

Effect of Workplace Incivility on Employee Engagement: A Quantitative Study amongst Service Employees engaged in the Public Health Care, Mahé, Seychelles.

Beverly Anna Quilindo

Asia Pacific University of Technology and Innovation, 57000 Kuala Lumpur
Email: annaquilindo@live.com

Jugindar Singh Kartar Singh

Asia Pacific University of Technology and Innovation, 57000 Kuala Lumpur
Email: jugindar.singh@apu.edu.my

Noraini Binti Ahmad

Asia Pacific University of Technology and Innovation, 57000 Kuala Lumpur
Email: noraini@staffmail.apu.edu.my

Article Info

Volume 82

Page Number: 617 - 627

Publication Issue:

January-February 2020

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to provide additional understanding of the impact of workplace incivility on employee engagement. The target population of this study were employees in the health care sector in Seychelles. Past research on workplace incivility have examined a variety of personal and contextual factors associated with prevalence of incivility in the workplace. However, the effect of supervisor incivility, co-worker incivility and customer incivility on employee engagement has not been empirically tested in health sector. In addition, there is a paucity of research on workplace incivility in Seychelles. This was a quantitative study and data was collected from a sample of 100 respondents. A hybrid approach using e-mail and direct deliver and collect method was used to collect primary data from a target sample of 100 respondents. The data was analyzed using SPSS. The findings revealed that coworker incivility and customer incivility had a significant relationship with employee engagement. However, an insignificant relationship was found between supervisor incivility and employee engagement. This research is one of very few to pursue this line of research and makes important contributions to theory and practice. This is the first research of its kind in Seychelles and understanding how customer incivility, supervisor incivility and co-worker incivility affect work engagement will be valuable for designing interventions to mitigate the risk associated of incivility and the related outcomes including employee engagement.

Article History

Article Received: 14 March 2019

Revised: 27 May 2019

Accepted: 16 October 2019

Publication: 04 January 2020

Keywords: *Supervisor incivility, Co-worker incivility, Customer incivility, Employee engagement, Seychelles*

INTRODUCTION

The Republic of Seychelles is a developing country located off the east coast of Africa (Savitsky, Rehnberg and Ibarra, 2000). The population of Seychelles is 96,762 as of 2018

(National Bureau of Statistics, 2018) but there are several foreigners working and residing there. The health care sector in Seychelles serves a small population that is scattered across the 115 islands (Workie et al., 2018). However, the health

facilities are more concentrated on the main island, which is Mahé, where over 85% of the inhabitants resides (Workie et al., 2018). The rest of the population resides on Praslin, La Digue and on the other smaller inner islands (Savitsky, Rehnborg and Ibarra, 2000). The health care sector in Seychelles is an important sector but there are several issues that are faced within this industry; such as a shortage of local medical professionals. Numerous foreigners were employed from China, India, Cuba, Sri Lanka and Eastern Europe. The expectations of the people for health care are extremely high. Additionally, for a small island state, Seychelles faces many issues, such as the geographic, geographic location, the size of the population and these pose several challenges that encompass health professionals training and retention and equipment maintenance (Bovet et al., 2013).

In today's globalized environment, engaging the right employees in displaying positive behaviors in the workplace is a critical component of organization performance and sustainability (Merry, 2013). Employees are the major assets of business organizations and consequently employee engagement is a critical issue for organizations (Al Mehrzi and Singh, 2016). A study by Aon Hewitt (2012) highlighted that there is high level of relationship between financial performance and employee engagement in organizations. As pointed out by J. Anita (2014), an engaged employee is knowledgeable and will go beyond the call of duty. However, employee engagement levels show that four out of ten employees are still not engaged (Merry, 2013). Ying et al. (2013) further highlighted that employee disengagement level amongst employees is increasing and this has led to the "engagement gap" in the working environment. High levels of employee disengagement can be very costly to organizations (Ying, et al., 2013). As stated by Whittington, Meskelis, Asare and Beldona (2017), the employee disengagement cost is estimated to be in the range from \$450 to \$550 billion dollars annually. Therefore, organizations need to take initiatives to improve engagement level of employees because engaged employees are expected to be productive and have an emotional connection with the organization (Saks, 2006; Shuck and Wollard, 2010). Researchers

have identified several determinants of employee engagement. A study by Aon Hewitt (2012) identified, career opportunities, organization reputation and pay as the top drivers of engagement. Lower levels of employee engagement level have been linked to counter-productive and negative behaviors such as absenteeism, withdrawal and intention to leaves (Whittington et al., 2017). One of the factors that affects employee engagement is the frequency and duration of workplace incivility experienced by the employee (Porath and Pearson, 2010). This study will investigate the relationship between incivility in the workplace and employee engagement.

