

Shirin Hasanvand ^{1,*}, Maryam Mohammadi Pour², Fateme Goudarzi¹, Maryam Rasouli³, Parastoo Baharvand⁴, Mohammad Zarei⁵ ¹Nursing Department, Social Determinants of Health Research Center, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences.

Khorramabad, Iran ²Shahid Rahimi Hospital of Khorramabad, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Khorramabad, Iran ³Cancer Research Center, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran Iran ⁴School of Medicine, Social

Determinants of Health Research Center, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Khorramabad, Iran ⁵Applied Research Center Police, Lorestan, Khorramabad, Iran

*Lorestan University of Medical Sciences Anooshirvan Rezaei Sq. Khorramabad, 6813833946 Iran

Tel: +98 6633120155-64 Fax: +98 6633120140 Email: hasanvand.sh@lums.ac.ir

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

نسبة وأهمية السلوكيات غير المدنية لطلاب التمريض: مقارنة بين تصورات المعلمين والطلاب

الخلفية والهدف: في حين أن التعليم العالي له دور فريد في مساعدة الطلاب على تحقيق الإحساس بالكياسة، نرى أن السلوك غير المدني آخذ في الارتفاع. كان الغرض من هذه الدراسة هو تقييم ومقارنة تصورات المعلمين والطلاب حول تواتر وأهمية السلوكيات غير المدنية لطلاب التمريض.

الطريقة: في هذه الدراسة الوصفية المقارنة ، تم اختيار ١٧٨ طالب تمريض عن طريق أخذ عينات عشوائية طبقية ، كما شارك سبعة وستين من المعلمين من جامعة لورستان للعلوم الطبية عن طريق أخذ عينات هادفة. تم جمع البيانات باستخدام مقياس غير متحضر تم تكييفه مع البيئة الأكاديمية ، وتم تحليل البيانات باستخدام إصدار برنامج20 SPSS ، والإحصاءات الوصفية والتحليلية بما في ذلك اختبار خي مربع وتحليل التباين.

النتائج: اختلف المعلمون والطلاب حول تواتر وأهمية بعض السلوكيات غير المدنية حيث لاحظ المعلمون أن أعلى تواتر في السلوكيات غير المدنية "غير مهتمين أو غير مبالين بمحتوى الدرس" (٧٢%) و "تأخر الدخول فى الصف "(۶۹،۹ ٪). وفقًا للطلاب؛ كان أعلى تردد يتعلق بـ "عدم الاهتمام أو عدم الاكتراث بمحتوى الدرس" (۶۸/۷٪) و "استخدام أدوات الوسائط في الصف" (۲۰۷٪). و أيضًا من وجهة نظر المعلمين و الطلاب؛ الحد الأقصى متوسط الدرجات ينتمي إلى "عنف وجهة نظر المعلمين و الطلاب؛ الحد الأقصى متوسط الدرجات ينتمي إلى "عنف (38.0±5.8 و "تهديدات جسدية أو أذى للآخرين"(50.0±5.8 هـ3.0±5.8 ر) مما يدل على أهمية عالية لهذه العناص. على النقيض من ذلك؛ فإن أدنى متوسط درجة ينتمي إلى "اختبارات المكياج والتمديدات" (1.2±1.07.1±21.9) و "كونها بعيدة وباردة تجاه الآخرين" (1.2±1.20±2.3).

الخلاصة: بالنظر إلى أوجه التشابه و الاختلاف بين وجهات نظر المعلمين و الطلاب حول أهمية و تواتر السلوكيات غير المدنية ؛ من الضروري تصميم استراتيجيات تهدف إلى زيادة وعيهم بالحضارة و استئصال أسباب هذه السلوكيات أو النظر فيها مع درج الموضوع فى مناهج التمريض التعليميه الجامعية. الكلمات المفتاحية: الطلاب ، التمريض ، الدمج ، التعليم

نرسنگ سیکٹر میں طلباءکی غیر اخلاقی رفتار و کردار، اساتذہ اور طلباء کی نظر

بیک گراونڈ : اعلی تعلیم کا هدف طلباء کو اعلی اخلاق و کردار سے مزین کرنا ہے لیکن کبھی کبھی یہ دیکھا جاتا ہے کہ اعلی تعلیم کے مرحلے میں بھی طلباء غیراخلاقی رفتار و کردار کا شکار ہوجاتے ہیں۔اس تحقیق کا مقصد اس سلسلے میں اساتذہ اور طلبا کا نقطہ نظر جاننا ہے۔

روش : اس تحقیق میں ایک سو انہتر نرسنگ طلباء نے شرکت کی جبکہ اساتذہ کی تعداد سڑسٹھ تھی۔ یہ تحقیق صوبہ لرستان کی یونیورسٹی آف میڈیکل سائنسس میں انجام پائی۔ ڈیٹا یونیورسٹی کے ماحول میں غیر اخلاقی رفتار وگفتار کے معیار پر حاصل کیا گیا اور اس کا تجزیہ ایس پی ایس ایس ٹونٹی اور چی اسکوائر اور ویریانس اینالائنسس کے ذریعہ کیا گیا۔

تیپچے : اساتذہ اور طلباء نے بعض غیراخلاقی امور کی تعداد اور ان کے ترک کئےجانے کی ا ہمیت پر اختلاف کا اظہار کیا ۔ اساتذہ کا کہنا تھا کہ پڑھائی کی طرف رغبت نم رکھنا اور نصاب پر توجہ نہ کرنا سب سے زیادہ دیکھا گیا ہے یعنی یہ امر تہتر فیصد ہے، کلاس میں دیر سے آنا انہتر فیصد ہے ، پڑھائی سے بے رغبتی ائہتر فیصد ہے۔ ان امور میں فزیکل تشدد ، اموال خراب کرنا، دوسروں کو فزیکل نقصان پہنچانے کی دھمکیاں دینا ، دوبارہ امتحان لینا اور زیادہ نمبروں یا زیادہ ٹائم کی درخواست اور دوسروں کے ساتھ خندہ پیشانی سے پیش نہ آنا جیسی مشکلات پائی گئیں جن کا جائزہ لینا اور ان سے یونیورسٹی کے ماحول کو پاک کرنا ضروری ہے۔

سفارش : بعض غیر اخلاقی امور کے بار_ے میں اساتذہ اور طلباء کے اختلاف کے پیش نظر ان مسائل کوحل کرنا ضروری ہے تاکہ نرسنگ کے شعبے سے فارغ التحصیل ہونے والے افراد نیک اقدار کے حامل ہوں۔

كليدى الفاظ : نرسنگ سيكثر، غير اخلاقي ، تعليم

The incidence and importance of uncivil behaviors of nursing students: Comparing the perception of educators and students

Background: Higher education plays a key role in helping students achieve civility; however, uncivil behaviors are growing. The aim of this study was to assess and compare the educators and students perceptions of frequency and importance of the incivility of nursing students.

