Work Engagement as A Mechanism Linking Workplace Incivility and Turnover Intention: A Multi Group Analysis

Wisit Rittiboonchai[1], Surasaek Phonghanyudh[2], Krisada Chienwattanasook[3], Kittisak Jermsittiparsert[4]

[1] Faculty of Management Sciences, Nakhon Pathom Rajabhat University, Thailand

[2] Dual Master Program (M.P.A., M.B.A.). Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand

[3] Faculty of Business Administration, Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Thailand

[4] College of Innovative Business and Accountancy, Dhurakij Pundit University, Thailand

[1] wisitson@webmail.npru.ac.th, [2] surasaek_p@yahoo.com, [3] krisada_c@rmutt.ac.th, [4] kittisak.jer@dpu.ac.th

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to investigate the effect of workplace incivility (WPI) on employee's turnover intention (TI) with the mediating effect of work engagement (WE) in the workplace in Thailand. Furthermore, this research also uncovers the intensity differences in these associations by gender. A total of 631 participants from different Thailand corporate sectors completed a quantitative survey on their perception of the effect of WPI, WE and TI. Partial least squares-multi group analysis (PLS-MGA) technique was used to analyze the data. The findings indicate that WPI negatively impact on WE and positively impact on TI and their strength varies by gender. Therein, WE has a significant and negative influence on TI and act as a mediator in the relationship between WPI and TI.

Introduction

The incivility at the workplace has been the subject of interest for many scholars and practitioners over the last two decades. Specific research studies were carried out in order to define and explain the causes and implications for individuals and organizations. Extensive research in America and Europe over the course of 1999 to 2009 shows that WPI has become a major problem (Lewis & Malecha, 2011). Although most researches in Europe and America revealed that employees in various sectors and industries accept a growing trend of uncivil behaviour. This situation demonstrates that incivility in the workplace is a global issue which needs critical response from professionals in human resources and organizations (Reio Jr, Ghosh, & Bang, 2013).

In the United States, most early studies were done on WPI, which was later developed in Canada (Andrusyszyn, Smith, & Spence Laschinger, 2010) and Australia (Cant et al., 2017; Loi & Loh, 2018). Several extensive studies have been conducted in Asia, e.g. China (Guo et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2018), India (Lund-Thomsen, Schuster, Kazmi, Sharma, & Singh, 2016), Korea (Jang & Son, 2017), Singapore (van Niekerk, Torres, & Orlowski, 2017) and the Philippines (Bolluch, 2017). Almost every research finds various forms of WPI and in different regions there are inconsistencies in norms and values of politeness. It does not make incivility an appropriate general type acceptable to all researchers, and therefore the WPI issue leaves a void to be addressed in a cross-cultural study. In Asian context, 77 percent of participants surveyed by different firms in Hong Kong, china, japan, India, Korea and Singapore reported being insulted at least once a year by their superiors and colleagues at least once a year (Griffin & Yeung, 2008). In

many countries in several research projects, the attention of scholars and professionals to WPI is reflected. It involves nearly all kinds of tasks, demonstrating that incivility at the workplace is still significantly increased and very troubling. Current research involves several efforts on WPI, WE and TI literature. Firstly, the proposed model tested the interrelationships between WPI and WE and TI that have been tested individually, for example, the association among WPI and WE (Griffin & Beattie, 2014) as well as intention to leave the organization (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016). Secondly, WE has a mediating role in different studies in the relationship between antecedents and TI (Gupta & Agarwal, 2018), but none of them has examined the mediation of WE in the relationship between WPI and TI. This research therefore seeks to expand earlier studies by investigating WE role as a mediating variable in the relationship between WPI and TI. Thirdly, this study developed a multi-group analysis model, taking gender into account (Hendryadi & Zannati, 2018). Gender has ineffectively affected perceptions of the WPI. This research therefore narrows this gap.

The main purpose of this research is to study the link between WPI, WE and TI. In particular, the current research looked at the direct as well as indirect relationships between WPI and TI with WE as a mediator. Another objective of this research is to broaden the field of WPI, WE and TI, as well as research on gender equality and gender diversity in the Thailand working environment. This literature provides management and organisations, particularly in Thailand, with better insights into how interactions and communication patterns can be managed more effectively. The next section will focus on review of literature and hypotheses development, methods, such as procedure for sampling, research design, measures and research analysis

technique. The results and discussions are discussed in the next section. A knowledge of this form of uncivil behaviour may help organizations to develop rules and policies on interactions and patterns of communication to develop an efficient workplace. This research ends with the theoretical and practical impact of the significance and results on Thailand organisations and their relevance.

