

This article was downloaded by:
Publisher: KKG Publications



Key Knowledge Generation

Publication details, including instructions for authors:

<http://kkgpublications.com/business/>

Interactive Effects of Social Support and Incivility on Affective Commitment in Banking Sector of Pakistan

FAROOQ ANWAR ¹, JULIAN PAUL SIDIN ²

^{1,2} Faculty of Business, Economics and Accountancy,
Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia

Published online: 13 December 2016

To cite this article: Anwar, F., & Sidin, J. P. (2016). Interactive effects of social support and incivility on affective commitment in banking sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies*, 2(6), 213-224.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.20469/ijbas.2.10006-6>

To link to this article: <http://kkgpublications.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/2/Volume2/IJBAS-10006-6.pdf>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

KKG Publications makes every effort to ascertain the precision of all the information (the “Content”) contained in the publications on our platform. However, KKG Publications, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the content. All opinions and views stated in this publication are not endorsed by KKG Publications. These are purely the opinions and views of authors. The accuracy of the content should not be relied upon and primary sources of information should be considered for any verification. KKG Publications shall not be liable for any costs, expenses, proceedings, loss, actions, demands, damages, expenses and other liabilities directly or indirectly caused in connection with given content.

This article may be utilized for research, edifying, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly verboten.

INTERACTIVE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT AND INCIVILITY ON AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT IN BANKING SECTOR OF PAKISTAN

FAROOQ ANWAR ^{1*}, JULIAN PAUL SIDIN ²

^{1,2} Faculty of Business, Economics and Accountancy, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia

Keywords:

Incivility
Social Support
Affective Commitment
Banking Industry
Pakistan

Abstract. Several researchers contended that mistreatment has a tendency to induce stress among individuals, which fosters responses that are often incompatible with work outcomes. Therefore, there is a need to adopt a more focused-approach on the systematic investigation of how mistreatment causes stress while social support playing a moderating role among the said relationship, especially in Pakistani working environment. Hence, the current research investigates the impact of mistreatment (through incivility) on affective commitment in the presence of social support as moderating variable. The data is collected from 529 employees working in Pakistani banking industry. The results indicate that social support and incivility has an impact on affective commitment while social support also act as moderator in incivility and affective commitment relationship. The present study applies occupational research framework, affective event theory and social exchange theory at mistreatment in the Pakistani context. This framework is rarely adapted in this situation so it would contribute to the literature.

Received: 12 August 2016

Accepted: 25 October 2016

Published: 13 December 2016

©2016 KKG Publications. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

Mistreatment is defined as a violent behavior that is spontaneous, undesirable, and violates an important right to respectful treatment (Harlos, 2010). This phenomenon has received increased scholars' interest as how to cope with mistreatment (Abas & Otto, 2016). This study focuses on interpersonal mistreatment rather than depersonalized forms such as mistreatment related to policies (Boswell & Olson-Buchanan, 2004; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2008). Interpersonal mistreatment at workplace describes some behaviors which have been a concern to organizations for decades. Although, legislations exist to protect individuals from such behaviors still much uncertainty exists (Willness, Steel & Lee, 2007). Mistreatment has been studied by different researchers using a plethora of different terms such as hardship (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999), emotional abuse (Keashly, 2001), sexual harassment (Lim & Cortina, 2005), bullying (Leymann, 1996; McAvoy & Murtagh, 2003), counterproductive work behaviors (Viswesvaran Schmidt & Ones, 2002), physical violence, organizational injustice (Aryee, Chen, Sun & Debrah, 2007; Tepper, Duffy, Henle & Lambert, 2006), and social undermining (Duffy, Ganster & Pagon, 2002). The results of these studies have confirmed that mistreatment is detrimental to individuals and organization (Yildirim, 2009; Bergman, Languh, Palmieri, Cortina & Fitzgerald, 2002; Fox & Stallworth, 2010; Salin & Hoel, 2013; Hershcovis, 2011; Keashly, Trott & MacLean, 1994).

Social support has been studied extensively in occupational health and related fields, and results have confirmed that organizational social support positively affects the workers' satisfaction, commitment and related outcomes (Viswesvaran, Sanchez & Fisher, 1999; Halbesleben, 2006; Van Daalen, Willemsen & Sanders, 2006). Besides, it's positive effects on job satisfaction, commitment, and related outcomes, the results of the above studies have also shown that organizational social support mitigates the effects mistreatment and stress on employees' attitude and behaviors. According to Saks (2006), organizational actions include social support that relates positively to the work outcomes of employees. If social support is used as a moderator between mistreatment and work outcomes, these would modify the negative impact of stress and ultimately, increase job satisfaction, work performance (Baruch-Feldman, Brondolo, Ben-Dayan & Schwartz, 2002) and well-being (Lim & Cortina, 2005).

