

Workplace Incivility, Job Performance and Turnover Intention among Employees Working in Corporate Sector

Ravi Rathee*
Shalini Singh**

Abstract

There is a difference between the concept of workplace incivility and workplace bullying as work place bullying is defined as a kind of behavior where an individual is exposed to negative behavior by the other employees for a long period of time. If the employee is going to get a negative kind of environment, then he will not be satisfied with his job and will think about leaving the organization. The present study aims to explore the association between work bullying and job performance of private employees. For the purpose of the study, a sample of 100 employees working in corporate sector (age= 30-45 years) having minimum work experience of 5 yrs were randomly selected from the corporate sector. The workplace incivility scale, job performance scale and turnover intention scale were administered on the subjects. Data was analyzed by using correlation and regression method. The result revealed that those having high work incivility at work place were found to have lower job performance and higher turnover intention.

Keyword: Workplace Incivility, Job Performance, Turnover Intention, Employees.

*Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, M.D.U, Rohtak

**Professor, Department of Psychology, M.D.U, Rohtak

Rapid changes can be seen at workplace during the 21st century and an increase in competition is also seen among different industries. Changes in an organization are constant in which a business approach is required to adapt into the environment and to maintain a flexible approach to remain practicable. A transformation can be seen at the workplace as the result of globalization, advancement of technology which results in new organizational structure and formation of new models (O'Toolc & Lawler, 2006). Boundaries between the work and personal time are unclear. Because of these continuous changes in an organization, some of the employees are unable to adapt accordingly and have to face the consequences i.e. conflict at workplace, lower job performance and deviation from the organization progress.

Andersson and Pearson (1999) defined workplace incivility as “low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others.” Examples of uncivil conduct include sarcasm, disparaging tones and remarks, hostile stares, and the “silent treatment.” The three important characteristics of uncivilized behavior at workplace are violation of workplace norms, ambiguous intent, and low intensity behavior (Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001). There is a direct relationship between uncivilized behavior and job performance.

Job performance is defined as the value an organization can expect from discrete behaviors performed by an employee over time (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997). Job performance consists of various components: it relates to behaviors, within a time context, has an evaluative component and is multidimensional (Motowidlo, 2003, Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997). Job performance is much more than completing a task which involves knowledge of the current surrounding, technical skills and potential ability of a worker (Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000). Borman and Motowidlo (1997) identified two categories of job

performance: task performance and contextual performance. Task performance includes the performance of an individual while performing a particular task and how skillful the worker is? Contextual performance involves "behavior that contributes to organizational effectiveness through its effects on the psychological, social and organizational context of work: (Motowidlo, 2003). More the job performance less will be the turnover intention shown by an employee.

Turnover intention is defined as a kind of intention where the employees working in an organization are willing to leave their job profile on their own free will without being forced by an organization (Shim & Chang, 2012). Turnover intention is divided into two categories i.e. voluntary and involuntary turnover. Voluntary turnover is a kind of turnover where the worker is dissatisfied by the environment condition and leaves the organization whereas in involuntary turnover the worker is forced by the organization to leave their job (Price, 1977).

It has been seen in many studies that uncivilized behavior faced at workplace tends to increase distrust among employees and it decreases positive exchange among employees. Perception of uncivilized behavior at workplace shows positive relationship with the intention to leave the organization (Shim, 2015). A study was conducted by Glendinning (2001), in which it was seen that 50 % of the workers who have experienced workplace incivility were about to leave the organization and 12 % actually terminated their job from workplace. A direct positive relationship was seen between uncivil work climates and lowered productivity, more absenteeism from the work place, slowdown of work, tardiness and more turnover (Neuman & Baron, 1997; Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001). Lim and Cortina, 2005 conducted a study and reported that those who are the targets of uncivilized behavior at workplace suffered from more job dissatisfaction, were having higher job stress and turnover intention.

Purpose of the study

The main aim of the present study is to discover the association between workplace incivility, task performance, contextual performance, job performance and turnover intention. How all of these variables are related with each other and how these variables are going to effect the workplace environment and performance of the employees.

Objective of the present study

To study the association between workplace incivility, task performance, contextual performance, job performance and turnover intention.

Hypotheses of the study

There would be a significant relationship between work incivility, task performance, contextual performance, job performance and turnover intention

Research Design

A correlational design was used for the present study.

Methodology

Participants

A sample of 100 participants working in corporate sector belonging to age group 30-45 years having a minimum of 5 years experience were taken from the Delhi NCR region. All the participants taken for the present study were working at least on managerial level.

Tools Used

Work Incivility Scale (2001): this scale was developed by Cortina, Magley, Williams and Langhout which contains 10 items which are used to assess the frequency of the behavior experienced by the every individual. The scoring is done by a 5 point likert scale i.e. 1) once or twice a year to 5) everyday. Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.89 for the single incivility scale of WIS.

Job Performance Scale (2004): this scale was given by Reio and Callahan which includes modified 11 item scale which is used to measure job performance. It also has two sub dimensions i.e. task performance and contextual performance. The scoring of this scale was done by 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *Not at all likely*, to 5 = *extremely likely*. Out of 11 questions, question from 1 to 5 measures task performance and 6 to 11 measures contextual performance.

Turnover Intention Scale: it contains 11 items which were designed to measure the perception of employees regarding their own psychological state related to their quality of work life issues

faced by them at workplace. This scale was invented by Seashore, Lawler III, Mirvis, & Cammann, 1983. Internal consistency of this scale was found to be 0.83 which is quite high with individual factor loading of .79. .41 and .75 were reported for the scale. Responses of the subject were summed on a 5 point Likert type scale.

