

## The consequence of workplace incivility among IT employees: Workplace stress or organizational citizenship behavior?

Narayanan Annalakshmi, Philip Roshni, Sanjay Abhirami, Pant Udita

Department of Psychology, Bharathiar University, India  
Corresponding author: [narayanan.annalakshmi@buc.edu.in](mailto:narayanan.annalakshmi@buc.edu.in)

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history

Received September 11, 2021  
Revised February 14, 2022  
Accepted February 17, 2022

#### Keywords

organization citizenship behavior;  
probabilistic orientation;  
workplace incivility;  
workplace stress.

### ABSTRACT

The impact of the work environment on employees has been well researched, with little focus on the pathways of such relationships. This study aimed to examine whether workplace incivility and personality predict workplace stress and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The role of John Henryism (JH), Probabilistic Orientation (PO), work self-efficacy, and resilience on workplace stress and OCB was also explored. The data were collected through a survey using self-report measures of perception of fair interpersonal treatment in the workplace, workplace incivility, work self-efficacy, JH, PO, workplace stress, and OCB from 206 ( $M=120$ ,  $F=86$ ) employees from the IT industry, aged 22 to 42 ( $M=30.47$ ,  $SD=5.60$ ). Multiple regression analyses revealed that workplace incivility (from supervisor and client) positively predicted workplace stress. At the same time, coworker incivility did not predict workplace stress. On the contrary, workplace incivility (supervisor, coworker, and clients) did not predict OCB significantly. JH and work self-efficacy positively predicted OCB, while PO negatively predicted OCB. This research provides new directions for future research that workplace stress is predicted by supervisor and client incivility, and OCB is not predicted by workplace incivility.

### Introduction

Workplace incivility refers to the exchange of what appears to be insignificant insensitive words and actions that typically go against the traditional norms of how individuals should conduct them in the workplace (C. Pearson & Porath, 2009). It is understood as a global problem that affects employees across multiple professions (Schilpzand et al., 2016). Those who observe incivility tend to have a negative reaction towards instigators, but their reactions towards the targets remain unchanged (Reich & Hershcovis, 2015). Various international studies (Cortina et al., 2001; C. Pearson & Porath, 2009; Torkelson et al., 2016) and Asian studies (D'Cruz & Rayner, 2012; Lim & Lee, 2011; Yeung & Griffin, 2008; Zhang et al., 2018) have reported that most of the employees experience a shade of incivility at their workplace. The present study will provide insight into how psychological factors and workplace incivility can affect workplace stress and OCB, all of which have implications for the employee as well as the organization.

Incivility may arise from different sources, including supervisors, coworkers, and even clients or customers. Supervisor incivility is the low-intensity aberrant behavior by supervisors to harm the subordinate with unclear intention to violate the standards for mutual respect prescribed in the workplace (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Coworker incivility denotes the uncivil behaviors instigated by individual coworkers, such as hurtful remarks, rude emails, shunning, and gossip (Reio, T. G. & Sanders-Reio, 2011). Customer incivility

indicates deviant behaviors of low-intensity performed by someone who is a client or customer that reflects unclear intent to hurt an employee and violates social norms of courtesy and mutual respect (Sliter et al., 2010). Incivility develops a toxic workplace which causes problems among the employees like depression (Lim & Lee, 2011), stress (Adams & Webster, 2013; Beattie & Griffin, 2014), poor memory recall (Porath & Erez, 2007), low affective trust (Cameron & Webster, 2011), intense aggressive behaviors (Blau & Andersson, 2005; C. M. Pearson et al., 2000), depletion in job performance (Blau & Andersson, 2005; Porath & Erez, 2007; Rhee et al., 2017; Schilpzand et al., 2016), and low job satisfaction (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim et al., 2008; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Wilson & Holmvall, 2013). Thus, incivility affects the overall well-being of the employees and the organization.

A previous study found that workplace incivility contributes to job stress (Shabir et al., 2014). John Henryism, for instance, refers to expending high effort in the context of prolonged exposure to stress as a form of coping (James et al., 1983). John Henryism (JH) refers to a strong behavioral predisposition to actively cope with psychosocial and environmental stressors (Angner et al., 2011; James, 1994; James et al., 1983). Researchers have found that African Americans may use JH to face psychosocial stressors (James, 1994; James et al., 1983). JH is related to various lifestyle risk factors for cancer (Van Loon et al., 2001). Moreover, men employed in lower rank professions who were high on JH had significantly higher risks of acute myocardial infarction, even when adjusted for age (Mujahid et al., 2017). Also, JH served as a protective factor against PTSD in intimate partner violence experienced by White women (Kramer et al., 2015). JH can influence how one perceives and responds to workplace stress.

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) refer to behaviors voluntarily performed by employees that contribute to an organization as a system to satisfy its functions systematically (Organ, 1988, 1990). Workplace incivility can result in employees perceiving that the social exchange relationship they shared with their organization is damaged, resulting in poor OCB (Taylor et al., 2011). Research on workplace aggression and abusive supervision also has found that higher workplace mistreatment results in less OCB in employees (Greitemeyer & Rudolph, 2003; Zellars et al., 2002). Merely attending to or observing workplace incivility events can result in employees engaging in less OCB (Porath & Erez, 2009). Incivility also negatively speculates individuals' OCB (Mao et al., 2019).