Pakistani work environment is worth to investigate the mistreatment and related its related concepts. As this concept originates in Western countries and researchers in those countries, have paid sufficient attention to this phenomenon, and due to their this effort, employees started raising voice against it and consequently, the organization adopted different mechanisms to cope with increasing mistreatment at the workplace. Though, Pakistan had democratic political set-up and encouraged the freedom of speech and respect for everyone. Despite

*Corresponding author: Farooq Anwar

†Email: farooqanwar79@gmail.com



this, facts are contrary to laws and such cases are hardly reported. Therefore, conducting this study in Pakistani work environment would be a unique case as compared to Western countries.

Researcher scholars have exerted considerable effort toward examining mistreatment and its work-related outcomes such as stress (Barclay, Skarlicki & Pugh, 2005), lower levels of commitment (Sakurai, Jex & Gillespie, 2011), job satisfaction (Penney & Spector, 2005), productivity (Ghosh, Jacobs & Reio Jr, 2011; Giumetti et al., 2013) and work effort (Burnes & Pope, 2007). Nevertheless, most of the earlier studies have mainly taken physical mistreatment such as physical violence. Apart from physical mistreatment, contemporary literature has incorporated mistreatment that encompasses the emotional type of victimization (Tepper, 2000; Schat, Kelloway & Desmarais, 2005; Nielsen, Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2008).

Previous researchers indicate that the victims of mistreatment and harassment tend to report lower commitment (Sakurai et al., 2011), job satisfaction (Penney & Spector, 2005) and work effort (Burnes & Pope, 2007). Nowadays, organizations are paying much attention to introducing controls as the coping source to overcome the negative consequences of workplace mistreatment. Thus, the purpose of this study is to develop an integrated approach to examining the consequences of workplace mistreatment (using incivility as mistreatment). Consequently, this study also determines the moderating effects of social support on incivility and affective commitment in Pakistani work settings.

LITERATURE REVIEW & THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

From last two decades, interpersonal mistreatment at the workplace has been increased exponentially in research. With the increasing phenomenon researchers are interested different aspects of workplace mistreatment that includes abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000), bullying (Einarsen, 1999), incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999), and social undermining (Duffy et al., 2002). The perception of abusive supervision was introduced by Tepper, in which he explained as subordinate views of the level of which supervisors involve in the continuous demonstration of unfriendly verbal and nonverbal behaviors, apart from physical contact (Tepper, 2000). Mistreatment is not only victimizing the individual but also adversely affects an organization. Organizations have accepted that the place of work can be used to encourage or strengthen good working practices and conventional varieties. Therefore, organizations are putting a lot of efforts for the well-being of their employees to increase the productivity (Coats & Lekhi, 2008).

Affective Events Theory is a psychological model that is used to explain the link between feelings and emotions in the workplace. It is highlighted by a belief that human beings are emotional and their behavior is directed by emotion. According to Weiss and Corpanzano (1996), some events occur that may affect the experience at the workplace, which ultimately affects the work behaviors, is called affective event theory. Such events caused the adverse effects of conflict among the individuals, which engage individuals that ultimately caused decreased work outcomes (Rusting & DeHart, 2000). According to Bowling and Beehr (2006), people face negative effects from interpersonal mistreatment at the workplace, so these effects cause in changing individual's reaction.

Social exchange theory was emerged in the 20th century with considering it in 1960. It was firstly introduced by sociologist George Homans with its work *Publications Social Behavior as Exchange* in 1987. Social Exchange Theory explains that humans in social situations choose behaviors that maximize the likelihood of meeting self-interest and also shared reserves and perceived responsibilities between two parties, such as an employee and an organization (Gouldner, 1960; Blau, 1964). Theory of social exchange encompasses other primary perceptions that extend support for defining the charisma of social interactions too. Mainly, it is a view of individuals as decision makers in rewards and cost. Rewards are defined as any advantage substituted in personal relationships. In all cases, though, the status of something as a reward is being perceived as rewarding by an individual in a social exchange. For example, receiving praise from an organization may be a strong remuneration for a person even though it might mean comparatively little to another individual (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1974; Lewis & Spainer, 1982; Makoba, 1993).

Interpersonal Mistreatment is a broad term that ranges from slightly disregard or discourtesy, to more serious acts such as continuous harassment, social prohibition, or verbal abuse. It also defines as violent behavior that is spontaneous and undesirable, and which violate an important right to respectful treatment (Harlos, 2010). Over the last decade, there is a great focus on these mistreatments in corporate settings (Gallus, Bunk, Matthews, Barnes-Farrell & Magley, 2014). Mistreating can happen in different ways like bullying (Leymann, 1996; McAvoy & Murtagh, 2003), emotional abuse (Keashly, 1997), abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000), counterproductive work behaviors (Viswesvaran et al., 2002), and social undermining (Duffy et al., 2002). When any form of workplace mistreatment occurs within an organization a series of occupational problems often ensue (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). In previous studies, it has been noticed an increased scholarly interest

in the mistreatment and how to cope with this phenomenon. In the present study, there is a focus on interpersonal mistreatment rather than depersonalized forms such as mistreatment related to policies (Boswell & Olson-Buchanan, 2004; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2008). The present study only takes incivility as mistreatment to understand its impact on the organizational outcome.

