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Abstract

**Purpose** – The purpose of this study is to evaluate the impact of workplace incivility on innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment and performance in travel agencies. The study also aims at exploring the mediating roles of innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment in the relationship between workplace incivility and performance.

**Design/methodology/approach** – The questionnaire was used to collect study data from the sample, which consisted of employees in Egyptian travel agencies, category (A), in Cairo Governorate. The questionnaire link was sent to 854 employees in travel agencies, with 644 obtained responses. Only 586 responses were suitable for analysis.

**Findings** – The results depicted that there is a significant and negative effect of workplace incivility on innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment and performance. The results also revealed a significant and positive effect of innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment on performance. Moreover, the results indicated that innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment play partial mediating roles in the link between workplace incivility and performance.

**Originality/value** – The current study attempts to measure the mediating role of innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment in the link between workplace incivility and performance. Managerial implications, limitations and future research are also presented.
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工作场所不文明行为是否会通过创新、组织公民行为和组织承诺影响旅行社绩效？

目的：本研究的主要目的是评估工作场所不文明行为对旅行社创新、组织公民行为、组织承诺和绩效的影响。该研究还旨在探讨创新、组织公民行为和组织承诺在工作场所不文明行为与绩效之间关系中的中介作用。

方法/途径：调查问卷用于从样本中收集研究数据。样本包括开罗省埃及旅行社（A类）的员工。问卷链接发送给854名旅行社员工，收到644份回复，只有586个回复适合分析。

结果/结论：结果表明，工作场所的不文明行为对创新、组织公民行为、组织承诺和绩效产生显著的负面影响。结果还揭示了创新、组织公民行为、组织承诺对绩效的显著和积极影响。此外，结果表明，创新、组织公民行为和组织承诺在工作场所不文明行为和绩效之间的联系中发挥部分中介作用。

原创性/价值：当前的研究试图衡量创新、组织公民行为和组织承诺在工作场所不文明行为和绩效之间的中介作用。还介绍了管理意义、局限性和未研究。

关键词：工作场所不文明行为、创新、组织公民行为、组织承诺、绩效、旅行社、埃及、文章类型：研究型论文
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Affecta la falta de civismo en el lugar de trabajo al rendimiento de las agencias de viajes a través de la innovación, los comportamientos de la ciudadanía organizativa y el compromiso de la organización?

Resumen

Objetivo: El objetivo principal del estudio es evaluar el impacto de la falta de civismo en el lugar de trabajo sobre la innovación, los comportamientos de ciudadanía organizativa, el compromiso de la organización y el rendimiento en las agencias de viajes. El estudio también pretende explorar los papeles mediadores de la innovación, las conductas de ciudadanía organizativa y el compromiso de la organización en la relación entre la incivilidad en el lugar de trabajo y el rendimiento.

Diseño/metodología/enfoque: Se utilizó el cuestionario para recopilar los datos del estudio de la muestra, que estaba formada por empleados de agencias de viajes egipcias, categoría (A), de la gobernación de El Cairo. El enlace del cuestionario se envió a 854 empleados de agencias de viajes, de los que se obtuvieron 644 respuestas. Sólo 586 respuestas fueron aptas para el análisis.

Resultados: Los resultados revelaron que existe un efecto significativo y negativo de la falta de civismo en el lugar de trabajo sobre la innovación, las conductas de ciudadanía organizativa, el compromiso de la organización y el rendimiento. Los resultados también revelaron un efecto significativo y positivo de la innovación, los comportamientos de ciudadanía organizativa, el compromiso de la organización sobre el rendimiento. Además, los resultados indicaron que la innovación, las conductas de ciudadanía organizativa y el compromiso de la organización desempeñan papeles mediadores parciales en el vínculo entre la falta de civismo en el lugar de trabajo y el rendimiento.