In a work context, self-efficacy is an essential antecedent of motivation. Studies show that individuals high on self-efficacy are more optimistic and determined about their ability to reach goals by applying their knowledge to specific tasks (Bandura, 1997; Chen et al., 2004). Self-efficacy and stress are two concepts that are connected. Individuals differ in how they perceive external demand or pressure, with some perceiving them as a threat while others perceiving them as a challenge. It is found that those who have high self-efficacy beliefs tend to perceive such external demands as a challenge instead of seeing them as threats (Chemers et al., 2001; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990). There is a significant negative correlation between job stress and self-efficacy among psychiatric nurses' (El-Azzab et al., 2019; Zaki, 2016). Self-efficacy controls the stress-strain association (Grau et al., 2000). Those with high job self-efficacy and increased accountability have an increased incidence of OCB (Royle et al., 2005), and general self-efficacy positively predicted citizenship behaviors in men (Beauregard, 2012).

Resilience refers to the dynamic capacity of the system to successfully adapt to conditions challenging its development, viability, and sustenance (Masten, 2013). It is indicated by positive outcomes despite being exposed to factors that increase one's vulnerability (Carlton et al., 2006; Tiët & Huizinga, 2002). Nowadays, there is an increasing interest in how employees in the business world manage the challenges they face in their workplace (Badran & Kafafy, 2008; Caverley, 2005). Few studies have reported a positive relationship between employee resilience and OCB (Paul et al., 2016; Sari & Wahyuni, 2019).

Resilience is a phenomenon that indicates positive adaptation in the face of challenges or adversity. However, it may also be possible that a resilient individual, in the context of workplace incivility, may respond to it by positive behavior like organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

Probabilistic orientation (PO) represents a personality orientation indicating a neutral locus of control (Annalakshmi, 2021; Narayanan, 1977). Several studies have shown that PO is associated with mental health, wellbeing, and resilience (Annalakshmi, 2004; Priya, 1997; Usha, 2005). Also, the relationship between PO and perceived self-efficacy is mediated by ego-resiliency (Annalakshmi, 2020). Personality factors like JH, self-efficacy, resilience, and PO can affect workplace stress and OCB. The rationale for the present study is that since individual factors and one's experience in the workplace can influence individual and organizational outcomes, it may be worthwhile to examine how certain personality factors and workplace incivility experiences influence outcomes like workplace stress and OCB.

Civility at the workplace helps create a favorable working environment for the employees and thus aids in forming a stable and productive organization. Workplace incivility grows up as a harmful habitat for employees to work, developing various physical and mental health problems. Hence, studying the factors associated with workplace incivility, workplace stress, and OCB deserves urgent attention, owing to its potential consequences on individual employees and the organization. The present research examines the relationship between workplace incivility and certain personality factors on the one hand and certain outcome variables like workplace stress and OCB on the other end. Specifically, the study examines the effect of personality factors (John Henryism, work self-efficacy, PO, and resilience) and workplace incivility on two outcome variables, namely, workplace stress and OCB. Specific to the current study, we operationalized work incivility in two ways: (a) the level of interpersonal fairness perceived by employees in their organization and (b) employee perception of unfair behavior or treatment by supervisors, coworkers, and customers. It is hypothesized that personality factors included in the study will positively predict OCB and negatively predict workplace stress. Further, it is also hypothesized that workplace incivility will positively predict workplace stress and negatively predict OCB. These hypotheses are tested in the study.

## Method

### *Research Design*

A quantitative research design was adopted for the study, and the data was collected from IT employees across India via an online survey. The researchers sought permission from the company officials to collect the data and obtained informed consent from the participants before giving the survey. Participation in this study was entirely voluntary, and the data was collected in an anonymized manner.

### *Participants*

The study was conducted on 206 IT professionals (120 men and 86 women) aged 22-42 years ( $M=30.47$ ,  $SD=5.60$ ). The mean number of years of work experience was 7.50 years ( $SD=4.24$ ), and the mean number of years worked in the organization there were serving during this study was 5.13 years ( $SD=3.36$ ). The participants were recruited from Kochi, Bangalore, Coimbatore, Chennai, Kolkata, and Delhi IT-based industries. Out of this, 74.3% of participants worked for Multi-National Companies (MNC), and 25.7% were from private organizations. A brief description of the sample is presented in [Table 1](#).

Table 1  
*Description of Participants*

No	Variable	Percentage
1	Marital Status	
	Single	49.0%
	Married	41.2%
	Divorced	6.4%
	Engaged	3.4%
2	Religion	
	Hindu	78.3%
	Christian	16.7%
	Muslim	2.0%
	Did not identify with any religion	3.0%
3	Community	
	FC/OC	61.2%
	BC	28.6%
	MBC	.5%
	SC	2.4%
	Did not disclose	7.3%
4	Place where most parts of their life were spent	
	City	39.9%
	Metro cities	33.8%
	Small towns	20.2%
	Rural area	6.1%
5	Education	
	Professional degree	39.8%
	Bachelor's degree	38.8%
	Master's degree	21.4%
6	Position	
	Manager	18.9%
	Senior analyst	36.9%
	Analyst	28.2%
	Data Operator	4.4%
	Web developers	5.3%
	Consultants	6.3%

Note: FC, BC, MBC, and SC are categories currently recognized by the Government of India as categories based on a historical hierarchy of caste in India to promote representation of the various equity groups in education and employment.