In mistreatment context, incivility appeared as a striking variable to be study (Blau & Andersson, 2005; Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008; Mohr et al., 2007). It was firstly defined by Andersson and Pearson (1999) as low-intensity divergent behaviors such as rude and uncivil verbal and non-verbal behaviors endorsed toward another individual with uncertain intent to harm. Workplace incivility is quite different from other specific forms of interpersonal mistreatment, such as workplace bullying (Hoel, Sparks & Cooper, 2001) and abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000). First, incivility consists of low-intensity interpersonal mistreatment. That is, if interpersonal mistreatment is categorized along a range of severity or intensity, incivility will create the lower end of this range (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Schat et al., 2005). It means that low-intensity mistreatment such as rude comments and talking to a coworker in an arrogant way would create incivility, but does not more intense aggression such as physical violence. Previous literature proposed that such low-intensity verbal forms of mistreated behavior are more frequent in the work environment (Kaukiainen et al., 2001).

Secondly, the intention behind incivility is unclear. Andersson and Pearson (1999) initially theorized that incivility initiators may act in such uncivil way what may damage the organization/target to benefit themselves or may also without any conscious intention. Its example is, a person make fun about another individual rudely in such a way that humiliated the person. After being humiliated that individual shows dissatisfaction with the organization and work unit or the individual may simply have an indigent sense of humor. This is divergence to another interpersonal mistreatment, such as bullying and abusive supervision wherein the intent to inflict harm to another is incontrovertible (Tepper, 2000; Hoel et al., 2001; Duffy et al., 2002; Hoel, Einarsen, Keashly, Zapf & Cooper, 2003).

Individuals are sensitive towards disrespect of interpersonal norms and being treated in an uncivil manner is related to different reduced outcomes for both individuals and organizations (Mikula, Petri & Tanzer, 1990). It is stated that individuals who experience uncivil behavior practice psychological stress like anxiety and depression (Caza & Cortina, 2007; Cortina et al.,

2002) and decreased well-being (Lim & Cortina, 2005). Re-

search also suggest that at an organizational level, the individual subject to incivility display reduced job performance (Skarlicki, Van Jaarsveld & Walker, 2008) and job satisfaction (Cortina et al., 2002). Therefore, it is projected that with a subject to incivility in the workplace businesses can costs 14,000 a year per employee as a result of diversion with work and delay in projects (Porath & Pearson, 2013).

Previous research suggested that at least one-third of employees who practiced mistreatment at work subsequently reported lower commitment (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Pearson et al., 2000). Similarly, after experiencing mistreatment in the workplace, employees are supposed to place less importance on the role of work and more importance on other roles in their life (Cortina et al., 2002). Studies have found that as a result of incivility, 12% of employees left the organization to avoid working with the abusive supervisors (Andersson Pearson, 1999; Pearson, Andersson & Porath, 2000). Furthermore, as mistreatment becomes more repeated, the commitment would decrease (Cortina et al., 2002).

Outcomes of workplace mistreatment may add to the formation of such workplaces that are unfavorable, discourteous, distrustful, restricted and stressful. It would ultimately reflect in workplaces with increased absenteeism, reduced commitment, and decreased job satisfaction (Pearson et al., 2000). The consequence is that mistreatment will be infrequent and counteracted quickly where policies are clear, and individuals have a strong normative commitment to fair treatment (Vardi, 2001). Individual proclivities for mistreatment are more expected to translate into mistreated behaviors when those with such proclivities find themselves in organizational tolerance climate (Dekker & Barling, 1998; Pryor & Meyers, 2000). It is also suggested that, in a few some organizations, mistreatment can't be integral component of culture, however is indirectly permitted' up till now. If mistreatment having no policy, no social support provided by the organization and no punishment for those who engage in mistreatment, it could be interpreted that the organization accepts the behavior (Rayner, Foorman, Perfetti, Pesetsky & Seidenberg, 2002).