Originalidad/valor: El presente estudio trata de medir el papel mediador de la innovación, las conductas de ciudadanía organizativa y el compromiso de la organización en el vínculo entre la falta de civismo en el lugar de trabajo y el rendimiento. También se presentan las implicaciones para la gestión, las limitaciones y las investigaciones futuras.

Palabras clave Falta de civismo en el lugar de trabajo, Innovación, Comportamientos de ciudadanía organizacional, Compromiso de la organización, Rendimiento, Agencias de viajes, Egipto

Tipo de papel Trabajo de investigación

Introduction

Interpersonal abuse (such as incivility, bullying, harassment and poor supervision) is associated with several negative feedback reactions, which lead to negative organizational consequences such as decreased job satisfaction and increased intent to leave (Moon and Sánchez-Rodríguez, 2020). Incivility is a salient issue in various organizations, which focus on the violation of norms of respect in the workplace (Vasconcelos, 2020). Workplace incivility expresses rude and inappropriate actions, rumors, gossip and refusal to help coworkers (Gosselin and Ireland, 2020). Workplace incivility also represents a type of psychological harassment and emotional aggression that violates workplace ideals of mutual respect (Zivnuska et al., 2020). Bryant (2020) has expressed that workplace incivility has a profound impact on organizations and work, as it is a deadly silent epidemic. In travel agencies, Al-Romeedy and Ozbek (2022) identified various forms, including neglecting gratitude, disregarding coworkers’ input, sending personal messages, making disparaging remarks, displaying aggression, prying, spreading gossip, ignoring others and being disrespectful. Moon and Sánchez-Rodríguez (2020) emphasized that workplace incivility occurs mostly to those in higher positions, and those with job power and authority. Workplace incivility is very costly to the organization. Supervisor’s incivility can deplete employees’ mental and psychological energy, creating an unhealthy work environment, where employees lose their confidence, loyalty and enthusiasm to perform their work better (Bryant, 2020).

Studying the effects of workplace incivility in travel agencies is essential due to the industry’s unique customer-centric nature, where employee interactions directly impact customer experiences (Wiang and Chen, 2020). In addition, understanding how incivility influences employee well-being, teamwork and organizational performance is vital for fostering a healthy work environment, reducing turnover, enhancing innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment (Smith et al., 2021; Salman Chughtai and Ali Shah, 2020; Vasconcelos, 2020).
This study aims to address several gaps in the existing knowledge regarding workplace incivility. First, it seeks to contribute to the literature by examining workplace incivility specifically within the context of travel agencies, which has been inadequately explored in previous studies. This original approach provides added value by investigating workplace incivility in travel agencies and within the specific country context of Egypt. Second, recent research emphasizes the importance of understanding the outcomes of workplace incivility among employees. However, in the field of tourism studies, there is a lack of empirical studies examining the impact of workplace incivility on key outcomes such as innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment and performance. Third, no studies have explored the effect of workplace incivility on travel agency performance through innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment.

Thusly, the study’s major objective is to develop an integrated model that investigates the mediating roles of innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment in the relationship between workplace incivility and performance in Egyptian travel agencies. The main objective of the study is divided into three sub-objectives as follows:

1. assessing the effect of workplace incivility on innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment and performance;
2. evaluating the effect of innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment on performance; and
3. exploring the mediating roles of innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment in the relationship between workplace incivility and performance.

By examining the relationships between workplace incivility, innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment, research in this area can provide travel agencies with actionable insights to create a healthier work environment, enhance employee performance and improve overall business outcomes.

