Self-esteem and Job Status on Workplace Incivility among Administrative Staff of College of Education

[1]Taiwo A. K. & [2]Abdulrahmon M. O.

[1]Counselling and Human Development Studies, University of Ibadan, Ibadan
[2]Educational Psychology, Federal College of Education (Special), Oyo
Corresponding Author: ak.taiwo5@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: The frequency of workplace incivility among administrative staff in colleges of education in recent times is alarming. The increase in workplace incivility which could be as a result of low level of job satisfaction, workplace instability and workplace aggression is still on the rise despite enormous researches on incivility in the workplace. Pertinent to look into factors touching incivility in workplace especially on administrative staffs. This study therefore investigated self-esteem and job status on workplace incivility among administrative staff of colleges of education in Oyo state in particular, and the country, Nigeria as a whole. Descriptive survey design was employed and population for the study were administrative staffs of colleges of education. A total of three hundred participants were selected from three colleges of education in the state by means of multistage sampling procedure. The procedure of sampling was stratified to get three (3) strata and proportionate sampling was used to select five (5%) of administrative staff from each colleges of education which is three hundred administrative staffs as sample participants. Data collected were subjected to analysis by using frequency counts, percentages, correlation and multiple regressions. The result showed inversely positive significant relationships between workplace incivility and self-esteem (r = -.245, p < 0.05), next job status (r = -.271, p < 0.05). Thus, it could be said that workplace incivility increases when there is low job status and self- esteem among administrative staffs of college of education. The two variables equally took account for 35.8% variance in workplace productivity of administrative staff of the population of interest. The independent variables made positive relative contribution to workplace incivility of administrative staff in colleges of education in this order: self-esteem (Beta =.234, t= 1.957, P <0.05), followed by job status (Beta = .173, t= 1.270, P <0.05). Based on this finding, it is recommended that the provosts and Heads of Department need to improve on workplace civility with their administrative staffs; should create a work conducive environment and reward mechanism to all administrative staffs members of the institutions; since work environment is germane to workplace incivility, emphasis should be on how to improve the job status, self-esteem and other schemes that uphold and reduce administrative staff workplace incivility. Furthermore, research for the future is thus required to look into other possible factors that may sway workplace incivility.

KEYWORDS: Job status, self-esteem and workplace productivity

1.   INTRODUCTION

Workplace incivility can be described a low-emitting maladaptive behaviour with silent motive to damage an institution, we can also say it is an unprofessional behaviour that is seen as lacking respect and thus not polite, and displaying lack of regard for other co-workers. But unfortunately, workplace incivility is still not well acknowledged accordingly. The cost of incivility is thus estimated at millions of naira per worker annually, due to the hindrances pose by work execution delays and other distraction from work (Porath, 2016). These numbers are huge as they show us that incivility affects many employees and has a large financial impact on the workplace. Moreover, the human costs borne by employees who are subjected to workplace incivility are quite severe. They may, for instance

worry, try to avoid the instigator, withdraw from work, and even take their frustrations out on customers (Porath & Pearson, 2013).

Workplace incivility by definition can be viewed minimally occurring deviant behaviour with latent intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms of mutual respect (Anderson and Pearson, 1999). Incivility can therefore be a soft form of deviant behaviour in which the intention to harm is subtle according to Lim, Cortina and Magley (2008). It can also include all kinds of harassment like gossip, spreading rumours or rude behaviour, but note that, it is not limited to verbal mistreatment only. Incivility can also involve nonverbal behaviours like excluding colleague in other engagements, ignoring colleagues among others (Lim et al., 2008).

Workplace incivility can show as deliberate disorderliness during meetings, truancy, not paying attention to co-workers and other improper behaviours such as suspending and ignoring others line of thought, discouraging others point of view, not attaching importance to colleagues' discussion, withholding sensitive information from a colleagues, taking credit for their effort, careless handling of workplace equipment and materials, shifting blames to colleagues and circulating unverified news about colleagues (Pearson & Porath, 2009).