In today's challenging environment of rapid globalization, workplace incivility is posing a greater challenge to business organizations. In addition, incivility is continuously showing an increasing uptrend (Porath and Pearson, 2010). Porath and Pearson (2010) highlighted that in 1998, only one-fourth of the employees that were surveyed, experienced rude treatment more than once a week. The study showed that in year 2010, 96% of employees had experienced incivility in the workplace and 99% of the employees witnessed behaviors that were rude (Porath and Pearson, 2010). There are several negative outcomes and negative consequences of incivility in the workplace. Past research have shown that there is a negative relationship between employee engagement and workplace incivility (Yeung and Griffin, 2008; Reio and Sanders-Reio, 2011; Chen et al., 2013). Employee productivity can plummet downwards due to the acts and words that are seemingly insensitive are uttered to employees by supervisors or peers. This further affects the effort, focus, time, creativity, energy, commitment and loyalty of employees and teams (Porath and Pearson, 2010). Incivility is also related to cost. According to Porath and Pearson (2009), the cost related to incivility per employee annually is estimated at \$14,000. Incivility experienced by employees leads to cognitive distraction from their work and this can lead to delays in projects (Schilpzand, De Pater and Erez, 2016). As pointed out by Pearson, Andersson and Wegner (2001), organizations focus more on workplace aggression and violence and less attention is paid to interpersonal and organizational mistreatment.

Hence, this study will empirically test the influence of supervisor, coworker and customer incivility towards employee engagement.

In view of the importance of workplace incivility in predicting job performance, it is worth undertaking this study. Despite the negative influence of incivility on performance and other outcomes of employees, past research have not empirically examined the influence of customer incivility, coworker incivility and supervisor incivility towards employee engagement among employees in the health sector. There is a paucity of research that has empirically tested the relationship between customer, coworker and supervisor incivility towards employee engagement in Seychelles. In addition, the specific impact of supervisor incivility, co-worker incivility and customers' incivility on employee engagement is unclear. Additionally, most of the past research that have been conducted focuses on incivility in the nursing sector only and not on the health care workforce. Furthermore, there is a lack of prior research conducted in the health care industry in Seychelles. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between incivility experienced by employees and employee engagement. This study will be useful from academic, practical and theoretical perspectives. The results of this study will assist practitioners to see the importance of managing workplace incivility and improve employee engagement.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Engagement

There are several definitions and determinants of employee engagement. The most referenced and cited definition of employee engagement is by Kahn (1990). Kahn (1990) defined engagement as members in organisation who harnessed themselves to the roles of their work; people employ and express themselves physically, emotionally and cognitively, throughout their work performance. May, Gilson and Harter (2004), stated that engagement is more concerned with the way a person employs itself throughout their job performance. In addition to cognitions, the active use of behaviour and emotions are involved when engaging (May, Gilson and Harter, 2004). Saks (2006), stated that employee

engagement is a unique and distinct concept. It is composed of emotional, cognitive and behavioural factors that are related with the performance of an individual role (Saks, 2006). According to Frank and Taylor (2004), employee engagement is the level of discretionary effort that employees put into their work. Macey and Schneider (2008), suggested to consider employee engagement as a broad range of terms which includes psychological state, disposition, performance construct, or the combination of all. Bakker (2011), referred to employee engagement as people that are cognitively, emotionally and physically connected with their roles at work. The people also devote themselves to achieving organisational goals, they are often highly involved in their work and they are full of energy. According to Macey and Schneider (2008), employee engagement is a condition that is desired. In addition, employee engagement has a purpose for the organisation plus it signifies involvement, passion, enthusiasm, commitment, energy and effort on focus. According to Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004), employees are considered engaged when they are aware of the context of the business and they work alongside their colleagues for the benefit of the organisation. Therefore, in addition, to different definitions of employee engagement, there is also an overlap of employee engagement with other organizational outcomes such as commitment.