Literature review and hypotheses development

**Workplace incivility**

Alquwez (2020) defined workplace incivility as a state of disrespect toward others, a lack of concern for others’ perspectives or a lack of appreciation for the outstanding performance of others. It is also defined as rude and disruptive behavior that can lead to distress and may develop into bullying and other threatening situations (Schoville and Aebersold, 2020). Workplace incivility leads to violations of workplace rules and policies (Kwak, 2020). Uncivil behavior takes many forms, such as ignoring, inequality and lack of professionalism (Shen et al., 2020). In addition, Samosh (2019) highlighted that there are 14 forms indicative of workplace incivility, which include criticism/insulting, inappropriate jokes, yelling, vandalism, inappropriate language, fighting/arguing, rough speaking, name calling, lying, invasion of privacy, threatening, withholding information, unfair dealings and lack of appreciation for others. Such behavior does not occur without causes, as there are many causes that lead to such deviant behavior within the organization. Vasconcelos (2020) indicated that these causes include organizational unfairness, low job satisfaction, organizational conflicts, organizational change, job instability, lack of social support from colleagues and work holism. Furthermore, Bolding et al. (2020) clarified that workplace incivility stems from factors like nepotism, competence, communication, organizational fluctuations, unethical values, role conflict and mental illness. The conceptual framework is depicted in Figure 1.
The impact of workplace incivility on employee performance can be understood through the lens of the job demands-resources (JD-R) model, which offers valuable insights (Kim and Qu, 2019). According to the JD-R model, job characteristics can be classified as either demands or resources, and their interplay influences employee well-being and job performance (Lesener et al., 2019). Workplace incivility represents a job demand, which refers to aspects of the job requiring sustained effort and resulting in physical or psychological costs (Beattie and Griffin, 2014). Incivility exposes employees to negative behavior and disrespect, causing emotional and psychological stress. This demand aspect can impair an employee's capacity to perform effectively (Kim and Qu, 2019).

The JD-R model identifies resources as factors that assist employees in achieving work-related goals and coping with job demands. When dealing with the adverse effects of workplace incivility, resources such as social support from colleagues, supervisors and the organization become crucial (Kuriakose et al., 2023). The model highlights the interaction between job demands and resources. When high job demands coexist with low resources, it can lead to burnout and decreased performance. Therefore, inadequate resources to cope with the demands of workplace incivility can exacerbate its negative effects on performance. By applying the JD-R model to workplace incivility, it emphasizes the significance of not only addressing the uncivil behaviors but also providing employees with the necessary resources to cope with and counteract their negative impact (Garrosa et al., 2022).

The effect of workplace incivility on innovation. The prevalence of unethical behavior at work, such as incivility including mockery and disrespect for others, leads to employees' feelings of resentment, frustration, job alienation, anxiety and pressure, which reflect negatively on innovation (Salman Chughtai and Ali Shah, 2020). Alias et al. (2020) revealed that workplace incivility hinders employee skill and ability development by creating an unsuitable learning environment, resulting in weaker innovation. As well, employees are less creative when exposed to such negative behaviors at work (Abid et al., 2015). Aljawarneh and Atan (2018)...
indicated that workplace incivility negatively affects employees’ innovation in performing their jobs. Consequently, the following hypothesis was postulated:

**H1.** Workplace incivility affects innovation negatively.

The effect of workplace incivility on performance. Exposure to any form of workplace incivility leads to difficulty in exchanging knowledge, and reduces efforts at work, which negatively affects performance (De Clercq et al., 2018). Coworkers’ incivility can negatively impact job performance and reduce support from colleagues. Furthermore, it may cause employees to be hesitant to improve their performance. Workplace incivility harms both employee performance and the organization (Wang and Chen, 2020). Wang and Chen (2020) added that there is a negative correlation between workplace incivility and employee performance. While the results of the Jiang et al. (2019) confirmed the negative impact of workplace incivility on both organizational performance and employee performance. Therefore, the following hypothesis was formulated:

**H2.** Workplace incivility affects performance negatively.

Innovation as a mediator between work incivility and performance. Innovation is a crucial component that enables service providers to thrive and improve their performance (Tajeddini et al., 2020). The tourism industry is being innovated with new products, services and experiences, as well as improved marketing and stakeholder relationships (Iglesias-Sánchez et al., 2019). Regarding travel agencies, innovation enhances the performance of online travel agencies by enhancing their long-term profits (Raad et al., 2023). So, the following hypothesis was assumed:

**H3.** Innovation affects performance positively.

The significance of innovation becomes apparent when employees encounter workplace incivility (Jiang et al., 2019). As mentioned before, workplace incivility leads to unfavorable outcomes (Abubakar et al., 2018) such as reducing innovative behaviors (Aljawarneh and Atan, 2018). Employees who experience workplace incivility are more likely to perform poorly on all job responsibilities. Employees who actively participate in innovative behaviors are more inclined to find imaginative solutions, adjust to difficult circumstances and overcome the adverse effects of incivility on their performance (Al-Romeedy and Ozbek, 2022). Encouraging employees to think creatively and explore innovative solutions equips them with the skills to handle workplace incivility. They may develop a growth mindset, embrace change and identify opportunities for growth and improvement, all of which positively influence their performance (Adil et al., 2020). Uncivil acts can cause deplete resources and exhaust employees, which hinders creativity and innovative job performance (Jiang et al., 2019). As well, employees who embrace innovation are more likely to seek alternative approaches and strategies when faced with workplace incivility. They may discover new ways to manage conflicts, enhance collaboration or improve their own efficiency, leading to improved performance despite the negative impact of incivility (Vasconcelos, 2020). Furthermore, innovation contributes to a positive work environment that counteracts the negative effects of incivility. When employees are encouraged to innovate, it fosters a culture of openness, collaboration and continuous improvement. This type of environment mitigates the impact of incivility and creates a supportive atmosphere where employees can thrive and perform at their best (Negara et al., 2023). Consequently, the following hypothesis was developed:

**H4.** Innovation mediates the link between workplace incivility and performance.

The effect of workplace incivility on organizational citizenship behaviors. Workplace incivility causes job insecurity, emotional attachment and weak motivation for voluntary work, helping and solving problems (Ramzy et al., 2018). As highlighted by Mubarak and Muntaz (2018), there is a negative relationship between workplace incivility and organizational citizenship behaviors. Employees who experience workplace incivility are also less likely to engage in
organizational citizenship behaviors. Workplace incivility leads to a decrease in employees’
willingness to perform organizational citizenship behaviors (Guo et al., 2022). Besides, the
results of the study by Salman Chughtai and Ali Shah (2020) showed that workplace
incivility negatively impacts organizational citizenship behaviors, as uncivil behaviors
genewly impact positive behaviors like volunteering and fostering a supportive work
environment (Liu et al., 2019). Therefore, the following hypothesis was suggested:

\textit{H5. Workplace incivility affects organizational citizenship behaviors negatively.}

Organizational citizenship behavior as a mediator between work incivility and performance.
Organizational citizenship behavior involves employees acting beyond job duties to
achieve organizational goals. It enhances employee self-development, work skills and
sustainable performance (Liu et al., 2018). Organizational citizenship behavior supports
new employees’ workplace integration (Khan et al., 2019). Organizational citizenship
behavior fosters flexible workplaces and improves overall performance (Taamneh et al.,
2018). So, the following hypothesis was postulated:

\textit{H6. Organizational citizenship behavior affects performance positively.}

As well, organizational citizenship behaviors are the unpaid volunteer work of employees as
a tool to achieve the developmental goals of the organization (Khan et al., 2019). They are
considered a critical factor that ensures the sustainability of the workplace (Abbasi and
Ismail, 2023) due to its effect on performance (Kloutsiniotis and Mihail, 2020). Uncivil
behaviors negatively affect organizational citizenship behaviors (Moon and Morais, 2022).
On the other side, good treatment in the workplace increases organizational citizenship
behaviors (Wang et al., 2021). Employees suffer as a result of workplace incivility, which
results in lower job performance, greater work disengagement, mental pressure and a
negative impact on personnel health and well-being (Irsm et al., 2020). Some researchers
have suggested that there is a positive relationship between organizational citizenship
behaviors and task performance (He et al., 2019).