Kossivi, Ming, and Bombona, (2016), posit that administrative staffs are one the most valuable resources of any educational institution because without them, to achieve institutional goal may become impossible. They are one of the vehicles that drive the institution and also one of the greatest challenges faced by human resources department of most institution is the retention and development of highly skilled staff is often important to an institutions human resource management (Kossivi, Ming, & Bombona, 2016). Managing and retaining skilled administrative staff is very important for an institution to achieve success because administrative staff' skills and knowledge is a prerequisite for institution to gain an edge (Porath, 2016). Furthermore, institutions today are much concerned with ensuring that the workplace is free of incivility and other conspicuous unethical behaviours which are easily identified as detrimental to the growth and progress of the institutions but at the same time, they neglect seemingly lesser forms of interpersonal maltreatment which unknown to them could metamorphose from a misdemeanour to an epidemic of bad and uncivil behaviours.

Pearson and Porath (2015) maintains that incidence of workplace incivility exact a staggering economic toll that institutions would be unproductive to ignore. They further emphasized that administrative staff that experienced incivility in the institutions are deeply affected and most of the administrative staff lowered their productivity at work, lost respect for their bosses, reduced effort and sometimes even left work, their unit or department (Pousa & Mathieru, 2010). Pousa, (2012) maintains that the rise in workplace incivility demands immediate intervention in that; uncivil workplace behaviour can hinder motivation, and reduce productivity.

Workplace incivility is having a negative impact on organisational revenue generation by stifling retention of skilled administrative staff as this create a general problem visible by inability to retain administrative staff in such institution thereby becoming a major obstacle for institutions managers. Thus, the repercussions for employees in the form of productivity, healthcare, finance, environment, structure, and administration are significant. All of the aforementioned are various strata of concern at institutional level that is being affected by workplace incivility.

It has been observed that in recent times there is wide spread incivility in institutions, such that it has eaten the attitudinal nature of some administrative staff, resulting in degraded working atmosphere between employees. An institution utilises resources from the environment; transforms same to finished goods for use. Public institutions make employment opportunity, pay their workers wages and salaries and also perform other social responsibilities. In order to ensure institutional well-being then it behoves on the institutions to tackle early occurrence of workplace incivility, but on the contrary it is appearing that some institutions are accommodating and turning a blind eye to uncivil behaviours.

However, self-esteem and job status are independent variables in this study. They are particularly germane to this study in that, they each take into consideration both internal and external locus of control respectively. This is due to the fact that self-esteem and job status had also been found to be important factors in workplace incivility (Adam, 2012).

Self-esteem is an important variable in the field of behaviour studies, because its integral part in the formation of behaviour as it affects development processes, as well as it prevents the occurrence of mental health problems (Baumeister, 2013). Baumeister (2013), posited variation interpretations of one's esteem based on observable theories, from psychological views where the dynamic development of self-esteem is an evolutionary phenomenon, either from the point of view of social and cultural perceptions, the self-esteem is individuals' attitudes about themselves. The behavioural position that self-esteem is a feature or acquired traits while still focusing on humanitarian perspective on the self-esteem is the ability of the individual to live to honour and accepting his view of himself.

According to Lewchuk (2017) people who has low esteem of themselves may have a negative view of themselves thus feel they are incompetent and unworthy and vice versa. When a person with a negative view of self shows addiction tendencies, this generally is on the increase according to Baumeister, (2013). Self-esteem is on the basis of two psychological processes: evaluation and affect (Baumeister, 2013). In evaluation the role of cognition is accentuates, while affect emphasizes the role of feelings as they relate to esteem. It is a global sense of self-worth and self-acceptance and is an overall emotional response to self-evaluation. Self-esteem is how much one values self as a person (Lewchuk, 2017). An overall self-attitude that permeates all aspects of life, high self-esteem carries the implication that one will be accepted, as opposed to reject by others (Leiter, 2013). Self-esteem is seen as both a relatively stable trait and a state that fluctuates around a stable baseline (Lim, 2012).

When self-esteem is on the declines, it can create variations of psychological and behavioural consequences, as well as a possible reconstitution of self concept. Psychological consequences associated with damaged self-esteem include: lower mood, anxiety, feeling of shame, suicidal ideation, isolation, and fear of others (Udry, 2016). Administrative staff who have problems with their self-esteem are prone to behavioural consequences such as not engaging in any social relationship with other staff, abscond from work and absent in work environment or coming late to his/her place of work (Udry, 2016). For other individuals, their behavioural consequences can include: excessive absence from work, anxiety and aggressive easily (Udry, 2003). Employees with problematic self-esteem might be drawing self-energy from their ability to show their strength on various activities assigned to them.

