

Workplace Incivility and Workplace Ostracism in Healthcare Workers

Selma Söyük¹ Aysun Kocabey² İbrahim Gün¹
¹ Department of Health Management, Istanbul University-Cerrahpasa
² Bagcilar Hospital
Corresponding Author: Selma Söyük

ABSTRACT: *The aim of this study is to investigate the level of workplace incivility and workplace ostracism among healthcare workers working in a university hospital. The aim of this study is to examine the level of workplace incivility and workplace ostracism among healthcare workers working in a university hospital. In this study, it is aimed to investigate the relationship between these concepts, their socio-demographic characteristics and statistical differences. In the study, workplace incivility and workplace ostracism scales were used and a questionnaire was applied to 101 health workers. Spearman Correlation Analysis was used to investigate the relationship between scores of workplace incivility and workplace ostracism. According to the results of the analysis, it was concluded that there was a significant low level positive relationship ($r = 0,301$; $p < 0,01$).*

KEYWORDS: *Workplace Incivility, Workplace Ostracism, University Hospitals, Healthcare Workers*

Date of Submission: 20-08-2019

Date of acceptance: 02-09-2019

I. INTRODUCTION

Because of the reasons such as urgency, cannot be postponed and all kinds of results are reflected to the patient of the work in the health sector, the relationships between the employee behaviors and the individuals in the workplace become increasingly important. In recent years, situations such as non-compliance with the basic rules accepted by everyone in terms of social norms and work ethics have started to emerge frequently. These behaviors negatively affect the individual's work performance and psychological status. Workplace incivility and workplace ostracism should be considered as a problem that organizations need to manage and avoid. There are limited number of studies that examines workplace incivility and workplace ostracism. Therefore, this study has been conducted in healthcare workers.

Workplace Incivility

Individuals working in institutions are expected to abide by the rules of minimum respect in their communication with each other and in their behavior towards each other. These are the rules that must be followed within the framework of professional working life, regardless of the individual choice and liking of each other. Employees acting in violation of these rules of respect are defined as workplace incivility.

Workplace incivility, defined as a deviation from institutional norms, is a type of damaging behavior with significant negative effects on organization and individuals (Kumral & Çetin, 2016). Workplace roughness, which is a social work stressor, is defined as a low-intensity abnormal (deviated from normal rules) behavior that aims or does not aim to harm the target person, disrupts workplace rules and mutual respect (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

In the literature, the concept of workplace incivility has been associated with various expressions. These are; psychological terror, emotional abuse, harassment, bullying, mistreatment, victimization, incivility, health endangering leadership, work abuse, workplace trauma, employee abuse and mobbing. What distinguishes incivility from aggression is that the offender is not intentional when harming (Anderson & Pearson, 1999).

It is easy to say workplace discouragement is seen as a form of violence, maltreatment, and even an open conflict, which can be said to pave the way for negative employee behavior in the workplace (Martin, 2008). Another important point when defining the concept of workplace incivility is which behaviors will be evaluated in this context. Due to the differences in personal values and perceptions, behaviors described as rude may vary from person to person.

But what we need to consider here are discourses and behaviors that contradict existing social norms. Some of those; within the framework of the basic rules of respect, not to say good morning, good day, please, thank you, the opposite of interrupting, scolding, making condescending comments, ignoring, spreading rumors, talking loudly, intervention in private life, non-professional appeals in business life, leaving the work

environment scattered unauthorized use of belongings of others, not responding to emails, disregarding ideas, etc. (Pearson et al., 2000, Anderson & Pearson, 1999).

Workplace incivility is increasing all over the world and studies show this result (Torkelsan et al., 2016). There are 3 important features of workplace incivility. These; frequency, density and uncertainty. In terms of frequency; workplace incivility, over time, many events occur. In terms of density, workplace incivility is a low-intensity behavior (Leiter, 2013). A low intensity behavior does not mean that it is harmless or insignificant. It is estimated that 98% of employees are exposed to workplace incivility and 50% experience this behavior at least once a week (Porath & Pearsan, 2013).