In general, organizational commitment can be express as faithfulness and devotion towards the organization, and principles. Employees' shows the enthusiasm to make an effort personally on behalf of the organization and a strong wish to sustain the relationship of the organization (Donald & Siu, 2001). The individuals with great magnitude of stress may have very less magnitude towards organizational commitment. In the prior studies, the correlation between commitment and the job satisfaction is also suggested (Brooke, Russel & Orice, 1988;

Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977). Commitment can be distinct in

several ways. Organizational commitment has three types that are; affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment (Mowday, Steers & Poter, 1979). The present study focused on the affective commitment because it is a lower order construct. It states that affective commitment is the positive emotional affection and identification of the individuals to the group (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

H1: Incivility has a significant and negative impact on affective commitment.

Social support defines as communications that redirect caring, empathy, emotional support, and the support in problem-solving with tangible help and instrumental information (House, 1981; Thoits, 1985). Supportive behaviors express messages to the individuals that they are valued member of the organization, and they would be treated with self-esteem and dignity (Vitanov, Halfmann, Shore & Bergmann 2001). Social support is a type of socio-emotional consequence that stimulates organization to respond towards the positive benefits to the individuals. It suggests that an organization encourage employee expectations for the benefits in future. Social support of the organization provides clear vision to the employees that they are treated with dignity and are the valued member of the organization (Spence, Shore & Klein, 2001).

Research suggests that social support relates positively to employee self-reported job and organizational engagement (Saks, 2006). Support behaviors by the organization also related significantly to individuals' work performance, as rated by an objective measure (Baruch-Feldman et al., 2002) and rated by an organization (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Within the context of social exchange theory, coworker instigated mistreatment, and it would result in decreased employee motivation to the organization because of feeling negative reciprocity and negatively aroused emotion. According to (Saks, 2006), social support also provides employee motivation for positive mutuality because supportive behaviors by the organization endorse individuals trust and expectancies that ultimately lead towards the increased work outcomes. Therefore, social support related positively with the work outcomes.

H2: Social Support has a significant and positive impact on affective commitment.

Previous research mainly observed the organization as a backdrop facilitating interpersonal mistreatment and bullying (Einarsen, Raknes & Matthiesen, 1994; Zapf, 1999). Using this framework, Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) conducted a meta-analysis to show that coworker social support correlates positively to employee organizational commitment, and negatively to job involvement and effort reduction. In contrast,

mistreatment correlates positively to stress and negatively to

employee organizational affective commitment and job satisfaction. Employee perceptions of the organizational obligation fulfillment about the social support given by the organization, either organization tolerate or in tolerate the stressful behavior and what policies they enforce to reduce such action (Coyle-Shapiro & Neuman, 2004; Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch & Rhoades, 2001). Based on the above argument it can be hypothesized that organizational actions moderate the relationship between stress and work outcomes.

H3: Social support moderates the relationship of incivility and affective commitment.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research design includes series of rational decision making adoptions to collect the data and examining it to draw deductions (Sekaran, 2003). In this study, the actual size of target population is known therefore probability sampling design is considered appropriate. A probability sampling design is one in which every item of the population has a known chance of being a part of sample (Sekaran, 2003). The next stage in sampling procedure is the determination of sample size. Sample size must be good demonstrative of population in order to increase the generalizability (Sekaran, 2003). Determination of sample size depends on factors such as variability in population, precision, confidence level and the choice of sampling design. Due to resource constraints, the data is collected from 529 random selected employees from four cities of Punjab Province; Multan, Sahiwal, Bahawalpur and Khanewal have been chosen.

The scales taken to measure the independent, dependent and moderated variable are valid and reliable in previous studies. Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS) of Cortina et al. (2002) is adapted to measure the uncivil behavior that an individual experience on the workplace. It was firstly defined by Andersson and Pearson (1999) as low intensity divergent behaviors such as rude and uncivil verbal and non-verbal behaviors endorsed toward another individual with uncertain intent to harm. In present study, incivility is one of the main dimension of mistreatment that leads toward stress and then decreased work outcomes.

Social support has been defined as communications that redirect caring, empathy, emotional support, and the support in problem solving with tangible help and instrumental information (House, 1981; Thoits, 1985). In the present study, social support performs a moderating role to the work outcomes while coping with stress. Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet & Farley, 1988) was used.

Affective commitment is the positive emotional connection and

employees identification to the organization (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986) after mistreating on the workplace what would be the effect on employees' affective commitment. We borrowed some items to measure the affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Data collected through questionnaires were coded and entered into SPSS for analysis purpose. To analyze the data, SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) and Partial Least Square (PLS) path modeling were used. First, procedure adopted for verification of data entry and handling of missing responses if any, is described. Second, descriptive statistics techniques used to describe the characteristics of data are listed. Third, measures of data normality used are briefed. Fourth, tests of validity and reliability of the measures are discussed. Fifth,

Pearson correlation coefficient as measures of degree and direction of association among variables is described. Fifth, structural models constructed in PLS path-modeling to test the proposed hypotheses of the study are briefed.