An employees' ranking on the job is referred to as job status which may sometimes be in levels or grades in any workplace. In the colleges of education, both level and grade are made use of in ranking an employee. Sidanius and Pratto (2014), posits that we are in a world of ranking and hierarchies. Thus, employers are of the opinion that by categorizing workers and giving them feedback on their work performance in the place of work can inspire employees to become more competitive, work harder, to catch up, or excel even more and vice versa.

People who are on a high level of job and are assigned higher ranking may put in less effort while, those ranking low offices may become depressed, having lowered motivation about their work and may drop ball and give up. Furnham (2012) also maintained that job status can be related as one of the many factors that influence a perception of an individual towards their job. In the other hand, a senior cadre officer who has quite a number of years to their credit on the job can show some laziness in the effort they give to the job and as such become less productive. Thus, to fill the gaps in the past studies which had not taken into consideration administrative staff in Nigeria, and, add more to existing literature, this current academic work illuminated on the effects of self-esteem and job status on workplace incivility in the midst of administrative staff in college of higher education.

2.   STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

During the past decades workplace incivility has entertained rise in attention in educational institution. Researchers have submitted shocking reports on the damning repercussions of workplace incivility, both for individuals and institutions that are concerned. In relation to the effects of the workplace incivility being associated with employee leaving work and drive to leave the institutions, higher absenteeism, and decreased commitment to the work leading to low productivity. In addition, for the victims, incivility has been reported to be a casual factor in both lower levels of job satisfaction, psychosomatic symptoms and physiological illness, and in rare cases, possible exit from the labour market. Thus, workplace incivility is more costly for institutions and the society as a whole. The adverse effects is making workplace incivility and other forms of counterproductive interpersonal workplace behaviours issues of great economic cum national interest and have led a growing number of researchers to be motivated. Workplace incivility is especially important for public institutions because, administrative staff represent almost 60

percent of victims of incivility even though they only account for approximately 50percent of the workforce. Although there may not be proper documentation in Nigeria, it is common knowledge that workplace incivility exists in the public institutions. Most people think of workplace incivility as only physical assault. The reported cases of workplace incivility among college of education administrative staff are high compared to the actual reality: many are suffering in silence, merely enduring their workplace when it should be enjoyed. The prevalence of cases of workplace incivility occurs daily in college of education is progressively high, and even then, the issues of workplace incivility among administrative staff are mostly unable to resolve the workplace problems presented. Little has been done in the sum, specifically among the college of education administrative staff, and therefore served as impetus for this research to filling this established research gap. On this premise this study investigated the special effects of self-esteem and job status on incivility of administrative staff.

3.   PURPOSE OF STUDY

To study the relationship of self-esteem cum job status on workplace incivility amongst administrative personnel in colleges of education in Oyo state, Nigeria. Specifically, the study is to:

1. Examine the relationship existing in-between self-esteem on workplace incivility among administrative staff.
2. Examine relationship present between job statuses on workplace incivility among administrative staff.
3. Investigate joint contribution of self-esteem on workplace incivility among administrative staff.
4. Investigate joint contribution of job status on workplace incivility among administrative staff.
5. Explore relative contribution of self-esteem on workplace incivility among administrative staff.
6. Explore relative contribution of job status on workplace incivility among administrative staff.

4.   RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What pattern of relationship there exists between self-esteem and job status on workplace incivility among administrative staff?
2. Is there joint contribution of self-esteem and job status in predicting workplace incivility among administrative staff?
3. Will there be a contribution of relative effect for self-esteem and job status on workplace incivility among administrative staff?

5.   METHODOLOGY

5.1 Design

The research adopted descriptive survey research using the ex-post facto method to arrive at the purpose for this study.

5.2 Population

Population under study is administrative staff of colleges of education in Nigeria.