Literature Review and Development of Hypotheses

Conceptualization of Workplace Incivility

The most significant effect of empirical research on WPI is unquestionably influenced by (Pearson & Andersson, 1999, p. 457) who define WPI as "low-intensity behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, which violates workplace norms for mutual respect; rude, showing a lack of respect towards others". Pearson and Andersson (1999) developed the spiral theory to describe how the workplace incivility has chain effects. The spiral concept begins with an incivility behaviour expressed by individuals as a non-civilized behaviour that violates standards or is an unacceptable type of behavior for survivors (Pearson & Andersson, 1999). This will probably lead to incivility in response to the uncomfortable experiences. As the cycle continues, either party or parties begin to strike an impulse due to embarrassment, anger and humiliation, that can stimulate extreme deliberate behaviour, including aggression and violence. The incivil spiral will continue until there is a mutual reconciliation arrangement among the two parties or until one party steps down. The incivility at the workplace is a deviant, verbal and nonverbal behavior, like impatience, harsh words, condescension or disrespect for other people's dignity. Consequently, people who are victimized tend to decline their engagement over time (Kane, Montgomery, & Vance, 2004).

Moreover, incivil behaviour at work is part of the day-to-day actions of employees working in the organisation. Often the victim does not know that he or she has committed such behaviour, for example, underestimating co-workers (do not say thank you for the basic help he or she has provided). The distinctive feature of incivility is that the intent often is not obvious and does not bias others. While individuals often act severely in order to insult or denounce others, sometimes their rude behaviour causes fatigue, neglect or indifference to local social standards. As a result, either the offender, the bystander or the victim is unclear about the intention (Pearson & Andersson, 1999).

Relationship between Workplace Incivility and Work Engagement

WE in the field of WPI is comparatively less studied (Griffin & Beattie, 2014). Kahn (1990) define engagement as, "the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances" (p.694). In addition, Kahn (1990) further defined engagement as "personal engagement is the immediate expression and employment of an individual self-desire to promote connection and task behaviors with work

and to others' and to show active personal presence (emotional, cognitive and physical) with full role performance" (p. 700). Schaufali, Salanova, González-Romá, and Bakker (2002) further defined WE as "a positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption". Workplace incivility reflects normative behaviour that goes against civility norms. It is disrespectful and rude and shows a lack of respect for other people (Magley, Cortina, Williams, & Langhout, 2001). A major research project amongst safety staff employed in Australia was carried out by Griffin and Beattie (2014). The outcomes have shown that security staff have high stress levels in their incivility, but strong support from the bosses has reduced this impact. Furthermore, the negative impact of WPI on WE is significant only for people with low self-evaluation. Research by Reio Jr and Sanders-Reio (2011) involving American computer company's workers and research by Griffin and Yeung (2008) in Asia also shows empirical support for incivility ties in the workplace. Therefore, when WE can be improved through work experiences, including encouragement from colleagues and superiors, employees' perceptions of their environment and low work engagement will be influenced by WPI as a type that appears to be demeaning, hostile treatment by colleagues and leaders. The hypothesis proposed is therefore based on the empirical evidence and theoretical explanation above:

H1. WPI has a negative and significant effect on WE.

Relationship between WPI and TI

The turnover of employees is referred to as when employee's voluntary chooses to leave their respective organization (Duffy, Shaw, Johnson, & Lockhart, 2005). The decision of the employee to leave the organisation for individuals and organization is extremely costly (Mitchell, Lee, Sablynski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004; Saengchai, Duangkaew, & Jermsittiparsert, 2019; Saengchai, S., Thaiprayoon, K., & Jermsittiparsert, K. (2019). Three fundamental factors, including the cost of recruitment, cost of training and cost of replacement, are generally taken into account when estimating employee's turnover costs (Jermsittiparsert & Urairak, 2019; Cascio, 2000). Scholars showed that WPI has negative impact on job satisfaction, productivity and has positive impact on tardiness, absenteeism and resign (Cosby & Rahim, 2016). Different researches provide valuable information on the impact of workplace incivility on turnover intention (Cosby & Rahim, 2016; Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016). Cosby and Rahim (2016) argued that WPI has a significant impact on intention to resign from their research on students of business administration in USA. Lund-Thomsen et al. (2016) noticed that incivility at the workplace would increase their intention to resign. Hendryadi and Zannati (2018) studies provide empirical strong evidence concerning the relationship between WPI and TI in the context of Thailand. Moreover, both studies have shown that the relationship between WPI and TI is significant. In general, and in many business sectors, disrespectful behaviour often occurs and organisations fail to understand its negative impacts, and many managers are unwilling to address this. Based on their experiences as victims of WPI, they are often less engaged