### ***Instruments***

Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment Scale (Donovan et al., 1998). This 18-items scale purports to measure employees' perceptions of the fairness of interpersonal treatment in their work environment. Specifically, the scale assesses an employee's perceptions of how their supervisors and coworkers in their organization treat them. The scale is composed of two subscales, supervisor and coworker treatment. The respondents are asked to rate each experience related to their workplace using a five-point rating scale, ranging from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*many times*). A sample item from the scale is "Employees are treated with respect." The Cronbach's alpha for the scale on the present sample is .75.

Workplace Incivility Scale (Cortina et al., 2001). This scale measures uncivil behaviors from supervisors, coworkers, and customers. The scale consists of 3 subscales: supervisor incivility (7 items), coworkers incivility (7 items), and customer incivility (5 items). The respondents are asked to rate each experience related to their workplace using a five-point rating scale, ranging from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*many times*). A sample item from the supervisor incivility subscale is "Your supervisor made demeaning or derogatory remarks about you." A sample item from coworker incivility is "Your coworker addressed you in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately." A sample item from customer incivility is "Your

customers/clients doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale on the present sample for the supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, and customer incivility are .85, .90, and .86, respectively. The Cronbach’s alpha for the overall scale is .93.

John Henryism Active Coping Scale (James, 1994). This scale is a 12-item scale that measures active coping. The scale intends to capture predisposition toward active, high-effort coping with psychosocial and environmental stressors. The respondents are asked to rate each experience related to their workplace using five response options, ranging from 0 (*completely false*) to four (*completely true*). A sample item from the scale is “When things don't go the way I want them to, that makes me work even harder.” The Cronbach's alpha for the scale on the present sample is .84.

Probabilistic Orientation Questionnaire (POQ) (Narayanan, 1977). The POQ consists of 30 items that purport to measure the phenomenological personality orientation of the respondent. A short form of POQ consisting of 14 items from the original scale was used in this study. The respondents are required to indicate their agreement with the items using a 'yes' or 'no' response. A sample item from this scale is “Event by themselves are just neutral ones; we only label them “good luck” or “odd-luck.” The Cronbach's alpha for the scale on the present sample is .68.

Workplace stress survey (American Institute of Stress, 1998). The scale consists of 10 items that assess the workplace stress of the subject. The respondents are asked to rate each item using a 5-point rating scale, ranging from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). A sample item from this scale is “Most of the time, I feel I have very little control over my life at work”. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale on the present sample is .76.

Work Self-Efficacy Scale (WSEC) (Avalлоне et al., 2007). The original scale consists of 10 items that assess perceptions regarding specific work domains. However, only the first nine items were selected for this project. Since item 6 and item 10 were pertaining to working with others and were overlapping, only item number 6 was included. The respondents are asked to rate each item using a 5-point rating scale, ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*very well*). A sample item from this scale is “Thinking of future work, how well can you finish assigned work.” The Cronbach's alpha for the scale on the present sample is .86.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C) (Fox et al., 2011). The scale aims to measure the frequency of citizenship behaviors at the workplace. Only ten items from the 20 items of the checklist that were most relevant to the culture and context of the sample in the present study were selected for use in this study. The respondents are asked to rate each item using a 5-point rating scale, ranging from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*always*). A sample item from the scale is “How often have you done this in your present job - Volunteered for extra work assignments.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale on the present sample is .87.

Bharathiar University Resilience Scale (BURS) (Annalakshmi, 2009). The 30-items scale purports to measure the resilience of an individual. Only ten items from the original 30 items scale were selected for this study. The respondents are asked to rate each item using a 5-point rating scale, ranging from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*very well*). A sample item from this scale includes “I always seek people and opportunity to overcome my difficulties and grow up”. The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale on the present sample is .75.

### **Procedure**

A link to the online survey was shared via Google Forms to potential participants working in IT companies, requesting them to share it with their contacts in the field. The researchers have also circulated a few questionnaires by visiting various IT companies.

### **Data Analysis**

IBM SPSS Statistics version 21 was used to do the data analysis. A one-way ANOVA, correlations, and hierarchical multiple regressions were used to analyze the data.

## Results

A one-way ANOVA was carried out to examine the gender differences with regard to study variables. It was found that males and females differed on interpersonal fair treatment [ $F(1,204) = 5.97, p < .05$ ], supervisor incivility [ $F(1,204) = 5.30, p < .05$ ], coworker incivility [ $F(1,204) = 12.56, p < .05$ ] and overall incivility [ $F(1,204) = 8.50, p < .05$ ] respectively. Males [ $M = 26.23, SD = 8.46$ ] were found to have higher scores on interpersonal fair treatment than females [ $M = 28.95, SD = 6.98$ ]. Females [ $M = 7.95, SD = 5.22$ ] were found to have higher scores on supervisor incivility than males [ $M = 6.14, SD = 5.81$ ]. Also, females [ $M = 7.58, SD = 5.64$ ] were found to have higher scores on coworker incivility than males [ $M = 4.79, SD = 5.52$ ]. In addition to that, females [ $M = 19.51, SD = 12.51$ ] have higher level of overall incivility than males [ $M = 14.06, SD = 13.74$ ]. In sum, males reported higher levels of interpersonal fair treatment than females. Females reported higher levels of supervisor incivility and coworker incivility than males. In addition to that, females have higher level of overall incivility than males.

No significant gender difference was found on clients incivility [ $F(1,204) = 2.01, p > .05$ ], John Henryism [ $F(1,204) = .06, p > .05$ ], probabilistic orientation [ $F(1,204) = .01, p > .05$ ], workplace stress [ $F(1,204) = .13, p > .05$ ], work self-efficacy [ $F(1,204) = .14, p > .05$ ], organizational citizenship behavior [ $F(1,204) = .00, p > .05$ ] and resilience [ $F(1,204) = 1.55, p > .05$ ] respectively. It is interesting to note that males and females did not differ on any of the personality factors or outcome variables included in this study. They also did not differ with regard to clients' incivility.

