

## Workplace Incivility and Job Stress: A Study among Nurses

<sup>1</sup>Maheen Mushtaq

<sup>2</sup>Nazir A Nazir

<sup>3</sup>Parvez A Shah

<sup>4</sup>Sabiya Mufti

### Abstract

*Workplace incivility, a brazen behavior, is an omnipresent form of antisocial behavior in the workplaces. It is an unethical organizational behavior which has reported a plethora of negative consequences on employees as well as on the organization as a whole. The ascendancy in uncivil workplace behaviors in organizations and its far and wide implications especially on employee well-being as reported in the literature occupies all the more relevance for carrying out the present study. The study therefore, aims to document the prevalence of workplace incivility and ascertain its relationship with job stress among nurses working in various hospitals of Srinagar city. Taking into cognizance the Affective Events to support the literature, the study investigated the strategies adopted by the nurses to combat the consequences of uncivil behaviors at the workplace. A total of 120 nurses who participated in the study were administered a well-established questionnaire using random sampling technique. As hypothesized, a positive correlation between workplace incivility and job stress was found.*

**Keywords:** *Workplace Incivility, Job stress, Nurses, Hospitals*

---

### Introduction

Owing to its unprecedented pervasiveness, the workplace incivility has been the subject of growing concern in the recent past (Wilson and Holmval, 2013). While positive interactions lead to a greater sense of commitment and job satisfaction (Harris et al. 2007; Heffner and Rentsch, 2001; Rousseau and Aube, 2010), the negative interactions on the other hand, are strongly linked to work-related negative outcomes like exhaustion or the desire to quit (Cortina et al. 2001; Miner & Reed 2010; Lim et al. 2008). With today's organizations being defined by increasingly diverse workforces and rapid-fire, high-tech workplace contacts (Lim & Teo, 2009), politeness in the workplace has become more important than ever. According to the existing research, employees' mental health suffers when they are subjected to any form of unfairness or uncivil behaviors on the job (Laschinger et al. 2013; Rai, 2015). A survey conducted by Porath & Pearson in 2013, indicated a stunning 98% of respondents reported that they have witnessed rude behaviors at work. A whopping 78% of those workers also said that incivility had a negative impact on their commitment to the company, and half of those workers had encountered it at least once a week (Porath & Pearson, 2013). According to the findings of

---

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, University of Kashmir, Srinagar;  
email:maheenamushtaq8@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Department of Commerce, University of Kashmir, Srinagar. Email: [nahmed@uok.edu.in](mailto:nahmed@uok.edu.in)

<sup>3</sup> Sr. Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, University of Kashmir, Srinagar;  
email:drparveezshah89@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup> Sr. Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, University of Kashmir;  
email:drsabiyamufti@gmail.com

Yeung and Gryphon (2008), the annual monetary cost exerted on organizations in the United Kingdom as a result of stress caused by impolite employees amounted to 1.3 billion Euros.

Notwithstanding the above, researchers employ a variety of terminology, such as bullying (Zapf & Gross, 2001), social undermining (Duffy et al., 2002), interpersonal aggression (Glomb & Uao, 2003), and deviance, to characterize unethical conduct (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) reflecting workplace incivility. Existing research shows that employees displaying such poor workplace attitudes are more inclined to encounter stress and less likely to partake in corporate citizenship actions (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Dalal, 2005). The term "workplace incivility" is relatively new in the vast literature on dishonest actions (Hanrahan & Leiter, 2014). It describes deviant actions that are not particularly harmful but yet breach the standards of the workplace by failing to treat others with dignity and respect (Anderson & Pearson, 1999). Porath & Pearson provided a list of typical instances of workplace incivility, including taking credit for others' work or placing blame for one's own error, checking email or texting during a meeting, talking down to others, not listening, belittling others, withholding information, paying little attention to or showing little interest in other people's opinions, making demeaning or derogatory remarks to someone, or avoiding them altogether. According to Pearson et al. (2001), all of these examples demonstrate that workplace incivility entails actions that are unfriendly, impolite, and disrespectful to others.