Workplace incivility reduces organizational performance by negatively changing employee attitudes and behaviors towards their colleagues and organization. Workplace incivility will negatively affect organizational performance by causing a decrease in the efforts of employees in terms of their roles and obligations (Söyük, 2018). Workplace incivility negatively affects employee welfare. Serious workplace incivility can cause further psychological consequences such as stress, depression, and suicide in an employee (Cortina et al., 2013). In the advanced stages, workplace incivility undermines the professional identity of the employees, decreases the self-confidence of individuals and their professional competencies and becomes increasingly passive (Paulin & Griffi, 2016). Although employees feel incivility and they are uncomfortable, they may experience emotional exhaustion by continuing their work and then have the purpose of quitting. In addition, workplace incivility causes social slacking (Kanten, 2014).

When the researches are examined, it can be said that workplace incivility decreases job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational trust, perception of organizational justice, organizational identification and decreases intention to quit, cynicism and professional burnout. The tense and restless environment created by workplace incivility poisoning the organizational climate disrupts the working harmony of others. (Miner et al., 2012, Miner & Cortina, 2016).

Managers who do not pay attention to workplace incivility do not realize how much time they spend to solve conflicts within the organization due to such behaviors. If they ignore these conflicts, workplace incivility will deform the corporate culture and cause damage to the institution (Pearson & Porath, 2005).

Most of the literature studies on this subject have been made in the field of health and incivility is seen to increase with each passing day. As a result of the literature analysis, a significant and positive relationship was found between incivility behaviors in the workplace and medical errors in nurses. In another study, it was determined that nurses perceived incivility behaviors in the workplace and caused insufficiency in patient safety and the quality of care they provided (Armstrong, 2017, Ward-Smith, et al., 2018).

Workplace incivility is a phenomenon that needs to be emphasized and further work done due to significant negative effects. One of the highest achievements of an organization; is to increase personal and organizational production with mutual respect by constructing an environment in which employees feel themselves belonging to the organization and feeling happy.

Workplace Ostracism

The concept of ostracism is defined as ignoring and ignoring people in their environment. Ostracism can be seen in all environments as well as in workplaces. This situation can harm the workplace as well as the individual (Çelik&Koşar, 2015). Because of the need to be part of a group, ostracism is sad and not pleasant. Examples of ostracized behavior in the workplace include: limitation of necessary knowledge, avoidance of speech and eye contact, and indifference (Wu, Wei & Hui, 2011, p.29).

Workplace Ostracism varies by individual. Ostracism perceived by one may not be perceived as ostracism by another. (Zhao et al., 2013, p.219). Ostracism includes other situations as well as lack of verbal communication. It can include keeping a person quiet, treating him as if he is completely invisible. It also includes rejecting the person by sending them to another place, or secretly blocking their physical presence in the organization. Workplace Ostracism is defined as disregard or exclusion by one or more employees (Ferris et al., 2017).

Individuals generally make social ties with people closer to them, and may be less communicative with relatively less similar organization members, although there is no clear intention in ostracism, but ostracism may be due to the fact that employees are very different characters from each other. When organizational hierarchy is vertical rather than horizontal; a larger number of members of the organization may rely on their official power or authority to control or dominate the behavior of other organization members. In unintentional ostracism, organizational stress and organizational diversity are important factors (Robinson, O'Reilly and Wang, 2013).

Organizational ostracism reduces the opportunities for social interaction necessary to enable people to meet their psychological needs. Furthermore, organizational ostracism potentially affects the physical and mental health of employees (Heaphy& Dutton, 2008). Especially recently, teamwork has increased significantly in organizations and is desirable. This means that employees need more frequent social interaction and

communication with their colleagues. Organizational ostracism is a very effective variable in explaining the reduction of aids in the workplace (Wu et al., 2012).

Organizational ostracism, which is a particular form of workplace incivility, involves discourteous behavior such as being avoided in the workplace, closing conversations, or leaving a salute unanswered in the workplace. At the same time, ostracism and incivility are similar in terms of the ambiguity of the purpose of destroying the target or not. Despite their similarities, there are significant conceptual differences between incivility and ostracism. The most important of the differences; while ostracism destroys social relations, incivility continues social relations (Ferris et al., 2017).

II. METHODOLOGY

Survey method was used in the research. The questionnaire used was composed of three parts. In the first part, sociodemographic characteristics were questioned. In the second and third sections, workplace incivility and organizational ostracism scales were used. Cortina et al. was developed by 7-item 'Workplace Incivility' scale was used. This scale was translated into Turkish by Polatçı and Özçalık. In order to determine the organizational psychological exclusion levels of employees, Ferris et al. The 13-item one-dimensional "Workplace Ostracism" scale was developed. This scale was translated into Turkish by Keklik et al. The reliability analyzes of the scales used in our study were made and the Cronbach's Alpha value of the organizational discouragement scale was 0.91, and the Cronbach's Alpha value of the organizational exclusion scale was 0.92. Therefore, it was concluded that the scales were reliable.