Workplace incivility

In today's work environment, workplace incivility is receiving increased attention due to its prevalent occurrence (Wilson and Holmvall, 2013). Andersson and Pearson (1999) refers to workplace incivility as deviant behavior of low magnitude. It includes ambiguous intention to harm the target that includes employees. According to Cho et al. (2016), workplace incivility refers to an act or conduct of incivility towards individuals that is incited by supervisors, co-workers and customers. The uncivil acts in the workplace include rudeness and discourteous behavior (Beattie and Griffin, 2014). The incivility spiral proposed by Andersson and Pearson (1999), can be utilized to understand how uncivil acts initiated by supervisors, co-workers or customers can result in negative outcomes such as

job satisfaction, intention to leave and level of engagement. Andersson and Pearson (1999) explained that acts of incivility grow into action of coerciveness in the workplace. The negative actions and behaviors by supervisors, customers or co-workers can lead to negative outcomes and counterproductive behaviors.

Relationship between Supervisor incivility and Employee Engagement

Prior studies have examined the relationship between supervisor incivility and employee engagement. Incivility in the workplace including supervisor incivility results in negative outcomes and leads to high cost incurred by business organizations (Porath and Pearson, 2013). Hogan and Kaiser (2005) pointed out that supervisors who are not good to employees bring health problems and this further weaken the organizational members' quality of life. Furnham and Taylor (2004) further added that supervisors and managers sometimes exhibit uncivil behaviours that encompass loss of temper, intimidation, bullying and being arrogant. Such incivility by supervisors affects employees' motivation, and energy and leads to emotional distress and higher turnover intentions (Bowling and Beehr, 2006). In addition, Schilpzand, De Pater and Erez (2016) highlighted that supervisor initiated uncivil behaviour is more harmful than uncivil behaviour initiated by co-workers. Employees perceive that they depend on supervisors for rewards and uncivil behaviours by their supervisors may generate unfavourable behaviours. Furthermore, Schilpzand, De Pater and Erez (2016) pointed out that supervisor initiated incivility affects the employees' health, commitment, intention to leave and job performance. Accordingly, Yeung and Griffin (2008), stated that incivility in the workplace affects employee engagement. Liu et al. (2017) further added that the supervisor is "a face" that represents the organization. Therefore, the definition of incivility encompasses acts that are uncivil, rudeness, or discourteous behaviour. Uncivil behaviours encompasses rudeness and discourteous plus a lack of regard for others in the workplace (Cortina, 2008; Andersson and Pearson, 1999). Reio and Sanders-Reio (2011) added that incivility or rude and disrespectful behaviours affects the engagement level of

employees. Based on the review, the researcher posits the following hypothesis:

H1: There is a significant relationship between supervisor incivility and employee engagement.

Relationship between co-worker incivility and employee engagement

Prior studies have examined the relationship between co-worker incivility and employee engagement. Research shows that co-worker incivility is prevalent in the working environment. Prior research conducted by Reio and Sanders-Reio (2011), reported that 81% of the respondents have faced co-worker incivility. Additionally, the study revealed co-worker incivility was experienced more by females in contrast to males (Reio and Sanders-Reio, 2011). Furthermore, according to Schilpzand, De Pater and Erez (2016), uncivil behaviour initiated by co-workers is more detrimental than uncivil behaviour coming from customers. Schilpzand, De Pater and Erez (2016) explained that employees have more direct face to face interactions with co-workers compared to customers. Like any other uncivil behaviour such as rudeness, employee engagement is affected by incivility (Yeung and Griffin, 2008). According to prior research, incivility between co-workers can severely lead to a negative outcome such as exhaustion, emotional instability, withdrawal behaviours or even psychological health worsening (Hur, Kim and Park, 2015). Reio and Sanders-Reio (2011) stated that some of the co-worker initiated uncivil behaviours encompass demeaning or rude remarks, talking negatively about the employee in his or her absence and not giving credit when it is due. Therefore, when co-worker incivility is being experienced by employees, they tend to feel unsafe and perceive their co-workers as unpredictable and threatening (Reio and Sanders-Reio, 2011). The incivility originating from colleagues in the workplace can be damaging to the employees' health and emotions (Pearson, Andersson, and Wegner, 2001). The following hypothesis was developed and tested.

H2: There is a significant relationship between co-worker incivility and employee engagement.