Methods: In this descriptive comparative study, 178 nursing students were selected through stratified random sampling. By purposive sampling, Sixty-seven educators of the Lorestan University of Medical Sciences were participated. Data were collected using Incivility in Nursing Education-Revised Survey. All analyses were carried out using SPSS, version 20, as well as descriptive statistics, chi-square test, and variance analysis.

Results: Educators and students, disagreed on the frequency and importance of some uncivil behaviors. The uncivil behaviors experienced mostly by educators were: "expressing disinterest about course content" (%73), and " arriving late for class" (%69.9). According to students, the uncivil behaviors experienced mostly were: expressing disinterest about course content"(%78.6), and " using a media device in class (%70.2)". Also, from the perspectives of educators and students, the maximum mean score belonged to" physical violence "(3.9±0.53, 3.84±0.58)," property damage" $(3.87\pm0.49, 3.83\pm0.59)$, and "physical threats or harm to others" $(3.87 \pm 0.58, 3.83 \pm 0.59)$ items, which indicated the high importance of these items. In contrast, the lowest mean score belonged to" demanding make-up exams, extensions" (2.19±1.07, 1.99±1.08), and "being distant and cold toward others" (2.33±0.9, 2.41±1.02). Conclusion: Given the similarities and differences between the views of educators and students on the importance and frequency of uncivil behaviors, the necessity of designing strategies to increase their awareness of civilization, rooting out the causes of such behaviors, or considering the topic in undergraduate nursing curriculum are felt. Keywords: Students, Nursing, Incivility, Education

ادراک مدرسین و دانشجویان زمینه و هدف: در حالیکه آموزش عالی سهم منحصربهفردی در کمک به دانشجویان

فراوانی و اهمیت رفتارهای غیرمدنی دانشجویان پرستاری: مقایسه

ر میک و محت. در علی که امورش علی شهم معصر به ری در عمل به داشت وین برای رسیدن به حس مدنیت دارد، رفتارهای غیرمدنی روند رو به رشدی دارد. هدف از این مطالعه ، بررسی و مقایسه ادراک مدرسین و دانشجویان در زمینه فراوانی و اهمیت رفتارهای غیر مدنی دانشجویان پرستاری می باشد.

روش: در این مطالعه توصیفی مقایسه ای، ۱۷۸ دانشجوی پرستاری به روش تصادفی طبقه ای انتخاب شدند. همچنین، ۶۷ مدرس دانشگاه علوم پزشکی لرستان هم به روش هدفمند مشارکت داشتند. داده ها با کمک مقیاس انطباق یافته غیر مدنیت در محیط دانشگاهی جمع آوری شد.تحلیل داده ها با استفاده از نرم افزار SPSS نسخه ۲۰، آماره های توصیفی و تحلیلی شامل آزمون کای دو و تحلیل واریانس انجام شد.

یافته ها: مدرسین و دانشجویان در زمینه فراوانی و اهمیت برخی رفتارهای غیر مدنی اتفاق نظر نداشتند.بیشترین فراوانی رفتارهای غیر مدنی از دیدگاه مدرسین به گویه های " اظهار بی علاقگی یا بی تفاوتی نسبت به محتوای درس " (۷۳ درصد) و "تخیر در ورود به کلاس "(۶۹/۹ درصد) اختصاص داشت . به عقیده دانشجویان، بیشترین فراوانی مربوط به گویه های " اظهار بی علاقگی یا بی تفاوتی نسبت به محتوای درس " (۶/۸۷ درصد) و" استفاده از ابزارهای رسانه ای در کلاس " (۲۰۰۷ درصد) بود.همچنین،ازدیدگاه مدرسین ودانشجویان حداکثر میانگین نمره به گویه های "خشونت فیزیکی" (۳۵/۵±۲۰/۳ و۲۵/۵±۳۸۳)، "صدمه به اموال " (۲۰/۹ ۲/۸۳/۹ ۵/۵±۳۸۳) و "تهدید یا آسیب فیزیکی به دیگران" (۲۵/۵±۲۸۳) و ۲۵/۵±۳۸۳) اختصاص داشت که موید اهمیت بالای این گویه بود. در مقابل سطوح پایین غیر مدنیت به گویه های "نقاضای امتحان مجدد، زمان بیشتر یا نمره " (۲۰/۲ ±۲/۱۲) و۲/۱±۲۹/۱) و "عدم صمیمیت و امرح بودن نسبت به دیگران" (۲۹/

ن**تیجه گیری**: با توجه به تشابهات و اختلافات دیدگاه مدرسین و دانشجویان در زمینه اهمیت و فراوانی رفتارهای غیر مدنی، لزوم طراحی راهبردهایی با هدف افزایش سطح آگاهی آنان در زمینه مدنیت، ریشه یابی علل بروز این قبیل رفتارها و یا در نظر گرفتن موضوع مورد نظر در قالب سرفصل دروس کارشناسی پرستاری احساس میشود. **واژه های کلیدی:** دانشجویان، پرستاری، غیر مدنیت، آموزش

INTRODUCTION

As a serious and growing problem in nursing education (1, 2), incivility occurs at all levels from classrooms to the clinical environment (3). According to Clark (2012), incivility is defined as any action or behavior that disturbs the occupational, social, personal or educational environment (4).