Procedure

For the collection of the data, all the participants were individually contacted and rapport was established with the participants by making them feel comfortable. After the establishment of rapport, the questionnaire was handed over to the participants. After the completion of the questionnaires, questionnaires were taken back and the participants were thanked for their precious time devoted and for the cooperation. The data was analyzed with the help of Pearson product moment correlation.

Statistical Analyses

For attaining the objective of the present study, collected data was recorded for the statistical analysis. A Pearson product moment correlation was used for attaining the objectives of the study.

Results & Discussion

Table 1: *Descriptive Statistics of work incivility, task performance, contextual performance, job performance and turnover intention.*

Variables	Mean	SD	N
Work Incivility	25.91	7.01	100
Task Performance	11.84	4.95	100
Contextual Performance	12.93	5.01	100
Job Performance	24.88	9.76	100
Turnover Intention	29.80	8.93	100

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of work incivility, task performance, contextual performance, job performance and turnover intention. In this table, we can see mean values of

work incivility (Mean = 25.91; SD = 7.01), task performance (Mean = 11.84; SD = 4.95), contextual performance (Mean = 12.93; SD = 5.01), job performance (Mean = 24.88; SD = 9.76) and turnover intention (Mean = 29.80; SD = 8.93). Rest of the results is shown in table 2.

Table 2: Showing Inter Correlational Matrix between work incivility, task performance, contextual performance, job performance and turnover intention (n=100).

Variables	WI	TP	CP	JP	TI
Work Incivility	-	-0.185	-0.229*	-0.215*	0.480*
Task Performance	-0.185	-	0.858**	0.948**	0.273**
Contextual Performance	-0.229*	0.858**	-	0.970**	-0.185
Job Performance	-0.215*	0.948**	0.970**	-	-0.235*
Turnover Intention	0.480*	0.273**	-0.185	0.235*	-

*Sig at .05 level, ** Sig. at .01 level

Table 2 shows the correlation between work incivility, task performance, contextual performance, job performance and turnover intention. To investigate the association between variables and to check whether the variables are significantly related with each other, Pearson correlation was applied. In the present study, we have found no significant relationship between work incivility and task performance. On the other hand, there is a negative correlation found between work incivility and contextual performance at .05 level which clearly stated that if there is an uncivilized behavior at workplace then the individual is not able to accept the environment of the workplace and he will be dissatisfied. The employee is also going to avoid the social gathering. There is a also a negative correlation found between work incivility and job performance at .05 level which clearly stated that if there is a violation of workplace norms and an intention to harm someone, then it discourages an employee to perform well in an organization which reduces his performance. There is a negative correlation found between work

incivility and turnover intention at .05 level which means that more the incivility at workplace more the intention to leave the organization is shown by employee because the individual is going to lose interest at work and will start thinking about leaving the organization.

While talking about the task performance dimension, there is a positive correlation found between task performance and contextual performance at .01 level which means that if the individual is going to perform well at workplace then he will be internally satisfied with his own performance. Because of it the employee is going to accept the social and psychological environment of the culture and will be more willing to interact with the others. On the other hand, there is a positive correlation found between task performance and job performance at .01 level which means that if the performance of employee is satisfied at work place then his overall performance will also be good at workplace. There is a negative correlation found between task performance and turnover intention at .01 level which states that if employee is not satisfied with his own performance in organization then the chances of leaving the organization with his own will is very high.

On the contextual performance dimension, there is a positive correlation found between contextual performance and job performance at .01 level which means that if there is a balance of psychological, social and physical environment at workplace then the performance of employee will be enhanced and the employee will develop an interest towards his work culture. On the other hand, we found no significant relationship between contextual performance and turnover intention. There is a negative correlation found between job performance and turnover intention at .05 level which states that if the overall satisfaction of the employee is not up to the mark regarding his performance then the employee will feel discouraged to work in such kind of environment and will be ready to leave the organization at any cost. Employee is going to be in a stressful situation and it is going to affect the mental and physical health.

Implications of the study

Although this study was done on a very small sample but has got very important aspects in relation to organizational work culture, it is indicative of the negative consequences of work

incivility over the performance on employees. One has to be aware about such kind of negative consequences on mental health also. These are some of the major reasons of which many employees do not enjoy their job culture and start thinking about shifting their job from place to place.

Limitations of the study

- It was a very small study; the sample taken was very small.
- Some other variables would have been taken i.e. gender difference, government- private employees to study the comparison.

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.
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. 1., Williams, 1. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 64-80.
- Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A Scandinavian approach. *Aggressive and Violent Behavior: A Review Journal*, 5(4), 371-401.
- Glendinning, P.M. (2001). Workplace bullying: Curing the cancer of the American workplace. *Public Personnel Management*, 30(3), 269-286.
- 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.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79,475-480.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. c., & Schmit, M. 1. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10, 71-83.
- Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1997). Aggression in the workplace. In R.A Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations* (pp. 37-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- O'Toole, J., & Lawler, E. E. III. (2006). *The New American Workplace*. New York:Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, I. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations*, 54, 1387-1419.
- Price, J. (1977). *The study of turnover*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State Press.
- Reio, T. G., Jr., & Callahan, J. (2004). Affect, curiosity, and socialization-related learning: A path analysis of antecedents to job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19, 3-22.
- Seashore, S. E., Lawler III, E. E., Mirvis, P. H., & Cammann, C. (Eds.). (1983). *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures and practices*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shim, J. (2015). *Concept exploration of workplace incivility: Its implication to HRD*. Unpublished master's dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.
- Shim, J., & Chang, H. (2012, August). The relationship between workplace incivility and the intention to leave: Implication to HRD. Paper presented at the Krivet Conference, Asia, South Korea.
- Van Scotter, J. R., Motowidlo, S. J., & Cross, T. C. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 526-535.

Our Heritage

ISSN: 0474-9030

Vol-68-Issue-1-January-2020