RESULTS

The demographic analysis consist of respondent's gender and age is shown in table 1. For gender, the statistics shows that 59.2% respondents were males and 40.8% respondents were females. In case of age, the results shows that 40.5% respondents were having the age between 21 and 30. 53.9% respondents were having the age between 31 and 5.7% respondents were having the age between 41 and 50. Overall, 26.66 years remained the average score of the respondents.

TABLE 1
Demographic Statistics (N = 529)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	313	59.2
	Female	216	40.8
Age	21 30	214	40.5
	31 40	285	53.9
	41 50	30	5.7

It is the necessary assumption in statistical estimation process to test the data normality (Bai & Ng, 2005). According to Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson (2010), data normality is tested through skewness and kurtosis. Kurtosis measures that how the peaked or flat a data distribution is and skewness measures the symmetry of the data. Data distribution with highly skewed nature or with high kurtosis is the indication that data are not normal and affect the estimation process. If it is bell

shaped than it is positively skewed. If data is positively skewed then data is normal. First, values of Kurtosis and Skewness should be between -3 and +3 range. Second, numeric values of skewness and kurtosis are compared with the twice of their respective standard errors. If their values fall in this range then normality assumption in data distribution is not violated (Hair et al., 2010). All the results summarized in table 2.

TABLE 2
Descirptive Statistics, Skewness and Kurtosis Results

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
				Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Affective Commitment	529	4.30	.403	-2.532	.106	7.706	.212
Social Support	529	3.42	1.374	.057	.106	-1.892	.212
Incivility	529	3.65	.840	-.365	.106	-1.127	.212
Valid N (listwise)	529						

To determine the validity of the constructs using in this study, factor analysis is performed. Factor analysis is used for confirmation of factor structure of the latent constructs and has two types: exploratory and confirmatory factor Analysis. According to Hair et al. (2010), confirmatory factor analysis is used to confirm the hypothesized factor structure of the construct based on prior theory. The present study is based on the adapted scales. Therefore, confirmatory factor analysis is used in present study in order to confirm the factor structure of the construct. Factor analysis is based on two assumptions. First, test of Sphericity should be tested through Bartlett test.

The p value is the criterion for deciding the control of Sphericity. Second is the adequacy of the sample used to analyze and the test used to check the adequacy is the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO). The value of KMO should be in between 0 and 1, the value closer to 1 means the data sample is accurate for running factor analysis (Anastasiadou, 2011). These tests are run in exploratory factor analysis using SPSS. In order to test Sphericity of the factors and data adequacy, exploratory factor analysis was performed on all the measures under study and results are summarized in the table 3.

TABLE 3
Factor Analysis & Reliability Statistics

Variable	Items	Factor Loading	AVE Composite	Reliability	Cronbach Alpha (α)
Incivility	IN1	0.77	0.584	0.907	0.881
	IN2	0.82			
	IN3	0.83			
	IN4	0.68			
	IN5	0.68			
	IN6	0.72			
	IN7	0.84			
Social Support	SS1	0.95	0.770	0.970	0.961
	SS2	0.94			
	SS3	0.97			
	SS4	0.96			
	SS5	0.88			
	SS6	0.55			
	SS7	0.95			
	SS8	0.95			
	SS9	0.96			
	SS10	0.94			
	SS11	0.75			
	SS12	0.70			
Affective Commitment	AC1	0.52	0.580	0.843	0.820
	AC2	0.62			
	AC3	0.66			
	AC4	0.77			
	AC5	0.72			
	AC6	0.50			
	AC7	0.58			
	AC8	0.67			
	AC9	0.88			
	AC10	0.76			
	AC11	0.74			

From the above Table, it is revealed that Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity is highly significant with p value $<.001$, and KMO’s value of .856 that is closer to 1, showing that both assumptions are satisfactorily met to run the confirmatory factor analysis. That is why, with the aim of confirmation of the latent constructs, and measurement of validity and reliability, a comprehensive model was structured in PLS path modeling, in which, the indicators were loaded on their parent constructs and then model was run through calculating PLS algorithm. Convergent validity is measured through factor loadings and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Factor loading score represents the regression weights of each indicator on its parent construct (Hair et al., 2010).

AVE is used to measure the magnitude of variance that a latent variable captures from its indicators relative to the amount due to measurement errors (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). According to Hair et al. (2010), the score of AVE is greater than 0.50

indicates that indicators are significantly converged to form a latent variable. The results of measurement model revealed that all the indicators have loading score greater than 0.50 and the value of AVE are also greater than 0.50, which show that measures have good convergent validity. Reliability is the measure of consistency over time and consistency among indicators (Mazzocchi, 2008). There are two types of reliability. Both of the reliabilities are calculated separately. Composite reliability score is calculated based on the factor loading scores and assume that indicators are weighted equally (Werts, Linn & Joreskog, 1974). The value of composite reliability should be greater than 0.80. The results presented in the table revealed that all composite reliability in all cases exceeded the 0.80, which shows that measure have good reliability.