Researchers argue that human resource developers should pay a strong heed to the issue of incivility given its far and wide consequences (Pearson & Porath, 2004). Witnesses of workplace incivility, as well as recipients of workplace incivility, suffer adverse effects by the presence of incivility in the workplace (Montgomery et al. 2004). Those who are the targets of incivility often feel depleted of energy, stressed out, and unmotivated as a result of the experience (Adams & Webster, 2013; Cortina et al., 2001; Giumetti et al., 2013; Kern & Grandey, 2009; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Miner et al., 2010; Sakurai & Jex, 2012). The victims of workplace incivility report a lower degree of well-being (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Lim et al., 2008); less marital fulfillment (Ferguson, 2012); and more work-family conflict as a result of being exposed to such behaviors (Ferguson, 2012; Lim & Lee, 2011). According to Guo et al. (2022), this antisocial behavior caused significant harm to both folks and business entities. Aggression, sparked by an increase in WI, can do significant harm to companies (Mahmood et al., 2023). The detrimental effects of WI on workers' organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), productivity, and work satisfaction have been highlighted in empirical research by Moon & Morais (2022) and Schilpzand et al. (2016). According to Mahmood et al. (2023), WI is linked to a variety of harmful behaviors that can happen in the workplace, including bullying, abuse, mistreatment, trauma, and employee abuse. These behaviors have a significant impact on employees' capacity to do their tasks well. Prior studies have established that endowed personnel are more prone to encountering WI; this, in turn, has detrimental effects on their physical and mental health, psychological capacities, moods, and personal lives (Chris, Provencher, Fogg, Thompson, Cole, Okaka, Bosco & González Morales et al., 2022; Gui, Bai & Wang, 2022; Sharma et al., 2022).

Researchers discovered that rudeness in the workplace was linked to negative mental outcomes such as stress, disorientation, unhappiness, and even suicidal thoughts (Cortina et al., 2001; Davenport et al., 2002; Pearson & Porath, 2005).

Moreover, Incivility in the workplace has a significant impact on unpleasant emotions; increases stress levels, and deplete individuals' resources (Leiter, 2013). Stress, which can exacerbate an individual's mental health, is an adaptive reaction to a situation that endangers their tranquility and well-being (Pandey, 2020). Numerous situations and issues pertaining to

organizational behavior are adversely affected by JS. A multitude of scholarly investigations demonstrate that JS has an adverse impact on organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Christy & Priartini, 2019; Velnampy, 2013; Dewe, O'Driscoll & Cooper, 2010; Huang & Hsiao, 2007; Vandenberg & Lance, 1992), thereby constituting a problem within the organization (Rulestri L.H. & Eryanto, 2013). As a job stressor, workplace incivility has attracted a considerable scholarly attention (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Lim et al., 2008). It's possible that stress is always going to be present in people's lives. Common sense tells us that when employees repeatedly experience noxious work environment factors like unfriendly clients, coworkers, or an angry boss, they become less cheerful and less able to focus on their job responsibilities. Understanding and eliminating workplace incivility is recommended to be of top focus for occupational health researchers, given the evidences that interpersonal stresses lead to physiological and psychological strains (Kelloway, & Desmarais, 2005; Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2008; Schat, Kelloway, & Desmarais, 2005; Tepper, 2000).

All in all, when employees endure rudeness on the job, it has a potential to cause emotional and physical pain amongst the victims of uncivil behaviours with those who lack the social skills and coping mechanisms to deal with it being more likely to suffer negative consequences. People therefore, need to take action against uncivil behaviours in the workplace to avoid it from negatively impacting their professional and personal lives. Hence, one must constantly be ready to deal with any unsettling scenario that may happen and be equipped to overcome any challenges that the environment or other people may throw in the way of his or her success in life. While much research has gone into understanding the causes and effects of incivility in the workplace, less has been done to explore how workers respond to it. Cortina and Magley (2009), conducted research that showed people respond differently to rudeness depending on their coping orientation and their perception of the level of threat they face. Even fewer researches have looked at how people react to or cope with workplace incivility based on their own unique characteristics (Milam et al., 2009).

With this in mind, the current research sought to detect and measure workplace incivility and its influence on stress among nurses, as health care has always been a top concern for any country and nurses play a crucial part in delivering this care. Most studies on incivility in the workplace have been conducted in the developed Western world. Yet the rest of the developing world, including our own country (India), is still in its infancy as far as research on this important organizational aspect is concerned. Few empirical researches on workplace incivility have been done, and because of cultural variations, they cannot be generalized and extended to our places of work. The current study is therefore a humble endeavor to assess the relationship between workplace incivility and employee stress among the nurses working in the hospitals in Srinagar city.

### **Objectives of the Study**

1. To determine the level of workplace incivility and workplace stress perceived by the target nurses under study;
2. to investigate the relationship between Workplace Incivility and stress among the nurses of the select hospitals;
3. to examine the differences across select demographic variables and workplace incivility; and
4. to examine the differences across select demographic variables and job stress among the sample respondents.