Two hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the unique contribution of independent variables on the dependent variables, viz., workplace stress and organizational citizenship behavior, respectively. Variables are entered as follows: gender, interpersonal fair treatment, supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, client incivility, John Henryism, probabilistic orientation, work self-efficacy, and resilience. The results are presented in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis to Predict Workplace Stress*

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B	$\beta$	B	$\beta$	B	$\beta$
Constant	19.21***		14.12***		17.4***	
Gender	-.33	-.030	-1.32	.10	-1.03	-.08
Interpersonal Fair Treatment			.09	.11	.07	.08
Supervisor Incivility			.28**	.25	.23*	.20
Coworker Incivility			-.02	-.02	.03	.03
Clients Incivility			.34**	.22	.28*	.19
John Henryism					-.03	-.04
Probabilistic Orientation					-.14	-.06
Work Self-efficacy					-.15	-.13
Resilience					.17	.14
$R^2$		.001		.21		.24
F		.130		10.86***		6.83***
$\Delta R^2$		.000		.21***		.03
$\Delta F$		.130		13.53***		1.63

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Table 3

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis to Predict Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	<i>B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	25.41***		30.2***		10.88*	
Gender	.02	.000	.62	.04	.53	.03
Interpersonal Fair Treatment			-.18*	-.19	-.05	-.06
Supervisor Incivility			.06	.05	.11	.08
Coworker Incivility			-.08	-.06	-.25	-.19
Clients Incivility			-.01	-.01	.17	.10
John Henryism					.19*	.19
Probabilistic Orientation					-.50**	-.17
Work Self-efficacy					.38**	.26
Resilience					.16	.09
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.001		.04		.25
<i>F</i>		.001		1.65		7.41***
$\Delta R^2$		.001		.04		.21***
$\Delta F$		.001		2.07		14.06***

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

Hierarchical multiple regression was run to determine if the addition of interpersonal fair treatment, supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, clients incivility, John Henryism, probabilistic orientation, work self-efficacy, and resilience improved the prediction of workplace stress over and above gender. A total of 24% variance in workplace stress was accounted for the predictor variables [ $\Delta R^2 = .03$ ,  $F(9,196) = 6.83$ ,  $p < .001$ ]. Model 2 variables (interpersonal fair treatment, supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, clients incivility) contribute an additional 21% of the variance in workplace stress [ $R^2 = .21$ ,  $F(5,200) = 10.86$ ,  $p < .001$ ]. Model 3 variables (gender, interpersonal fair treatment, supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, clients incivility, John Henryism, probabilistic orientation, work self-efficacy, and resilience) accounted additionally 3% of the variance on workplace stress [ $\Delta R^2 = .03$ ,  $F(9,196) = 6.83$ ,  $p < .001$ ].

Hierarchical multiple regression was run to determine if the addition of interpersonal fair treatment, supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, clients incivility, John Henryism, Probabilistic orientation, work self-efficacy, and resilience improved the prediction of organizational citizenship behavior over and above gender. A total of 25% variance in organizational citizenship behavior was accounted for the predictor variables [ $\Delta R^2 = .21$ ,  $F(9,196) = 7.41$ ,  $p < .001$ ]. Model 2 variables (interpersonal fair treatment, supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, clients incivility) contribute an additional 4% of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior [ $R^2 = .04$ ,  $F(5,200) = 1.65$ ,  $p < .001$ ]. Model 3 variables (gender, interpersonal fair treatment, supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, clients incivility, John Henryism, probabilistic orientation, work self-efficacy, resilience) accounted additionally 21% of the variance on organizational citizenship behavior [ $\Delta R^2 = .21$ ,  $F(9,196) = 7.41$ ,  $p < .001$ ].

## Discussion

Recent years have seen a surge in the number of employees in the IT industry. With a growing ratio of male and female employees, the preliminary analysis in the present study examined the gender differences in workplace incivility, workplace stress, and OCB. The results of the present study show that males perceived significantly higher interpersonal fair treatment but lower supervisor incivility, coworker incivility, and overall incivility than females. The results go in line with the findings of previous studies. Female employees report more

workplace incivility than males (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Cortina et al., 2001, 2013; Gabriel et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2021; Young et al., 2021), especially supervisors (Clay, 2013; Hu & Liu, 2017; Hurst et al., 2017) and coworker incivility. Whether this may be due to women being perceived as less threatening who may not retaliate and soft targets needs to be examined in further studies.

It is also found that supervisor incivility and client incivility positively predicted workplace stress. Supervisor incivility will trigger workplace stress in employees. Likewise, substandard behavior of clients (Sliter et al., 2010), unnecessary work overload, negligence of supervisors also can be a source of work-related stress (Lim et al., 2008). Further, supervisor incivility has a significant negative effect on the value congruence of the employees besides its influence on employees' stress and recovery (Jiménez et al., 2015). Workplace incivility is more pervasive than abusive behavior in high-context cultures (Liu et al., 2019). Thus, supervisor incivility could lead to a host of negative factors, including high workplace stress. The present study also found that client incivility was positively predicting workplace stress. Customer incivility was positively related to emotional job demands and burnout experienced by employees, and coworkers' incivility was also positively related to burnout (Kim & Qu, 2018). The employees are under pressure to meet the client's demands. Hence, client incivility can significantly influence employees' perceived workplace stress. Further, work self-efficacy negatively predicted workplace stress in the present study. This finding is in line with findings of previous studies (Dijk, 2009; Prahara & Indriani, 2019). Employees who are confident in executing the course of action to manage a wide range of work situations may experience less workplace stress.