Such behaviors will be a major challenge for educators in academic settings (5). They increasingly face incivility among their students (3,6) and believe that the incidence and severity of incivility has increased (7). These behaviors result in a disturbance in the student-educator communication and the learning environment, especially in team learning (3, 8, 9). They don't only disturb the teaching and learning process, but also they have negative effects on interpersonal interactions (5). The educators' fear of maintaining personal safety, due to confronting uncivil students, leads to physical and mental tensions, as well as doubting their abilities as an instructor (10) to the extent that in some sources, incivility has been mentioned as one of the most important predictors of job leaving (11).

In spite of the importance and the prevalence of incivility among students, there is little published data on the instructor' experiences of incivility. In the study by Sprunk et al (2014), the Participants' experiences indicated that educators face various kinds of unacceptable student behaviors and, in their opinion, facing such behaviors are time consuming .In addition, they refered to the connection between the civic behaviors of the academic period with those of the professional period (9). Also, Larson (2014) believed that there is a connection between the incivility in the academic environment and the occurrence of these behaviors in the healthcare environment¹², which is a point requiring contemplation by itself. According to Schaeffer (2013), the main goal of nursing education is to train students who will become empathetic nurses in the future. He believed that incivility, due to minor or major effects on the students, prevents students from moving towards this goal (13, 14). Today's students are the future colleagues, and if these uncivil behaviors are not managed, they will turn into uncivil future personnels (7, 15).

Therefore, not only incivility is a direct threat to the patient's safety, but also its continuation at work place results in leaving the job and thus leads to an inefficient care (10, 16), a toxic workplace, and clinical problems such as increasing the likelihood of medical errors and reducing the quality of care (3, 12, 14, 16).

Bjorklund and Rehling (2009) showed that, incivility is a slippery notion (17). What one educator may experience as troublesome and challenging in a classroom may not bother another and may not reflect the experience of the students they teach. Since uncivil behaviors are perceptions based on individual explanations, one behavior may be perceived as uncivil by some but not by others (18).

To date, there is a relative paucity of studies investigating and comparing the students'and educators' perceptions of incivility. In a study by Nutt (2013), results demonstrated that educators and learners, agreed on the types of uncivil behaviors ,but disagreed on the frequency of incivility (19). In anouther study, there was agreement between students and educators on the majority of behaviors perceived to be troublesome (20).

Nutt (2013) believed that the main precursor to creat favoured strategies to reduce incivility among students would be to assess the perceptions of both educators' and students' experiences with incivility. Once it could be determined what behaviors both groups perceived as uncivil and what occurred most frequently, those behaviors could be recognized and considered in strategies (19).

In Iran, few studies have quantified the levels of incivility and they have mostly been conducted in a qualitative method (21).Thus, considering the limited national literature and the need to examine this subject regarding the different perceptions and reactions of the educators and students in dealing with incivility, as well as due to the subject of incivility being based on an individual's perception and the necessity of identifying the mentioned behaviors before the students' entering the professional practice (7), the aim of this study is to explore and compare the nursing educators' and students' perceptions and the frequency of their uncivil behaviors in academic environments.

METHODS

In this descriptive comparative study conducted from 2017 to 2018, 63 educators were selected by purposive sampling from 4 nursing faculties of the Lorestan University of Medical Sciences in Iran. Students (178 participants) were selected using stratified sampling, proportional to size of the strata. The students were stratified based on the year of entrance to the university. The entering students of each year were considered as a category and the intra- category included the two sub-categories of men and women. Eventually, a systematic sampling was done in sub-category based on the student number. The original sample size was estimated based on the following formula: $n = \frac{Z^2 \times S^2}{d^2}$. Considering Z = 1.96, S = 24 and d = 5, the sample size was estimated to be about 89 persons, which was decided to be twice that number, regarding the design effect, which means 178 persons.

Criteria for selecting the participants were as follows: the willingness to enter the study, the second-year students and higher, and being neither a transferred student nor a guest. The inclusion criteria for the educators included the willingness to participate in the study and having at least one year of teaching experience (class or clinical setting). Those who did not wish to continue participating in the study and completing the instrument were excluded. After preparing a list of sample names and coordinating with the faculty education unit, the researcher provided them with the tool by referring to the classroom or clinical setting and completed it within ten minutes.

Incivility in Nursing Education-Revised (INE-R) Survey(Clark 2014) consists of 2 parts. The first part includes demographic information, and the second part includes a 24-item list of uncivil behaviors in nursing students. The participants are asked to rate the level of incivility based on a 4-point Likert

scale (from 1 = not uncivil to 4 = very uncivil) and to evaluate the frequency of these behaviors in the last year based on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = never to 4 = often). These are behaviors they may have experienced or seen in the nursing academic environment over the past 12 months. Finally, the mean and the frequency are calculated separately for each item. Higher mean scores indicated higher levels and therefore higher importance of non-civil behaviors.

After presenting the list in the form of several open-ended questions, the participants define how much incivility has been identified by them as a problem in the educational programs. Then they are asked to choose three strategies, among 10, as the most important strategies for promoting civilization. The frequency is calculated separately for each item (5).

Since the tool was in English, it was translated through forward (to Persian) and back (to English) translation, after sending a written request to the developer and getting permission. In order to evaluate the validity, the scale was provided to 11 experts (5 nursing faculty members, 3 sociologists, and 3 psychologists). The content validity index for the items (I-CVI) was higher than 0.78 and content validity index for the scale was 0.91. For measuring the reliability through test-retest method, the scale was provided to 30 nursing students and teachers, and it was filled out with an interval of 72 hours. The intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) was 0.94 and the internal consistency of the scale was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha method, which was confirmed with the Cronbach's alpha of 0.94^2 .

For data analysis, SPSS software version 20 and descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency and percent), and inferential statistics (Chi-square test and variance analysis) were used and a p value <0.05 was considered to be significant. Prior to data collection, the participants received an explanation of the project. Ethical approval was obtained from the committee of the Research Vice Chancellorship of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences (no: lums.REC.1395.197).

RESULTS

Characteristics of the participants

The age of majority of the students was 19-23, they were single, male, and not dormitory residents. Most of the educators were married females. The age of majority was 40 years and more. Descriptive statistics of the demographic data are given in Table 1.