5.3 Sample and sampling technique

Three hundred (300) of the administrative staffs were selected. Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select the participants for the study. This was done by dividing colleges of education into three (3) strata: federal colleges; state colleges and private colleges. At the first stage colleges of education was divided into three (3) strata: federal, state and private. Second stage, total enumeration was used to select the only federal college (because there is only one federal college in the state of Oyo) while random sampling techniques was used to select one college of education each from state and private college of education. In third stage, the researcher employed proportionate sampling to select five (5%) of administrative staff from each colleges sampled for this work.

Table 1: Total number of administrative staff in the selected population

S/N	Colleges of Education	Ownership Category of College of Education Type	Administrative staff	(5%) of administrative staff
1	Federal College of Education (Sp),Oyo	Federal	756	152
2	Emmanuel Alayande College/University of Education, Oyo	State	587	118
3	Mufutau Lanihun College of Education, Ibadan	Private	162	33
	Total		**1,505**	**303**

6.   RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Incivility Scale: Workplace Incivility Scale was used to observe incivility. WIS scale was developed by Burnfield, Clark, Montgomery et al. (2004) using 6 likert scale range from **1** (Almost every day), **2** (At least one time in a week), **3** (At least one time every 2 weeks), **4** (At least one tme every 3 weeks), **5** (At least one time in a month), **6** (Experienced very rarely). WIS has five sub-scales (personal affair, abandonment, unfriendly communication, inconsiderate behaviour, and privacy intrusion). The author reported a split-half reliability of .75 and .68 respectively, with a Cronbach alpha of .91

Self-esteem Scale: Self-esteem scale by Rosenberg (1995). It consists of 10 items with a response format ranging from Strongly Disagree = SD to Strongly Agree = SA. The author reported a split-half reliability of .86 and .67 were observed for part 1 and 2 respectively, with a Cronbach alpha of .95

Job Status: Job status was measured using the participant level or grade in institutions.

7.   PROCEDURE FOR THE DATA COLLECTION

The participants were reached and retained through the help of Head of Administrative staff allocated to the colleges of education. The researcher informed all the administrative staff of their right to be involved or opt out of the study. The researcher further assured participants of the confidentiality of the information provided. The instruments were distributed and collected immediately after participants have filled out the items on the questionnaire.

8.   ANALYSIS OF DATA

This was executed using frequency counts, percentages, correlation and multiple regressions. Pearson product correlation was major tool employed to establish the relationship among the variables while the multiple regression analysis was used to establish the joint and relative contributions of the independent variables on the dependent variable in the study.

9.   RESULT

Research question one: What pattern of relationship exists between self-esteem and job status on workplace incivility among administrative staff of colleges of education?

Table 2: Correlation matrix showing relationship between variables

Variables	Mean	Std Dev	1	2	3
Workplace incivility	27.38	9.90	1.000		
Self esteem	50.49	8.36	-.245	1.000	
Job status	89.82	17.26	-.271	-.063	1.000

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 (2-tailed)

Table 2 revealed inversely positive significant relatedness between workplace incivility and self esteem(r= -.245, p < 0.05), followed by job status(r= -.271, p < 0.05).Thus, it could be deduced that workplace incivility increases when there is low job status and self- esteem among administrative staffs of college of education.

Research question two: What is the joint contribution of the self-esteem and job status on workplace incivility among administrative staff?

Table 3: Summary of regression for the joint contributions of variables to the prediction of workplace incivility among administrative staff.

R =.465 R Square =.370 Adjusted R square = .358 Std. Error = 9.6079						
Model		**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	4034.039	2	2017.0195	22.665	.000[b]
	Residual	26431.837	297	88.99		
	Total	30465.876	299			

Table 3 reveals a significant joint contribution of the variables (job status and self esteem) to the prediction of workplace incivility among administrative staff of colleges of education. The result yielded a coefficient of multiple regressions R = 0.465 and multiple R-square = 0.370. This suggests that the three factors combined accounted for 0.358% (Adj.R^2= .358) variance in the prediction of workplace incivility. The other factors accounting for the remaining variance are beyond the scope of this study. The ANOVA result from the regression analysis shows that there was a significant effect of the independent variables on the workplace incivility, $F_{(2, 297)}$ = 22.665, P <0.05.

Research question three: What is the relative contribution of the self-esteem and job status on workplace incivility among administrative staff?