Interestingly, workplace incivility did not predict OCB significantly in the present study. This finding is contradictory to previous research findings. Workplace incivility had significant indirect effects on OCB mediated through burnout (Liu et al., 2019) among employees from different types of industries. The findings related to workplace incivility and OCB in this present study could be attributed to the professional context of the participants who are from the IT industry. We hypothesized that workplace incivility would negatively predict OCB since those subjected to workplace incivility may try to give it back to others by not engaging in OCB. However, the present study's finding related to workplace incivility shows that it did not predict OCB. It is possible that in the IT industry, the employees who experience workplace incivility do not respond to it by engaging in incivil behavior avoiding OCB but may be responding to it in different ways. It is also possible that the relationship between workplace incivility and OCB is not a straightforward one; rather, it may be mediated by several potential factors like work engagement (Jawahar & Schreurs, 2018).

All internal factors are chosen in the present study, John Henryism (JH) and work self-efficacy significantly positively predicted OCB, while probabilistic orientation (PO) negatively predicted OCB. A negative relationship is shared between stress and OCB (Soo & Ali, 2017). Hence, individuals with higher active coping may adapt well and engage in OCB. Previous studies have also found self-efficacy positively influenced OCB (Anfajaya & Rahayu, 2020; Pratiwi & Nawangsari, 2021), and those engaging in approach coping demonstrate higher levels of OCB (Lilly & Virick, 2013). Self-efficacy has a positive effect on employee engagement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction, all of which can, in turn, positively influence OCB (Na-Nan et al., 2021).

In the present study, it was hypothesized that those high on PO would also report higher levels of OCB. However, it is intriguing to note that we found a negative relationship between PO and OCB. PO reflects a neutral locus of control (Narayanan et al., 1984), and the factors of PO may be more relevant to an individual coping than interpersonal relationships. Further studies may be needed to understand the dynamics involved in the relationship between PO and OCB.



There was no significant difference between males and females on the clients' incivility they reported. The study is on IT employees, where gender may not play a prominent role compared to other industries. It is plausible that clients' behavior towards employees in the IT sector may depend more upon the competency and work efficiency of the individual, with gender playing a minimal role. No gender difference is observed on JH and PO in the present study. It indicates that irrespective of gender, expending high levels of effort to cope with the stressors and accumulating physiological costs is the same for all employees. However, a study has found that gender moderated the relationship between behavioral disposition of JH and blood pressure (Dressler et al., 1998), and this contradicts the finding of the present study. Further research is required to understand how gender influences JH. PO reflects matured personality and a worldview that enables individuals to understand the big picture instead of getting lost in minute details. It reflects an outlook that helps individuals perceive all outcomes with equanimity. In this study, there is no gender difference in PO, both genders included in the study were given to PO at similar levels.

This study has no gender difference in workplace stress and work self-efficacy. It indicates that whatever be the stressor, the stress experienced by individuals depends on how they perceive the event and not on the gender of the person. Certain studies (Geller & Hobfoll, 1994) have reported that women and men experience similar levels of work stress. In contrast, some studies have found that women experience higher levels of work stress than men (Antoniou et al., 2006; Michael et al., 2009), while others report that men experience higher levels of stress than women (Loosemore & Waters, 2004; Rivera-Torres et al., 2013). However, the present study's findings did not show any gender difference in workplace stress. As the present study participants were from the IT industry, where mental competence matters more than physical competence, gender may not have a significant role in workplace stress. The same factor, i.e., the nature of work in the IT industry, may be used to explain the lack of gender difference in work self-efficacy.

It was also found from the present study that there is no gender difference in OCB. This finding implies that OCB depends on each individual's voluntary commitment towards an organization and is not predicted by gender. Previous studies have shown that altruism and civic virtue lead to work self-efficacy, ultimately leading to engagement in OCB (Shahidi et al., 2015), and perception of organizational justice also leads to OCB (Moorman, 1991). In addition, studies have indicated that organizational involvement, task orientation, and altruistic behavior are contributors to OCB (Turnipseed, 1996), and resilient individuals also show responsibility and ownership, which predicts OCB (Paul et al., 2016). Psychological factors rather than gender appear to influence OCB.

With regard to resilience, the present study found no significant gender difference. It may indicate that despite any gender, people can bounce back from a threatening or stressful situation. This finding is supported by other studies (Bezek, 2010). However, a few studies have identified that women reported lower resilience than men (Erdogan et al., 2015; Hirani et al., 2016). It is interesting to note that while men scored higher on resilience than women, the association was not significant when trauma type was controlled (Portnoy et al., 2018).

Though the present study has some significant findings, the study also has a few limitations that need to be duly acknowledged. First is the use of self-report measures for collecting data. There is a possibility for social desirability bias in the study, which cannot be ruled out entirely. Second, as it is an online survey, participants may try to provide answers to present themselves favorably. They may also feel bored or exhausted while doing the survey online on their own. Also, a qualitative study can provide better insight as it can provide more elaborated information to describe complex matters.

