The Role Civility Promotion Programs Can Play in Preventing Sexual Harassment in Different Higher Education Environments

Dana Kabat-Farr
Dalhousie University

Benjamin M. Walsh
Grand Valley State University

Commissioned paper prepared on March 4, 2022 for the Action Collaborative on Preventing and Addressing Sexual Harassment in Higher Education

The Action Collaborative on Preventing Sexual Harassment in Higher Education brings together leaders from academic and research institutions, and key stakeholders to work toward and share targeted, collective action on addressing and preventing sexual harassment across all disciplines and among all people in higher education. The Action Collaborative creates an active space where colleges, universities, and other research and training institutions move beyond basic legal compliance to evidence-based policies and practices for addressing and preventing all forms of sexual harassment and promoting a campus climate of civility and respect. Four Working Groups within the Action Collaborative focus on prevention, response, evaluation, and remediation of sexual harassment in higher education. Members of the Prevention Working Group wanted to better understand the landscape of civility research and civility promotion programs so they could inform efforts within higher education institutions. To gather this information, the Working Group commissioned Drs. Dana Kabat-Farr and Benjamin Walsh to write a paper on the topic using their research expertise.

Preface

Knowing that promoting civility in workplaces has shown to be beneficial in addressing and preventing harassment, this paper was commissioned to review the benefits, barriers, and limitations to civility promotion. The authors were asked to examine:

- civility and factors that influence a civil environment,
- types and characteristics of civility promotion programs,
- different groups (including marginalized groups) impacted by civility and civility promotion programs,
- challenges to promoting a healthy environment using concepts of 'civility'
- limitations of civility promotion programs,
- gaps in civility research, and
- strategies that highlight other behaviors and behavioral programs that extend beyond civility.

This paper lays the groundwork for understanding how institutions can address the described challenges of civility and civility promotion programs. The research gaps and suggestions detailed in this paper can assist higher education institutions to build upon current civility work in hopes of creating robust programs that support healthier environments and more adequately prevent sexual harassment.

We are grateful for the thorough and thoughtful work of Drs. Kabat-Farr and Walsh. This paper highlights both the benefits and limitations of civility research and promotion programs, helping us to clearly see the additional work that needs to be done. This paper, and the table reviewing civility promotion programs, is intended to be a valuable resource for readers hoping to create more civil and positive environments in higher education. We hope that leaders, researchers, and other stakeholders in higher education will be inspired to enact change based to the authors' suggestions and calls for action.

Laura Kaufman, Heidi Steltzer, Teri Reed, and Lydia Finney
Members of the Prevention Working Group

and

Jeena Thomas
National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine

The Role Civility Promotion Programs Can Play in Preventing Sexual Harassment in Different Higher Education Environments

By Dr. Dana Kabat-Farr and Dr. Benjamin M. Walsh

Introduction

Sexual harassment is defined as "behavior that derogates, demeans, or humiliates an individual based on that individual's sex" (also termed "sex-based harassment"; Berdahl, 2007, p. 644). Although sexual harassment occurs for various reasons, research shows that organizational culture/climate is among the strongest drivers of sexual harassment experiences in organizations (Willness et al., 2007). Given the widespread prevalence of sexual harassment in higher education (NASEM, 2018), this manuscript explores whether cultivating climates of civility might prevent sexual harassment, and especially gender harassment, which encompasses "a broad range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors not aimed at sexual cooperation but that convey insulting, hostile and degrading attitudes" based on one's gender (Fitzgerald et al., 1995, p. 430).

Our focus on gender harassment is guided by several factors. Gender harassment is the most frequent form of sexual harassment, particularly in contexts that are male-dominated, such as in STEM higher education (NASEM, 2018). Likewise, gender harassment exists at the intersection of other forms of interpersonal mistreatment, including general incivility and racial harassment, representing intersecting forms of oppression that have substantial impacts on the professional lives of women, in general, and particularly women who hold other intersecting marginalized identities (e.g., Black women, sexual-minority women, women who are mothers, women with a disability), in higher education. For example, Clancy and colleagues (2017) found, in a sample of astronomers and planetary scientists, that women of color experienced the highest rates of inappropriate remarks, harassment, and assault. Likewise, in a U.S. medical school, Vargas and colleagues (2021) found that underrepresented minorities, Asian/Asian American, and female participants reported the highest levels of racialized sexual harassment. Another study in an Australian university found that noncisgender students (e.g., transgender, gender nonconforming, or gender queer identities) reported higher fear of heterosexism than their cisgender peers, and that disabled staff and students reported higher rates of fear of heterosexism than staff and students living without a disability (Brady et al., 2022). These disparate experiences underscore the need for an intersectional approach to understand the complex ways in which general incivilities and identity-based mistreatment affect the lives of women and other marginalized or underrepresented identities in higher education.

Below we continue by providing a definition of "civility" and describing related forms of interpersonal workplace mistreatment, including workplace incivility, as well as the theoretical linkage between civility and sexual harassment. Then we explore research findings on factors that promote civil climates, with an emphasis on the role of organizational leaders. Next, we outline existing civility promotion programs and evidence for their effectiveness. We then consider the limitations and potential downsides to civility promotion programs, particularly in higher education contexts, as well as considerations for implementing civility promotion programs in varying environments and structural hierarchies. We close by reviewing workplace interventions and practices that "go beyond" civility.

What is Civility and What is a Civil Environment?

Civility is defined in various ways, for lay and academic audiences. Lay definitions conflate civility with being polite (Merriam-Webster, 2022). This narrow conceptualization is

problematic because perceptions of what is "polite" are subject to gendered stereotypes and expectations, and women may be punished for exhibiting the same behaviors as men (Lapine & Sachdev, 2019). Academic definitions of civility span disciplinary boundaries, including in sociology (e.g., Peck, 2002), management (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999), history (e.g., Scott, 2015), and communication (e.g., Calabrase, 2015).

In this manuscript, we adopt Pearson and colleagues' definition of civility: "Civility has less to do with formal rules of etiquette than with demonstrating sensibility of concern and regard, treating others with respect. Workplace civility is behavior that helps to preserve the norms for mutual respect at work; it comprises behaviors that are fundamental to positively connecting with another, building relationships and empathizing" (2000, p. 125). This definition is important in at least two ways. First, it acknowledges civility as being more than "nice" and "polite" and focuses on concern, regard, and respect for one another. Second, it defines civility with respect to norms, akin to an organizational climate in which respectful treatment is perceived to be the norm for all individuals in a particular unit. Subsequent research has continued in this tradition of measuring civility in terms of individual or shared perceptions of norms supporting respectful treatment (e.g., Osatuke et al., 2009; Walsh et al., 2012). For instance, Walsh et al.'s (2012) Civility Norms Questionnaire – Brief includes items such as "Your coworkers make sure everyone in your unit/workgroup is treated with respect," which are similar to items in Osatuke et al.'s (2009) Veterans Health Administration Civility Scale, such as "People treat each other with respect in my work group."

Research suggests that workplace civility – including perceptions of such positive norms for respect – is associated with beneficial outcomes for individuals and organizations. These outcomes include more positive attitudes about work (e.g., job satisfaction, intention to remain in one's job), a safer workplace, and improved performance (Leiter et al., 2011; Porath et al., 2015; McGonagle et al., 2014; Walsh et al., 2012). When individuals perceive a more civil work environment, they also tend to report fewer experiences of workplace incivility (Leiter et al., 2011; Leiter et al., 2012; Walsh et al., 2012; Walsh et al., 2018), which includes "rude, condescending, and ostracizing acts that violate workplace norms of respect…" (Cortina et al., 2017, p. 299). Next, we consider the factors that influence workplace civility, with a focus on the role of leadership.

Leadership Styles that Influence Civility at Work

Previous research on factors that affect respectful climates coalesce around the fundamental role of leadership. As Walsh and colleagues (2012) assert, "norms are a function, first and foremost, of the behavior of organizational leaders" (p. 417). Leadership in higher education includes the upper echelon such as provosts and presidents, and other unit leaders such as lab heads and department chairs. Problematic leaders may adopt destructive leadership styles (Krasikova et al., 2013), such as abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000) and passive leadership (Harold & Holtz, 2015), that are associated with incivility and disrespect. Conversely, leaders can exemplify positive leadership practices to model respectful behavior throughout the organization. Research in this realm has uncovered various conceptualizations of positive leadership behaviors that help to promote climates of civility and respect.

One leadership style that holds promise for promoting civility is charismatic leadership. For example, Walsh et al. (2018) found that charismatic leadership fosters perceived norms of respect among employees. Generally speaking, charismatic leaders communicate an inspiring vision to followers and encourage followers to pursue that vision despite personal sacrifice (House & Shamir, 1993). Other core qualities of charismatic leadership include focusing on the collective, using values and morals to justify the vision, and motivating action with a sense of

purpose (Baur et al., 2016). Department heads seeking to promote a respectful work climate should share this vision with their faculty and staff, citing its benefits for all members of the department, while encouraging the adoption of inclusive and respectful practices and being a role model of respect toward others. We believe that when enacted in pursuit of a vision of a respectful workplace, each of these core qualities may foster higher perceived norms of respect.