## **Theoretical background and hypotheses development**

### ***Workplace incivility and job stress***

In the workplace, incivility, or impolite and discourteous behaviour, is quite common (Cortina, 2008). In a pivotal theoretical piece published in the *Academy of Management Review*, Anderson & Pearson (1999), identified this conduct as "Workplace Incivility" and as a new area of influence within the research on unfavourable workplace behaviors. They moreover, defined it 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" (p.475). As reported by Cortina (2008), the workplace environment has a crucial impact in either encouraging or discouraging uncivil behaviour. The effects of incivility in the workplace might vary depending on whether it is initiated from above or below. The former is referred to as top-down incivility and the latter as lateral incivility. Research argues that these forms of rudeness are linked together with different consequences (Laschinger et al., 2009; Leiter et al. 2011). For example, supervisor's incivility was found to be a more significant predictor of job dissatisfaction and desire to quit (Laschinger et al., 2009) than colleague's incivility. Additionally, Estes & Wang (2008) and Brad & Jia (2016) show that management philosophy, organisational culture, worker demographics, informality at work, authority, and social standing are major factors that directly affect and provide light on the prevalence of incivility in the workplace. Research shows that victims of uncivil behaviour experience emotional pain (Estes & Wang, 2008), have problems with emotional stability, sleep, confidence, and stress (Estes & Wang, 2008), suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder and live in continual fear of being victimized again (Cortina, 2008). In reality, also much of the victims' time in the office is taken up with discussions about the unpleasant events they endured (Cortina, 2008).

Individuals may experience negative stress outcomes due to an increase in perceived stress when the demands of their work environment surpass their ability to cope with those expectations (Hobfoll 1989; Kohler et al. 2006). Stress is a state that forces a person to depart from normal functioning as a result of a change (i.e., disruption or enhancement) in their psychological and/or physiological condition (Beehr & Newman, 1978). Taking cue from Beehr (1995) job stress is "a situation in which some characteristics of the work situation are thought to cause poor psychological or physical health, or to cause risk factors making poor health more likely." Given that, stress is construed as a reaction to the environment when a danger of resource loss or a lack of projected resource gain prompts people to seek and protect resources (Hobfoll, 1989).

Studies show that workplace incivility causes heightened emotionality (Bunk & Magley, 2013), sorrow and emotional disturbances (Miner et al., 2012). According to Yamada (2000), workplace incivility can cause stress, depression, mood swings, sleep problems, guilt, embarrassment, and low self-esteem. Cortina et al. (2001) link workplace incivility to chronic job stress from daily challenges. Persistent uncivil encounters negatively damage employee emotions and mental health, causing psychological injury and occupational stress (Lim et al., 2008).

The Affective Event Theory (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996) postulates that unfavourable experiences cause unfavourable emotional responses, which in turn lead to unfavourable attitudes and, finally, unfavourable behaviours. They have put out a guiding theoretical framework that concentrates on the factors and consequences of affective experiences at work in order to investigate the workplace's emotions. To put it another way, when awful things occur at work, individuals respond like such. Hence, Lim et al. (2008) discovered that people's levels of work satisfaction and mental health, such as elevated stress levels, were significantly

impacted when they encountered incivility. For instance, a challenging work environment like workplace incivility might result in a person being publicly ridiculed or disregarded by his manager or coworker (event), which can create frustration or aggravation (affective state). Hence, stressful job events, such as workplace incivility, may cause stressful emotional responses, which has a potential to amplify the stress the individual feels and deplete his or her resources (Leiter, 2013). If this mismatch between stress and available resources persists, it further saps the person's vitality and results in tiredness, which is a sign of burnout (Maslach et al. 2001). The theory contends that workplace incivility damage's social identity, leads to a conflict between personal and corporate standards, raises stress, and depletes people's resources. Consequently, it is essential for workers in toxic environments to have a backup strategy to deal with rudeness and stress.

Against the above background, the present study hypothesizes;

H1: The level of workplace incivility experienced by the sample respondents will be moderate to high in the select hospitals;

H2: Job stress among the sample respondents will be high in the select hospitals;

H3: Workplace incivility will be positively related to job stress;

H4: Workplace incivility will vary significantly across the select demographic variables; and

H5: Job stress will vary significantly across the select demographic variables.

## **Research Methodology**

### ***Sample and Procedure:***

The sample of the study included the nurses drawn randomly from six reputed public and private sector hospitals operating in the summer capital of J&K. About 120 questionnaires were distributed amongst the sample respondents personally during working hours after seeking proper permission from the relevant authorities of the sample hospitals. With the assistance of each hospital's Medical and Nursing Superintendents, we were able to successfully receive back duly filled up all survey questionnaires. In addition, in the survey's demographics section, each participant indicated their gender, age, level of education, years of work experience, marital status, and the job title. IBM SPSS version 24 was used for all statistical analysis, including frequency analysis, descriptive analysis, correlation analysis, and one-way analysis of variance of the collected data.

### ***Measures***

A structured questionnaire carrying three (03) sections i.e., demographics, workplace incivility, and job stress was used for obtaining responses from the sample respondents.