In practical terms, the study provides a sense of urgency for an empirical investigation of workplace incivility. It also highlights the importance of gender as a factor in organizational behavior-related studies. From the study, organizations can understand the importance of applying suitable OD interventions to create an effective work environment

and nurture positive personality characteristics of the employees. If the management exhibits fair interpersonal treatment, their employees will be committed to the organization's goals, which will lead them to display positive employee actions. Management needs to epitomize the behaviors they want their employees to take on. Higher active coping (JH) and work self-efficacy of the employees should be boosted by offering professional development opportunities and self-management training, which would help them cope effectively with situations that cause stress. However, more studies are required to understand the relationship dynamics between PO and OCB.

## Conclusion

Findings of the present study indicate that females are more vulnerable to workplace incivility than males. Females specifically faced higher supervisor and coworker incivility than males. Therefore, it is important to address these issues efficiently and empower women to ensure the sustainable development of society and remove gender inequality. However, workplace incivility did not predict OCB significantly. John Henryism and work self-efficacy positively predict OCB, while probabilistic orientation negatively predicts OCB.

## 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.698057>
- American Institute of Stress. (1998). *Workplace Stress Survey*. <https://www.stress.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/Workplace-Stress-Survey.pdf>
- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for Tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 452–471. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259136>
- Anfajaya, M. A., & Rahayu, A. (2020). The role of self-efficacy in organizational citizenship behavior. *Proceedings of the 5th ASEAN Conference on Psychology, Counselling, and Humanities*, 395, 108–111. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200120.024>
- Angner, E., Hullett, S., & Allison, J. J. (2011). "I'll die with the hammer in my hand": John Henryism as a predictor of happiness. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 32(3), 357–366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2011.01.002>
- Annalakshmi, N. (2004). Intervention for cancer patients through integral psychotherapy. In K. Joshi & M. Cornelisen (Eds.), *History of science, philosophy and culture in Indian civilization* (Vol. XI, pp. 444–460). Munshiram publishers.
- Annalakshmi, N. (2009). Bharathiar University Resilience Scale. In P. Harish & W. Ajay (Eds). *Research methodology tools and techniques* (pp. 105–121). Sree Publishers.
- Annalakshmi, N. (2020). Ego-resiliency, probabilistic orientation, and self-efficacy. In S. Subramanian., S. J. M. Raj., A. Velayudhan., & N. Annalakshmi (Eds.). *The recent trends in psychology* (pp. 17–31). Garuda Publisher.
- Annalakshmi, N. (2021). Probabilistic orientation and 'sailing through' therapy. *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 48(2), 100–111.
- Antoniou, A., Polychroni, F., & Vlachakis, A. (2006). Gender and age differences in occupational stress and professional burnout between primary and high-school teachers in Greece. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 682–690. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690213>
- Avallone, F., Pepe, S., Porcelli, R., & Farnese, M. L. (2007). Autoefficacia percepita nella

- ricerca del lavoro: scale di misura. *Isfol, Bisogni, valori e autoefficacia nella scelta del lavoro*. Roma: ISFOL, 133-142.
- Badran, M. A., & Kafafy, J. H. (2008). The effect of job redesign on job satisfaction, resilience, commitment, and flexibility: The case of an Egyptian public sector bank. *International Journal of Business Research*, 8(3), 27–41.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Beattie, L., & Griffin, B. (2014). Day-level fluctuations in stress and engagement in response to workplace incivility: A diary study. *Work and Stress*, 28(2), 124–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2014.898712>
- Beauregard, T. A. (2012). Perfectionism, self-efficacy and OCB: The moderating role of gender. *Personnel Review*, 41(5), 590–608. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481211249120>
- Bezek, E. (2010). *Gender differences in resilience in the emerging adulthood population*. [Master Thesis, Rochester Institute of Technology]. New York.
- Blau, G., & Andersson, L. (2005). Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(4), 595–614. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905x26822>
- Cameron, A., & Webster, J. (2011). Relational outcomes of multicommuting: Integrating incivility and social exchange perspectives. *Organization Science*, 22(3), 754–771. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0540>
- Carlton, B. S., Goebert, D. A., Miyamoto, R. H., Andrade, N. N., Hishinuma, E. S., Makini, G. K., Yuen, N. Y., Bell, C. K., McCubbin, L. D., Else, R., & Nishimura, S. T. (2006). Resilience, family adversity and wellbeing among Hawaiian and Non-Hawaiian adolescents. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 52(4), 291–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764006065136>
- Caverley, N. (2005). Civil service resilience and coping. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 18(5), 410–413.
- Chemers, M. M., Hu, L., & Garcia, B. F. (2001). Academic self-efficacy and first-year college student performance and adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 55–64. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.93.1.55>
- Chen, G., Goddard, T. G., & Casper, W. J. (2004). Examination of the relationships among general and work-specific self-evaluations, work-related control beliefs, and job attitudes. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(3), 349–370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00175.x>
- Clay, R. (2013). That's just rude. *American Psychological Association*, 44(10), 34.
- Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management*, 39(6), 1579–1605. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311418835>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64>
- D'Cruz, P., & Rayner, C. (2012). Bullying in the Indian workplace: A study of the ITES-BPO sector. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 34(4), 597–619. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831x12452672>
- Dijk, M. (2009, September). *Employee self-efficacy and job stress during organizational change: The mediating effect of risk perception*. [Master Thesis, University of Twente]. Utrecht.]. [https://essay.utwente.nl/60540/1/MSc\\_Dijk,\\_M.\\_van.pdf](https://essay.utwente.nl/60540/1/MSc_Dijk,_M._van.pdf)
- Donovan, M. A., Drasgow, F., & Munson, L. J. (1998). The perceptions of fair interpersonal