Ethical leadership is another style that leaders can adopt to foster perceived norms of respect, and reduce forms of mistreatment such as incivility (Taylor & Pattie, 2014). Ethical leadership is reflected when leaders enact appropriate conduct in their relationships (Brown et al., 2005), and encourage others to act ethically through the use of rewards and punishments (Treviño et al., 2003). In essence, ethical leaders are moral people – they "do the right thing" in and out of work because they are trustworthy and demonstrate integrity – and they are moral managers, who actively communicate about ethics and model ethical, fair, and just behavior toward others (Treviño et al., 2000). In a cross-industry sample, employees with more ethical leaders reported higher perceived norms of respect in the organization and fewer personal incivility experiences (Walsh et al., 2018). This research suggests that it is not enough to simply refrain from incivility as a leader; ethical leadership conveys normative expectations for positive interactions integral to developing perceived norms of respect at work. Leaders have the power to encourage, model, and shape positive relationships to promote a climate of civility and respect, where incivility is not tolerated. As we will describe next, there is reason to believe that such efforts may also decrease the likelihood of gender harassment at work.

Connections Among Civility, Incivility, and Gender Harassment

Incivility experiences take the form of disrespect and disregard to fellow colleagues, coworkers, and students. Incivility is traditionally regarded as facially neutral – that is to say, there is no overt reference to gender, race, or other social identity characteristics (Lim & Cortina, 2005). However, research has revealed that incivility is experienced at higher rates by women[1] (Cortina et al., 2013; Yao et al., 2021), which suggests that incivility and sexual harassment may co-occur. Lim and Cortina (2005) showed that gender harassment could serve as a kind of bridge between incivility and sexual harassment, such that the dominance and power that drive instigation of sexual harassment could also drive incivility experiences toward women. This work uncovered that experiences of sexual harassment "often took place against a backdrop of generalized disrespect in the workplace" (Lim & Cortina, 2005, p. 492).

Cortina's (2008) selective incivility theory provides additional insight into the connection between incivility and sexual harassment. Rather than existing merely as a facially neutral form of mistreatment (e.g., general rudeness), selective incivility theory explains that workplace incivility is a modern form of bias and discrimination (Cortina, 2008). Subtle and low-level forms of disrespect function to exclude, diminish, and dissuade marginalized individuals from full participation in work. Selective incivility is part of a constellation of subtle actions and experiences that convey a larger meta-message of exclusion, disrespect, and devaluation, collectively sending strong, negative messages to women, racial minority, sexual minority, and other marginalized members (Kabat-Farr et al., 2020).

Research on women's experiences in higher education further links experiences of workplace incivility to sexism and discrimination. For example, women in higher education often experience "chilly climates" (e.g., Blackwell et al., 2009; Cortina et al., 1998) which erode

[1] Given this paper's focus on reduction of gender harassment via civility interventions, our paper largely refers to experiences of women on account of the existing research in this realm. Future research is needed to more fully understand how non-binary gender identities may experience incivility or civility.

their level of felt influence in their departments and their job satisfaction (Settles et al., 2016). This can take the form of behaviors that align with male gender roles, such as being aggressive and competitive (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002), and sexism in the form of exclusion and disparaging comments (Settles et al., 2013). Importantly, this work maps the recurring and overlapping ways that various forms of mistreatment (e.g., gender derogation, sexual harassment, gender harassment) manifest and affect women's larger perceptions of organizational climate (such as organizational sexism), which often trigger negative professional outcomes for women, such as scholarly alienation and reduced job satisfaction (Settles et al., 2006; Settles et al., 2013). Other work by Settles and colleagues examined experiences of female scientists attending academic conferences, finding a link between incivility experiences (which were higher than men's), perceptions of a sexist climate, and experiences of exclusion. In a nuanced examination of STEM faculty experiences, at the intersection of race-ethnicity and gender identities, Rios and Stewart (2015) found women of color to report feelings of being outsiders, linked to a lack of belonging, pressure to counteract stereotypes, and having their views validated less frequently than dominant groups. In contrast, white faculty reported climates that were friendly and supportive, demonstrating how different groups have markedly different experiences as STEM faculty.

This collection of research and theory suggests that incivility and gender (and race-based) harassment are not distinct forms of workplace mistreatment. Rather, they are intertwined and likely to co-occur in organizations, including in higher education (also see Columbia University Policy and Planning Committee Equity Reports, 2018). Efforts to promote an organizational climate of civility and respect may help to counter a variety of negative behaviors, including incivility and gender harassment. Recent research supports this specific argument. In particular, Robotham and Cortina (2021) found across two studies that a climate for civility and respect was associated with less frequent gender harassment (Study 1) and less frequent ethnic harassment (Study 2). Given this evidence, we turn our attention to a review of civility promotion programs and the evidence for their effectiveness.

Civility Promotion Programs

Researchers, practitioners, and organizations have worked to promote civility through various initiatives. The primary means through which this goal is achieved is via the implementation of dedicated programs focused on the promotion of civility. To develop a thorough understanding of extant civility promotion programs in higher education and other contexts, we conducted a search of the scholarly literature on civility promotion programs via Google Scholar, utilizing various combinations of pertinent search terms (e.g., civility, civility promotion, civility training, sexual harassment, higher education, university, outcomes, evaluation). The focus of our review was on empirical examples of programs published in peer-reviewed journals, especially those programs with a primary emphasis on civility, as opposed to programs that directly emphasize sexual harassment, for which many specific examples and reviews exist in the literature (e.g., Roehling et al., 2021). We retained examples from pertinent dissertations and theses if the program was implemented and focused on higher education contexts. As part of this search, we also reviewed the NASEM Sexual Harassment Collaborative Repository and identified additional examples specific to higher education classified as "Civility or Respect Prevention Programs" using the topic search function available to website users.

The results from these searches are presented in the Appendix. For each identified example, we summarize the program, the context in which the program was implemented, whether it was peer-reviewed, whether a comparison group (e.g., control group) was included in studying the impact of the program, whether an evaluation (of any kind) was conducted, and given the focus of the present manuscript, whether the evaluation captures variables that relate

directly to sexual harassment (e.g., knowledge about sexual harassment, attitudes about sexual harassment).

Our search uncovered numerous examples of civility promotion programs. The specific nature of the programs differs, but the majority of these programs entail some form of training on civility and related constructs, such as workplace incivility. Some of the programs also cover content that arguably extends beyond the domain of civility, such as bystander intervention skills (e.g., MIT lab-based inclusive culture workshops). Likewise, it appears that the specific goals of the programs vary, yet common themes underlie these programs. Common objectives include: educating participants about the nature and consequences of workplace civility and incivility, enhancing participants' ability to recognize incivility and other forms of disruptive behavior, improving the quality of interpersonal relationships in the work environment, and helping to create a more general organizational climate of civility where respectful treatment is the norm. The programs that entail some form of training appear to use various methods, including didactic presentations, small-group discussions, and role playing.

Although there is variability in the particular research methodology, and in the level of rigor, evaluation efforts suggest that civility promotion initiatives may lead to desired outcomes in the short-term and long-term. Research designed to understand the short-term impacts of civility training is more common, with observed outcomes including increases in knowledge about workplace civility and incivility (e.g., nature and consequences of the behaviors) and attitudes about incivility (e.g., willingness to intervene when incivility occurs). Research designed to capture the long-term outcomes of civility promotion programs is less common, but again the evidence suggests that benefits can be obtained.

It is worth noting that many of the civility promotion programs identified in the literature are implemented in healthcare contexts. These include healthcare organizations (e.g., hospital systems) and healthcare higher education contexts (e.g., nurse education). The emphasis on civility and incivility may stem from the evidence that healthcare is a context in which incivility and other forms of interpersonal mistreatment occur frequently (Park et al., 2015). Accreditation organizations such as the Joint Commission for the Accreditation of Health Care Organizations have long recognized the nature of and harm associated with workplace incivility (JCAHCO, 2008), which likely served as additional impetus for the widespread focus on civility promotion programs in healthcare organizations.

One of the few rigorously evaluated civility promotion programs for which long-term outcomes are studied is known as "Civility, Respect, and Engagement in the Workplace" (CREW), which is described in various publications (e.g., Leiter et al., 2011; Osatuke et al., 2009). CREW is a 6-month intervention designed to improve the quality of interpersonal relationships among participants. Work groups identify specific areas of interpersonal relationships to work on over time, and interventions are tailored to the unique needs of each group. Evidence suggests that CREW promotes increases in workplace civility and decreases in workplace incivility over time.

While there is evidence for the benefits of civility promotion programs, and the factors that influence their effectiveness, substantial gaps in the evidence remain. First, to our knowledge and as shown in the Appendix, the civility promotion programs that have been implemented and evaluated with the most rigorous research methods (e.g., CREW) have taken place primarily in health care organizations, not in higher education. More rigorous research designs are needed to evaluate whether the benefits observed in health care contexts generalize to higher education. As an example, departments could be randomly assigned to either a civility promotion or control condition (or a waitlist control condition so that all individuals eventually participate in the civility promotion program), while tracking variables of interest before and

after participation, such as perceived norms for respect over time. Such research methods would not be perfect, but they would enable stronger inferences that any observed changes were caused by participation in the civility promotion program (Shadish et al., 2002). We call for scholars to take on this important task of implementing civility promotion programs in higher education while also taking care to consider how to evaluate the impact of the program in the short-term and long-term.