Frequency of uncivil behaviors

Table 2 provides the frequency of the students' incivility. To evaluate which students behaviors were perceived as most frequently occurring, the percentages listed in the sometimes and often columns were summed. Students' behaviors identified as most frequently occurring uncivil behaviors were:

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the demographic data of Nursing Students and educators									
Students					Educators				
Variables	Category	Frequency	Percent	Variables	Category	Frequency	Percent		
					29/9	9	14.3		
Age	19-23	163	81.6	Age	30-39/9	18	28.6		
Age	23<	15	18.4		40	36	57.1		
Gender	Male	96	53.9	Gender	Male	15	23.8		
Gender	Female	82	46.1	Gender	Female	48	76.02		
Marital status	Single	162	91	Marital status	Single	22	34.9		
Marital status	Married	16	9	Marital status	Married	41	65.1		
	2013	29	16.3	Education	Bachelor	21	33.3		
University	2014	45	25.3		Master's degree	10	15.9		
entering year	2015	66	37.1		PhD	32	50.8		
	2016	38	21.3		<5	16	25.4		
	3-4	76	42.7	work experience (Year)	5-14	27	42.9		
Semester	5-6	56	31.5	(1011)	>15	20	31.7		
	7-8	46	25.8		Faculty /Non- Faculty	47	74.6		
Average of passed courses	<16	37	20.8	Academic Rank	Assistant Professor/Associat e Professor /Professor	16	25.4		
	16-17.99	107	60.1		Native	59	93.7		
	18≥	34	19.1	Place of Residence	Non-native	4	6.3		

Table 1. Continued										
	Students	5			Educators					
Variables	Category	Frequency	Percent	Variables	Category	Frequency	Percent			
Residence status	Dormitory	78	43.8	Employment conditions	Formal	25	39.7			
	Non-dormitory	100	56.2		contractual	20	31.7			
	Khorramabad	81	45.5	contantions	others	18	28.6			
Callaga	Aligoudarz	27	15.2		Khorramabad	51	81.1			
College	Poldokhtar	36	20.2	College	Aligoudarz	4	6.3			
	Boroujerd	34	19.1		Poldokhtar	4	6.3			
					Boroujerd	4	6.3			

survey Items	Frequency of item	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	X ² and
survey items	Groups	Never	Kareiy	Sometimes	Often	p-value
Expressing disinterest, boredom, or apathy	G: 1 (170)	9(5.1)	29(16.3)	78(43.8)	62(34.8)	X2 = 2.018
about course content or subject matter	Faculty(63)	2(3.2)	15(23.8)	25(39.7)	21(33.3)	p = 0.569
Making rude gestures or non-verbal behaviors towards others (e.g. eye rolling,	Students(178)	35(19.7)	76(42.7)	52(29.2)	15(8.4)	X2 = 4.072
finger pointing, etc.)	Faculty(63)	7 (11.1)	29 (46)	24(38.1)	3(4.8)	p = 0.254
Sleeping or not paying attention in class (doing work for other classes, ot taking	Students(178)	12(6.7)	50(28.1)	80(44.9)	36(20.2)	X2 = 4.360
notes, etc.)	Faculty(63)	8(12.7)	17(27)	31(49.2)	7(11.1)	p = 0.225
Refusing or being reluctant to answer	Students(178)	21(11.8)	69(38.8)	64(36)	24(13.5)	$X_2 = 2.668$
direct questions	Faculty(63)	7(11.1)	31(49.2)	20(31.7)	5 (7.9)	p = 0.446
Using a computer, phone, or other media device during class, meetings, activities	Students(178)	13 (7.3)	40(22.5)	67(37.6)	58(32.6)	X2 = 10.782
for unrelated purposes	Faculty(63)	1 (1.6)	19(30.2)	33(52.4)	10(15.9)	p = 0.013
Arriving late for class or other scheduled	Students(178)	23(12.9)	57 (32)	80(44.9)	18(10.1)	$X_2 = 4.345$
activities	Faculty(63)	6 (9.5)	13(20.6)	35(55.6)	9(14.3)	p = 0.227
Leaving class or other scheduled	Students(178)	27(15.2)	73(41)	63(35.4)	15(8.4)	X2 = 5.142
activities early	faculty(63)	7(11.1)	18(28.6)	30(47.6)	8(12.7)	p = 0.162
Being unprepared for class or other	Students(178)	13(7.3)	62(34.8)	70(39.3)	33(18.5)	X2 = 437
scheduled activities	Faculty(63)	6(9.7)	20(32.3)	24(38.7)	12(19.4)	p = 0.932
Skipping class or other scheduled	Students(178)	22(12.4)	79(44.4)	63(35.4)	14(7.9)	X2 =3.205
activities	Faculty(63)	13(20.6)	22(34.9)	23(36.5)	5(7.9)	p = 0.361
Being distant and cold toward others (unapproachable, rejecting faculty or	Students(178)	20(11.2)	82(46.1)	53(29.8)	23(12.9)	X2 = 6.985
other student's opinions	Faculty(63)	8(12.7)	26(41.3)	27(42.9)	2(3.2)	p = 0.072
Creating tension by dominating class	Students(178)	30 (16.9)	83(46.6)	46(25.8)	19(10.7)	X2 = 10.004
discussion	Faculty(63)	18 (28.6)	28(44.4)	17 (27)	0 (0)	p = 0.019
Holding side conversations that distract	Students(178)	17 (9.6)	62(34.8)	72(40.4)	27(15.2)	X2 = 13.300
you or others	Faculty(63)	12 (19)	31(49.2)	18(28.6)	2 (3.2)	p = 0.004
Cheating on exams or quizzes	Students(178)	20(11.2)	41(23)	56(31.5)	61(34.3)	X2 = 14.428
cheating on exams of quizzes	Faculty(63)	9(14.3)	27(42.9)	19(30.2)	8(12.7)	p = 0.002
Making condescending or rude remarks	Students(178)	53(29.3)	64(36)	43(24.2)	18(10.1)	X2 = 4.544
toward others	Faculty(63)	16(25.4)	24(38.1)	21(33.3)	2(3.2)	p = 0.208