Relationship between Customer Incivility and Employee Engagement

Customer incivility is another component of incivility that is experienced by employees. As stated by Baranik, Wang, Gong and Shi (2017), uncivil behaviours initiated by customers can affect the health and job performance of employees. The uncivil behaviour by customers lead to emotional distress, burnout, and absenteeism (Baranik et al., 2017). Han, Bonn and Cho (2015) added that rude or demeaning behaviours exhibited by customers resulted in high levels of stress experienced by employees. A study by Cho, Bon Han and Lee (2016) revealed that customer incivility had a much higher impact on employee exhaustion than supervisor incivility. Andersson and Pearson (1999) also stated that incivility is linked to negative outcomes. A study by Jung and Yoon (2014) stated that frontline employees are exposed to uncertain situations where they may need to serve unhappy customers. Karatepe (2015) added that frontline employees frequently encounter uncivil behavior from customers. This results in higher level of emotional exhaustion as compared with co-worker or supervisor incivility. Employees who are exposed to uncivil or rude behaviours by customers could experience psychological problems. As explained by McWilliams (2017), employees who encounter uncivil behaviour can experience higher levels of anxiety, sleeping problems, and other emotional problems. A study by Yeung and Griffin (2008) revealed that incivility negatively influence employee engagement. Kim and Qu (2019) added that uncivil behaviour by customers leads to higher level of stress and counterproductive behaviours. This further leads to lower level of job performance of employees (Kim and Qu, 2019). The following hypothesis was developed for testing.

H3: There is a significant relationship between customer incivility and employee engagement.

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Design

This was a basic research to add further knowledge to the existing knowledge base (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). The researcher's assumption was about the development of

knowledge and a positivism research philosophy was selected (Saunders et al., 2012). For this study, a deductive approach was more appropriate to study the phenomena based on exiting theories and using facts and observations (Saunders et al., 2012). Based on the time horizon, this study was classified as a cross-sectional study where a snapshot of data was collected for analysis. Non probability sampling method was used to collect primary data from a sample of the target population and generalize the findings (Pandey and Pandey, 2015). Quantitative method was more appropriate in this deductive research and a survey was undertaken to collect numeric data. The researcher delivered self-administered questionnaires electronically and by hand to the qualified respondents. Descriptive and inferential statistics were generated using the SPSS statistical tool.

Sampling Technique and Sample Size

The sampling techniques are divided into two types; probability sampling or representative sampling and non-probability sampling (Saunders, et al., 2012). Non-probability sampling was used in this study as a sampling frame could not be developed. Convenience sampling was used because this is the fastest and easiest method to collect data from qualified respondents. The sample size was based on the formula by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). According to the formula, the sample size is equal to $50 + 8m$ (m is the number of variables). The target population in this study covers all service employees who have direct contact with the patients and are working in the public healthcare in Mahé, Seychelles. Based on the formula by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), the sample size should be at least 74 respondents. The researcher set the target sample size as 100 respondents.

Instrumentation

A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data from the target population. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The Section A of the questionnaire covered demographic information using nominal and ordinal scales. In Section B of the questionnaire, a five point Likert type scale was used to measure the respondents' attitude or behaviors. Employee engagement in this study refers to a work-related

state of mind that is fulfilling and positive, which are characterized by dedication, vigor and absorption (Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova, 2006). The measurement was based on the scale adapted from Schaufeli and Bakker (2003). To measure supervisor incivility, questions were adapted Cortina, et al (2001) and Martine and Hine (2005). Measurement of co-worker incivility was based on questions adapted from a study by Martine and Hine (2005). Customer Incivility questions were adapted from a study by Wilson and Holmyall (2013).

Data Collection

The questionnaire was a self-completed questionnaire. It was sent to qualified respondents in the health sector electronically and direct by hand. The objective was to get a high response rate. The researcher sent 200 questionnaires through e-mail. Initially the response rate was low (only 25 percent). Follow up was done and reminders were sent to get more responses. After two months, 108 questionnaires were received.

Data Analyses

The data was edited and coded before being transferred into the data file provided in the SPSS system. Blank responses and outliers were checked and a total of 8 questionnaires were removed. Only 100 questionnaires were used for the analysis. A feel of data was done through a visual summary by checking the frequency, central tendency and data dispersion (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). In addition, the demographic information was analysed to describe the respondents. The SPSS tool was used to generate data to test the reliability, normality and the hypothesized relationships among variables of this study. The multivariate analysis showed the relationship between the variables in this study.