Second, it is unclear whether different stakeholders (e.g., university students, faculty, staff, administration) and marginalized/understudied groups (e.g., people of color, sexual and gender diverse populations) are differentially impacted by civility and civility promotion programs. To our knowledge, the programs noted in the Appendix do not address such potential variability in program outcomes. However, a scan of the related literature on diversity training suggests that reactions to programs may vary as a result of such characteristics, including how the programs are framed to participants (Kidder et al., 2004). Experimental and quasi-experimental research such as in the example described above may provide the best opportunity to study whether there is a differential impact of civility promotion programs on participants.

Third, the focus of this manuscript is on the potential impact of civility promotion programs for the prevention of sexual harassment. Although many examples exist of authors asserting the potential benefits of civility promotion for sexual harassment prevention (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016; Walsh & Magley, 2019), research designed to directly test such a linkage is largely missing from the literature (see Appendix). We identified only two examples of interventions broadly associated with workplace civility in the published literature that included some evaluation related to sexual harassment (Keashly & Neuman, 2005; Meloni & Austin, 2011), but neither focused on a higher education context, and information provided on the evaluation in relation to sexual harassment was limited. Research focusing on outcomes related to sexual harassment (e.g., likelihood to sexually harass, sexual harassment myth endorsement, experiences of sexual harassment) should be conducted to test the purported claims of the efficacy of civility promotion programs for addressing sexual harassment. The possibility that civility promotion programs, which largely address respect at work, often without explicit attention to identity-based mistreatment, could reduce incidence of sexual harassment is an important and largely unexplored possibility.

Applying Civility Promotion Programs Across Varying Environments and Structural Hierarchies

We know that a variety of structural and contextual features influence the likelihood that counterproductive behavior manifests at work, such as unquestioned power imbalances and rigid rank structure (Pearson & Porath, 2005; Salin, 2003). However, we have little empirical evidence to decipher how these same contextual features may pose limits for *civility* efforts. It is likely that power dynamics and status differentials have implications for civility, as well, and in such circumstances, civility promotion programs may be less potent in their ability to enact meaningful change. As an example, when a Dean takes on an autocratic style in an academic faculty with staunch and salient rank structures (e. g., full professors, research chairs, pre-tenure faculty, contract staff), these factors may make the desired outcomes of civility promotion efforts more difficult to achieve. Staff may be unable to see how efforts to build connections and enact respect will appreciably change entrenched power dynamics that dictate “how things are done around here”, which may reflect a general cynicism around the possibility of securing meaningful change (Wanous et al., 2000).

Findings from the literature on training effectiveness support this argument. Fundamentally, participants need to be motivated to learn and engage with the program (Chung

et al., 2021; Colquitt et al., 2000; Noe, 1986; Walsh & Magley, 2020). More motivated participants are likely to learn more from the program and to actually apply acquired knowledge and skills to their own work environment (Chung et al., 2021), which is the ultimate goal of any civility promotion program. Many individual and situational factors influence motivation to learn (Chung et al., 2021; Colquitt et al., 2000). An essential ingredient is the existence of a climate that supports the focal program, including support from one's leaders and peers (Chung et al., 2021). Consequently, implementing civility promotion programs in uncivil units, departments, or colleges may be met with challenges, at least at first. For example, Walsh and Magley (2020) found that workers were more skeptical and less motivated about a civility promotion program when they personally experienced incivility or worked in an environment in which incivility was the norm. Likewise, individuals with higher levels of cynicism about organizational change tend to be less motivated for sexual harassment training (Kath, 2005). This research suggests that students, faculty, and staff in academic units or departments that have the greatest need for civility promotion may be resistant, cynical, and less motivated to learn, at least at the outset of the program's implementation. We anticipate that such resistance may be more likely to crystallize if civility promotion programs are implemented with poor planning, inadequate communication, and/or in a standalone fashion at one point in time.

To address this potential resistance, we believe that it is necessary to engage in carefully planned, well-communicated, and sequentially delivered civility promotion programs, starting first with academic leadership. In reflecting on the CREW program, Hanrahan and Leiter (2014) emphasize that support from leaders is absolutely imperative to reap its benefits. This is consistent with the aforementioned literature showing that leadership plays a central role in the development of workplace civility (Walsh et al., 2018). Securing the buy-in, commitment, and support of academic leadership for civility promotion represents a key first step in the implementation of such programs in higher education. It is reassuring to see that several of the civility promotion programs being implemented in higher education focus first on academic leadership, such as the University of Michigan Respect in Striving for Excellence (RISE) program (see Appendix).

After starting with academic leadership, we believe that it is helpful to then raise awareness of the importance of civility and respect by delivering a program to individual participants (e.g., faculty, staff) across academic units. Our theory is that such an approach may catalyze individual change in their awareness of and their attitudes toward civility and respect, which may help to signal to cynical participants that change in civility is coming, in turn minimizing any individual resistance to the civility promotion program. Such introductory, individual-level modules could be delivered digitally to participants online. Examples of such an approach are evident in the Appendix, such as the "Creating a Culture of Civility" program described by Merkel et al. (2020) that was implemented among nursing students and faculty. Participants first individually completed an e-learning module, after which they participated in interactive sessions with other participants (in their case, separate sessions for faculty and students).

Following the rollout of individual civility promotion modules, we believe that it is important to implement civility promotion programs within defined and interdependent units (e.g., lab, department) in order to reap the most benefits. This is because effective civility interventions like CREW rely on participative decision making and participants owning the process (Hanrahan & Leiter, 2014). There are examples of such programs being implemented in higher education and listed in the Appendix. For instance, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) has focused on a lab-based approach to promote civility and respect with a 2-hour in-person workshop titled "Promoting a Professional and Inclusive Lab Culture" that addresses

topics related to civility and beyond (e.g., topics related to gender harassment, microaggressions) (NASEM, 2021). They note that "…the lab workshops provide an opportunity for MIT resources to connect with the lab and help establish norms" (NASEM, 2021, p. 102), which further reinforces the value of intervening at the local level to build norms of civility and respect, and help deter gender harassment.

We also recognize that when thinking about creating cultures of respect and inclusion of marginalized members such as women and women of color, other contextual and historical factors play a role. White men are overrepresented in powerful and high-status positions in higher education (e.g., provost, dean, department head), whereas women and women of color are underrepresented in many academic units (NCSES, 2021). Research examining the effects of numerical underrepresentation suggests these individuals will be at increased risk of stereotypes and isolation, and subject to heightened visibility (Kanter, 1977). White men dominate the culture in academia, but this dominant culture is not experienced the same by all people (Rios & Stewart, 2015). We believe that these issues cannot be ignored in civility promotion efforts, otherwise the white male voice may be the loudest and have the largest impact on defining what it means to be "civil" and "respectful", which may further ostracize women and women of color. Consequently, we believe that civility promotion programs implemented in an effort to reduce gender harassment must acknowledge the power dynamics and underrepresentation of women and ethnic minority group members to ensure the engagement and input of all members.

In summary, based on our review of literature and theory on civility, as well as contextual and structural considerations, we recommend that civility promotion programs enacted to reduce gender harassment take an expanded form – to move beyond a focus on "politeness" and "niceness" – to focus on enacting respect and justice at work, and address the following components:

1. Carefully plan the design, development, communication, and evaluation of the civility promotion program from the start.
2. Begin first with academic leadership to ensure buy-in and support for the civility promotion program.
3. Build awareness of civility and respect via individual interventions, prior to implementing the programs within intact units (e.g., labs, academic departments).
4. Focus on establishing respectful and high-quality connections.
5. Enable an inclusive and participatory approach in academic units, while ensuring that women and underrepresented members have ample opportunity to share their input and define their unit's civility norms.
6. Implement the programs in conjunction with other organizational efforts to eradicate sexual harassment (Cortina & Areguin, 2021), bias, systemic issues of discrimination, and more general inequities.

Potential Shortcomings or Unintended Consequences of Civility

Although civility is associated with benefits, it also has shortcomings and potential unintended consequences that are important to acknowledge. First, what constitutes "civility" or "incivility" is determined by the perception of others, and human perception is subject to bias and stereotypes. For example, in the context of determining "appropriate" civil behavior of one's colleagues, being assertive or saying "no" goes against gender role stereotypes that women should be communal (e.g., affectionate, helpful; Fiske et al., 2002). However, men who engage in such assertive behaviors often experience positive outcomes, because it is seen as "typical" and consistent with masculine gender stereotypes (Lapine & Sachdev, 2019). Such gender role stereotypes carry over to a team environment (e.g., research lab) and affect team outcomes:

recent experimental research found that teams with an uncivil woman suffered worse outcomes (e.g., decreased creativity) compared to teams with an uncivil man (Motro et al., 2021). These negative team-level effects, that vary based on the gender of an uncivil member, demonstrate the entrenched nature of our gender-based behavioral assumptions and the powerful ways we are subject to these biases.

Gender role expectations also need to be considered in their intersection with racial stereotypes. For example, research finds that the trope of Black women as an "Angry Black Woman" (Collins, 2000) results in perceptions that their ambiguously aggressive behavior is more hostile than the perceptions of the same behavior performed by whites (Duncan, 1976). Further, emotional display rules reflect white norms and regulate minority members' emotional expression (Mirchandani, 2003). Black women report enacting strategies to be perceived as less demanding, more accommodating, and may also refrain from offering dissenting opinions (Rabelo et al., 2021). In higher education, which is dominated by masculine and white norms[2], recommendations and interventions to promote civility need to recognize the disparate perceptions of employee behavior based on gender and racial stereotypes.