at work, less work time, and less work performance (Cosby & Rahim, 2016). In other words, the higher the perception of a person's workplace incivility, the higher the desire to resign or seek a new job. The second hypothesis is therefore proposed on the basis of the above-mentioned studies:

H2. WPI has a positive and significant impact on TI.

The Relationship between WE and TI

The Job Demand Resource Model (J D-R Model) provides two main factors contributing to WE: job resources (JR) and personal resources (PR) and job demand (JD). Job resources, including performance feedback, social support (from superiors and colleagues), autonomy, skills variation and learning opportunities have important consequences for employee WE (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). This means that employees with more JR (e.g. superiors and colleagues who support them) tend to have a greater sense of attachment. Secondly, PR are significant resilience-related self-assessments, referring to employee personal views regarding environmental control (Hobfoll, 2002). In addition, PR are available in the form of optimism, self-esteem, self-efficacy, resilience etc. However, JD are referred to as working aspects requiring constant mental and physical efforts and thus related to some psychological or physiological costs (Schaufeli, Hakanen, & Ahola, 2008). In the job demand resource model, JD act as a moderator in the link between JR and PR and WE. JD may be in the form of physical, intellectual and emotional demands. Several studies recently found that WE is negatively associated with intention to leave the organization (Khosa, Ishaq, & Kamil, 2020a, 2020b; Planta, De Simone, & Cicotto, 2018; Stinglhamber, Caesens, & Marmier, 2016). Supervisors and employees' data from 28 hotels across North America (Cosby & Rahim, 2016) show that employees at supervisory level are considerably higher in terms of WE, while employees at line level are lower in terms of TI.

Besides having a direct relationship with TI, WE act as a mediator in various studies (Datta, Agarwal, Blake-Beard, & Bhargava, 2012; Gupta & Agarwal, 2018; Shaheen & Gupta, 2017). Datta et al. (2012) show that WE has a negative relationship with TI and mediate the link between leader member exchange and turnover intentions. Recent research by Gupta and Agarwal (2018) demonstrated that WE has a mediating effect in between job characteristics and TI. Shaheen and Gupta (2017) argued that the relationship between psychological capital and TI is significantly mediated by work engagement and the relationship between WE and TI is moderated by personal resources (Gupta & Shaheen, 2017). This research indicates based on empirical evidence that work engagement can mediate the link between WPI and TI which is in line with the support for relationship between WPI and WE (Griffin & Yeung, 2008; Shaheen & Gupta, 2017) and WE and TI relationship (Gupta & Agarwal, 2018; Planta et al., 2018; Stinglhamber et al., 2016). Therefore, based on the empirical evidence discussed above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3. WE has a negative and significant impact on TI.
H4. The link between WPI and TI is mediated by WE.

Demographics distinguish employees from other employees. Gender, age, education, work experience and various social elements can constitute demographic factors. Several research scholars have speculated that gender classification may be objectionable. As compared to males, females tend to be more disrespectful at work (Welbourne, Gangadharan, & Esparza, 2016). In view of this concept, females are more sensitive than men to social behaviour. This results in behavioral issues, including incivility at the workplace, which women are more likely to experience than men. Reio Jr and Sanders-Reio (2011) indicated that females face more workplace incivil behaviour from their colleagues, whereas men face more workplace incivil behaviour from their supervisors. Nevertheless, most research comparing males and females shows that males and females appear to be similarly negatively affected by incivility (Cortina, Lim, & Magley, 2008). Recent findings indicate that 65 per cent of females have "general incivility" in their places of work compared to 47 per cent of males (Kabat-Farr, Cortina, Leskinen, Huerta, & Magley, 2013).