#### ***Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS)***

Developed by *Cortina et. al (2001)* was used for measuring the workplace incivility experienced by the sample respondents. Cortina and Magley (2009) have however, since supplemented the WIS with three additional items. The WIS consists of 10 items that measure the frequency with which individuals have experienced the incivility at the workplaces. Participants responded using a 5-point scale ranging from (1) once or twice a year to (5) every day. A sample item of the scale was: “*My co-worker/supervisor paid little attention to a statement I made or showed little interest in my opinion*”.

#### ***Job Stress Scale***

Developed by *Elo A.L, Leppannen A, Jahkola A (2003)* was used to measure the overall

stress of respondents from the job they were working at. The JSS consists of 1 item that measures the frequency with which individuals have experienced stress at the workplace. Responses were recorded by the select respondents on a 5point Likert scale ranging from (1) not at all to (5) very much.

Cronbach’s coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951), the reliability coefficient for the single incivility scale of the WIS was .888 as shown in table 1:

The sample characteristics are recorded in Table 2. Of the total 120 respondents, only 13 (10.8%) were male and 107 (89.2%) were female; 65 (54.2%), 29 (24.2%), 21 (17.5%) and 5 (4.2%) respondents fall in the age groups of up to 30, 30–40, 41–50 and 51–60 respectively. Besides, 45 (37.5%) were married, 69 (57.5%) unmarried, 3 (2.5%) divorced and 3 (2.5%) were separated. About 5 (4.2%) belonged to administrative section,9 (7.5%) was Nursing incharge/Matron/CNO, 36 (30%) were senior grade nurses and 60 (50%) belonged to junior grade nurses. Table 2 also shows that among the selected sample of 120, only 1 (0.8%) respondent has not attained any educational qualification, 50 (41.7%) respondents have studied up to 10+2, 45 (37.5%) were graduate and 24 (20%) were post-graduate. Furthermore, 78 (65%) were having the experience of less than 10 years, 31(25.8%) have service length of 10-20 years, 8 (6.7%) have service length of 20-30 years and 3 (2.5%) have service length of 30 years and above.

**Table 1: Reliability Analysis**

Variables	No. of questions	Cronbach Alfa ( $\alpha$ ) Values
Workplace incivility	10	.888

*Sample characteristics*

## Results and Analysis

The descriptive analysis of workplace incivility and job stress are shown in the above table 2. All the two study variables were measured on a five-point Likert scale resulting in the mid-point of 3. The mean score and the standard deviation of workplace incivility and job stress were (2.17 & 0.93) and (3.18 & 1.21) respectively. The mean score of workplace incivility was less than the mid-point and depicts the respondents i.e. nurses face uncivil behaviors at their workplaces at a low level. Further, the mean score of job stress lies approximately at the mid-point and thus depicts that the respondents sometimes feel stressed owing its reason to many factors and one might be the workplace incivility.

**Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation of Workplace Incivility**

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Workplace incivility	120	1	5	2.1742	0.92587
Job stress	120	1	5	3.1833	1.20909

Table 3 shows correlation of two variables under study and Pearson’s correlation coefficient was used to determine the extent of relationship between the variables. The analysis depicts that there exists a significant positive correlation between Workplace Incivility and Job Stress as evident from “r value= .533” and “p value < .05”. It states that if employees’ face Workplace Incivility, their level of Job Stress increases. Relationship between Workplace Incivility and Job Stress also proved to be significant and positive. Our result was in line with the existing literature (Shabir et al., 2014, Mahfooz et al., 2017) reflecting that Workplace Incivility and Job-stress are positively related.

**Table 3: Correlation between Variables of study (n=120)**

	Workplace Incivility	Job Stress
Workplace Incivility	1	
Job Stress	.533**	1
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

**Table 4: Demographic variables and workplace incivility**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Age</b>	Between Groups	27.090	31	.874	1.110	<b>.344</b>
	Within Groups	69.277	88	.787		
	Total	96.367	119			
<b>Gender</b>	Between Groups	2.724	31	.088	.872	<b>.659</b>
	Within Groups	8.867	88	.101		
	Total	11.592	119			
<b>Marital Status</b>	Between Groups	15.042	31	.485	1.250	<b>.208</b>
	Within Groups	34.158	88	.388		
	Total	49.200	119			
<b>Job Title</b>	Between Groups	24.776	31	.799	.961	<b>.535</b>
	Within Groups	73.215	88	.832		
	Total	97.992	119			
<b>Level of education</b>	Between Groups	20.601	31	.665	1.150	<b>.301</b>
	Within Groups	50.866	88	.578		
	Total	71.467	119			
<b>Length of service</b>	Between Groups	18.558	31	.599	1.163	<b>.287</b>
	Within Groups	45.308	88	.515		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>63.867</b>	<b>119</b>			

*\*the significance level of p value in ANOVA=0.05*

Table5 reports the results of ANOVA between a host of independent demographic variables and workplace incivility. As revealed by the table there exists no statistically significant difference between any of the demographic variables and workplace incivility which indicates that the demographic variables don't determine the level of workplace incivility. In other words, the feeling of incivility doesn't change with the change in respondents' age, gender, marital status, education level, and the like.