Efforts to regulate behavior and speech (in order to create civil norms) can also be perceived as an infringement on free speech or a damper on justice by discouraging employees from speaking against the status quo (see Cortina et al., 2019 for a discussion of this tension in academia). Critiques of civility, which come largely from the humanities, focus on the potential for civility to be used as an instrument of the powerful to determine acceptable behavior, which may promote self-silencing and acquiescence to those in power (Cortina et al., 2017). In this way, calls for civility can be a cover for larger issues of injustice and inequity (Davis et al., 2021; Gibson, 2019). For example, women faculty of color who speak out about inequities may be labeled as confrontational, uncooperative and uncivil (Settles et al., 2019), and told that "it can't be as bad as you say" or to be grateful to have a job (Gibson, 2019). Women faculty of color experience calls for civility as prioritizing white comfort (Erskine & Bilimoria, 2019) and reproducing existing inequities (Gibson, 2019). Calls for civility in this way manifest as oppressive power dynamics and leave marginalized employees without an avenue to seek justice, given the possibility of being disregarded or denigrated for violating civility norms (Davis et al., 2021).

With these critiques and cautions regarding "civility" in mind, organizations also have much to learn from research and theory on incivility and selective incivility in particular, which have the goals of protecting workforce well-being by ensuring dignity for all workers, especially those who are marginalized or in the minority (Cortina et al., 2017; Cortina et al., 2013). As presented earlier, research documents benefits for workplace culture from civility promotion programs. Accordingly, civility efforts need to both promote safe and healthy working conditions and do so while also ensuring that biased perceptions of behavior and calls for "civility" do not censure some groups. In an effort to overcome this tension, and as noted above, civility promotion programs should be participatory in nature, with efforts to create a psychologically safe space for minority employees to contribute, be clear in the goals of respect for all, and be

[2] Interested readers may find research on how some work contexts are sites of masculinity contests (i.e., masculinity contest cultures) helpful in understanding how dysfunctional organizational climates (including toxic leadership and harassment) perpetuate and engage all members of the organization in playing "a game to survive or win" (Berdahl et al., 2018, p. 431). During this, non-white/non-male members may become supporting actors or even co-perpetrators in a system that involves falling in line with white masculine norms to win a game of dominance and feel a constant need to fit in (or be pushed out; Berdahl et al., 2018). As connected to the current paper, gender harassment is likely used to police this maintenance of traditional masculinity, underscoring the seriousness with which organizations need to review their cultures and practices for dysfunctional patterns of hegemonic masculinity.

coupled with other organizational investigations to address systemic discrimination, prioritizing the experiences and well-being of diverse members of higher education.

Looking Beyond Civility

Civility programs hold promise for promoting norms for respectful treatment, generally, and mitigating gender harassment, more specifically. But additional possibilities exist that extend "beyond civility" for addressing these issues in higher education, by focusing on encouraging behaviors (i.e., positive behavior change), rather than focusing on what employees should *not* do. Indeed, civility policy has been enacted by some neighboring professional societies, including the American Psychological Association (APA; Plante, 2017), which established a working group to combat the deterioration of respectful and collegial behavior (Davis et al., 2021). The resulting policy scripted behavioral expectations of civility, including operational definitions and procedures for communication (Davis et al., 2021). Referred to as a helpful start, and also a "low bar", there were calls for revision to move beyond civility, with a focus on hospitality, solidarity, and kinship (Plante, 2019), and the need to embrace cultural humility, linking that to benefits for gender diversity (Davis et al., 2021).

Practices that promote positive social behavior beyond civility are worth considering. These practices vary based on level of intervention, and on their level of acknowledging gender-based experiences in organizations. Accordingly, we close by briefly reviewing research and practices that serve to move the bar beyond civility, to actions that foster meaningful relationships across difference. We organize these practices around three themes: creating high-quality connections via generalized reciprocity and allyship, forging purposeful networks, and taking actions to create greater personal resources. We end by reviewing recent research on the effectiveness of institution-wide positive organizational scholarship efforts in academia specifically. We close with a cautionary note on toxic positivity. Except where noted, the following practices have not been empirically tested to reduce sexual harassment.

One possible positive behavior change effort focuses on creating high-quality connections, characterized by vitality, mutuality, and positive regard (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). Acts of generosity and kindness grow emotional resources (such as joy) and also promote an openness to new ideas (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). These interactions are able to increase connections and promote sharing of resources and assistance through one's social networks (i.e., social capital, Coleman, 1988). One way to enact high-quality connections is to promote generalized reciprocity (Baker & Dutton, 2007), which involves the exchange of help and assistance among individuals. Generalized reciprocity is experienced as a repository of goodwill in which people give and receive help when they are able or need it (Baker & Dutton, 2007). Generalized reciprocity is a shared norm of helping that can enrich social relationships by increasing the interconnectedness of members. Organizations interested in boosting positive connections and reciprocity may find the University of Michigan's Center for Positive Organizations helpful as they offer tools, activities, and resources, such as the "Reciprocity Ring" or "Givitas" (Center for Positive Organizations, 2022). Perhaps most compelling is the potential for these connections to promote trust, respect, and a greater appreciation and knowledge about one another and each other's individual strengths (Baker & Dutton, 2007).

Another possibility is to more directly address how to build connections between different people. One example of this is male allyship. An ally is defined as "a member of the 'dominant' or 'majority' group who works to end oppression in his or her personal and professional life through support of, and as an advocate with and for, the oppressed population" (Washington & Evans, 1991, p. 195). Dominant approaches to reducing sexual harassment may instill feelings of shame and fear in men, and may reduce the likelihood that men engage in anti-

harassment efforts (Cole et al., 2021). Using positive behavior change to combat gender harassment shifts to a positive psychology focus wherein men's healthy relationships, behaviors, and attitudes are emphasized (Cole et al., 2021). In an examination of male allyship in higher education, Warren and colleagues (2021) found that allyship benefits female faculty (in terms of greater inclusion and energy for work), and male allies experience personal growth and work-family enrichment (e.g., how allyship at work benefits the ability to relate to family members). Programs to encourage male allyship could include practices that display humility, show openness to failure, and display emotional intelligence (Kelan et al., 2018). Allyship should also focus on intersecting identities. For example, Erskine and Bilimoria (2019) call for white allyship (by both men and women) of Afro-diasporic women (i.e., "Black women from across the African diaspora who identify as African, West Indian, African American, Afro-Latina, Afro-Asian, biracial, multiracial, or a combination of these identities, and who may speak any language", p. 319) as a transformative strategy to accelerate their career development and advancement. These allyship behaviors include taking a critical look at oneself, interrogating whiteness, having courage to disrupt the status quo, and offering solidarity and support (Erskine & Bilimoria, 2019). Allyship has the potential to increase the representation of women, and women of color in particular, in an effort to create contexts in higher education where they are not tokenized and scrutinized (and also more likely to experience gender harassment; Kabat-Farr & Cortina, 2014). Research finds that having social support networks of coworkers with shared lived experiences is paramount in attenuating the negative effects of stress caused by incivility and harassment for women of color scientists (Rodrigues et al., 2021).

Taking a purposeful approach to social networks may also help enhance respectful interactions and curb sexual harassment. Recent work by Cunningham et al. (2021) and Hershcovis et al. (2021) exposes how established and unquestioned network features work to silence and squash sexual harassment complaints. To combat the ways social networks keep sexual harassment alive, organizations should strengthen intersex network ties (to enhance informal connections between men and women), reward men for mentoring (which has the dual purpose of also strengthening women's networks), and facilitate ties through team building and collaboration (Hershcovis et al., 2021). The use of affinity groups may also provide an avenue to establish connections and share experiences with similar peers (Hershcovis et al., 2021). A social network approach could also help connect academic administrators in an effort to foster peer-to-peer learning of ways to create and enact policies that mitigate injustices and inequities. For example, Friedman and colleagues (2021) in a qualitative study of school public health administrators found peer mentorship amongst administrators to link to key benefits, including enhancing the importance of respect and inclusivity and the skills to handle complex personnel issues. As Dutt-Ballerstadt (2020) documents, there is a need to proactively address and solve personnel situations that are unbearable and result in higher education faculty and staff leaving their departments. Peer-mentoring amongst administrators allows leaders to connect over issues of fostering respect and enhanced skills around listening, cultural proficiency, and tactics to increase inclusion (Friedman et al., 2021). Creating strategic links between administrators will create network ties and information sharing to better implement policies and practices that promote respect and root out inequities.