Table 2. Continued						
survey Items	Frequency of item Groups	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	X ² and p-value
Demanding make-up exams, extensions,	Students(178)	19(10.7)	59(33.1)	64(36)	36(20.2)	X2 = 1.208
or other special favors	Faculty(63)	8(12.7)	23(36.5)	23(36.5)	9(14.3)	p = 0.751
Ignoring, failing to address, or	Students(178)	24(13.5)	69(38.8)	60(33.7)	25(14)	X2 = 2.349
encouraging disruptive behaviors by classmates	Faculty(63)	13(20.6)	24(38.1)	20(31.7)	6(9.5)	p = 0.503
Demanding a passing grade when a	Students(178)	30(16.9)	59(33.1)	54(30.3)	35(19.7)	X2 = 1.852
passing grade has not been earned	Faculty(63)	9(14.3)	18(28.6)	25(39.7)	11(17.5)	p = 0.604
Being unresponsive to emails or other	Students(178)	42(23.6)	79(44.4)	43(24.2)	14(7.9)	X2 = 16.987
communications	Faculty(63)	32(50.8)	18(28.6)	8(12.7)	5(7.9)	p = 0.001
Sending inappropriate or rude emails to	Students(178)	104(58.4)	41(23)	20(11.2)	13(7.3)	X2 = 4.514
others	Faculty(63)	43(68.3)	15(23.8)	2(3.2)	3(4.8)	p = 0.211
Making discriminating comments (racial, ethnic, gender, etc.) directed toward	Students(178)	63(35.4)	62(34.8)	35(19.7)	18(10.1)	X2 = 5.241
others	Faculty(63)	27(42.9)	24(38.1)	11(17.5)	1(1.6)	p = 0.155
Using profanity (swearing, cussing)	Students(178)	89(50)	56(31.5)	24(13.5)	9(5.1)	$X_2 = 5.140$
directed toward others	Faculty(63)	39(61.9)	18(28.6)	6(9.5)	0(0)	p = 0.162
Threats of physical harm against others	Students(178)	114(64)	47(26.4)	13(7.3)	4(2.2)	X2 = 5.655
Threats of physical narm against others	Faculty(63)	50(79.4)	10(15.9)	3(4.8)	0(0)	p = 0.133
Property damage	Students(178)	116(65.2)	38(21.3)	19(10.7)	5(2.8)	X2 = 1.670
Toperty damage	Faculty(63)	41(65.1)	11(17.5)	10(15.9)	1(1.6)	p = 0.644
Physical violence	Students(178)	155(87.1)	14(7.9)	4(2.2)	5(2.8)	X2 =6.072
i nysicar violence	Faculty(63)	57 (90.5)	5 (7.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	p = 0.194

"expressing disinterest, boredom, or apathy about course content" (78.6%), "using a computer, phone, or another media device in class" (70.2%), and "cheating on exams" (65.8%). From the table 2, 95% of the students hadn't experienced never or rarely, "physical violence"; 91.5%, "property damage", and 86.5%, "threats of physical harm against others " over the past 12 months.

In the case of teachers, the results also showed that during the previous year,73% of them had often or sometimes experienced " expressing disinterest, boredom,or apathy about course content "; 69.9%, "arriving late for class or other scheduled activities " and 68.3%, " using a computer, phone, or other media device during classes and meetings. By contrast, 98.2% had never or rarely experienced "physical violence "; 91.6%, " threats of physical harm against others (implied or actual)"; 90.5%, " using profanity (swearing, cussing) directed toward others " over the past 12 months. It can be seen from the data in Table 2 that There are no significant differences between educators and students perceptions of uncivil behaviors frequency except on behaviors such as using a computer, phone, or other media device during class, meetings, activities for unrelated purposes; creating tension by dominating class discussion; holding side conversations that distract you or others; cheating on exams or quizzes; and being unresponsive to emails or other communications.

The mean score of the students' incivility level

Table 3 presents the mean score of the students' incivility level for each group. From the perspectives of educators and students, the maximum mean score belonged to the items, "physical violence" $(3.9 \pm 0.53, 3.84 \pm 0.58)$," property damage" ($3.87 \pm 0.49, 3.83 \pm 0.59$) and "physical threats, or harm to others" $(3.87 \pm 0.58, 3.83 \pm 0.59)$, which indicated the high importance of these items. In contrast, the lowest mean score belonged to the items "demanding make-up exams, extensions, or other special favors" (2.19 ± 1.07) , 1.99±1.08), and " being distant and cold toward others" $(2.33\pm0.91$, $2.41\pm1.02).$ Data in table 3 represents there were significant differences between the educators and students ratings of uncivil behaviors such as using a computer, phone, or other media device during class, meetings, activities for unrelated purposes; leaving class or other scheduled activities early; being unprepared for class or other scheduled activities; skipping class or other scheduled activities; cheating on exams or quizzes; and demanding a passing grade when a passing grade has not been earned.

Also, there was a significant correlation between the mean score of the students' perceptions of incivility and the college where they studied (0.022). The students of Khoramabad and Boroujerd nursing faculties reported a higher level of incivility, but there was no significant correlation regarding other characteristics (P > 0.05).