A study of healthcare workers on workplace incivility and organizational ostracism has not been found in the literature. Therefore, it is thought that this study will make important contributions to the literature as it is one of the first studies in the field of health management.

III. FINDINGS

	n	%
Department		
Medicalservices	54	53,5
Surgical Services	6	5,9
Radiology/Laboratory	4	4,0
Intensivecareandetc	6	5,9
Pediatry	4	4,0
Orthopedics	3	3,0
Gynecology	2	2,0
Other	22	21,8
Operation		
Continuouslyday	30	29,7
DayandNight	70	69,3
ContinuouslyNight	1	1,0
Job		
Physician	27	26,7
Nurse/Midwife	19	18,8
Technician/technician	8	7,9
Secretary	17	16,8
Labworker	6	5,9
Officer	12	11,9
Other	12	11,9
Tenure of Office		
Under 1 Year	16	15,8
1-5 Year	25	24,8
6-10 Year	38	37,6
11-15 Year	13	12,9
16YearsandMore	9	8,9
Experince		
Under 1 Year	11	10,9
1-5 Year	26	25,7
6-10 Year	27	26,7
11-15 Year	20	19,8
16YearsandMore	17	16,8

Age		
Under 25 Year	7	6,9
26 -30	33	32,7
31 -40	30	29,7
41andMore	31	30,7
MaritalStatus		
Married	54	53,5
Single	47	46,5
Education		
HealthProficiency High School	33	32,7
Pregraduated	26	25,7
University	20	19,8
Specialist in medicine	16	15,8
Master Degree	6	5,9
Jobsatisfaction		
Yes	77	76,2
No	24	23,8
Gender		
Female	51	50,5
Male	50	49,5

Table 1: Sociodemographic features

When the demographic characteristics of the participants were examined (Table 1); most of them work in medical services department (53.5%), approximately 70 percent work day and night, 26.7% physician, 18.8% midwife / nurse, 6-10 years compared to others majority (37.6%). When the professional experience of the employees is examined, it is seen that the number of employees is more than 6-10 years (26.7%). In addition, it was found that the participants were between the ages of 26-30 (32.7%), 53.5% were married, 50.5% were women, and 32.7% were high school graduates. 76.2% of the participants stated that they were satisfied with their work.

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Workplace Incivility	1,90	,91
Organizational Ostracism	1,65	,74

Table 2: Mean scores of scales

When the answers of the participants were examined, the average score of workplace incivility was 1.90 and the average score of Organizational ostracism was 1.65.

Within the scope of the study, Kruskal Wallis and Man Witney U test were used to determine whether there is a difference between demographic data and organizational exclusion and organizational incivility. As a result, statistically significant differences were found with the variables of unit, professional experience, marital status, being satisfied with the job, doing the job lovingly with workplace incivility. There was no significant difference between organizational ostracism and demographic characteristics.

Scale	Groups	N	Mean Rank	Chi-square	sd	p
Workplace Incivility	Medical services	54	40.56	17.31	7	0.01
	Surgical Services	6	67.75			
	Radiology/Laboratory	4	47.00			
	Intensive care and etc	6	70.33			
	Pediatriy	4	55.38			
	Orthopedics	3	62.50			
	Gynecology	2	55.50			
	Other	22	64.75			

Table 3: Differences analysis by units

A statistically significant difference was found between the scores obtained from the workplace incivility scale and the units ($p < 0.05$). The group with the lowest average rank belongs to the employees in the medical services unit. Intensive care and etc. unit workers more exposed to workplace incivility than others.

Scale	Groups	N	Mean Rank	Chi-square	sd	p
Workplace Incivility	Under 1 Year	11	63.82	11.61	4	0.02
	1-5 Years	26	36.48			
	6-10 Years	27	50.30			
	10-16 Years	20	51.73			
	16 Years and More	16	62.94			

Table 4: Difference analysis according to experience

A statistically significant difference was found between the mean score of workplace incivility and experience ($p < 0.05$). The average rank of those who have experience of 1-5 years is lower than other groups. In other words, there is less perception of incivility. The highest perception of incivility belongs to employees that works over 16 years (Table 4).