A further possibility centers on building personal resources to enable participants to engage in more positive behavior toward others. This goal may be achieved via various interventions, such as programs focused on developing mindfulness or gratitude. Mindfulness is "a process of openly attending, with awareness, to one's experience in the present moment" (Creswell, 2017, p. 492). Mindfulness interventions are designed to drive greater awareness of the present moment, and they use various methods to achieve their goals, such as daily practice

via guided mediations (e.g., loving kindness meditation; Creswell et al., 2017). Experimental evidence suggests that participants in such interventions engage in greater prosocial behavior. For example, Hafenbrack et al. (2018) found across several studies that mindfulness interventions lead to increases in prosocial behavior, with evidence suggesting that participants become more empathetic, which explains their beneficial impact. In addition, gratitude interventions represent a similar, yet distinct possibility for intervention. Locklear et al. (2021) view gratitude as "a feeling of appreciation in response to an experience that is beneficial to, but not attributable to, the self" (p. 1315). Locklear et al. (2021) studied the benefits of a gratitude intervention wherein participants journaled for 10 days on aspects of their job/work for which they were grateful. Results showed that relative to a control condition, participants in the gratitude intervention experienced increases in self-control, which led them to engage in less interpersonal mistreatment (e.g., workplace incivility). Interventions such as these could be readily adapted to implementation in higher education. For example, an email blast summarizing the benefits of gratitude and encouraging readers to engage in a daily gratitude writing reflection could be sent to all faculty and staff, or a similar message could be sent to encourage students to download and use the Headspace mindfulness app, which has specifically been shown to reduce participant stress and enhance well-being (Bostock et al., 2019).

As noted above, calls for civility are sometimes viewed as attempting to squash academic debate or to silence challenges to the status quo. Because of this, institutions might find skill development around collaborative approaches to conflict management helpful. Collaborative conflict management techniques (which include respectful debate) may give faculty, staff, and students constructive ways to come together over conflict. Characterized as an active and agreeable stance toward conflict, collaborative conflict cultures welcome open resolution of conflicts but do so in a cooperative manner (Gelfand et al., 2008). Organizational cultures that embrace collaborative conflict management relate to positive outcomes such as climates of psychological safety (i.e., the ability to freely contribute without fear of negative consequences), strong learning orientations (e.g., treating differences as a source of knowledge, being open to improvement), and feelings of justice (i.e., fair treatment; Gelfand et al., 2012). To engage in collaborative conflict techniques, members would engage in active listening, avoid blame and snap judgements, be open to feedback, and respect one another (Ely & Thomas, 2020).

All of these actions and initiatives do not occur in a vacuum, but rather are influenced by the organizational and social context of the workplace. Pressures to engage in positive thought or positive interactions, while denying the experience of emotional distress or negative experiences (i.e., promoting toxic positivity), can be harmful (Princing, 2021). Change initiatives that target increasing connections between employees will likely not be effective, lasting, or equitable to the extent that some members feel maligned by system-level injustices. Research that has investigated these larger systems-level factors finds that justice climates and inclusive climates may help reduce gender-based mistreatment. Justice climates, or "employee beliefs that their employer is fair" (Rubino et al., 2018, p. 520) have been shown to decrease prevalence of sexual harassment at individual and unit levels (Rubino et al., 2018). One tool for illuminating the subtle ways sexism and unconscious bias unfairly influence the trajectory of female academic careers is through WAGES, an experiential learning activity (Shields et al., 2018). This activity takes 75-90 minutes and participants learn about patterns of inequity, and also what they can do as individuals and organizations to interrupt them (Shields et al., 2018). Inclusive climates (characterized by equitable employment practices, integration of differences, and inclusion in decision-making, Nishii, 2013) are also important to cultivate a social context that minimizes degradation and hostility along gendered lines. Sexual harassment is a form of mistreatment driven by status and power differentials (Berdahl, 2007). To the extent that gender-based

inequities exist in organizations, sexual harassment is likely to persist. However, inclusive leadership that minimizes these inequities will likely reduce conflict along gender lines, including sexual harassment (Nishii, 2013). Consequently, more general efforts to promote justice, fairness, and inclusion – such as justice training for unit heads (e.g., Greenberg, 2006) – may complement or extend any benefits realized from civility promotion programs.

We close by highlighting recent research by Cameron (2021) who conducted case studies of higher education institutions that enacted organization-wide practices based on positive organizational scholarship (POS) – which we might consider "beyond civility". These practices were woven throughout the culture, processes, goals, and interaction patterns of the institution and featured eight dimensions: 1) dignity and respect, 2) meaningfulness and purpose, 3) trust and integrity; 4) gratitude and appreciation; 5) caring and concern; 6) support and compassion; 7) forgiveness and understanding; 8) inspiration and positive energy (Cameron, 2021). These initiatives bring together some of our previously reviewed practices. One example of an institution adopting such an approach is Laureate – the world's largest university consortium (Cameron, 2021). Through a systematic process involving the senior leadership team and human resource staff, all leadership in its colleges and universities were trained in POS. Workshop participants were educated on the benefits of positive organizational practices for financial outcomes, students, staff, and faculty members. Various tools were shared including leader-subordinate exchange, supportive communication, culture diagnosis and change, gratitude, and generalized reciprocity (Cameron, 2021). Initiatives were also developed to track "positive energizers" and their effects – by challenging the consortium members to have "90 percent of all staff members throughout the world … infected with positive leadership and POS in 90 days" (Cameron, 2021, p. 752). Data suggests that these efforts led to increases in the eight previously mentioned dimensions (including dignity and respect) as well as increased student satisfaction and performance (Cameron, 2021). More research will be needed to assess whether such an institution-wide approach to increase positive organizational practices can also reduce gender harassment.

Conclusion

In closing, while we found theoretical support to reason that civility promotion programs (especially those that capture a broad range of behaviors) may reduce gender harassment, there is limited empirical investigation of this possibility. Given the promise of civility promotion to positively affect an array of employee outcomes, it may be reasonable to implement such efforts on their own merits and to collect data to assess its effects on gender harassment. When doing so, organizations should be mindful of the central role leadership plays in this process. We also presented some unintended consequences and the potential "dark side" of civility, particularly at the expense of employees seeking to rectify injustices and to thrive in organizations outside of the white masculine culture that pervades higher education. We concluded by highlighting some initiatives and practices that may push "beyond civility" to forge connections via allyship, reciprocity, purposeful networks, justice and inclusive climates, and organization-wide embrace of positive organizational practices.

References

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

Baker, W., & Dutton, J.E. (2007). Enabling positive social capital in organizations. In J.E. Dutton & B. Ragins (Eds.)*, Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 325-346). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Baur, J., Parker Ellen, B., Buckley, M., Ferris, G., Allison, T., McKenny, A., & Short, J. (2016). More than one way to articulate a vision: A configurations approach to leader charismatic rhetoric and influence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*, 156-171.

Berdahl, J. L. (2007). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review, 32*, 641-658.

Berdahl, J. L., Cooper, M., Glick, P., Livingston, R. W., & Williams, J. C. (2018). Work as a Masculinity Contest. *Journal of Social Issues*, *74*, 422–448.

Blackwell, L., Snyder, L., & Mavriplis, C. (2009). Diverse faculty in STEM fields. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*, 195-205.

Bostock, S., Crosswell, A. D., Prather, A. A., & Steptoe, A. (2019). Mindfulness on-the-go: Effects of a mindfulness meditation app on work stress and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24*, 127–138.

Brady, B., Asquith, N. L., Ferfolja, T., & Hanckel, B. (2022). Fear of heterosexism among sexuality and gender diverse staff and students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*, NP1908-NP1938.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*, 117–134.

Calabrese, A. (2015). Liberalism's disease: Civility above justice. *European Journal of Communication (London), 30*, 539-553.

Cameron, K. (2021). Applications of positive organizational scholarship in institutions of higher education. In M. L Kern & M. L. Wehmeyer (Eds), *The Palgrave handbook of positive education* (pp. 741-766). Palgrave Macmillan.

Center for Positive Organizations. (2022). Retrieved from https://positiveorgs.bus.umich.edu/

Chung, S., Zhan, Y., Noe, R. A., & Jiang, K. (2021). Is it time to update and expand training motivation theory? A meta-analytic review of training motivation research in the 21st century. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000901

Clancy, K. B. H., Lee, K. M. N., Rodgers, E. M., & Richey, C. (2017). Double jeopardy in astronomy and planetary science: Women of color face greater risks of gendered and racial harassment. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 122*, 1610-1623.

Clawson, J. G. (2006). *Level three leadership: Getting below the surface* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cole, B. P., Moffitt-Carney, K., Patterson, T. P., & Willard, R. (2021). Psychology of Men and Masculinities' focus on positive aspects of men's functioning: A content analysis and call to action. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities, 22*, 39–47.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94,* S95–S120.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Columbia University Policy and Planning Committee Equity Reports (October, 2018). Retrieved from: https://fas.columbia.edu/home/diversity-arts-and-sciences/ppc-equity-reports

Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 33*, 55-75.

Cortina, L. M., & Areguin, M. A. (2021). Putting people down and pushing them out: Sexual harassment in the workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 8*, 285-309.

Cortina, L. M., Cortina, M. G., & Cortina, M. J. (2019). Regulating rude: Tensions between free speech and civility in academic employment. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 12*, 357–375.

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management, 39*, 1579-1605.

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Magley, V. J., & Nelson, K. (2017). Researching rudeness: The past, present, and future of the science of incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*, 299–313.

Cortina, L., Swan, S., Fitzgerald, L., & Waldo, C. (1998). Sexual harassment and assault. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 419-441.

Creswell, J. D. (2017). Mindfulness interventions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 68*, 491-516.

Cunningham, P., Drumwright, M.E. and Foster, K.W. (2021). Networks of complicity: Social networks and sex harassment. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, 40*, 392-409.

Davis, E. B., Plante, T. G., Grey, M. J., Kim, C. L., Freeman-Coppadge, D., Lefevor, G. T., Paulez, J. A., Giwa, S., Lasser, J., Stratton, S. P., Deneke, E., & Glowiak, K. J. (2021). The role of civility and cultural humility in navigating controversial areas in psychology. *Spirituality in Clinical Practice*, *8*, 79–97.