On the basis of previous empirical data, two key factors are noted: firstly, the acceptance of unethical harassment behaviour is more likely to be tolerated by females by their co-workers (Reio Jr & Sanders-Reio, 2011). Secondly, on the basis of the findings of (Rouseau, Manning, & Denyer, 2008), the disparity in findings can be clarified that national culture appears to have an impact on social norms and to interpret and resolve the impact of incivility on the workplace. The current research therefore perceives that gender can only affect and strengthen the relationships between WPI, WE and TI.

Research Methods

Sampling procedures

Twelve companies from several business industries in Bangkok, Thailand took the research sample. 570 participants participated in the survey in 2019. Out of the total, 51.84 percent of those participants were men and most of the participants (67) percent received secondary education. Most of the participants were still unmarried (59.45) percent. The majority of the participants were between 20 to 25 years of age (43.21) percent.

Measurement Scales

The scale of WPI with seven (7) items was adapted from Magley et al. (2001). Sample item of the scale was, "How often in the past year have you received … …". The items of the scale were measured on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 to 5 (never to most of the time). Moreover, the three dimensional WE scale (vigor, dedication and absorption) with a total nine (9) items was adopted from a Utrecht Work Engagement short scale (UWES-9) developed by Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006). Each dimension has three (3) items respectively. Sample item of vigor is, "I feel enthusiastic about going to work", sample item of dedication is, "I want to know about the results of my work" and sample item of absorption is, "time goes by so fast while working". The items of the scale were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 to 4 (never to always). Lastly, the scale of TI with three (3) items was adopted from "Michigan Organizational Assessment Scale" (Lawler,

Seashore, Mirvis, & Cammann, 1982). Sample items of the scale are, "I am actively looking for a new job" and "I often think of quitting". The items of the scale were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 to 5 (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Data Analysis Technique

The first section of the present study seeks to analyze the psychometric properties of WPI, WE and TI. The hypotheses are tested in the second part of the study. The model is tested using partial least squares - structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) along with multi group analysis (MGA) technique. Smart PLS 3.0 was used to carry out the data analysis (Hair, Sarstedt, Pieper, & Ringle, 2012).

Common Method Bias (CMB)

The CMV is investigated first before further statistical analysis is conducted. Common method variance describes false correlations commonly occurring when measuring variables in the cross-sectional data collection method (Ramayah, Tehseen, & Sajilan, 2017). CMV was evaluated in this analysis using a Harman's single factor analysis with a PCA method (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). The common method variance analysis outcomes indicate that in the three latent variables, there is no single factor which accounts for more than 50 per cent of the overall variance. Therefore, in this study CMV cannot be said to be a serious problem.

Research Findings

Descriptive Analysis

This research analysis starts with descriptive statistics showing the arithmetic mean and standard deviation of the latent constructs analyzed as shown in Table 1. However, male groups have marginally high average scores of WPI, WE and TI than females. Surprisingly, males are more perceptive than females in WPI (Table 1). Furthermore, males have low level of WE and TI than females. In addition, an independent sample t-test was carried out to determine if there is a substantial difference between gender in the WPI, WE and TI. Table 1 showed that there were no statistical differences between the three latent variables by gender (all of them significant in independent sample t-tests > 0.05).

Table 1 Descriptive Analysis

Constructs	Gender	N=570	A.M	Std Deviation	Sig
TI	Men	295	2.43	1.02	0.287
	Women	275	2.56	1.05	
WPI	Men	295	1.98	0.87	0.089
	Women	275	1.87	0.74	
WE	Men	295	3.56	0.64	0.284
	Women	275	3.82	0.57	

Note: Turnover intentions (TI), Workplace incivility (WPI) and Work engagement (WE).

Structural Equation Model

A one-stage measurement model was used to describe this study, and Hair, Sarstedt, Hopkins, and Kuppelwieser (2014) and Henselar, Hubona, and Ray (2016) made a recommendation to explain the outcomes. Firstly, the evaluation of the measurement model is carried out to test the reliability and validity of the latent constructs and then to determine the importance of the parameters in order to show the link between the latent variables.