Survey items	Groups	М	SD	t	df	P value
Expressing disinterest, boredom,or apathy about course content	Students	2.46	0.93	t	ui	1 value
or subject matter	Faculty	2.28	1.07	-0.109	239	0.91
Making rude gestures or non-verbal behaviors towards others	Students	3.51	0.77		239	0.241
(e.g. eye rolling, finger pointing, etc.)	Faculty	3.37	0.92	1.175		
Sleeping or not paying attention in class (doing work for other	Students	3.12	0.95		239	
classes, ot taking notes, etc.)	Faculty	3.21	0.98	-0.627		0.531
	Students	2.51	0.94		239	
Refusing or being reluctant to answer direct questions	Faculty	2.73	1.03	-1.579		0.116
Using a computer, phone, or other media device during class,	Students	2.74	0.89	-3.063		
meetings, activities for unrelated purposes	Faculty	3.14	0.93		239	0.02
	Students	2.75	0.93			
Arriving late for class or other scheduled activities	Faculty	2.98	0.88	-1.755	239	0.08
	Students	2.67	0.91			
Leaving class or other scheduled activities early	Faculty	3.03	0.89	-2.673	239	0.008
	Students	2.35	0.93			
Being unprepared for class or other scheduled activities	Faculty	2.96	0.97	-0.2187	239	0.03
	Students	2.50	0.92		239	0.009
Skipping class or other scheduled activities	Faculty	2.94	0.98	-2.637		
	Students	2.42	1.02	0.600		
Being distant and cold toward others (unapproachable, rejecting faculty or other student's opinions	Faculty	2.42	0.91		239	0.549
5 1	Students	2.65	1.07		239	0.240
Creating tension by dominating class discussion		2.83	0.94	-1.178		
	Faculty Students	2.85	0.94			
Holding side conversations that distract you or others		2.95	0.87	100	239 239	0.920
	Faculty					
Cheating on exams or quizzes	Students	3.17	1.03	-3.178		0.002
	Faculty	3.63	0.65			
Making condescending or rude remarks toward others	Students	3.62	0.81	-1.44	239	0.151
	Faculty	3.78	0.58			
Demanding make-up exams, extensions, or other special favors	Students	1.99	1.08	-1.234	239	0.218
	Faculty	2.19	1.07			
Ignoring, failing to address, or encouraging disruptive behaviors by classmates	Students	2.83	0.97	-0.962	239	0.337
by classifiants	Faculty	2.97	0.93			
Demanding a passing grade when a passing grade has not been earned	Students	2.14	1.06	-3.296	239	0.001
canica	faculty	2.67	1.15			
Being unresponsive to emails or other communications	Students	2.67	1.03	0.1069	239	0.286
	Faculty	2.51	1.12			
Sending inappropriate or rude emails to others	Students	3.63	0.79	-7.24	239	0.47
	Faculty	3.17	0.60			
Making discriminating comments (racial, ethnic, gender, etc.)	Students	3.43	0.84	0.034	239	0.973
directed toward others	Faculty	3.42	0.71			
Using profanity (swearing, cussing) directed toward others	Students	3.75	0.70	-1.255	239	0.211
	Faculty	3.86	0.49			
Threats of physical harm against others (implied or actual)	Students	3.83	0.59	-0.547	239	0.585
	Faculty	3.87	0.58			0.505

Table 3. Continued						
Survey items	Groups	Μ	SD	t	df	P value
Descrite descrite	Students		-0.974	220	0.221	
Property damage	Faculty 3.90 0.42	-0.974	239	0.331		
Discussion	Students	3.84	0.58	-0.746	239	0.457
Physical violence	Faculty	3.9	0.53			0.437

Moreover, there was a significant difference among the frequency of the students' incivility based on their year of entrance at university (0.004), their average score (0.056) and their college, but no significant correlation was found regarding other characteristics (P > 0.05). The frequency of uncivil behaviors was reported to be higher from the perspective of the students of Khoramabad's nursing college who had entered university in 2013 and whose average score was 18 or more.

According to the non-native teachers' opinions, the importance of uncivil behaviors was reported to be at a higher level (P=0.001). In addition, the frequency of incivility showed a significant difference based on the employment status (0.005) and age group (0.017). The teachers who were more than 40 years old and were employed by the government reported a higher frequency of incivility.

Both groups reported incivility as a serious problem in nursing education. From the students' perspective, the probability of the occurrence of incivility was higher among students than educators, while the educators reported it to be equal in both groups. From the educators' perspective, three strategies for promoting the civility in nursing education were respectively "increasing awareness of civility" (2.4 ± 1.24) , "being a role model in terms of professional behavior and civility" (2.52 ± 1.44) , and "training in effective communications and discussions on conflicts" (3.34 ± 0.90) . From the perspective of the students, the most important strategies included "increasing awareness of civility" (2.7 ± 1.24) , "being a role model in terms of professional behavior" (3.08 ± 1.32) , and "defining behavioral codes" (3.42 ± 1.18) .

DISCUSSION

The primary question in this study sought to determine the frequency and the importance of uncivil behaviors from the perspectives of nursing educators and students.One interesting finding are the offensive behaviors such as threats of physical harm against others, and property damage possess the highest mean scores. This result indicates the importance of these behaviors from the both group perspective. This finding is consistent with that of De Gagne et al. (2015) who also found that the items of the threat of physical harm to others and physical violence have been identified as highly uncivil (22). Similarly, Karimi Moonaghi et al. (2015) and Foreman (2017) reported that physical threats and harm have the highest level of incivility (23,24). In this study, therefore, physical violence was considered as

a threat. Nevertheless, fortunately, their frequency was negligible and from the perspectives of both groups nobody had experienced such things during the previous year. Similarly, in the study of Vardanjani et al (2016), the frequency of these behaviors has been reported to be negligible and near zero (25), since a threatening behavior does not necessarily mean that it is committed by the person (22). This outcome is contrary to that of Natarajan et al. (2017) who found the item" property damage " was one of the most common uncivil behaviors experienced by educators (20).

Another possible explanation is that other researchers as well as the present researchers have used the scales of the western countries in Asia, which despite their acceptable validity and reliability, they do not cover the socio-cultural conditions of the incivility of the working environment. Also, as a result of cultural and social unevenness, the threshold of people tolerance towards incivility may vary (26). Hence, these items were most significant, but their frequency was reported to be low and sometimes insignificant.

In contrast, " demanding make-up exams, extensions, or other special favors ", and " being distant and cold toward others" had the lowest mean score from both groups' perspectives, which could be due to the lack of awareness of these issues and ignoring them, on the part of the students and even the teachers, since in the current study most of the participants have experienced the mentioned items in the previous 12 months. Also,in China "demanding make up exams" was one of the common uncivil students' behaviors reported by instructors.

According to the students and teachers, the mostly experienced uncivil behaviors were: expressing disinterest, boredom, or apathy to course content, using a media device during class, and cheating on exams. There are similarities between the findings expressed by common uncivil behaviours in this study and those described by Clark (2009). Also, these results are in line with those of previous studies. In a study by Foreman (2007), most of the participants believed that using a computer, phone, or other media devices during class were experienced (24, 27). Also, cheating on exam as one of the highly-occurring forms of academic dishonesty (28) was reported in the study. In the study by Luparell et al. (2007), offensive behaviors from the teacher' perspective included items such as delaying in entering the class, using mobile phones, and cheating on exams (29). However, the incidence of behaviors such as cheating on the exam was reported to be among the most frequent behaviors on the part of students, which was

consistent with the students' viewpoints in this study. In Clark et al. (2007), the most important offensive behaviors from the educators' perspective included having rude gestures, being ill prepared for class, distracting discussions, using mobile phones, and cheating on the exam (30), which were all consistent with our results.