4. Results

4.1 Demographic profiles of the respondents

Based on age group, around 26% of respondents were in the 20 to 30 years old age group. Another 15% were between 31 to 35 years old and 17% were between 36 to 40 years old. Around 28% were between 41 to 50 years old. The rest were above the age of 50 years. Based on marital status, 67% of the respondents were single and 33% were married. This indicates that majority of the respondents were single. Based on working experience, 4% of the respondents had a working experience of up to 2 years, 27% had a working experience of more than 2 to 5 years, 20% had a working experience of more than 5 to 10 years, 10% had a working experience of more than 10 to 15 years, 10% had a working experience of more than 15 to 20 years, 8% had a working experience of more than 20 to 25 years, 11% had a working experience more than 25 to 30 years and lastly 10% had a working experience of more than 30 years and above. This indicates that the majority of the respondents had 2 to 5 years of experience as service employees in the public health care.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics and Normality

To check for goodness of data and normality, descriptive statistics showing the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis were generated. The cut-off point set for skewness and kurtosis is 2.00 (Garson, 2012). In this study, the normality of data was not violated as the values for skewness were between the range of -.620 to -.201. Left skewness was indicated by the negative values. In this study, the kurtosis or peakedness of data was also not violated. The values for kurtosis are between the acceptable range of -406 to -.711. A negative kurtosis is represented by the negative values. According to Garson (2012), the acceptable range of absolute value of skewness and kurtosis is ± 2 . Therefore, in this study the data was normally distributed and normality of data was not violated. The table shows that the mean value is high and the standard deviation is low. This indicated the data is good for further analysis.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	Minimum Statistic	Mean Statistic	Std. Deviation Statistic	Skewness		Kurtosis	
				Statistics	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Supervisor Incivility	3.11	4.3078	0.51896	-0.62	0.241	-0.406	0.478
Co-worker Incivility	2.6	4.002	0.62328	-0.201	0.241	-0.711	0.478

Customer Incivility	2	3.368	0.75917	-0.335	0.241	-0.646	0.478
Employee Engagement	2.5	3.823	0.61132	-0.345	0.241	-0.51	0.478

4.3 Reliability

Cronbach alpha values were generated by the researcher to check reliability. As specified by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), the Cronbach alpha value should be .6 or higher. In this study, the Cronbach alpha values are above .6. The Cronbach alpha values in this study are

considered high. The Cronbach alpha value for the dependent variable was .817. For the three independent variables, the Cronbach alpha value was .809, .891 and .849 respectively. This shows that there is consistency in the responses from the respondents and reliability of data is not violated in this study.

Table 2: Reliability statistics

Variables	Cronbach Alpha value
Employee Engagement	.817
Supervisor Incivility	.809
Customer incivility	.891
Co-worker incivility	.849

4.4. Pearson Correlation

The researcher used Pearson's correlation coefficient to test the correlation between the independent and the dependent variables in this study. All the variables were continuous variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient value between all the dependent variable and the three independent variables was significant. As stated by Pallant (2010), the value of the correlation indicates the strength of the relationships between the variables. The correlation coefficient between employee engagement and supervisor incivility was .240. The correlation coefficient between employee engagement and coworker incivility was .299. The correlation coefficient between employee engagement and customer incivility was .251. However, the association between the variables is significant but considered low.

4.5 Model fit

The overall model fit was checked by the researcher. R-squared value of .165 indicates that around 17% of the variance in employee engagement was explained collectively by the independent variables (Pallant, 2010). As stated by Field (2009), the r-square value provides a good gauge of the substantive size of the relationship. However, as argued Frost (2013), the low R-squared values in regression models can be perfectly alright. Furthermore, as explained by Frost (2013), R-square does not indicate if a regression model provides an adequate fit to your data. Frost (2013) stated that r-square is the coefficient of determination that evaluates the scatter of the data points around the fitted regression line. The F-ratio is another important statistic to check the model fit. In this study, the F is 6.318, which is significant at $p < .001$. This proves the fitness of the model. Therefore, the model in this study explains a significant amount of the variance (Field, 2009).

Table 3 Overall Model Fit

Multiple R	.406
Coefficient of Determination (R square)	.165
Adjusted R square	.139
Standard Error of estimate	.56731
F Change	6.318
Sig F Change	.001

4.6 Multiple Regression and Multicollinearity
The values of the regression coefficient ‘B’ represent the change in the outcome resulting from a unit change in the predictor (Field, 2009). In this study, the multiple regression analysis, shows that supervisor incivility is not significantly related to employee engagement ($p>0.05$). Therefore, hypothesis H1 is rejected. Coworker

incivility was significantly related to employee engagement ($p<0.05$). Customer incivility is also significantly related to employee engagement ($p<0.05$). Therefore, hypothesis H2 and H3 were accepted. By comparing the standardized beta coefficients, it was also noted that both co-worker and customer incivility has low but almost equal impact on employee engagement.