**Table 6: Demographic variables and job stress**

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>Df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
<b>Age</b>	Between Groups	4.127	4	1.032	1.286	<b>.279</b>
	Within Groups	92.240	115	.802		
	Total	96.367	119			
<b>Gender</b>	Between Groups	.582	4	.146	1.521	<b>.201</b>
	Within Groups	11.009	115	.096		
	Total	11.592	119			
<b>Marital Status</b>	Between Groups	2.113	4	.528	1.290	<b>.278</b>
	Within Groups	47.087	115	.409		
	Total	49.200	119			
<b>Job Title</b>	Between Groups	3.187	4	.797	.966	<b>.429</b>
	Within Groups	94.805	115	.824		
	Total	97.992	119			
<b>Level of education</b>	Between Groups	7.160	4	1.790	3.201	<b>.016*</b>
	Within Groups	64.307	115	.559		
	Total	71.467	119			
<b>Length of service</b>	Between Groups	4.848	4	1.212	2.161	<b>.050*</b>
	Within Groups	59.019	115	.513		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>63.867</b>	<b>119</b>			

*\*the significance level of p value in ANOVA=0.05*

Table 6 reports the results of ANOVA between a host of independent demographic variables and job stress. As revealed by the table there exists no statistically significant difference between the independent variables (except for level of education and length of service) and job stress which indicates that the demographic variables don't determine the level of job stress. In other



words, the feeling of stress doesn't change with the change in respondents' age, gender and marital status but does change with the level of education and length of service.

### **Conclusion and discussions**

The present study showed that the uncivil behaviors are not grossly so high, in fact, they come under moderate range on 5-point Likert scale with mean score of 2.17. While the stress levels as reported in the study are above the mid value of 3 indicating that the respondents do witness a good amount of stress not necessarily because of uncivil behaviors. Moreover, correlation of 0.533 between workplace incivility and stress was found significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Our results were in line with the existing literature (Shabir et al., 2014, Mahfooz et al., 2017) reflecting that Workplace Incivility and Job-stress are positively related with each other.

The results in Table 6 reveal that the level of education and length of service do play a significant role in the stress level among the respondents with the p value standing at 0.016 and 0.05 respectively. The results indicate that respondents' having different education qualification and service length do show significant statistical difference. The result is line with (Isikhan, 2004) which determined that marital status, age and work experience have a significant relationship with the job stress, however our results showed only significant relationship with work experience and level of education. Thus, depicting that level of education and length of service are considered determinant factor of the stress level among the respondents. On the other hand, age, gender, marital status and job title invalidate any role these play on the stress level of the respondents as the p values of all the above four demographic variables stand at greater than 0.05. Thus, neither showing any significant statistical difference between the group means nor considered the determinant factor of the job stress levels among the respondents.

On the whole, it can be concluded that workplace incivility does exist in the health care institutes though being at less than moderate level. Also, an uncivil behavior of the supervisors and co-workers does influence the stress level of the nurses of health care institutes at a moderate level. In other words, it can be said that uncivil behaviors are not that prevalent in the hospitals of our state especially in Srinagar district owing to the congeniality existing among the nurses and their supervisors.

### **Practical implications**

Companies can use the findings of this study to better understand the connection between workplace incivility and productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness in the health industry and allied fields, all of which are facing rising levels of competition. In spite of the fact that our research revealed a low likelihood of incivility in the workplace, this may be due to nurses' reluctance to speak up about any problems they may be experiencing due to their fear of repercussions. According to a study conducted by Cortina et al. (2001), as much as 70% of businesses may face workplace incivility in the future. In this way, the negative consequences on workers and businesses can be lessened through the development and dissemination of treatments based on a deeper comprehension of workplace incivility. Managers might apply the study's findings to their own practices by, for example, considering whether or not they screen for personality traits that operate as a buffer in the context of workplace pressures during the hiring process. Managers can reduce the negative effects of workplace incivility on employees by addressing the underlying causes, such as the lack of well-defined processes and regulations, ineffective communication methods and information infrastructures, poor leadership, and inadequate guidance and feedback. It's clear from a number of studies that rudeness in the workplace is detrimental to both employees' and employers' efforts, thus upper management should take it seriously (Porath, & Pearson, 2010; Lim et al., 2008). Also, once a

year, managers should conduct a mental audit to assess the mental health of their staff and any issues related to job stress. As a means of dealing with the stress that comes with the job, employees should be taught to strengthen their emotional resilience and to employ a variety of coping mechanisms. Managers can help reduce employees' stress by organizing fun extracurricular activities. They can also require workers to participate in stress reduction and ethics training programmes. When it comes to improving the workplace culture, managers can do a great deal more to model ethical behaviour. In conclusion, it can be stated that managers can benefit both their employees and the organisation as a whole by taking further measures to prevent acts of incivility situations once they have acknowledged the seriousness of incivility in the workplace.