- treatment scale: Development and validation of a measure of interpersonal treatment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(5), 683–692. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.5.683>
- Dressler, W. W., Bindon, J. R., & Neggers, Y. H. (1998). John Henryism, gender, and arterial blood pressure in an African American community. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 60(5), 620–624. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006842-199809000-00019>
- El-Azzab, S. E. H. I., Hassan, I., & Alam, M. (2019). Work related stress, burnout and self-efficacy among psychiatric nurses. *International Journal of Novel Research in Healthcare and Nursing*, 62(2), 729–744. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.33523.48161>
- Erdogan, E., Ozdogan, O., & Erdogan, M. (2015). University students' resilience level: The effect of gender and faculty. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 1262–1267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.047>
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2011). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(1), 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02032.x>
- Gabriel, A. S., Butts, M. M., Yuan, Z., Rosen, R. L., & Sliter, M. T. (2018). Further understanding incivility in the workplace: The effects of gender, agency, and Communion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(4), 362–382. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000289>
- Geller, P. A., & Hobfoll, S. E. (1994). Gender differences in job stress, tedium, and social support in the workplace. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11(4), 555–572. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407594114004>
- Grau, R., Salanova, M., & Peiró, J. (2000). Moderator effects of self-efficacy on occupational stress. *Apuntes de Psicología*, 18(1), 57–75.
- Greitemeyer, T., & Rudolph, U. (2003). Help giving and aggression from an attributional perspective: Why and when we help or retaliate. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(5), 1069–1087. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01939.x>
- Hirani, S., Lasiuk, G., & Hegadoren, K. (2016). The intersection of gender and resilience. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 23(6–7), 455–467. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12313>
- Hu, L., & Liu, Y. (2017). Abuse for status: A social dominance perspective of abusive supervision. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(2), 328–337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.06.002>
- Hurst, J., Leberman, S., & Edwards, M. (2017). The career impacts of women managing women. *Australian Journal of Management*, 43(1), 132–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0312896217701981>
- James, S. A. (1994). John Henryism and the health of African-Americans. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 18(2), 163–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01379448>
- James, S. A., Hartnett, S. A., & Kalsbeek, W. D. (1983). John Henryism and blood pressure differences among Black men. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 6(3), 259–278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01315113>
- Jawahar, I., & Schreurs, B. (2018). Supervisor incivility and how it affects subordinates' performance: A matter of trust. *Personnel Review*, 47(3), 709–726. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-01-2017-0022>
- Jiménez, P., Dunkl, A., & Peißl, S. (2015). Workplace incivility and its effects on value congruence, recovery-stress-state and the intention to quit. *Psychology*, 06(14), 1930–1939. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2015.614190>

- Kim, H., & Qu, H. (2018). The effects of experienced customer incivility on employees' behavior toward customers and coworkers. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 43(1), 58–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348018764583>
- Kramer, N. M., Johnson, N. L., & Johnson, D. M. (2015). Is John Henryism a resilience factor in women experiencing intimate partner violence? *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 28(6), 601–616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2014.1000879>
- Lilly, J. D., & Virick, M. (2013). Coping mechanisms as antecedents of justice and organization citizenship behaviors: A multi-focal perspective of the social exchange relationship. *Current Psychology*, 32(2), 150–167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-013-9172-7>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.483>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021726>
- Liu, C.-E., Chen, Y., He, W., & Huang, J. (2019). Supervisor incivility and millennial employee creativity: A moderated mediation model. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 47(9), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.8365>
- Loosemore, M., & Waters, T. (2004). Gender differences in occupational stress among professionals in the construction industry. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 20(3), 126–132. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0742-597x\(2004\)20:3\(126\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597x(2004)20:3(126))
- Mao, C., Chang, C.-H., Johnson, R. E., & Sun, J. (2019). Incivility and employee performance, citizenship, and counterproductive behaviors: Implications of the social context. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 24(2), 213–227. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000108>
- Masten, A. S. (2013). Global perspectives on resilience in children and youth. *Child Development*, 85(1), 6–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12205>
- Michael, G., Anastasios, S., Helen, K., Catherine, K., & Christine, K. (2009). Gender differences in experiencing occupational stress: The role of age, education, and marital status. *Stress and Health*, 25(5), 397–404. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1248>
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845–855. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845>
- Mujahid, M. S., James, S. A., Kaplan, G. A., & Salonen, J. T. (2017). Socioeconomic position, John Henryism, and incidence of acute myocardial infarction in Finnish men. *Social Science & Medicine*, 173, 54–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.11.034>
- Na-Nan, K., Kanthong, S., & Joungrakul, J. (2021). An empirical study on the model of self-efficacy and organizational citizenship behavior transmitted through employee engagement, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in the Thai automobile parts manufacturing industry. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(3), 170–188. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7030170>
- Narayanan, S. (1977). *Probabilistic orientation and social change*. Paper presented at the Seminar on Rural Development, Department of Social Work, Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya Arts College, Coimbatore.