Duncan, B. (1976). Differential social perception and attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of Blacks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*, 590-598.

Dutt-Ballerstadt, R. (2020). In our own words: Institutional betrayals. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/03/06/under represented-faculty-members-share-real-reasons-they-have-left-various

Dutton, J., & Heaphy, E. (2003). The power of high-quality connections. In K. Cameron, J. Dutton and R. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 263-278). Berrett-Koehler.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2020). Getting serious about diversity: Enough already with the business case. *Harvard Business Review*, *98*, 114–122.

Erskine, S. E., & Bilimoria, D. (2019). White allyship of Afro-diasporic women in the workplace: A transformative strategy for organizational change. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 26,* 319–338.

Feldblum, C. R., & Lipnic, V. A. (2016). *Select task force on the study of harassment in the workplace*. U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Fiske, S., Cuddy, A., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 878-902.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 17*, 425–445.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Magley, V. J. (1997). But was it really sexual harassment? Legal, behavioral, and psychological definitions of the workplace victimization of women. In W. O'Donahue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 5-28). Allyn & Bacon.

Foronda, C., Baptiste, D.-L., Reinholdt, M. M., & Ousman, K. (2016). Cultural Humility: A Concept Analysis. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, *27*, 210–217.

Friedman, D. B., Yelton, B., Corwin, S. J., Hardin, J. W., Ingram, L. A., Torres-McGehee, T. M., & Alberg, A. J. (2021). Value of peer mentorship for equity in higher education leadership: a school of public health focus with implications for all academic administrators. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 29*, 500-521.

Gelfand, M. J., Leslie, L. M., & Keller, K. M. (2008). On the etiology of conflict cultures. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 137–166.

Gelfand, M. J., Leslie, L. M., Keller, K., & de Dreu, C. (2012). Conflict cultures in organizations: How leaders shape conflict cultures and their organizational-level consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*, 1131–1147.

Gibson, A. N. (2019). Civility and structural precarity for faculty of color in LIS. *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*, *60*, 215–222.

Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: Attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 58-69.

Hafenbrack, A. C., Cameron, L. D., Spreitzer, G. M., Zhang, C., Noval, L. J., & Shaffakat, S. (2020). Helping people by being in the present: Mindfulness increases prosocial behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 159*, 21-38.

Hanrahan, M., & Leiter, M. P. (2014). Workplace mistreatment: Recent developments in theory, research, and interventions. In P. Y. Chen & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Work and wellbeing* (pp. 263–294). Wiley Blackwell.

Harold, C. M., & Holtz, B. C. (2015). The effects of passive leadership on workplace incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*, 16–38.

Hershcovis, M. S., Vranjes, I., Berdahl, J. L., & Cortina, L. M. (2021). See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil: Theorizing network silence around sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *106*, 1834–1847.

House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 81–107). Academic Press.

Hurley, K., Sholar, B., & Rodeheffer, L. (2021). An examination of department of defense environmental factors that contribute to reporting sexual harassment. *Military Psychology, 33*, 417-425.

Joint Commission for the Accreditation of Health Care Organizations. (2008). Behaviors that undermine a culture of safety. *Sentinel Event Alert, Issue 40.* Retrieved from: http://www.jointcommission.org/SentinelEvents/SentinelEventAlert

Kabat-Farr, D., Settles, I. H., & Cortina, L. M. (2020). Selective incivility: An insidious form of discrimination in organizations. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, 39*, 253-260.

Kabat-Farr, D. & Cortina, L.M. (2014). Sex-based harassment in employment: New insights into gender and context. *Law and Human Behavior, 38*, 58-72

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* Basic Books, Inc.

Kath, L. M. (2005). *How cynicism about organizational change can influence the effectiveness of socialization training: Sexual harassment training as exemplar*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2005). Bullying in the workplace: Its impact and management. *Employee Rights and Employment Policy Journal, 8*, 335-373.

Kelan, E. (2018). Men doing and undoing gender at work: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 20*, 544-558.

Kidder, D. L., Lankau, M. J., Chrobot-Mason, D., Mollica, K. A., & Friedman, R. A. (2004). Backlash toward diversity initiatives: Examining the impact of diversity program justification, personal, and group outcomes. *The International Journal of Conflict of Management, 15,* 77-102.

Krasikova, D. V., Green, S. G., & LeBreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive leadership: A theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda. *Journal of Management, 39*, 1308-1338.

Lapine, C. M., & Sachdev, A. R. (2019). Juggling in heels: The struggle of female professors to balance civility and free speech without suffering from negative student evaluations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *12*, 391–394.

Leiter, M. P., Day, A., Oore, D. G., & Spence Laschinger, H. K. (2012). Getting better and staying better: Assessing civility, incivility, distress, and job attitudes one year after a civility intervention. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*, 425–434.

Leiter, M. P., Laschinger, H. K. S., Day, A., & Oore, D. G. (2011). The impact of civility interventions on employee social behavior, distress, and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 1258–1274.

Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Interpersonal Mistreatment in the Workplace: The Interface and Impact of General Incivility and Sexual Harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 483–496.

Locklear, L. R., Taylor, S. G., & Ambrose, M. L. (2020). How a gratitude intervention influences workplace mistreatment: A multiple mediation model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 106*, 1314-1331.

McGonagle, A. K., Walsh, B. M., Kath, L. M., & Morrow, S. L. (2014). Civility norms, safety climate, and safety outcomes: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19,* 437–452.

Meloni, M., & Austin, M. (2011). Implementation and outcomes of a zero tolerance of bullying and harassment program. *Australian Health Review, 35*, 92-94.

Merriam-Webster (2022). *Definition of civility*. Retrieved from: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/civility

Mirchandani, K. (2003). Challenging racial silences in studies of emotion work: Contributions from anti-racist feminist theory. *Organization Studies, 24,* 721–742.

Motro, D., Spoelma, T. M., & Ellis, A. P. J. (2021). Incivility and creativity in teams: Examining the role of perpetrator gender. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *106*, 560–581.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2021). *Evaluating the effectiveness of interventions to prevent and address sexual harassment: Proceedings of a workshop*. The National Academies Press.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Sexual harassment of women: Climate, culture, and consequences in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine*. The National Academies Press.

National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (2021). *Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in science and engineering: 2021*. Special Report NSF 21-321. National Science Foundation.

Nishii, L. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*, 1754-1774.

Osatuke, K., Moore, S. C., Ward, C., Dyrenforth, S. R., & Belton, L. (2009). Civility, Respect, Engagement in the Workforce (CREW): Nationwide organization development intervention at Veterans Health Administration. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 45*, 384-410.

Park, M., Cho, S., & Hong, H. (2015). Prevalence and perpetrators of workplace violence by nursing unit and the relationship between violence and the perceived work environment. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 47*, 87-95.

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics, 29*, 123–137.

Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for "nice"? Think again. *Academy of Management Executive*, *19*, 7–18.

Peck, D. L. (2002). Civility: A contemporary context for a meaningful historical concept. *Sociological Inquiry, 72*, 358-375.

Plante, T. G. (2017). Making APA civil again: The efforts and outcomes of the civility working group. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 48,* 401– 404.

Plante, T. (2019). Possible next steps in APA's civility efforts: Moving from civility to hospitality, solidarity, and to kinship. *The Specialist, 44*, 23-26.

Princing, M. (2021). What you need to know about toxic positivity. *Right as Rain by UW Medicine*. Retrieved from: https://rightasrain.uwmedicine.org/mind/well-being/toxic-positivity

Porath, C. L., Gerbasi, A., & Schorsch, S. L. (2015). The effects of civility on advice, leadership, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*, 1527-1541.

Rabelo, V. C., Robotham, K. J., & McCluney, C. L. (2021). "Against a sharp white background": How Black women experience the white gaze at work. *Gender, Work & Organization, 28*, 1840– 1858.

Rios, D., & Stewart, A. J. (2015). Insider and outsider-within standpoints: The experiences of diverse faculty in science and engineering fields. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, *21*, 295-322.

Robotham, K., & Cortina, L. (2021). Promoting respect as a solution to workplace harassment. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, 40*, 410-429.

Rodrigues, M. A., Mendenhall, R., & Clancy, K. B. H. (2021). "There's realizing, and then there's realizing": How social support can counter gaslighting of women of color scientists. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, *27*, 1-23.

Roehling, M. V., Wu, D., Choi, M. G., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2021). The effects of sexual harassment training on proximal and transfer training outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Personnel Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12492

Rubino, C., Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., Moore, B. L., Wilson, D. C., Van Driel, M. S., Witt, L. A., & McDonald, D. P. (2018). And justice for all: How organizational justice climate deters sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology, 71*, 519–544.

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations, 56*, 1213–1232.

Scott. J. W. (2015). The new thought police: Why are campus administrators invoking civility to silence critical speech? *The Nation.* Retrieved from: https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/new-thought-police/

Settles, I., Buchanan, N., & Dotson, K. (2019). Scrutinized but not recognized: (In)visibility and hypervisibility experiences of faculty of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 113*, 62-74.

Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Buchanan, N. T., & Miner, K. N. (2013). Derogation, discrimination, and (dis)satisfaction with jobs in science: A gendered analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*, 179–191.

Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*, 47–58.

Settles, I., & O'Connor, R. (2014). Incivility at academic conferences: Gender differences and the mediating role of climate. *Sex Roles*, *71*, 71–82.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference.* Houghton, Mifflin and Company.

Shields, S. A., McCormick, K. T., Dicicco, E. C., & Zawadzki, M. J. (2018). Demonstrating the cumulative effects of unconscious bias with WAGES-Academic (Workshop Activity for Gender Equity Simulation): Short and long-term impact on faculty and administrators. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering, 24*, 147–163.

Taylor, S. G., & Pattie, M. W. (2014). When does ethical leadership affect workplace incivility? The moderating role of follower personality. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 24*, 595–616.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 178-190.

Treviño, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations, 56*, 5–37.

Treviño, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral personal and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. *California Management Review, 42*, 128-142.

Walsh, B. M., Lee, J., Jensen, J. M., McGonagle, A., & Samnani, A. (2018). Positive leader behaviors and workplace incivility: The mediating role of perceived norms for respect. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 33*, 495-508.

Walsh, B. M., Magley, V. J., Reeves, D. A., Davies-Schrils, K. A., Marmet, M. D., & Gallus, J. A. (2012). Assessing workgroup norms for civility: The development of the Civility Norms Questionnaire – Brief. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27*, 407-420.

Walsh, B. M., & Magley, V. J. (2019). Don't forget the role of civility interventions in workplace sexual harassment. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 12*, 39-41.

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Austin, J. T. (2000). Cynicism about organizational change: Measurement, antecedents, and correlates. *Group & Organization Management, 25*, 132-153.

Warren, M., Bordoloi, S., & Warren, M. (2021). Good for the goose and good for the gander: Examining positive psychological benefits of male allyship for men and women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 22*, 723-731

Washington, J., & Evans, N.J. (1991). Becoming an Ally. In N.J. Evans & V.A. Wall (Eds.), *Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians and bisexuals on campus* (pp. 195 – 204). American Association for Counseling and Development.

Willness, C. R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 127-162.

Yao, J., Lim, S., Guo, C. Y., Ou, A. Y., & Ng, J. W. X. (2021). Experienced incivility in the workplace: A meta-analytical review of its construct validity and nomological network. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000870

Appendix

To develop a thorough understanding of extant civility promotion programs in higher education and other contexts, we conducted a search of the scholarly literature on civility promotion programs via Google Scholar, utilizing various combinations of pertinent search terms (e.g., civility, civility promotion, civility training, sexual harassment, higher education, university, outcomes, evaluation). The focus of our review was on empirical examples of programs published in peer-reviewed journals, especially those programs with a primary emphasis on civility, as opposed to programs that directly emphasize sexual harassment, for which many specific examples and reviews exist in the literature (e.g., Roehling et al., 2021). We retained examples from pertinent dissertations and theses if the program was implemented and focused on higher education contexts. As part of this search, we also reviewed the NASEM Sexual Harassment Collaborative Repository and identified additional examples specific to higher education classified as "Civility or Respect Prevention Programs" using the topic search function available to website users.

The results from these searches are presented in the Appendix shown below. For each identified example, we summarize the program, the context in which the program was implemented, whether it was peer-reviewed, whether a comparison group (e.g., control group) was included in studying the impact of the program, whether an evaluation (of any kind) was conducted, and given the focus of the present manuscript, whether the evaluation captures variables that relate directly to sexual harassment (e.g., knowledge about sexual harassment, attitudes about sexual harassment).

Program Name and/or Reference(s)	Summary	Context	PR	COMP	EVAL	SH in EVAL
Argonne National Laboratory. Allyship success in research and development webinar. Retrieved from: https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education/repository	Describes a 2-hour webinar provided to Argonne, FermiLab and University of Chicago personnel covering topics such as emotional intelligence in order to help improve interpersonal interactions.	Higher Education / Research Center	N	N	Y	U
Argonne National Laboratory. Core values shout-outs. Retrieved from: https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education/repository	Describes the Core Values Shout-Outs program designed to reinforce Argonne's core values of Impact, Safety, Respect, Integrity, and Teamwork. Evaluation suggested that Shout-Out's were widespread, suggesting the program was effective at building awareness of Argonne's core values.	Research Center	N	N	Y	U
Armstrong, N. (2017). A quality improvement project measuring the effect of an evidence-based civility training program on nursing workplace incivility in a rural hospital using quantitative methods. *Online Journal of Rural*	Four training sessions following the CREW model were implemented in a small sample of nurses. No decrease in incivility experiences was observed, but increases in ability to recognize and respond to incivility were found.	Health Care	Y	N	Y	N

Nursing and Health Care, 17. https://doi.org/10.14574/ojrnhc.v17i1.438						
Chipps, E. M., & McRury, M. (2012). The development of an educational intervention to address workplace bullying. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development, 28*, 94-98.	An educational intervention on workplace bullying, collegiality, and collaboration was implemented in a small sample of healthcare workers. Results showed that experiences of bullying increased from pre- to post-intervention, which may be due to increased ability to recognize bullying behaviors.	Health Care	Y	N	Y	N
Civility Among Healthcare Professionals (CAHP) • Walsh, B. M. (2011). Workplace incivility training: A model of training effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. • Walsh, B. M., & Magley, V. J. (2020). Workplace civility training: understanding drivers of motivation to learn. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 31*, 2165-2187.	Describes the development and short-term evaluation of a workplace (in)civility training program in a correctional healthcare setting, as well as an assessment of the antecedents to civility training motivation to learn. Participants attended 1.5-hour workshops on workplace civility and incivility with lecture and small-group discussion. Significant pre to post-training change in attitudes toward workplace incivility and knowledge about workplace incivility was observed.	Health Care	Y	N	Y	N
Civility, Respect, and Engagement in the Workplace (CREW). • Laschinger, H. K. S., Leiter, M. P., Day, A., Gilin-oore, D., & Mackinnon, S. P. (2012). Building empowering work environments that foster civility and organizational trust: Testing an intervention. *Nursing Research, 61*, 316-325. • Leiter, M. P., Day, A., Oore, D. G., & Laschinger, H. K. S. (2012). Getting better and staying better: Assessing civility, incivility, distress, and job attitudes one year after a civility intervention. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*, 425–434. • Leiter, M. P., Laschinger, H. K. S., Day, A., & Oore, D. G. (2011). The impact of civility interventions on employee social	Various publications describe the nature and impact of CREW. CREW is a 6-month intervention designed to improve the quality of interpersonal relationships among participants. Work groups identity specific areas of interpersonal relationships to work on over time, and hence interventions are tailored to the needs of each group. CREW results in increases in workplace civility and various positive work attitudes, and decreases in workplace incivility over time.	Health Care	Y	Y	Y	N

behavior, distress, and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 1258–1274. • Osatuke, K., Moore, S. C., Ward, C., Dyrenforth, S. R., & Belton, L. (2009). Civility, Respect, Engagement in the Workforce (CREW): Nationwide organization development intervention at Veterans Health Administration. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 45*, 384-410.						
Columbia University & Columbia University Irving Medical Center. Working group for civility and professionalism at Columbia University Irving Medical Center (CUIMC). Retrieved from: https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education/repository	Describes the efforts of the CUIMC, who are focused on building an academic culture of civility, professionalism, and respect for all individuals. The CUIMC is focused on developing principles of professionalism, developing recommendations for creating organizational structures to support civility and respect, and developing reporting structures.	Higher Education	N	N	Y	U
Dartmouth College. Cultivating an Inclusive Community (CIC). Retrieved from: https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education/repository	Describes the content of workshops being delivered to address conscious and unconscious bias, negative encounters, and positive behaviors for participants to engage in. Pre- and post-workshop surveys are conducted to help conduct a short-term evaluation of the workshops, although data are not provided in the summary.	Higher Education	N	N	Y	U
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Respectful Workplace Training Program. Retrieved from: https://eeotraining.eeoc.gov/profile/web/index.cfm?PKwebID=0x2547d970&varPage=activity	Provides training on Leading for Respect (for supervisors) and Respect in the Workplace (for all employees) which focuses on building a more respectful and inclusive workplace.	Misc.	N	N	N	N
Farzi, F., Hasanvand, S., Goudarzi, F., Gavgani, M. T., & Mokhayeri, Y. (2021). Management of students' uncivil behaviors in academic environments: A context-based educational intervention. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion.* https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_1316_20	A four-week educational intervention on workplace civility and incivility was implemented among nursing students. Results showed significant increases from pre- to post-intervention in experienced civility and awareness/understanding of incivility.	Higher Education / Health Care	Y	N	Y	N
Fort Lewis College. Trauma fatigue recognition and prevention. Retrieved from:	Describes programs focused on recognizing trauma fatigue, with the goal of reinforcing an academic climate	Higher Education	N	N	Y	U