Scale	Groups	N	Mean Rank	U	Z	p
Workplace Incivility	Yes	77	44.34	411	-3.92	0.00
	No	23	71.13			

Table 5: Differences analysis according to satisfaction

A significant difference was found between job satisfaction and workplace incivility mean scores ($p < 0.01$). The average scores of those who are satisfied with the work are lower.

Scale	Groups	N	Mean Rank	U	Z	p
Workplace Incivility	Evet	68	45.81	769	-2.58	0.01
	Hayır	33	61.70			

Table 6: Differences analysis according to choosing job willingly

There was a statistically significant difference between workplace incivility and choosing job willingly variable ($p < 0.05$). It was observed that the average mean scores of those who willingly chose their profession were lower.

In our study, the relationship between workplace incivility and scores obtained from organizational ostracism scales was examined with Spearman Correlation Analysis. According to the results of the analysis, it was concluded that there was a significant low level positive relationship ($r = 0,301$; $p < 0,01$).

		Workplace Incivility	
Organizational Ostracism	r		,301**
	p		.002

Table 7: Relationship between organizational ostracism and workplace incivility

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Most of the health personnel who participated in the study worked in the medical services department (53.5%), approximately 70 percent were working day and night, 26.7% were physicians, 18.8% were midwives / nurses, It was found that between the ages of 26-30 (32.7%), 53.5% were married and 32.7% were high school graduates. 76.2% of the participants were satisfied with their work.

The average workplace incivility of the employees was 1,90; the average of organizational ostracism was found to be 1.65. According to this study in which we determined the organizational incivility and

organizational ostracism status of university hospital workers, it was concluded that there was a positive low level significant relationship between workplace incivility and organizational ostracism ($r = 0,301$; $p < 0,01$).

There are limited number of studies directly investigating the relationship between workplace incivility and organizational ostracism. It has been observed that studies related to workplace incivility generally focuses on job satisfaction, intention to quit and psychological problems.

In their study in 2018, Abubakar et al. Evaluated the indirect effect of ostracism in the workplace and incivility in the workplace with the negative feelings of intention to sabotage. incivility in the workplace shows that it is positively and significantly associated with negative emotions. In the same study, they found that organizational incivility causes negative emotions and behaviors that harm the institution rather than exclusion.

Kumral and Çetin (2018) found that organizational incivility causes organizational silence in their study in nurses. In the same study, it was stated that organizational incivility plays a role in silence.

Miner and Cortina (2016) showed a positive relationship between incivility towards women and perception of injustice among individuals. Halis and Demirel (2016) found that there is a negative relationship between the dimensions of social support and organizational incivility and that social support affects organizational incivility.

Mahfouz et al. (2017) found a negative relationship between organizational ostracism and intention to quit. Çelik and Koşar found a negative relationship between organizational culture and ostracism. It can be said that individuals who adopt organizational culture, support organizational activities, and view the organizational structure positively are less exposed to ostracism in the workplace. Workplace incivility refers to a climate of unorganized organization and is considered as an undesirable problem to be solved in organizations. Because the incivility in the working environment, the spread of attitudes and behaviors and the abstraction of the employee will affect the performance of individuals negatively and this will decrease the productivity of the organization.