Also, there were significant differences between the teachers' and students' rating of some uncivil behaviors such as using a computer or phone in class; leaving class early; being unprepared for class; skipping class; cheating on exams or quizzes; and demanding a passing grade when a passing grade has not been earned. These behaviors were more important from the instructors' perspectives. According to knepp et al. (2012), technology is widely available to students; however, the form of uncivil behaviors has varied in the past two decades (31). In accordance with the present results, Natarajan et al.(2017) demonstrated that since the teachers are older, they are more sensitive to behaviors such as using cell phones in the classroom (20). Also, cheating on exam was more important to the instructors. There are some similarities between the attitudes expressed by instructors in this study and those described by Nutt (2013) and Krecara et al.(2016) (19, 32). Krecara et al.(2016) examined the prevalence and disturbance of 30 destructive behaviors from the viewpoint of instructors and students. Similarly, instructors estimated the disturbance of behaviors such as cheating on exams more than the students (32).

There are significant differences between teachers and students perceptions of uncivil behaviors such as using a computer or a phone during the class; creating tension by dominating class discussion; holding side conversations; cheating on exams; and being unresponsive to emails. For all of the mentioned behaviors, students reported more frequency. While in the study by Natarajan et al. (2017), instructors described the side conversations more than students (20).

Moreover, the mean score of the perception of uncivil behaviors was reported to be higher in non-native lecturers, the reason behind which can be traced back in cultural differences. In addition, regarding the year of entrance to the university, the highest amount of incivility was reported by the students entering the university in 2013, while the lowest one was reported by the students entering the university in 2015. This confirms that these results are likely to correlate directly with the students' age. The frequency of uncivil behaviors has been reported to be lower by the elder students while the younger ones seem to be more sensitive. Also, from the perspective of the teachers, the frequency of uncivil behaviors was significantly different depending on the employment status and the group age. Most reports on the high frequency of these behaviors were made by the official and contractual staffs. It seems that the occurrence of such behaviors has been of more importance from the viewpoint of the official and contractual staffs due to a stronger employment commitment and having a better job prospect. Regarding the age variable, it seems that due to less age differences and having a closer relationship with students, as well as less work experiences, a lower incivility frequency has been reported by younger educators.

Both groups reported incivility as a serious problem in nursing education. Regarding the occurrence of incivility in the two groups, it seemed that the educators have a more moderate attitude in comparison with the students and they generally ignored many of the students' uncivil behaviors or considered them to their age as well as their rawness. In the study of Vardanjani et al. (2016), according to 58% of students, the degree of uncivil behavior was moderate and 48% of them believed that uncivil behaviors had been seen equally among both the teachers and the students. From the perspective of the teachers, too, the occurrence of such behaviors in educational environments was moderate and it was reported to be a bit higher among the students (25). Contrary to the present study, in the study of Joibari et al. (2011), the frequency and the severity of offensive behaviors have not been reported to be significant. The reason behind this difference may be the time of doing the research, the previous decade, and the upward trend of uncivil behaviors in the recent years (33), as pointed out in the study of Ibrahim et al. (2016) (34).

Regarding the major strategies of promoting civility, the educators and the students had a mutual perception of offering common solutions. Both groups emphasized the need to raise awareness of uncivil behaviors. Focusing on teaching civil ethics and informing students are requied in higher educaion. If the necessary training is provided for educators and students, their perception of civility will be enhanced and, as a result, the possibility of the occurrence of uncivil behaviors will decrease (33). Role modeling is also a method based on patterning and the presentation of objective and practical examples. Regarding their experiences and their social integrity, educators are at a higher level in comparison to students. Therefore, they are considered as objective models for students. The third strategy offered by educators was training through effective communication. Effective communication is considered as a element in the civility of the medical vital education. Therefore, it is necessary to include the techniques of effective communication and enhance the interpersonal skills as much as possible as credits in curriculum.

From the perspective of students, defining the codes of conduct can identify norms and abnormalities and place them within the framework of ethics. Generally, holding meetings to discuss challenging behaviors and their causes, as well as the establishment of a specific framework and discovering the procedures to make the necessary changes are among the useful strategies to prevent uncivility and deal with challenging behaviors (35). Clark et al. (2011), have highlighted the importance of making students and educators familiar with the topic of incivility (36).

Given the findings of this study, the high frequency of some behaviors such as students' reluctance to contents, delayed entry, and the use of media tools in the classroom from the perspective of both educators and students, identifying the reason for these behaviors is of a high importance. On the other hand, the different views of these two groups on some uncivil behaviors and the seriousness of the uncivil behaviors in nursing education, the necessity of designing interventions such as holding workshops with the aim of raising their awareness of uncivil behaviors or considering the subject in the undergraduate nursing curriculum are necessary.

Ethical considerations:

Ethical issues (Including plagiarism, informed consent, misconduct, data fabrication and/or falsification, double publication and/or submission, redundancy, etc.) have been completely observed by the authors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors express their gratitude to the Research and

Technology Deputy of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences for the financial support, and to the teachers and the students participating in the study.

Financial Support:

This article is a part of the Master Thesis of Nursing approved by Lorestan University of Medical Sciences. It was approved by the Research and Technology Deputy of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences with the project code: A-10-1496 and ethical approval code: lums.REC.1395.197.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest in this study.

REFERENCES

1. Zhou Z. Effects of Workplace Incivility on Nurses' Emotions, Well-being, and Behaviors: A Longitudinal Study [PhD thesis]. University of South Florida; 2014. Graduate Theses and Dissertations. Available from: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/5338

 Mohammadipour M, Hasanvand S, Goudarzi F, Ebrahimzadeh F, Pournia Y. The Level and Frequency of Faculty Incivility as Perceived by Nursing Students of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences. J Med Life. 2018;11(4):334-42.