Table 4: Relative effect of the independent variables to the prediction of workplace incivility

Model		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**T**	**Sig.**
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1	(Constant)	-.435	6.645		-.066	.948
	Job status	8.677E-02	.068	.173	1.270	.004
	Self esteem	6.484E-02	.033	.234	1.957	.003

Table 4 shows two independent variables (job status and self esteem) are potent predictors of workplace incivility. The most potent factor was self-esteem (Beta =.234, t= 1.957, P < 0.05), followed by job status (Beta = .173, t= 1.270, P < 0.05). This implies that workplace incivility is likely to increase if low job status and self-esteem persists among administrative staffs.

10.   DISCUSSIONS

In response to research question one stated that what pattern of relationship exists between self-esteem and job status on workplace incivility among administrative staff. The result shows that there was inversely significant relationship

between self-esteem and workplace incivility. This finding is in line with Luster and Small (2017), whom have consistently found that administrative staff women survivors of infertility report greater workplace incivility with lower self esteem. Research studies by Tyler (2012), has revealed that the higher self-esteem plays pivotal role in lessen workplace incivility among staff institutions while lower self-esteem reports higher workplace incivility among staff institutions. Sanchez and Roda (2013) found that self-esteem positively predicts and powerfully lessen workplace incivility, as well as depression among patients with infertility. Clark (2018) observed a solid relationship between self-esteem and incivility in the workplace similar to a quantitative study done by Sikhwari (2014) on randomly selected patients at the University Teaching Hospital in Vend both showing agreement with this result.

An inversely significant relationship exists between job status and workplace incivility. Yu, (2010) agrees with this assertion by showing that job status and job level – indicated by level of education, type of job, income and marital status – all related to workplace incivility among administrative staff. Butler, (2017) showed the significance job status had on incivility among administrative staff and revealed that job status has significant effects on workplace incivility among administrative staff.

Research question two inquired whether for joint contribution of the independent variables (job status and self esteem) to the workplace incivility among administrative staff. Yes, result shows that there was joint effect of the independent variables (job status and self esteem) on workplace incivility as the research enquired. The combination of the independent variables accounted for 35.8% of the total variance in workplace incivility among administrative staff of colleges of education. The analysis of variance of the multiple regression data yielded an F-ratio value which was found to be significant. From the regression analysis also attests to the causal effect of the independent variables on the dependent variables. In line with this finding, a combination of variables like job status and self-esteem has been observed by Walker (2014) on workplace incivility among college staff of institutions.

The result of the third research question on the relative contribution of each of the variables has also been significant. In all academic work as a whole, it was revealed that the degree of level of Education, life work balance and gender is very relevant to an actualization of workplace incivility among administrative staff of colleges of education. This is as similar to the study of Verkuil, Atasayi and Molendijk (2015) who found above variables have independent contribution on workplace incivility among administrative staff.

11.   CONCLUSION

The results of the study have been able to reveal workplace incivility of administrative staff exists undoubtedly, and that job status and self-esteem have not been effective enough to reduce workplace incivility. It is clear from the findings that good job status and self-esteem are not enough to achieve workplace incivility of administrative staff, because despite facts that all these things were confirmed to be minimally present in the establishment of interest sampled. We have presented facts and empirical data on the job status and self-esteem, as they significantly influenced workplace incivility of administrative staff in colleges of education. The job status and self-esteem were

not effectively utilized by the administrative staff of college of education to consider staying longer in the system hence there is workplace incivility among administrative staff. With a result of workplace incivility among administrative staff of College of Education, it portends that some of the administrative staffs might have quitted and more are waiting for a door of opportunity to open to quit for where they will have better conditions of service.

12.   RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendation are given and discussed below.

1. It is recommended among other measure that the provost and heads of department need to improve on job status and self-esteem with their administrative staffs; should create a work conducive environment occasioned by a working means for rewarding all staff of the institutions; because the environment of workers is key determinant to reducing workplace incivility, importance to be on how to improve the work atmosphere, making it more enticing to administrative staff in providing loans and other scheme that uphold and sustain administrative staff job` productivity and dedication to their jobs.

2. Training of employees should not be a onetime activity, hence should be that every organisation must continuously engage in maintain for its survival. Therefore as matter of duty, it is necessary to expend appreciable amount of time and money to ensure the continuous training of administrative staffs in order to reduce their incivility at all level of the organization.