Assessment of Measurement Model

The measurement model assessment is performed for the internal consistency and validity of the construct (convergent and discriminant validity) as defined by Hair et al. (2014). The Cronbach's alpha and reliability of the construct is evaluated in the first stage of the internal consistency. The findings of this study show that all variables meet criteria for the internal consistency Cronbach's alpha greater than 0.70 (WPI = 0.876; WE = 0.804; TI = 0.821). The next step is the assessment of the composite reliability (CR) and the findings are in accordance with CA where the value of composite reliability is greater than 0.7 (WPI = 0.920; WE = 0.856; TI = 0.873). The measurement model, as proposed by Hair et al. (2014) and Chin (2010), has fulfilled all the criteria for reliability. Moreover, convergent validity (CV) and discriminant validity need to be tested. CV is evaluated by factor loadings and average variance extracted (AVE). The AVE threshold value is 0.5 and the threshold value of factor loading should be greater than 0.7 as suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981). All the values of factor loadings are greater than 0.7 and all the values of AVE above 0.5 are considered sufficient and findings are acceptable (Hair et al., 2012). Furthermore, the degree to which a construct varies from other constructs is checked through discriminant validity. The fornell larcker parameter recommended by Hair et al. (2012) is to compare AVE to the latent constructs' correlations. If the correlation between the constructs is lesser than the AVE square root, it is shown to be of strong discriminant validity in the measurement model. The square root of AVE of all constructs is larger than the correlation between latent constructs as shown in Table 3. Therefore, the measurement scale used in this research has ample construct validity.

Table 2 Results of Measurement Model

Constructs	Items	Loadings	SD	Alpha	CR	AVE
Turnover intention	TI_1	0.756	0.03	0.821	0.873	0.742
	TI_2	0.840	0.02			
	TI_3	0.794	0.03			
Workplace incivility	WPI_1	0.764	0.01	0.876	0.920	0.591
	WPI_2	0.861	0.01			
		0.762				
	WPI_3	0.790	0.01			
		0.846				
	WPI_	0.747				
		0.773	0.0			

	4		1			
	WPI_5		0.0 1			
	WPI_6		0.0 1			
	WPI_7		0.0 1			
Work engageme nt	Vig_1	0.870 0.791	0.0 3	0.804	0.85 6	0.68 0
	Ded_2	0.846	0.0 2			
	Abs_3		0.0 2			

Table 3 Fornell Larcker Criterion

Constructs	WPI	WE	TI
WPI	**0.842**		
WE	-0.344	**0.743**	
TI	0.437	-0.374	**0.867**

Note: Turnover intentions (TI), Workplace incivility (WPI) and Work engagement (WE).

Assessment of Structural Model

The next step is to test the structural model after an evaluation of the measuring model. Structural model evaluation criteria as proposed by Hair et al. (2014) is R^2, f^2 and Q^2. The next step is the testing of path coefficients and path significance. The R^2 value of the endogenous construct explains the variance sum of all exogenous constructs in the model representing the corresponding predictive value with a threshold values of 0.25, 0.50 or 0.75 considered as weak, moderate and strong as suggested by (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). In this model, the R^2 values obtained show that the predictive power of the latent constructs (e.g. WE and TI) is weak ($R^2 = 0.05$, and $R^2 = 0.16$).

Furthermore, the values of R^2 of all dependent variables can also be changed if any independent variable(s) are replaced by a model to determine whether they can have a significant effect on dependent variables. This measure is referred to as effect size f^2 (Hair et al., 2012). The parameters for evaluating a given f^2 value are 0.35, 0.15 or 0.02 considered as large, moderate and small effect sizes (Cohen, 2013; Hair et al., 2011). The results have shown f^2 values as; 0.05 (WPI -> WE); 0.06 (WE -> TI), (WPI -> WE), 0.07 (WPI -> TI) and 0.14 (WPI -> TI). The values of f^2 range from 0.05 to 0.14 and are considered weak.

The next step for evaluation is to use Stone-Geisser blindfolding (Q^2) to test each construct's crossing. The value of Q^2 greater than zero suggests predictive relevance of independent variables on dependent variables (Hair et al., 2011). The findings have shown that the value of Q^2 for WE is 0.08 and TI is 0.16. The findings show that the predictive relevance of WPI is weak, but that it is good enough for TI. Lastly, a conservative parameter is used to check the theoretical model fitness, such as when the value of SRMR is < 0.08, the parameter indicates that the model fits well (Hair et al., 2011). On the basis of the findings of this study, the value of SRMR is 0.05, which is less than 0.08. The findings of the study can be shown to be sufficiently enough for theoretical research.