- Narayanan, S., Venkatapathy, R., & Govindarasu, S. (1984). Locus of Control and Probabilistic Orientation. *Psychological Studies*, 29(1), 68–70.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior - The good soldier syndrome* (1st ed.). Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 43–72). CT: JAI Press.
- Paul, H., Bamel, U. K., & Garg, P. (2016). Employee resilience and OCB: Mediating effects of organizational commitment. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, 41(4), 308–324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0256090916672765>
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(2), 123–137. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-2616\(00\)00019-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-2616(00)00019-x)
- Pearson, C., & Porath, C. (2009). *The cost of bad behavior: How incivility is damaging your business and what to do about it*. Penguin Books Ltd.
- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.33>
- Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2007). Does rudeness really matter? The effects of rudeness on task performance and helpfulness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1181–1197. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.20159919>
- Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2009). Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109(1), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.01.003>
- Portnoy, G. A., Relyea, M. R., Decker, S., Shamaskin-Garroway, A., Driscoll, M., Brandt, C. A., & Haskell, S. G. (2018). Understanding gender differences in resilience among veterans: Trauma history and social ecology. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 31(6), 845–855. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.22341>
- Prahara, S. A., & Indriani, N. (2019). Employees: Occupational self-efficacy and work stress. *Journal of Psychology and Instruction*, 3(3), 91–96.
- Pratiwi, L. A., & Nawangsari, L. C. (2021). Organizational citizenship behavior while mediating self-efficacy, servant leadership and organization culture on employee performance. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 6(1), 225–231. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.1.713>
- Priya, D. (1997). *A study of mental health among college students in relation to I-E locus of control and probabilistic orientation* [Master thesis, Bharathiar University]. Coimbatore.
- Reich, T. C., & Hershcovis, M. S. (2015). Observing workplace incivility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 203–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036464>
- Reio, T. G., J., & Sanders-Reio, J. (2011). Thinking about workplace engagement: Does supervisor and coworker incivility really matter? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 462–478. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422311430784>
- Rhee, S. Y., Hur, W. M., & Kim, M. (2017). The relationship of coworker incivility to job performance and the moderating role of self-efficacy and compassion at work: The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) approach. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(6), 711–726. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9469-2>
- Rivera-Torres, P., Araque-Padilla, R. A., & Montero-Simó, M. J. (2013). Job stress across

- gender: The importance of emotional and intellectual demands and social support in women. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 10(1), 375–389. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph10010375>
- Royle, M. T., Hall, A. T., Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewé, P. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2005). The interactive effects of accountability and job self-efficacy on organizational citizenship behavior and political behavior. *Organizational Analysis*, 13(1), 53–71.
- Sari, A. D. K., & Wahyuni, S. (2019). Effect of employee resilience against OCB: The role of organizational commitment mediation. *International Journal of Education and Social Science Research*, 2(6), 27–38.
- Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37, S57–S88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1976>
- Shabir, M., Abrar, M., Baig, S. A., & Javed, M. (2014). The contribution of workplace incivility and psychological capital toward job stress. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 4(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v4i2.5786>
- Shahidi, N., Shamsnia, S. A., & Baezat, S. (2015). Studying the relationship between self-efficacy and organizational citizenship behavior (case study: Islamic Azad University – Zone 1). *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 9(9), 1499–1503.
- Sliter, M., Jex, S., Wolford, K., & McInnerney, J. (2010). How rude! Emotional labor as a mediator between customer incivility and employee outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(4), 468–481. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020723>
- Smith, A. E., Hassan, S., Hatmaker, D. M., DeHart-Davis, L., & Humphrey, N. (2021). Gender, race, and experiences of workplace incivility in public organizations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 41(4), 674–699. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X20927760>
- Soo, H. S., & Ali, H. (2017). Can stressed employees perform organizational citizenship behavior? *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 5(2), 121–126. <https://doi.org/10.18178/joams.5.2.121-126>
- Taylor, S. G., Bedeian, A. G., & Kluemper, D. H. (2011). Linking workplace incivility to citizenship performance: The combined effects of affective commitment and conscientiousness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(7), 878–893. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.773>
- Tiêt, Q. Q., & Huizinga, D. (2002). Dimensions of the construct of resilience and adaptation among inner-city youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 17(3), 260–276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558402173003>
- Torkelson, E., Holm, K., Bäckström, M., & Schad, E. (2016). Factors contributing to the perpetration of workplace incivility: the importance of organizational aspects and experiencing incivility from others. *Work and Stress*, 30(2), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2016.1175524>
- Turnipseed, D. (1996). Organization citizenship behaviour: An examination of the influence of the workplace. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(2), 42–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437739610111222>
- Usha, P. G. (2005). *Probabilistic orientation and stress tolerance*. [Master dissertation, Bharathiar University]. Coimbatore.
- Van Loon, A. J. M., Tjihuis, M., Surtees, P. G., & Ormel, J. (2001). Personality and coping: Their relationship with lifestyle risk factors for cancer. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31(4), 541–553. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(00\)00158-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00158-6)
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032753>
- Yeung, A., & Griffin, B. (2008). Workplace incivility: Does matter in Asia? *People & Strategy*, 31(3), 14–19.
- Young, K. A., Hassan, S., & Hatmaker, D. M. (2021). Towards understanding workplace incivility: gender, ethical leadership and personal control. *Public Management Review*, 23(1), 31–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1665701>
- Zaki, R. A. (2016). Job stress and self- efficacy among psychiatric nursing working in mental health hospitals at Cairo , Egypt. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(20), 103–113.
- Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1068–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1068>
- Zhang, S., Ma, C., Meng, D., Shi, Y., Xie, F., Wang, J., Dong, X., Liu, J., Cang, S., & Sun, T. (2018). Impact of workplace incivility in hospitals on the work ability, career expectations and job performance of Chinese nurses: A cross-sectional survey. *BMJ Open*, 8(12). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-021874>