https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education/repository	of civility and respect. Separate programs (e.g., workshops) are focused on (a) students and (b) faculty and staff.					
Holme, C. A. (2006). Impact not intent. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 38*, 242-247.	Describes the design and implementation of a training program (among other facets) for managers and employees on workplace bullying in an organization.	Corporate Distribution Center	Y	N	Y	N
Howard, M. S., & Embree, J. L. (2020). Educational intervention improves communication abilities of nurses encountering workplace incivility. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, 51*, 138-144.	An educational intervention designed to increase awareness of workplace incivility and bullying was implemented and evaluated. Increases in perceived levels of civility competence were observed in the treatment group, as measured via the Workplace Civility Index.	Health Care	Y	Y	Y	N
Johns Hopkins University. Consent education campaign. Retrieved from: https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education/repository	Describes a consent education program developed by the Sexual Violence Advisory Committee (SVAC) to the Provost. The campaign includes themes of civility and respect by highlighting desirable behaviors (as opposed to merely undesirable behaviors).	Higher Education	N	N	Y	U
Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2005). Bullying in the workplace: Its impact and management. *Employee Rights and Employment Policy Journal, 8*, 335-373.	Describes the Workplace Stress and Aggression Project implemented in the United States Department of Veterans Affairs. Participating sites received customized interventions and training on aggression and other topics. Survey data collected via the Workplace Aggression Research Questionnaire (WAR-Q) – which includes items related to sexual harassment and assault – was used in part to evaluate the intervention. Improvement was observed in many of the negative behaviors studied between Time 1 and Time 2 data.	Health Care	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kile, D., Eaton, M., deValpine, M., & Gilbert, R. (2019). The effectiveness of education and cognitive rehearsal in managing nurse-to-nurse incivility: A pilot study. *Journal of Nursing Management, 27*, 543-552.	Describes the design and evaluation of an intervention involving cognitive rehearsal training on nurse's ability to recognize workplace incivility, and confront it when it occurs. Participants were trained on definitions of incivility, techniques for responding to common types of incivility, and role playing was used to practice responses to incivility. Significant decreases in perceptions of several forms of incivility and increases in the ability to recognize incivility were observed in participants over time.	Health Care	Y	N	Y	N
Kirk, B. A., Schutte, N. S., & Hine, D. W. (2011). The effect of an expressive-writing intervention for employees on emotional self-	Tested the effectiveness of an expressive-writing intervention on outcomes including workplace incivility experiences and perpetration. Participants were asked to	Misc., including employed	Y	Y	Y	N

efficacy, emotional intelligence, affect, and workplace incivility. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41*, 179-195.	write for 20 minutes for 3 days. Treatment condition participants were asked to write about their emotions and thoughts about work events, while control condition participants were asked to write on any topic not related to work. The intervention group showed significant decreases in incivility perpetration, among other outcomes, compared to the control group.	university students				
Lasater, K., Mood, L., Buchwach, D., & Dieckmann, N. F. (2015). Reducing incivility in the workplace: Results of a three-part educational intervention. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, 46*, 15-24.	Describes a 6-month, three-part intervention on workplace (in)civility in a healthcare setting. The intervention included (a) a 1-hour presentation and discussion on incivility, (b) a 4-hour lecture, discussion, and role play on setting norms and addressing incivility, and (c) a 2-hour simulation to practice learned skills. Workplace incivility decreased significantly over time in participating units.	Health Care	Y	Y	Y	N
Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Lab-based inclusive culture workshops. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2021). *Evaluating the effectiveness of interventions to prevent and address sexual harassment: Proceedings of a workshop*. Washington, DC. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/26279	Describes a 2-hour workshop called "Promoting a Professional and Inclusive Lab Culture" which covers topics related to respect, sexual harassment, and microaggressions, among other topics. The workshop is specifically designed to be delivered to intact groups (e.g., research labs).	Higher Education	N	N	Y	U
Meloni, M., & Austin, M. (2011). Implementation and outcomes of a zero tolerance of bullying and harassment program. *Australian Health Review, 35*, 92-94.	Describes in a case study a workplace bullying and harassment intervention program, including policy, training, posters, and an orientation program, in a healthcare organization. Harassment was defined as "a behaviour towards an individual or a group which is offensive, humiliating, intimidating or threatening; is unwelcome, unsolicited, usually unreciprocated, and a reasonable person would consider to be offensive, humiliating, intimidating or threatening" (p. 92). Descriptive statistics suggested improvements over time in levels of bullying and harassment, knowledge of reporting bullying and harassment, and organizational tolerance of bullying and harassment.	Health Care	Y	N	Y	Y
Merkel, R., Olsen, J., Pehler, S., Sperstad, R., Sisto, H., Brunsell, K., & Mades, H. (2020). An innovative civility intervention created by a	Describes the design and evaluation of a workplace civility and incivility intervention among nursing faculty and students – the Creating a Culture of Civility training.	Higher Education / Health Care	Y	N	Y	N

faculty and student action research team. *Journal of Nursing Education, 59*, 214-217.	Students and faculty were trained separately. Part 1 was an e-learning module, whereas part 2 was interactive and in person. Reactions to the program were gathered via a survey.					
Mikkelson, E. G., Hogh, A., & Puggaard, L. B. (2011). Prevention of bullying and conflicts at work: Process factors influencing the implementation and effects of interventions. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management, 4*, 84-100.	Describes a workplace bullying intervention in two organizations: a business college and hospital department. Interventions included two 1.5-hour lectures on bullying, a 2-day course on conflict management, newsletters, and meetings around interpersonal issues. No systematic quantitative data were gathered to track change in knowledge, experiences, skills or attitudes related to workplace bullying or incivility.	Higher Education / Health Care	Y	N	N	N
Pate, J., & Beaumont, P. (2010). Bullying and harassment: A case of success? *Employee Relations, 32*, 171-183.	Describes a program designed to address workplace bullying in a U.K. public sector organization. Included in the program was the implementation of a new Dignity at Work policy and mandatory training for all employees on the policy. Results showed that self-reports of the extent to which workplace bullying was a problem declined significantly over time.	Public Sector Org.	Y	N	Y	N
Razzi, C. C., & Bianchi, A. L. (2019). Incivility in nursing: Implementing a quality improvement program utilizing cognitive rehearsal training. *Nursing Forum, 54*, 526-536.	Describes a 1-hour cognitive rehearsal training program on workplace incivility for nurses. Definitions of workplace incivility and civility were provided, cognitive rehearsal was reviewed, and participants were given time to rehearse responses to workplace incivility via role play. Participants reported significant decreases in experienced workplace incivility over time.	Health Care	Y	N	Y	N
Roberts, T., Hanna, K., Hurley, S., Turpin, R., & Clark, S. (2018). Peer training using cognitive rehearsal to promote a culture of safety in health care. *Nurse Educator, 43*, 262-266.	Nursing students at a public university were trained in a 2-hour background session on workplace incivility, and a 1-hour cognitive rehearsal session to practice responding to incivility. Evaluation focused on self-reported reactions and perceptions, and suggested increased awareness of incivility.	Higher Education / Health Care	Y	N	Y	N
Rose, K. A., Jenkins, S. D., Astroth, K., Woith, W., & Jarvill, M. (2020). Lessons learned: Raising awareness of civility and incivility using semi-virtual reality simulation. *Journal of Nursing Education, 59*, 461-464.	Nursing students participated in a civility and incivility training session, including a faculty-led discussion on civility and incivility, as well as a web-based semi-virtual reality training, and a web-based debriefing. The researchers report that students were more aware of	Higher Education / Health Care	Y	N	Y	N

	civility and incivility following the training, although few details are provided.					
Strengthening a Culture of Respect and Engagement (SCORE). Described in: National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2021). *Evaluating the effectiveness of interventions to prevent and address sexual harassment: Proceedings of a workshop*. Washington, DC. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/26279	SCORE is a program based on CREW (described above) that attempts to promote civility and respect via the implementation of five 90-minute sessions among participants. Evaluation suggests that the SCORE program promotes civility and decreases incivility within participating units.	Misc.	N	Y	Y	N
Stagg, S. J., Sheridan, D., Jones, R. A., & Speroni, K. G. (2011). Evaluation of a workplace bullying cognitive rehearsal program in a hospital setting. *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, 42*, 395-401.	Describes a 2-hour cognitive rehearsal training program on workplace bullying for nurses. The training significantly increased nurse's knowledge of workplace bullying, attitudes toward bullying, and perceived adequacy of training on the management of bullying.	Health Care	Y	N	Y	N
University of Michigan. Respect in Striving for Excellence (RISE). Retrieved from: https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education/repository	Describes a multi-pronged program aimed at promoting civility, respect, and inclusion at the University of Michigan. Key components of RISE are workshops for academic leaders, informal meetings with program participants, and communications on maintaining a respectful climate. Feedback is gathered on the workshops as a means of providing evaluative data.	Higher Education	N	N	Y	U
University of Minnesota. Restorative justice and climate support network. Retrieved from: https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education/repository	Describes the Climate Support Network and use of restorative justice, with the ultimate goal of enhancing a positive academic culture and climate.	Higher Education	N	N	Y	U
University of Washington. Senior leadership education. https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education/repository	Describes an education program for senior leadership (Board of Deans and Chancellors) on promoting civility, respect, and inclusion.	Higher Education	N	N	Y	U

Note. References for programs included in the Appendix are included in the Reference list only if they are cited in the main text of the manuscript. Context denotes the focal environment for the program. PR = whether the program was published in a peer-reviewed journal at the time our search was conducted (Yes or No). COMP = whether there was a control/comparison group (Yes or No). EVAL = whether an evaluation has been or is being conducted on the program (Yes or No). SH in EVAL reflects whether the program evaluation includes criteria specifically related to sexual harassment (Yes, No, Unknown).