Multi Group Analysis (MGA)

The next step is to evaluate the significance of the path coefficient by using bootstrapping procedure with 5000 resamples as proposed by Hair et al. (2014). This study used partial least squares-multi group analysis (PLS-MGA) to carry out group comparisons. For each path coefficient, Table 4 shows the confidence interval and p-value. The relationship between WPI and WE is significant for all groups as shown in Table 4 (beta value = -0.230 and p-value < 0.01); for male group (beta value = -0.201 and p-value < 0.01) and for female group (beta value = -0.281 and p-values > 0.01). Furthermore, the association between WPI and TI was statistically significant for all groups (beta value = 0.351 and p-value < 0.01). The link between WE and TI was also statistically significant for all groups (beta value = -0.213 and p-value < 0.01), for males (beta value = -0.240 and p-value < 0.01) and for females (beta value = < -0.143 and p-value < 0.05). Finally, WE significantly mediate the link between WPI and TI (beta value = 0.041 and p-value < 0.01).

Table 4 Results of Path coefficients

Relationships	n = 570 (groups)	n = 295 (male)	n = 275 (female)
WPI -> TI	0.351	0.351	0.351
WPI -> WE	-0.230	-0.201	-0.281
WE -> TI	-0.213	-0.240	-0.143
WPI -> WE -> TI	0.041		

Conclusions

Various studies in cross-cultural contexts have shown the association among WPI, WE and TI. The current research is focused on examining the direct impact of WPI on TI. This research also explores the mediating impact of WE using MGA technique by adding gender as an unique element among constructs. The outcomes indicate that WPI negatively impact WE and positively impact TI and the strength of the relationship varies by gender. WE negatively impact TI and play a significant role as a mediator in the relationship among WPI and TI. The following section addresses theoretical and practical implications, limitations and guidelines for future research.

Implications

This research adds in a variety of different ways to the existing literature about the effect of WPI on TI with WE as a mediator. Firstly, the present research has shown that WPI negatively affect WE and has a positive impact on TI. Moreover, the association among WPI and TI can be seen through WE, thus extending prior studies that only focus on the direct impact of WPI on WE (Griffin & Yeung, 2008; Reio Jr & Sanders-Reio, 2011) and WE and TI relationship (Gupta & Agarwal, 2018; Planta et al., 2018; Stinglhamber et al., 2016). Secondly, the association between WPI and WE and TI differ by gender. In particular, this paper demonstrates how men and women staff respond to workplace incivility when they see or witness it. Researches on the link between WPI and TI through gender differences

are fewer in number (Magley et al., 2001; Reio Jr & Sanders-Reio, 2011). However, the present research confirms reflects earlier findings in comparisons of male and female showing that the impact of general impairment on male and female is similar (Cortina et al., 2008; Magley et al., 2001). Moreover, the results of the study have shown that gender played a moderating role in WPI and TI relationship which is in accordance with prior empirical outcomes (Hendryadi & Zannati, 2018; Kabat-Farr et al., 2013).

Based on previously established empirical evidences, the organizations need to consider some important contributions when developing policies. First of all, superiors should pay close attention to circumstances of incivility in the workplace to minimize turnover intention of employees, in particular WPI which may further lead to reduce WE and increase TI. Our results indicate that WPI plays a significant role in decreasing WE and increasing TI. It is therefore vital for superiors to recognize and stop the existence of workplace incivility.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Within this analysis, there are several limitations. Firstly, data from different business organisations in Thailand were collected using convenient sampling, which may restrict the generalizability of research. It is therefore suggested that potential scholars use a random sample to replicate the current study in different industries. Secondly, most of the participants in this research were unmarried between 20 and 25 years of age with secondary educational level. The perceptions and values of these senior older workers (above 35 years) may not reflect these participants characteristics. Further study is proposed by adding the proportion of workers above 35 years of age to a more diversified sample. Lastly, there are limited causal statements on the cross-sectional aspect of this analysis. Future studies should therefore use a longitudinal approach to evaluate positive changes that are very useful in assessing causality over time

References

[1] Andrusyszyn, M. A., Smith, L. M., & Spence Laschinger, H. K. (2010). Effects of workplace incivility and empowerment on newly-graduated nurses' organizational commitment. Journal of Nursing Management, 18(8), 1004-1015.