The correlation results among study variable is shown in table 4.

TABLE 4
Correlation

		Incivility	Social Support	Affective Commitment
Incivility	Pearson Correlation	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	N	529		
Social Support	Pearson Correlation	-.459**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	529	529	
Affective Commitment	Pearson Correlation	-.331**	.517**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	529	529	529

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 5 indicates the direct effects of incivility and social support on affective commitment of employees working in Pakistani banking industry. The SEM results from the following table reveals that incivility has significant and negative ef-

fects on affective commitment ($\gamma = -0.194, p < 0.001$), whereas social support has significant and positive impact on affective commitment ($\gamma = 0.421, p < 0.001$).

TABLE 5
Direct Effects (Dependent Variable Affective Commitment)

Variable	R Square	Beta Coefficient	Standard Error
Incivility	0.12	-0.194***	0.033
Social Support	.260	0.421***	0.018

*** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

After estimating the direct effects, structural model was constructed to estimate the moderating effect of social support between incivility and affective commitment. Level of significance is determined through bootstrapping procedure. The results of moderating effect indicates in table 6. The results indicates that the interaction term of incivility and social sup-

port has significant and positive impact on affective commitment. As Baron and Kenny (1986) proposes, social support act as moderating variable which changes the negative effect's direction of incivility on affective commitment towards positive impact.

TABLE 6
Moderating Results (Dependent Variable Affective Commitment)

Variable	Beta Coefficient	Significant
Incivility * Social Support	0.541***	*** $p < 0.001$

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Mistreatment minimizes employee job satisfaction through four different factors that are; workplace incivility, workplace bullying, abusive supervision and social undermining. Mistreatment can create stress because of mistreated behavior among employees in the organization. It is tough for the individuals to face mistreated behavior. Employees become dissatisfied with their works. If social support uses as a moderator, then it would lessen the negative impact of stress. Therefore, it predicts that mistreatment has a significant impact on the work outcomes; job satisfaction, affective commitment, and well-being. The main focus of the present study is to develop the model then tests it which designed to examine the connection between incivility and affective commitment. Additionally, this study also investigates the moderating role of social support in incivility and affective commitment relationship. As discussed earlier, previous research agreed on the existence of mistreatment. However, no concrete evidence has been found from Pakistani context. Considering the workplace changes, the relationship between well-being and mistreatment has never been analyzed before in any study.

Firstly, current study had tested the direct effects of social support and incivility on affective commitment. In doing so, the path coefficients of predictors on outcomes and the amount of R Square attributable to each variable is 12% for incivility and 26% for social support. The results indicates that incivility as negative impact (beta = -0.194***, *** $p < 0.001$) and social support has positive impact on affective commitment (beta = 0.421***, *** $p < 0.001$). To understand the moderating role of social support, the results reveals that social support positively moderates the relationship of incivility and affective commitment.

The current study adds theoretical and practical evidence to the mistreatment literature. It gives an empirical validation and

conceptual model to the interpersonal mistreatment idea. The outcomes of the present study specify that mistreatment exists and there is a need for more consideration in the current workplace environment. Moreover, the present study also recognized a mechanism that may have the potential to lessen the adverse effects of mistreatment. The Structural Equation Modeling techniques (SEM) was used to test the instantaneous causal relationship between mistreatment and other constructs which explain work outcomes. Findings of ongoing research confirm the results of antecedent studies that work outcomes mainstream have ability to predict the work outcomes. It gives additional pragmatic support for the reliability and validity of the constructs of mistreatment within organizational environment. Many managerial implications have been suggested from the result of this study that may be considered while making a strategy to decrease stress from mistreated behavior and increase organizational productivity. The results recommend that there is a need to implement a stress reduction policy to support the employees to deal with this phenomenon in the organizations. The result also recommends that the commitment of top management and their support for the employees is very crucial in making a strategy.

There is a need to measure the few limitations while results interpretation. First, if there is a large sample, then chances of the risk of unfair results will be lessened and confirm that adequate valid questionnaire are collected. The sample size of 529 is acceptable limit but if sample size would increase than a risk of biases will ultimately be decreased and this sample size is accordance with the studies already has been done. Thus, it recommends that future study needs to take a reasonably large sample. In future longitudinal study can be conducted to test the before and after applying for a particular social support as compare to the correlational because the present study was correlational (Saks, 2006). The present study is conducted in

the banking sector which is not enough so that the study can be conducted in any other sector as well. Finally, future study should lengthen these findings with the exploration of the relationships between by adding policy enforcement and tolerance as the moderators.