### **Suggestions**

Hospital administrations should take effective measures and create a conducive working environment for nurses so that as little unprofessional conduct as possible occurs on the job and nurses may focus on their duties without being distracted by the stress generated by the unprofessional actions of their superiors and coworkers. The efficiency and efficacy of the nurses and the hospital as a whole will increase in a friendly environment. For nurses to have the least amount of stress at work, the hospital administration must make sure that nurses are treated courteously, respectably, and dignifiedly by the authorities, their coworkers, and other third parties. Hospitals should also continue to train supervisors and nurses in interpersonal skills so that instances of uncivil behaviour are kept to a minimum. In order to prevent a culture of abuse, nurses' teamwork should also be improved. There should be enough and the right short-term educational courses put up to familiarize the nurses with the concepts of interpersonal behaviours and how to effectively implement them.

In addition, hospitals should standardize their human resources policies and initiatives to establish a consistent work environment and interpersonal climate. When individuals are given standards, methods, and procedures that establish expectations for their roles and actions, they are more likely to act accordingly. The hospital administration has to formally establish a grievance cell where the victims can voice their grievances. When management becomes aware of the unruly behaviour, they should thoroughly examine it and take corrective action. If these issues continue unresolved, it will be hazardous not just for the individuals, but also for the organization as a whole. The management should foster an environment in which employees feel understood, heard, and confident that the company cares about their wellbeing. Also, nurses should work to come up with effective coping mechanisms for stress and incivility. In the event that management fails to enact hospitable laws and regulations at the workplace, they should equip themselves with the skills necessary to adjust and/or adapt to the current working environment. In order to work more efficiently, nurses might make plans to minimize stressful situations and deal with issues as they arise. They can fortify their own emotional defenses to the extent that they are able to function normally despite the rudeness of their superiors and/or coworkers.

### **Limitations of the study & Directions for Future Research**

Although the study offers some insightful observations, it also has certain flaws. The current study did not look at other economic sectors; it solely looked at the health sector. Future studies may also include industries like finance, insurance, and the hospitality industry. All of the questionnaires in the current study were close-ended because its technique was quantitative and correlational. As a result, it is acknowledged that the current study would lack precise or in-depth explanatory data. Yet, one technique to further explore the connection between rudeness and stress is to use a qualitative methodology that includes interview and/or open-ended questionnaire. Self-report survey tools were also used in the current investigation. The current

study is limited by the fact that researchers must rely on each respondent to answer questions completely and honestly, which is in fact quite difficult to achieve. The current study only examined one effect of workplace incivility on nurses, namely stress. Future research can examine further effects on employee involvement, pleasure at work, knowledge sharing, and other factors. Also, due to time constraints, the study did not include any mediating or moderating variables to examine the potential indirect link between workplace incivility and job stress. Future researchers can therefore employ various mediating and moderating variables.

**References:**

- Adams, G. A., & Webster, J. R.(2013). Emotional regulation as a mediator between interpersonal mistreatment and distress. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(6), 697–710. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2012.698057
- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M.(1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 452–471. doi:10.2307/259136
- Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E.(1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review 1. *Personnel Psychology*, 31(4), 665–699. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1978.tb02118.x
- Beehr, T. A.(1995). *Psychological stress in the workplace, London and New York*.
- Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A.(2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and metaanalysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 9, 998–1012.
- Bunk, J. A., & Magley, V. J.(2013). The role of appraisals and emotions in understanding experiences of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(1), 87–105. doi:10.1037/a0030987
- Chen, Y., Ferris, D. L., Kwan, H. K., Yan, M., Zhou, M., & Hong, Y.(2013). Self-love's lost labor: A self-enhancement model of workplace incivility. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4), 1199–1219. doi:10.5465/amj.2010.0906
- Cooper, C. L., & Cartwright, S.(1994). Healthy Mind; Healthy Organization— A Proactive Approach to Occupational Stress. *Human Relations*, 47(4), 455–471. doi:10.1177/001872679404700405
- Cortina, L. M.(2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 55–75. doi:10.5465/amr.2008.27745097
- Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J.(2009). Patterns and profiles of response to incivility in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(3), 272–288. doi:10.1037/a0014934
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D.(2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(1), 64–80. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64
- Dalal, R. S.(2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241–1255. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M.(2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 331–351. doi:10.2307/3069350
- Dunkley, D. M., Blankstein, K. R., Halsall, J., Williams, M., & Winkworth, G.(2000). The relation between perfectionism and distress: Hassles, coping, and perceived social support as mediators and moderators. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(4), 437–453. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.4.437
- Elo, A. L., Leppänen, A., & Jahkola, A.(2003). Validity of a single-item measure of stress symptoms. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*, 29(6), 444–451. doi:10.5271/sjweh.752