[2] Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328.

[3] Bolluch, H. C. (2017). Ambivalent moralities of cooperation and corruption: Local explanations for (under) development on a Philippine island. The Australian Journal of Anthropology, 28(1), 56-71.

[4] Cant, R. P., Birks, M., Budden, L. M., Russell-Westhead, M., Özçetin, Y. S. Ü., & Tee, S. (2017). Uncovering degrees of workplace bullying: A comparison of baccalaureate nursing students' experiences during clinical placement in Australia and the UK. Nurse Education in Practice, 25(1), 14-21.

[5] Cascio, W. F. (2000). Costing Human Resources: The Financial Impact of Behavior in Organizations. (4 ed.): South-western College Publishing.

[6] Cohen, J. (2013). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: awrence Erlbaum.

[7] Cortina, L. M., Lim, S., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: impact on work and health outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93(1), 95-107.

[8] Cosby, D. M., & Rahim, A. (2016). A model of workplace incivility, job burnout, turnover intentions, and job performance. Journal of Management Development, 35(10), 255–1265.

[9] Datta, S., Agarwal, U. A., Blake-Beard, S., & Bhargava, S. (2012). Linking LMX, innovative work behaviour and turnover intentions. Career Development International, 17(3), 08–230.

[10] Duffy, M. K., Shaw, J. D., Johnson, J. L., & Lockhart, D. E. (2005). Turnover, social capital losses, and performance. Academy of Management Journal, 48(4), 594-606.

[11] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(1), 39-50.

[12] Griffin, B., & Beattie, L. (2014). Day-level fluctuations in stress and engagement in response to workplace incivility: A diary study. Work & Stress, 28(2), 124-142.

[13] Griffin, B., & Yeung, A. (2008). Workplace incivility: Does it matter in Asia. People and Strategy, 31(3), 14-19.

[14] Guo, H., Shi, Y., Zhang, S., Xie, F., Wang, J., Sun, Z., . . . Fan, L. (2018). Impact of workplace incivility against new nurses on

job burn-out: a cross-sectional study in China. BMJ open, 8(4), e020461.

[15] Gupta, M., & Shaheen, M. (2017). The relationship between psychological capital and turnover intention: Work engagement as mediator and work experience as moderator. Jurnal Pengurusan (UKM Journal of Management), 49(1), 117–126.

[16] Gupta, V., & Agarwal, U. A. (2018). Relationships between job characteristics, work engagement, conscientiousness and managers' turnover intentions. Personnel Review, 47(2), 353–377.

[17] Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 19(2), 139-152.

[18] Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). European Business Review, 26(2), 106–121.

[19] Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Pieper, T. M., & Ringle, C. M. (2012). The use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in strategic management research: A review of past practices and recommendations for future applications. Long Range Planning, 45(5-6), 320-340.

[20] Hendryadi, H., & Zannati, R. (2018). Hubungan workplace incivility dan turnover intention: Efek moderasi gender. INOVASI, 14(2), 123-133.

[21] Henselar, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. A. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines. Industrial Management & Data Systems, 116(1), 2–20.

[22] Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. Review of General Psychology, 6(4), 307-324.

[23] Jang, J.-H., & Son, J.-L. (2017). The relationship between dental hygienist's exposure to incivility at workplace and their turnover intention. Journal of Korean Society of Dental Hygiene, 17(5), 779-789.

[24] Jermsittiparsert, K. & Urairak, B. (2019). Exploring the Nexus Between Emotional Dissonance, Leadership, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave Among Medical Professionals in Thailand. Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana, 24(Extra 6), 378-386.

[25] Kabat-Farr, D., Cortina, L. M., 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.

[26] Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692-724.

[27] Kane, K., Montgomery, 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 & Organization Management, 29(2), 248-268.

[28] Khosa, M., Ishaq, S., & Kamil, B. A. M. (2020a). Antecedents of Employee Engagement with the Mediating Effect of Occupational Stress in the Banking Sector of Pakistan. International Journal of Management Studies and Social Science Research 2(1), 63-79.

[29] Khosa, M., Ishaq, S., & Kamil, B. A. M. (2020b). Antecedents of Employee Engagement with the Mediation of Occupational Stress and Moderation of Co-worker's Support in the Banking Sector of Pakistan. International Journal of Management Studies and Social Science Research 2(1), 45-62.