 Rad M, Ildarabadi E-h, Moharreri F, Moonaghi HK. Causes of incivility in Iranian nursing students: A qualitative study. Int J Community Based Nurs Midwifery. 2016;4(1):47-56.

4. Clark CM, Werth L, Ahten S. Cyberbullying and incivility in the online learning environment, Part 1: Addressing faculty and student perceptions. Nurse Educ. 2012;37(4):6-150.

5. Clark CM, Barbosa-Leiker C, Gill LM, Nguyen D. Revision and psychometric testing of the incivility in nursing education (INE) survey: introducing the INE-R. Journal of Nursing Education. 2015;54(6):15-306.

 Luparell S. Incivility in nursing: The connection between academia and clinical settings. Crit Care Nurse. 2011;31(2):5-92.

 Theodore LL. Nursing faculty perceptions of and responses to student incivility [PhD thesis]. Walden University; 2015.

8. Cicotti C. The relationship between incivility and engagement in nursing students at a state college [PhD thesis]. M.S.N. University of Florida; 2012.

9. Sprunk EA, LaSala K.B, Wilson V.L. Student incivility: Nursing faculty lived experience. Journal of Nursing Education and Practice 2014; 4(9):. 1-12.

10. Heydari A, Rad M, Rad M. Evaluating the Incivility between Staff Nurses and Matrons Employed in Iran/Procena nepristojnog ponašanja u međusobnom odnosu medicinskih sestara i glavnih medicinskih sestara zaposlenih u Iranu. Acta Facultatis Medicae Naissensis. 2015;32(2):46-137.

11. D'ambra AM, Andrews DR. Incivility, retention and new graduate nurses: an integrated review of the literature. Journal of Nursing Management 2014;22(6):42-735.

 Larson AC. Male students' experiences with faculty incivility [PhD thesis]. Montana State University-Bozeman, Montana; 2014.
Schaeffer A. The effects of incivility on nursing education. Open Journal of Nursing. 2013;3(02): 178-81.

14. Milesky JL, Baptiste D-L, Foronda C, Dupler AE, Belcher AE. Promoting a culture of civility in nursing education and practice. J Nurs Educ Pract. 2015;5(8):4-90.

15. Rad M, Ildarabadi E-h, Moharreri F, Moonaghi HK. A study of incivility in the Iranian nursing training system based on educators and students' experiences: a quantitative content analysis. Glob J Health Sci. 2015;7(2):203-9.

16. Shanta LL, Eliason AR. Application of an empowerment model to improve civility in nursing education. Nurse Educ Pract. 2014;14(1):6-82.

17. Bjorklund WL, Rehling DL. Student perceptions of classroom incivility. College Teaching. 2009;58(1):8-15.

 Hoffman RL. Differences in student perceptions of student and faculty incivility among nursing program types: An application of attribution theory [PhD thesis]. Indiana University of Pennsylvania; 2013.

19. Nutt CM. Stop the madness! College faculty and student perceptions of classroom incivility. 2013 Ed.D. Dissertations. 59. Available from: https://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/edd_diss/ 59

20. Natarajan J, Muliira JK, van der Colff J. Incidence and perception of nursing students' academic incivility in Oman. BMC Nurs. 2017;16(1):19.

21. Masoumpoor A, Borhani F, Abbaszadeh A, Rassouli M. Nursing instructors' perception of students' uncivil behaviors: A qualitative study. Nurs ethics. 2017;24(4):92-483. 22. De Gagne JC, Kang HS, Hyun MS. Psychometric properties of the Korean version of the incivility in nursing educationrevised (INE-R) survey. Nurs Health Sci. 2016;18(4):34-524.

23. Karimi Moonaghi H, Rad M, Torkmannejad Sabzevari M. Management of challenging behavior (incivility) among medical students. Future Med Educ J. 2014;4(1):41.

24. Foreman RA. Coping Strategies of Prelicensure Registered Nursing Students Experiencing Student-to-Student Incivility. Int J Nurs Res Health Care: IJNHR-136. 2018. DOI: 10.29011/ IJNHR-136.1000362018.35-40.

 Vardanjani R, Parvin N, Shafiee Z, Safdari Dehcheshmeh F. Assessment of Uncivil Behaviors of Teachers and Students in Nursing and Midwifery faculties of Shahrekord. Development Strategies in Medical Education. 2016;3(2):25-37. Persian.
Ghosh R. Workplace Incivility in Asia-How do we take a Socio-Cultural Perspective? Taylor & Francis; 2017.264.

27. Clark CM, Otterness NS, Jun WY, Allerton BW, Juan CM, Black M, et al. Descriptive study of student incivility in the People's Republic of China. J Cult Divers.2010;17(4):12.

28. Saana SBBM, Ablordeppey E, Mensah NJ, Karikari TK. Academic dishonesty in higher education: students' perceptions and involvement in an African institution. BMC Res Notes. 2016;9(1):234.

29. Luparell S. The effects of student incivility on nursing faculty. Journal of Nursing Education. 2007;46(1).11.

30. Clark CM, Springer PJ. Incivility in nursing education: A descriptive study of definitions and prevalence. Journal of nursing Education. 2007;46(1).7-11.

31. Knepp KAF. Understanding Student and Faculty Incivility in Higher Education. Journal of Effective Teaching. 2012; 12(1):33-46.

32. Krecar IM, Kolega M, Krampus V. Students' and Professors' Perception of Occurrence and Disturbance of Disruptive Classroom Behaviors. Proceedings of 7th International Conference on Education and Educational Psychology; 2016 Nov 20; P. 192. 34. Ibrahim SAE-A, Qalawa SA. Factors 33. Joibari L ,Mohammadi Z, Sanagoo A. A affecting nursing students' incivility: As D. Fostering civility in nursing education and Glance at Students and Faculty Members Perceptions of Incivil Behavior in Nurse Educ Today. 2016;36:23-118. Educational Settings. Strides in

Development of Medical Education. 2011;7(2):33-127.

perceived by students and faculty staff.

35. McNamara SA. Incivility in nursing:

Unsafe nurse, unsafe patients. AORN journal. 2012;95(4):40-535.

36. Clark CM, Olender L, Cardoni C, Kenski practice: Nurse leader perspectives. The Journal of Nursing Administration. 2011;41(7/8):30-324.