- Estes, B., & Wang, J. (2008). Integrative literature review: Workplace incivility: Impacts on individual and organizational performance. Interaction: A multiple constituencies approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 471–490.
- Estes, B., & Wang, J. (2008). Integrative literature review: Workplace incivility: Impacts on individual and organizational performance. *Human Resource Development Review*, 7(2), 218–240. doi:10.1177/1534484308315565
- Ferguson, M. (2012). You cannot leave it at the office: Spillover and crossover of coworker incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(4), 571–588. doi:10.1002/job.774
- Garst, H., Frese, M., & Molenaar, P. C. M. (2000). The temporal factor of change in stressor–strain relationships: A growth curve model on a longitudinal study in East Germany. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 417–438. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.417
- Giumetti, G. W., Hatfield, A. L., Scisco, J. L., Schroeder, A. N., Muth, E. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (2013). What a rude e-mail! Examining the differential effects of incivility versus support on mood, energy, engagement, and performance in an online context. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(3), 297–309. doi:10.1037/a0032851
- Glomb, T. M., & Liao, H. (2003). Interpersonal aggression in work groups: Social influence, reciprocal, and individual effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(4), 486–496. doi:10.2307/30040640
- Hanrahan, M., & Leiter, M. P. (2014). *Workplace mistreatment: Recent developments in theory, research, and interventions*.
- Harris, J. I., Winkowski, A. M., & Engdahl, B. E. (2007). Types of workplace social support in the prediction of job satisfaction. *Career Development Quarterly*, 56(2), 150–156. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.2007.tb00027.x
- Heffner, T. S., & Rentsch, J. R. (2001). *Organizational commitment and social*.
- Herscovis, M. S. (2011). “Incivility, social undermining, bullying...oh my!”: A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 499–519. doi:10.1002/job.689
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
- Holm, K. (2014). *Workplace incivility as a social process: How witnessing incivility relates to uncivil conduct, well-being, job satisfaction and stress*.
- Jex, S. M., & Bliese, P. D. (1999). Efficacy beliefs as a moderator of the impact of work-related stressors: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), 349–361. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.349
- Kern, J. H., & Grandey, A. A. (2009). Customer incivility as a social stressor: The role of race and racial identity for service employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 46–57. doi:10.1037/a0012684
- Kim, T.-Y., & Shapiro, D. (2008). Revenge against supervisor mistreatment: Negative emotion, group membership, and crosscultural difference. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 19, 339–358.
- Spence Laschinger, H. K., Leiter, M., Day, A., & Gilin, D. (2009). Workplace empowerment, incivility, and burnout: Impact on staff nurse recruitment and retention outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 17(3), 302–311. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2009.00999.x
- Laschinger, H., Wong, C., Regan, S., Young-Ritchie, C., & Bushell, P. (2013). ‘Workplace incivility and new graduate nurses’ mental health’, *JONA: Journal of Nursing Administration*, 43(7/8), 415–421.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1990). Theory-based stress measurement. *Psychological Inquiry*, 1(1), 3–13. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli0101\_1

- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. NY: Springer.
- Lazarus, R. S., DeLongis, A., Folkman, S., & Gruen, R. (1985). Stress and adaptational outcomes: The problem of confounded measures. *American Psychologist*, 40(7), 770–779. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.40.7.770
- Leiter, M. (2013). *Analyzing and theorizing the dynamics of the workplace incivility crisis*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Leiter, M. P. (2013). *Analyzing and Theorizing* Chang, C., & Lyons, B. J. (2012). Not all aggressions are created equal: A multifoci approach to workplace aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(1), 79–92. doi:10.1037/a0026073
- Leiter, M. P., Laschinger, H. K. S., Day, A., & Oore, D. G. (2011). The impact of civility interventions on employee social behavior, distress and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1258–1274. doi:10.1037/a0024442
- 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(3), 483–496. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.483
- Lim, S., & Lee, A. (2011). Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: Does family support help? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(1), 95–111. doi:10.1037/a0021726
- Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 95–107. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95
- Lim, V. K. G., & Teo, T. S. H. (2009). Mind your e-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. *Information and Management*, 46(8), 419–425. doi:10.1016/j.im.2009.06.006
- Mahfooz, Z., Arshad, A., Nisar, Q. A., Ikram, M., & Azeem, M. (2017). Does workplace incivility & workplace ostracism influence the employees' turnover intentions? Mediating role of burnout and job stress & moderating role of psychological capital. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(8), 398–413.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397
- Milam, A. C., Spitzmueller, C., & Penney, L. M. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 58–69. doi:10.1037/a0012683
- Miner, K. N., Settles, I. H., Pratt-Hyatt, J. S., & Brady, C. C. (2012). Experiencing incivility in organizations: The buffering effects of emotional and organizational support. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(2), 340–372. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00891.x
- Miner-Rubino, K., & Reed, W. D. (2010). Testing a Moderated Mediation Model of Workgroup Incivility: The Roles of Organizational Trust and Group Regard. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40(12), 3148–3168. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00695.x
- Montgomery, K., Kane, K., & Vance, C. M. (2004). Accounting for Differences in Norms of Respect: A Study of Assessments of Incivility through the Lenses of Race and Gender. *Group and Organization Management*, 29(2), 248–268. doi:10.1177/1059601103252105
- Nielsen, M. B., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2008). Sense of coherence as a protective mechanism among targets of workplace bullying. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(2), 128–136. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.13.2.128
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, J. W. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations*, 54(11), 1387–1419. doi:10.1177/00187267015411001

- Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2004). On incivility, its impact, and directions for future research. *Dark Side of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 403–425.
- Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for “nice”? Think again. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19(1), 7–18. doi:10.5465/ame.2005.15841946
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(2), 123–137. doi:10.1016/S0090-2616(00)00019-X
- Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2013). The price of incivility: Lack of response hurts morale—And the bottom line. *Harvard Business Review*, 115–121.
- Pritchard, M. E., Wilson, G. S., & Yamnitz, B. (2007). What Predicts Adjustment Among College Students? A Longitudinal Panel Study. *Journal of American College Health*, 56(1), 15–22. doi:10.3200/JACH.56.1.15-22
- Rai, S. (2015). Organizational justice and employee mental health’s moderating roles in organizational identification. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 4(1) No. pp. 68–84, 68–84. doi:10.1108/SAJGBR-01-2014-0006
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555–572. doi:10.2307/256693
- Rousseau, V., & Aubé, C. (2010). Social support at work and affective commitment to the organization: The moderating effect of job resource adequacy and ambient conditions. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(4), 321–340. doi:10.1080/00224540903365380
- Schat, A. C. H., & Kelloway, E. K. (2005). Workplace aggression. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 189–218). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Sliter, M. T., Jex, S., & Grubb, P. (2013). The relationship between the social environment of work and workplace mistreatment. *Journal of Behavioral Health*, 2(2), 120–126. doi:10.5455/jbh.20130330090134
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(4), 356–367. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.3.4.356
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178–190. doi:10.2307/1556375
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* (pp. 1–74). Greenwich, UK, CT: JAI Press.
- Wilson, N. L., & Holmvall, C. M. (2013). The development and validation of the Incivility from Customers Scale. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(3), 310–326. doi:10.1037/a0032753
- Yamada, D. C. (2000). The phenomenon of “workplace bullying” and the need for status-blind hostile work environment protection. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 88, 475–537.
- Yeung, A., & Griffin, B. (2008). Workplace incivility: Does it matter in Asia? *People and Strategy*, 31(3), 14–19.
- Zapf, D., & Gross, C. (2001). Conflict escalation and coping with workplace bullying: A replication and extension. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 497–522. doi:10.1080/13594320143000834

**Appendix**

**Table 1 sample characteristics**

<b>Demographic variables</b>	<b>Frequency f</b>	<b>Percent %</b>
<b>Age</b>		
up to 30 years	65	54.2
30-40	29	24.2
41-50	21	17.5
51-60	5	4.2
Total	120	100
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	13	10.8
Female	107	89.2
Total	120	100
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married	45	37.5
Unmarried	69	57.5
Divorced	3	2.5
Separated	3	2.5
Total	120	100
<b>Job Title</b>		
ANS/DNS/NS	5	4.2
Nursing Incharge/Matron/CNO	9	7.5
SGN/SNO	36	30
JGN/NO	60	50
Any other	10	8.3
Total	120	100
<b>level of Education</b>		
No education	1	0.8
studied up to 10+2	50	41.7
Graduate	45	37.5
Post Graduate	24	20
Total	120	100
<b>Length of Service</b>		

less than 10 years	78	65
10-20 years	31	25.8
20-30 years	8	6.7
30-40 years	3	2.5
Total	120	100