[30] Lawler, E. E., Seashore, S. E., Mirvis, P., & Cammann, C. (1982). Observing and measuring organizational change: A guide to field practice. In. New York: Wiley.

[31] Lewis, P. S., & Malecha, A. (2011). The impact of workplace incivility on the work environment, manager skill, and productivity. The Journal of Nursing Administration, 41(1), 41-47.

[32] Loi, N., & Loh, J. M. (2018). Tit for tat: Burnout as a mediator between workplace incivility and instigated workplace incivility. Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration, 10(1), 100-111.

[33] Lund-Thomsen, P., Schuster, T., Kazmi, B. A., Sharma, N., & Singh, V. (2016). Effect of workplace incivility on job satisfaction and turnover intentions in

India. South Asian Journal of Global Business Research, 5(2), 234–249.

[34] Magley, V. J., Cortina, L. M., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6(1), 64-80.

[35] Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., Sablynski, C. J., Burton, J. P., & Holtom, B. C. (2004). The effects of job embeddedness on organizational citizenship, job performance, volitional absences, and voluntary turnover. Academy of Management Journal, 47(5), 711-722.

[36] Pearson, C. M., & Andersson, L. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. Academy of Management Review, 24(3), 452-471.

[37] Planta, A., De Simone, S., & Cicotto, G. (2018). The role of job satisfaction, work engagement, self-efficacy and agentic capacities on nurses' turnover intention and patient satisfaction. Applied Nursing Research, 39(1), 130-140.

[38] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(5), 879-903.

[39] Ramayah, T., Tehseen, S., & Sajilan, S. (2017). Testing and controlling for common method variance: A review of available methods. Journal of Management Sciences, 4(2), 142-168.

[40] Reio Jr, T. G., Ghosh, R., & Bang, H. (2013). Reducing turnover intent: Supervisor and co-worker incivility and socialization-related learning. Human Resource Development International, 16(2), 169-185.

[41] Reio Jr, T. G., & Sanders-Reio, J. (2011). Thinking about workplace engagement: Does supervisor and coworker incivility really matter? Advances in Developing Human Resources, 13(4), 462-478.

[42] Rouseau, D., Manning, J., & Denyer, D. (2008). Evidence in management and organizational science: Assembling the field's full weight of scientific knowledge through syntheses. The Academy of Management Annals, 2(1), 475–515.

[43] Saengchai, S., Duangkaew, S., & Jermsittiparsert, K. (2019). Consequences of the Recruitment and Selection Process on Employee Turnover & Absenteeism: Profitability in the Textile Sector of Indonesia. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 10(1), 40-57.

[44] Saengchai, S., Thaiprayoon, K., & Jermsittiparsert, K. (2019). Employee Turnover Intentions: The Role of the Supervisor's Support and Job Autonomy with Job Satisfaction Acting as a Mediator: A Case of Paramedical Staff in Thai Government Hospital. Journal of Computational and Theoretical Nanoscience, 16(11), 4789-4797. DOI: 10.1166/jctn.2019.8391.

[45] Schaufali, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3(1), 71-92.

[46] Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66(4), 701-716.

[47] Schaufeli, W. B., Hakanen, J. J., & Ahola, K. (2008). The Job Demands-Resources model: A three-year cross-lagged study of burnout, depression, commitment, and work engagement. Work & Stress, 22(3), 224-241.

[48] Shaheen, M., & Gupta, M. (2017). Impact of work engagement on turnover intention: Moderation by psychological capital in India. Business: Theory and Practice, 18, 136-143.

[49] Stinglhamber, F., Caesens, G., & Marmier, V. (2016). The curvilinear effect of work engagement on employees' turnover intentions. International Journal of Psychology, 51(2), 150-155.

[50] van Niekerk, M., Torres, E. N., & Orlowski, M. (2017). Customer and employee incivility and its causal effects in the hospitality industry. Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 26(1), 48-66.

[51] Wang, Z., Chen, Y., Peng, Y., Geimer, J., Sharp, O., & Jex, S. (2018). The multidimensionality of workplace incivility: Cross-cultural evidence. International Journal of Stress Management, 26(4), 356–366.

[52] Welbourne, J. L., Gangadharan, A., & Esparza, C. A. (2016). Coping style and gender effects on attitudinal responses to incivility. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31(3), 720–738.