REFERENCES

- Abas, N. A. H. B., & Otto, K. (2016). Interpersonal mistreatment, organizational attitudes and well-being: The impact of instigator's hierarchical position and demographic characteristics. *Organization Management Journal*, 13(1), 5-20.
- Anastasiadou, S. D. (2011). Reliability and validity testing of a new scale for measuring attitudes toward learning statistics with technology. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, 4(1), 1-10.
- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 452-471.
- Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L. Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 191-201.
- Bai, J., & Ng, S. (2005). Tests for skewness, kurtosis, and normality for time series data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 23(1), 49-60.
- Barclay, L. J., Skarlicki, D. P., & Pugh, S. D. (2005). Exploring the role of emotions in injustice perceptions and retaliation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 629-643.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182.
- Baruch-Feldman, C., Brondolo, E., Ben-Dayan, D., & Schwartz, J. (2002). Sources of social support and burnout, job satisfaction, and productivity. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7(1), 84-93.
- Bergman, M. E., Langhout, R. D., Palmieri, P. A., Cortina, L. M., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). The (un) reasonableness of reporting: Antecedents and consequences of reporting sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 230-242.
- Blau, G., & Andersson, L. (2005). Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(4), 595-614.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: Transaction Publishers.
- Boswell, W. R., & Olson-Buchanan, J. B. (2004). Experiencing mistreatment at work: The role of grievance filing, nature of mistreatment, and employee withdrawal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(1), 129-139.
- Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 998-1012.
- Brooke, P. P., Russell, D. W., & Price, J. L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 139-145.
- Burnes, B., & Pope, R. (2007). Negative behaviours in the workplace: A study of two primary care trusts in the NHS. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 20(4), 285-303.
- Caza, B. B., & Cortina, L. M. (2007). From insult to injury: Explaining the impact of incivility. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(4), 335-350.
- Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1082-1103.
- Coats, D., & Lekhi, R. (2008). *'Good work': Job quality in a changing economy*. London, UK: Work Foundation.
- Cortina, L. M., Lonsway, K. A., Magley, V. J., Freeman, L. V., Collinsworth, L. L., Hunter, M., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). What's gender got to do with it? Incivility in the federal courts. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 27(2), 235-270.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M., & Neuman, J. (2004). Individual dispositions and the psychological contract: The moderating effects of exchange and creditor ideologies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1), 150-164.
- Dekker, I., & Barling, J. (1998). Personal and organizational predictors of workplace sexual harassment of women by men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(1), 7-18.
- Donald, I., & Siu, O. L. (2001). Moderating the stress impact of environmental conditions: The effect of organizational commitment in Hong Kong and China. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21(4), 353-368.

- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 331-351.
- Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 16-27.
- Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. R. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 4(4), 381-401.
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 42-51.
- Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1999). Unfairness and resistance to change: Hardship as mistreatment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12(1), 35-50.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(3), 382-388.
- Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2010). The battered apple: An application of stressor-emotion-control/support theory to teachers' experience of violence and bullying. *Human Relations*, 63(7), 927-954.
- Gallus, J. A., Bunk, J. A., Matthews, R. A., Barnes-Farrell, J. L., & Magley, V. J. (2014). An eye for an eye? Exploring the relationship between workplace incivility experiences and perpetration. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(2), 143-154.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844.
- Ghosh, R., Jacobs, J. L., & Reio Jr, T. G. (2011). The toxic continuum from incivility to violence: What can HRD do? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(1), 3-9.
- Giumetti, G. W., Hatfield, A. L., Scisco, J. L., Schroeder, A. N., Muth, E. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (2013). What a rude e-mail! Examining the differential effects of incivility versus support on mood, energy, engagement, and performance in an online context. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(3), 297-309.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), 161-178.
- Hair, J. F., Black, B., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Halbesleben, J. R. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1134-1145.
- Harlos, K. (2010). If you build a remedial voice mechanism, will they come? Determinants of voicing interpersonal mistreatment at work. *Human Relations*, 63(3), 311-329.
- Hershcovis, M. S. (2011). "Incivility, social undermining, bullying ... oh my!": A call to reconcile constructs within workplace aggression research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 499-519.
- Hoel, H., Einarsen, S., Keashly, L., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (Eds.) (2003). *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Hoel, H., Sparks, K., & Cooper, C. L. (2001). *The cost of violence/stress at work and the benefits of a violence/stress-free working environment*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labor Organization.
- Homans, G. C. (1974). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. Oxford, UK: Harcourt Publishing.
- House, J. S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. California, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Kaukiainen, A., Salmivalli, C., Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., Lahtinen, A., Kostamo, A., & Lagerspetz, K. (2001). Overt and covert aggression in work settings in relation to the subjective wellbeing of employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, 27(5), 360-371.
- Keashly, L. (1997). Emotional abuse in the workplace: Conceptual and empirical issues. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 1(1), 85-117.
- Keashly, L. (2001). Interpersonal and systemic aspects of emotional abuse at work: The target's perspective. *Violence and Victims*, 16(3), 233-268.
- Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, 9(4), 341-357.
- Lewis, R., & Spanier, G. B. (1982). Marital quality, marital stability, and social exchange. In F. I. Nye (Ed.), *Family relationships: Rewards and costs* (pp. 49-66). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165-184.
- 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.
- 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.
- Makoba, J. W. (1993). Toward a general theory of social exchange. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 21(3), 227-239.
- Mazzocchi, M. (2008). *Statistics for marketing and consumer research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Mcavoy, B. R. & Murtagh, J. (2003) Workplace bullying. *BMJ*, 326, 776-777.
- Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. New York, NY: Sage Publications.
- Mikula, G., Petri, B., & Tanzer, N. (1990). What people regard as unjust: Types and structures of everyday experiences of injustice. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(2), 133-149.
- Mohr, D. C., Warren, N., Hodgson, M., Osatuke, K., Ward, C., & Dyrenforth, S. (2007). Workplace civility, workplace incivility and employee sick leave rate usage. In M. Nagy (Moderator), *Measuring and assessing workplace civility: Do "nice" organizations finish first?* Paper presented at the *Symposium at the 67th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, Philadelphia, PA.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- Nielsen, M. B., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2008). Sense of coherence as a protective mechanism among targets of workplace bullying. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(2), 128-136.
- Olson-Buchanan, J. B., & Boswell, W. R. (2008). An integrative model of experiencing and responding to mistreatment at work. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 76-96.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-499.
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29 (2), 123-137.
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(7), 777-796.
- Porath, C., & Pearson, C. (2013). The price of incivility. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(1), 114-121.
- Pryor, J. B., & Meyers, A. B. (2000). Men who sexually harass women. In L. B. Schlesinger (Ed.), *Serial offenders: Current thought, recent findings, unusual syndromes* (pp. 207-228). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D. T. (1977). Organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84(2), 265-288.
- Rayner, K., Foorman, B. R., Perfetti, C. A., Pesetsky, D., & Seidenberg, M. S. (2002). How should reading be taught? *Scientific American-American Edition*, 286(3), 70-77.
- Rusting, C. L., & DeHart, T. (2000). Retrieving positive memories to regulate negative mood: Consequences for mood-congruent memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 737-752.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Sakurai, K., Jex, S., & Gillespie, M. (2011). Negative work-family spillover of affect due to workplace incivility. *Japanese Association of Industrial/Organizational Psychology Journal*, 25, 13-23.
- Salin, D., & Hoel, H. (2013). Workplace bullying as a gendered phenomenon. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(3), 235-251.
- Schat, A. C., Kelloway, E. K., & Desmarais, S. (2005). The Physical Health Questionnaire (PHQ): Construct validation of a self-report scale of somatic symptoms. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 363-381.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Skarlicki, D. P., Van Jaarsveld, D. D., & Walker, D. D. (2008). Getting even for customer mistreatment: the role of moral identity in the relationship between customer interpersonal injustice and employee sabotage. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1335-1347.

- Spence, C., Shore, D. I., & Klein, R. M. (2001). Multisensory prior entry. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 130(4), 799-832.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178-190.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(1), 101-123.
- Thoits, P. A. (1985). Social support and psychological well-being: Theoretical possibilities. In I. G. Sarason & B. R. Sarason (Eds.), *Social support: Theory, research and applications* (pp. 51-72). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Springer.
- Van Daalen, G., Willemsen, T. M., & Sanders, K. (2006). Reducing workfamily conflict through different sources of social support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(3), 462-476.
- Vardi, Y. (2001). The effects of organizational and ethical climates on misconduct at work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 29(4), 325-337.
- Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, J. I., & Fisher, J. (1999). The role of social support in the process of work stress: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(2), 314-334.
- Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S. (2002). The moderating influence of job performance dimensions on convergence of supervisory and peer ratings of job performance: Unconfounding construct-level convergence and rating difficulty. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 345-354.
- Vitanov, N. V., Halfmann, T., Shore, B. W., & Bergmann, K. (2001). Laser-induced population transfer by adiabatic passage techniques. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, 52(1), 763-809.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). *Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work*. New York, NY: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.
- Werts, C. E., Linn, R. L., & Joreskog, K. G. (1974). Intraclass reliability estimates: Testing structural assumptions. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 34(1), 25-33.
- Willness, C. R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A metaanalysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(1), 127-162.
- Yildirim, D. (2009). Bullying among nurses and its effects. *International Nursing Review*, 56(4), 504-511.
- Zapf, D. (1999). Organisational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 70-85.
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 30-41.

– This paper does not have any appendix. –