M., Hasanvand, S., Goudarzi, F., Ebrahimzadeh, F., & Pournia, Y. (2018). The level and frequency of faculty incivility as perceived by nursing students of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences. *Journal of Medicine and Life*, 11(4), 334. <https://dx.doi.org/10.25122%2Fjml-2018-0055>
- Moradi, E & Ghabanchi, G. (2019). Intercultural sensitivity: A comparative study among Business English Undergraduate Learners in two Countries of Iran and China. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 6(3), 134-146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/278>
- Natarajan, J., Muliira, J. K., & van der Colff, J. (2017). Incidence and perception of nursing students' academic incivility in Oman. *BMC nursing*, 16(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-017-0213-7>
- Osinski, K. (2003). Due process rights of nursing students in cases of misconduct. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 42(2), 55-58. <https://doi.org/10.3928/0148-4834-20030201-05>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539-569. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452>
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index: are you sure you know what's being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 29(5), 489-497. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20147>
- Rahim, A., & Cosby, D. M. (2016). A model of workplace incivility, job burnout, turnover intentions, and job performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(10), 1255-1265. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2015-0138>
- Sauer, P. A., Thompson, C. E., & Verzella, M. M. (2018). Empowering nursing students to address incivility. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 21, 40-45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2018.06.004>
- Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, S57-S88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1976>
- Segrist, D., Bartels, L. K., & Nordstrom, C. R. (2018). "But everyone else is doing it:" A social norms perspective on classroom incivility. *College Teaching*, 66(4), 181-186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2018.1482858>
- Spadafora, N., Frijters, J., Molnar, D., & Volk, A. (2020). Do little annoyances relate to bullying? The links between personality, attitudes towards classroom incivility, and bullying. *The Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, 1-9. doi:10.1017/edp.2019.20
- Tehseen, S., Ramayah, T., & Sajilan, S. (2017). Testing and controlling for common method variance: A review of available methods. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 4(2), 142-168. Doi: 10.20547/jms.2014.1704202
- Vuolo, J. (2018). Student nurses' experiences of incivility and the impact on learning and emotional wellbeing. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 8(4), 102-111. Retrieved from <https://uhra.herts.ac.uk/handle/2299/20652>

- Weger, H (2017). Instructor active empathic listening and classroom incivility, *International Journal of Listening*, 00: 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2017.1289091>
- Welbourne, J. L., Miranda, G., & Gangadharan, A. (2020). Effects of employee personality on the relationships between experienced incivility, emotional exhaustion, and perpetrated incivility. *International Journal of Stress Management*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000160>
- Ziefle, K. (2018). Incivility in nursing education: Generational differences. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 13(1), 27-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2017.09.004>

Notes on Contributors

Dr. Ani Cahyadi is a Senior Lecturer at the Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty and Postgraduate Program, Universitas Islam Negeri Antasari, Indonesia. The author is a Doctor of Education and a researcher in the academic field. His research interests include Islamic education, educational technology, learning design, and teaching media as well as learning strategies.

Hendryadi is a lecturer at Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia. He is a part of the reviewers in some scientific journals and is the author and co-author of research papers. He is Head of the Research Center at the Imperium Research Institute, Jakarta. His current research interests include Islamic work ethics, leadership, workplace incivility, and quantitative research methods.

Dr. Suryani is an Associate Professor at the Islamic State Institute of Lhokseumawe. Her research interests include organizational culture, leadership, and ethics from the Islamic perspective.