3. Government and other employers of labour should take advantage of this to enhance administrative staff output. This should be by comprehensively upgrading the amalgamated variables to achieve the desired objective of reduced administrative staff workplace incivility.

4. Top management echelon should make policies that aid in ensuring that administrative staffs are adequately extrinsically motivated to remain intrinsically energized on the job.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. 2012. Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 65:5, 422-436.

Baumeister, R. F 2013. The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 497-529.

Butler, D. 2017. Hospital RNS' experiences with disruptive behavior.A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 1-12.

Clark, C. J. 2018. Civility and Self esteem: A Concept Analysis. Journal of Theory Construction and Testing, 12(1), 11-15.

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., and Magley, V. J. 2013.Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organization: Evidence and impact. Journal of Management, 39, 1579–1605. doi:10.1177/0149206311418835

Furnham, E. 2012. Status: Violence against women and girls. GSDRC Professional Development Reading Pack no. 32. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Heymann, A. 2017. *Job Status and Personality at Work*. New York: Routledge.

John, E. H. 2016. *Organizational culture and leadership* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kossivi, B., Ming Xu, Bombona, K. 2016. ''Study on determining factors of employee retention'' *Open Journal of Social Science*.4:2-6

Leiter, M. P., 2013. Analyzing and theorizing the dynamics of the workplace incivility crisis. New York, NY: Springer; 2013.

Lewchuk, W. 2017. 'Precarious jobs: Where are they, and how do they affect well-being?' *Economic and Labour Relations Review*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 402-419.

Lim, S. Cortina, L. M. And Magley V. J. 2008. Personal and work group incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 95-107.

Lim, V. K. G. 2012. The IT way of loafing on the job: cyber-esteem, neutralizing and organizational justice. *Journal of organizational Behaviour*. 23(5), 63-78.

Luster, J. A and Small, V. J. 2017. An eye for an eye? Exploring the relationship between workplace incivility experiences and perpetration. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19,143–154.doi:10.1037/a0035931

Pearson, C. M., and Porath, C. L. 2009. The cost of bad behaviour: How incivility damages your business and what you can do about it. New York: Portfolio

Pearson, C. M., and Porath, C. L. 2015. The cost of bad behaviour: How incivility damages your business. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 5, 239–273. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534811011031373

Porath, C. 2016. An antidote to incivility. Harvard Business Review.

Porath, C., and Pearson, C. 2013. The price of incivility. Harvard Business Review, 91(1/2), 114–121. Retrieved from https://hbr.org

Pousa, C. and Mathieu, A. 2010. Sales managers' motivation to moach salespeople: An exploration using expectancy theory. International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 8(1), 34-50

Pousa, C. E. 2012. The impact of coaching on salesperson's performance and the mechanisms that regulate this relationship, Doctoral Dissertation.Facultéd'Administration, Université de Sherbrooke.

Sanni, M. R. 2017. Consolidated Accounts Made Simple. Ilaro, Ogun State, Nigeria, IPS Educational Press, 178-180

Sidanius, A. M and Pratto, W. R. 2014. "Institutions and organizations: towards a theoretical synthesis", in Scott, W.R. and Meyer, J.W. (Eds), Institutional Environments and Organizations: Structural Complexity and Individualism, CA Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, pp. 55-80.

Sikhwari, G. 2014. Extra- and intra-organizational drivers of workplace deviance. Service Industries Journal, 34, 1134–1153. doi:10.1080/02642069.2014.939645

Udry, S. T. 2016. ''Study on determining factors of employee retention'' Open Journal of Social Science.4:261

Verkuil B., Atasayi S., Molendijk M. L. 2015. Workplace bullying and mental health: a meta-analysis on cross-sectional and longitudinal data. *PLoS ONE.* 2015;**10**(8):e0135225. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0135225. [PMC free article] [PubMed]

Walker, D. 2014. Exploring the Effects of Individual Customer Incivility Encounters on Employee Incivility: The Moderating Roles of Entity (In)civility and Negative Affectivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 99(1), pp. 151-161.

Yu, G. 2010. Extra- and intra-organizational drivers of workplace deviance. Service Industries Journal, 34, 1134–1153.