Table 5 Variables entered in the Regression Model

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
(Constant)	1.446	.580		2.494	.014
Supervisor Incivility	.207	.114	.175	1.814	.073
Coworker Incivility	.222	.095	.226	2.325	.022
Customer Incivility	.177	.076	.220	2.346	.021

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings from this study revealed that the relationship between supervisor incivility and employee engagement was not significant amongst service employees in the public health care in Mahé, Seychelles. The findings deviated from the results of past studies. This could be due to organization culture in the health care sector in Seychelles. The relationship between employees and the organization is critical. Organizational justice is related to organizational culture and in business organizations the supervisor plays a significant role in the employees’ perception of organizational justice. Tepper and Taylor (2003) explained that the perceptions of procedural justice measured the fairness of procedures in the organization. According to Agarwal et al. (2012), the exchanges between employees and their immediate supervisors influence employees’ work engagement. Another reason could be the stronger impact of co-worker and customer incivility on employee engagement. A study by Reio and Sanders-Reio (2011) revealed that coworker incivility was more powerful than supervisor incivility. A study by Yeung and Griffin (2008) revealed that supervisors are less likely to instigate uncivil behaviour. In this study, a high percentage of the respondents were older people and as pointed out by Reio and Sanders-Reio (2011), older people encountered lesser level of supervisor incivility. Nonetheless, a supervisor’s

roles should not be underestimated, as they have the ability to influence the extent of uncivil behaviour amongst the employees (Yeung and Griffin, 2008).

The results of this study revealed that coworker incivility was significantly related to and employee engagement in the health sector in Seychelles. This study further showed that co-worker incivility had a slightly higher influence that customer incivility on employee engagement. The results of this research showed that coworker incivility had a significant impact on employee engagement and the results are consistent with past studies by by Reio and Sanders-Reio (2011) and Yeung and Griffin’s (2008). Yeung and Griffin (2008) also found that coworker incivility was the highest source of incivility. Employees interact frequently on a daily basis with other coworkers and they may perceive coworkers as competitors. Therefore, uncivil acts by co-workers such as rudeness, belittling and discourteous behavior can affect the employees’ emotions (Yeung and Griffin, 2008).

It was hypothesized that customer incivility was positively related to employee engagement. However, the impact of customer incivility was slightly lower than coworker incivility. The results were consistent with past studies (Baranik, Wang, Gong and Shi, 2014; Jung and Yoon,

2014). Uncivil acts or behaviors instigated by customers especially for frontline employees can affect their health and job performance. As stated by Baranik et al. (2014), the uncivil behavior by customers lead to emotional distress, burnout, and absenteeism. As revealed in this study, customer incivility had a much higher impact on employee exhaustion than supervisor incivility. This is similar to the results of a study by Cho, Bon, Han and Lee (2016). A study by Karatepe (2015) revealed that frontline employees frequently encounter uncivil behavior from customers that leads to higher level of emotional exhaustion as compared with co-worker or supervisor incivility.

This research has several practical and theoretical implications. From the practical perspective, the results of this study highlighted the importance of managing and handling customer and coworker incivility. In this study, coworker and customer incivility were the two significant predictors of lower levels of employee engagement in the health sector. This study provided policy makers and leaders in the health sector with new insights. In the health sector there is a lot of interaction with patients and uncivil behaviors by patients or customers can result in stress and burnout of employees. Therefore, training should be provided to employees on how to manage and handle difficult and uncivil patients and customers. Higher levels of autonomy is recommended for managers in the health sector to diffuse or deal with uncivil customers. Organizational leaders should also take note that coworker incivility is important because it can affect employee engagement. Therefore, leaders should provide training on team-working and managing conflict. Business organizations need to recognize the importance of incivility and take positive initiatives to implement internal policies to manage incivility and support employees. Human resource managers should include incivility into performance management systems. The concept of workplace incivility is still relatively new and there is ongoing research on this concept. From the theoretical perspective, this study revealed some new insights such as the significant role of both coworker incivility and customer incivility. This research extended the workplace incivility literature by providing the influence of customer,

supervisor and co-worker incivility on employee engagement.