In the study conducted by Wu, Yim, Kwan and Zhang (2012), a positive relationship was found between ostracism and work stress in the workplace, emotional exhaustion and work depression. As can be seen, these two concepts, which can be neglected from time to time in the business environment, can cause many results in organizations and should be included in the subject of further research.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abubakar, A., Yazdian, T. and Behraves, E. (2018). A riposte to ostracism and tolerance to workplace incivility: a generational perspective. *Personnel Review*, 47(2):441-457.
- [2]. Andersson, L. M. and Pearson, C.M. (1999). Tit for Tat? The Spiraling Effect of Incivility in the Workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3):452-471.
- [3]. Armstrong, N. E. (2017). A quality improvement project measuring the effect of an evidence-based civility training program on nursing workplace incivility in a rural hospital using quantitative methods. *Online Journal of Rural Nursing and Health Care*, 17(1):100-137.
- [4]. Çelik, C., and Koşar, A. (2014). Analyzing the relationship between organizational culture and workplace ostracism. *Journal of Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences*, 24(2):47-62.
- [5]. Cortina, L.M., Dana Kabat, F., Leskinen, E.A., Huerta, M. and Magley, W.J. (2013). Selective in-civility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management*, 39(6):1579-1605.
- [6]. Ferris, D. L., Chen, M., & Lim, S. (2017). Comparing and contrasting workplace ostracism and incivility. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4:315-338.
- [7]. Halis, M, Demirel, Y. (2016). The impact of social support on organizational ostracism. *The Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences of Kastamonu University*, 11(1):318-335.
- [8]. Heaphy, E. D., & Dutton, J. E. (2008). "Positive social interactions and the human body at work: Linking organizations and physiology. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1):137-162.
- [9]. Kanten, M. (2014). The effect of workplace incivility on social loafing behavior and turnover intention: mediating role of emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Aksaray University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 6(1):11-26.
- [10]. Keklik, B., Saygın, T., and Oral Kara, N. (2013). The history of organizational ostracism in OYP people. *1st Organizational Behavior Congress, Sakarya University*, 15-16 November 2013; 351-355.
- [11]. Kumral, T., Çetin, C. (2016). A literature review on workplace incivility, *Kafkas University Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences*, 1:153-171.
- [12]. Kumral, T., Çetin, C. (2018). The mediating role of workplace ostracism on workplace incivility and organizational silence relationship, *5th International Conference on Business and Economics Studies New York, USA - 10-12, August 2018*.
- [13]. Leiter, M. (2013). *Analyzing and theorizing the dynamics of the workplace incivility crisis*. New York: Springer Science.
- [14]. Mahfooz, Z., Arshad, A., Nisar, Q. A., Ikram, M., and 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.
- [15]. Martin, W. F. (2008). Is your hospital safe? disruptive behavior and workplace bullying. *Hospital Topics*, 86(3):21-28
- [16]. Miner, K.N. and Cortina L.M. (2016). Observed workplace incivility toward women, perceptions of interpersonal injustice, and observer occupational well-being: differential effects for gender of the observer. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(1):1-12.
- [17]. Miner, K.N., Settles, I.H., Pratt-Hyatt, J.S., and Brady, C.C. (2012). Experiencing incivility in organizations: the buffering effects of emotional and organizational support. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(12):340-372.
- [18]. Paulin, D. and Griffi, B. (2016). The relationships between incivility, team climate for incivility and job-related employee well-being: a multilevel analysis. *Work & Stress*, 30(2):132-151.
- [19]. Pearson, C. and Porath, C.L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: no time for "nice"? Think again. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1):7-18.

- [20]. Pearson, C., Andersson, L.M. and Porath, C.L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(2):123-137.
- [21]. Polatçı, S., and Özçalık, F. (2013). The effects of structural and psychological empowerment on workplace incivility and burnout. *Journal of Business Science*, 1(1):17-34.
- [22]. Porath, C.L and Pearson, C.M. (2013). The price of incivility. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(1-2): 115-121.
- [23]. Robinson, S. L., O'Reilly, J., and Wang, W. (2013). Invisible at work: An integrated model of workplace ostracism. *Journal of Management*, 39(1):203-231.
- [24]. Torkelsan, E., Holm, K. and Backstrom, M. (2016). Workplace incivility in a Swedish context. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 6(2):3-22.
- [25]. Ward-Smith, P., Hawks, J.H., Quallich, S.A. and Provance, J. (2018). Workplace incivility: perceptions of urologic nurses". *Urologic Nursing*, 38(1):20-26.
- [26]. Wu, L. Z., Yim, F. H. K., Kwan, H. K., and Zhang, X. (2012). Coping with workplace ostracism: The roles of ingratiation and political skill in employee psychological distress. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(1):178-199.
- [27]. Wu, L., Wei, L. and Hui, C. (2011). Dispositional antecedents and consequences of workplace ostracism: an empirical examination". *Higher Education Press*, 5(1):23-44.
- [28]. Zhao, H., Peng, Z. and Sheard, G. (2013). "Workplace ostracism and hospitality employees' counterproductive work behaviors: the joint moderating effects of proactive personality and political skill". *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33: 219-227.

Selma Söyük" Workplace Incivility and Workplace Ostracism in Healthcare Workers"
International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention(IJHSSI), vol. 08, no. 8, 2019,
pp. 48-54