Several limitations were noted in this research. Firstly, the research was done in Seychelles. The combined effect of customer, coworker and supervisor incivility should be empirically tested in other countries for generalization. There are cultural differences that include organizational culture. For instance, there can be difference in authoritarian and non-authoritarian cultures. Therefore, it is further recommended that future research consider the role of organization culture. This study looked at the impact of workplace incivility on employee engagement. It is recommended that future studies incorporate the antecedents and consequences of workplace incivility that will provide better understating. This was a quantitative study and a self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data. A more in-depth qualitative study is recommended. It is recommended that a qualitative study based on phenomenology be undertaken to get an in-depth information on employees' experience of a certain phenomenon. The in-depth experience of respondents through a phenomenological study will set aside biases and preconceived assumptions about human experiences, feelings, and responses to a particular situation.

References

1. Al Mehrzi, N. and Singh, S. K. (2016) 'Competing through employee engagement: a proposed framework', *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(6), pp. 831–843.
2. Aon Hewitt (2012). *Total Reward Survey*, Aon Hewitt, London. IMF (2013), *Modest Growth Pickup in 2013*, Projects IMF, *Global Economic Outlook*, January 2013. (Online) Available at: www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2013/new012313a.htm (Assesed September 28 2019).
3. Andersson, L. M. and Pearson, C. M. (1999) 'Tit for Tat? The Spiraling Effect of Incivility in the Workplace', *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), pp. 452–471. doi: 10.2307/259136.
4. Bakker, A. B. (2011) 'An Evidence-based Model of Work Engagement', *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), pp. 265–269. doi: 10.1177/0963721411414534.
5. Baranik, L.E., Wang, M., Gong, Y. and Shi, J., 2017. Customer mistreatment, employee health, and job performance: Cognitive rumination and social sharing as mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Management*, 43(4), pp.1261-1282.

6. Beattie, L. and Griffin, B. (2014), "Day-level fluctuations in stress and engagement in response to workplace incivility: a diary study", *Work and Stress*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 124-142
7. Bovet, P., Gédéon, J., Louange, M., Durasnel, P., Aubry, P., and Gaüzère, B. A. (2013). Health situation and issues in the Seychelles in 2012. *Medecine et sante tropicales*, 23(3), 267-268.
8. Bowling, N.A. and Beehr, T.A., 2006. Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: a theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 91(5), p.998.
9. Chen, Y., Ferris, D.L., Kwan, H.K., Yan, M., Zhou, M. and Hong, Y., 2013. Self-love's lost labor: A self-enhancement model of workplace incivility. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4), pp.1199-1219.
10. Cho, M., Bonn, M., Han, S. and Lee, K. (2016), "Workplace incivility and its effect upon restaurant frontline service employee emotions and service performance", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 28 No. 12, pp. 2888-2912.
11. Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 55-75.
12. Field, A. P. (2009) 'Multiple Regression Using SPSS', *Research Methods in Psychology*, pp. 1-11.
13. Frank, F. and Taylor, C. (2004), "Talent management: trends that will shape the future", *Human Resources Planning*, Vol. 27, pp. 33-41.
14. Frost, J. (2013, May). Regression Analysis: How do I interpret R-squared and assess the goodness-of-fit? (Online) Retrieved from <http://sphsdevilphysics.weebly.com/uploads> (Assessed September 28 2019)
15. Furnham, A. and Taylor, J., 2004. The dark side of behaviour at work: Understanding and avoiding employees leaving, thieving and deceiving. Springer.
16. Garson, G. D. (2012). Testing statistical assumptions. Asheboro, NC: Statistical Associates Publishing.
17. Han, S. J., Bonn, M. A. and Cho, M. (2016) 'The relationship between customer incivility, restaurant frontline service employee burnout and turnover intention', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. Elsevier Ltd, 52, pp. 97-106. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.10.002.
18. Hogan, R. and Kaiser, R. B. (2005) 'What We Know About Leadership', *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2), pp. 169-180. doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.169.
19. Hur, W.-M., Kim, B.-S. and Park, S.-J. (2015) 'The Relationship between Coworker Incivility, Emotional Exhaustion, and Organizational Outcomes: The Mediating Role of Emotional Exhaustion', *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing and Service Industries*, 25(6), pp. 701-712. doi: 10.1002/hfm.
20. J. Anitha (2014) 'Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance', *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), pp. 308-323. doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008.
21. Jung, H.S. and Yoon, H.H. (2014), "Antecedents and consequences of employees' job stress in a foodservice industry: focused on emotional labor and turnover intent", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 38, pp. 84-88
22. Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
23. Karatepe, O.M. (2015), "Do personal resources mediate the effect of perceived organizational support on emotional exhaustion and job outcomes?", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 4-26.
24. Kim, H. and Qu, H. (2019) 'The Effects of Experienced Customer Incivility on Employees' Behavior Toward Customers and Coworkers', *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 43(1), pp. 58-77. doi: 10.1177/1096348018764583.
25. Macey, W. H. and Schneider, B. (2008) 'The Meaning of Employee Engagement', *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(01), pp. 3-30. doi: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002. x.
26. Martine, R. J., and Hine, D. W. (2005). Development and validation of the uncivil workplace behavior questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 477-490.
27. May, D. R., Gilson, R. L. and Harter, L. M. (2004) 'The Psychological Conditions of Meaningfulness, Safety and Availability and the Engagement of the Human Spirit at Work', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, pp. 11-37. doi: 10.5301/ijao.5000431.
28. McWilliams, C. T. (2017) 'Take It or Leave: Customer Incivility and Intention to Quit in New-Hire Frontline Hospitality Employees', Dissertation, Grand Canyon University.
29. Merry, J. (2013). Aon Hewitt's 2013 trends in global engagement: where do organizations need to focus attention? *Strategic HR Review*, 13(1), 24-31. doi:10.1108/shr-07-2013-0073
30. National Bureau of Statistics (2018). (Online). Available from <https://www.nbs.gov.sc/> (Assessed September 28 2019)
31. Nunnally, J. C., and Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGrawHill
32. Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows* (4th ed.). Berkshire: Open University Press.
33. Pearson, C.M., Andersson, L.M. and Wegner, J.W., 2001. When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human relations*, 54(11), pp.1387-1419.
34. Porath, C. L. and Pearson, C. M. (2010) 'The Cost of Bad Behavior', *Organizational Dynamics*, 39(1), pp. 64-71. doi: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2009.10.006.

35. Robinson, D., Perryman, S. and Hayday, S., 2004. The drivers of employee engagement. Report-Institute for Employment Studies.
36. Reio, T. G. and Sanders-Reio, J. (2011) 'Thinking about workplace engagement: Does supervisor and coworker incivility really matter?', *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), pp. 462–478. doi: 10.1177/1523422311430784.
37. Saks, A. M. (2006) 'Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), pp. 600–619. doi: 10.1108/02683940610690169.
38. Sekaran, U., and Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach* (5th ed.). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
39. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business students*. Essex: Pearson Savitsky, E., Rehnborg, G. B. and Ibarra, K. (2000) 'Emergency medical services development in the Seychelles islands', *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 18(3), pp. 332–335. doi: 10.1016/S0735-6757(00)90131-1.
40. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B. and Salanova, M. (2006) 'The Measurement of Work Engagement with a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study', *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), pp. 701–716. doi: 10.1177/0013164405282471.
41. Schaufeli, W.B. and Bakker, A.B., 2010. Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, 12, pp.10-24.
42. Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E. and Erez, A. (2016) 'Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(October), pp. S57–S88. doi: 10.1002/job.1976.
43. Shuck, B. and Wollard, K., 2010. Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human resource development review*, 9(1), pp.89-110.
44. Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. (2013) *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 6th edn, New York: Harper and Row. 6th edn. United States: Pearson Education Inc. doi: 10.1037/022267.
45. Whittington, J.L., Meskelis, S., Asare, E. and Beldona, S., 2017. *Enhancing employee engagement: An evidence-based approach*. Springer.
46. Wilson, N.L. and Holmvall, C.M. (2013), "The development and validation of the incivility from customers scale", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 310-326.
47. Whittington, J.L., Meskelis, S., Asare, E. and Beldona, S., 2017. *Enhancing employee engagement: An evidence-based approach*. Springer.
48. Workie, N. W. et al. (2018) 'Who Needs Big Health Sector Reforms Anyway? Seychelles' Road to UHC Provides Lessons for Sub-Saharan Africa and Island Nations', *Health Systems and Reform*. Taylor and Francis, 4(4), pp. 362–371. doi: 10.1080/23288604.2018.1513265.
49. Yeung, A., and Griffin, B. (2008). *Workplace incivility: Does it matter in Asia? People and Strategy*, 31, 14-19.
50. Ying, H. H. et al. (2013) 'Employee Engagement in Nursing Industry: A study on Hospital-based Nurses', Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, (August). Available at: <http://eprints.utar.edu.my/1121/1/BA-2013-1100331.pdf>.