Organizational citizenship behaviors help explain how workplace incivility influences
employee performance (Salman Chughtai and Ali Shah, 2020). Employees who engage in
organizational citizenship behaviors are more likely to exhibit positive behaviors such as
assisting others, demonstrating cooperation, displaying loyalty and going the extra mile,
even in the face of incivility (Wang et al., 2022). Engaging in organizational citizenship
behaviors can counterbalance the negative effects of workplace incivility by fostering a
positive work environment. Employees who demonstrate organizational citizenship
behaviors contribute to a supportive and collaborative atmosphere, which can offset the
negative impact of incivility on performance (Bani-Melhem et al., 2023). Moreover,
organizational citizenship behaviors can enhance employee resilience and motivation.
When employees engage in helpful and cooperative behaviors, they may experience a
sense of achievement and fulfillment. This positive experience can serve as a buffer against
the detrimental effects of incivility, leading to improved performance (Gardner et al., 2021).

\textit{H7. Organizational citizenship behaviors mediate the link between workplace incivility
and performance.}

The effect of workplace incivility on organizational commitment. Workplace incivility
including insulting colleagues, belittling opinions and interrupting reduces the trust and
satisfaction of employees (Han et al., 2022), which leads to poor organizational commitment
(Abid et al., 2015). Workplace incivility increases absenteeism, delays, lack of commitment
and time waste (Zia-ud-Din et al., 2017). Guo et al. (2020) found a negative relationship
between workplace incivility and organizational commitment, impacting employee well-
being. Also, Zia-ud-Din et al. (2017) confirmed that workplace incivility negatively affects organizational commitment, as it leads to weak organizational commitment. Subsequently, the following hypothesis was proposed:

**H8.** Workplace incivility affects organizational commitment negatively.

**Organizational commitment as a mediator between work incivility and performance.** Organizational commitment enhances employees’ motivation to make superfluous efforts beyond their formal tasks (Afsar et al., 2019). Organizational commitment enhances performance, productivity and employee retention, reducing turnover rates (Ahmed, 2019). High organizational commitment is crucial for employers, as it enhances performance, productivity and competitiveness (Arasanmi and Krishna, 2019). Hence, the following hypothesis was formulated:

**H9.** Organizational commitment affects performance positively.

Workplace incivility refers to disrespectful or impolite behavior in the workplace, which can have negative consequences on employees’ well-being and their ability to perform effectively (Nitzsche et al., 2018). Moreover, there is a strong relationship between commitment and workplace incivility (Liu et al., 2018). Incivility has a negative impact on employees’ behavior which leads to decreased commitment in the workplace (Zia-ud-Din et al., 2017). An affective organizational commitment is theoretically and empirically linked to job performance (Sungu et al., 2019). Work incivility highly affects task and citizenship performance (Jawahar and Schreurs, 2018). Work incivility affects performance in the context of reducing the quality of work (Vasconcelos, 2020). Organizational commitment serves as a mediating factor that helps explain how workplace incivility impacts employee performance. It functions as a mechanism through which the negative effects of incivility on performance are transmitted (Shin and Hur, 2021). Employees with high organizational commitment may feel a greater sense of responsibility and loyalty toward the organization. They may have a personal investment in the organization’s success, which drives them to deliver high-quality work, even when faced with incivility (Paramita et al., 2020). Highly committed employees may exhibit greater resilience to the adverse impacts of workplace incivility. Their strong allegiance to the organization can serve as a motivational force, driving them to maintain high performance levels despite encountering incivility. These individuals value their job and are driven to contribute to the organization’s overall success (Al-Romeedy and Ozbek, 2022). Furthermore, highly committed employees may have a stronger sense of purpose and identification with the organization’s goals and values. This sense of purpose can motivate them to overcome the negative effects of incivility and continue performing at high levels (Abdirahman et al., 2018).

When employees experience workplace incivility, the level of organizational commitment becomes crucial. Employees who are highly committed are more likely to exhibit behaviors and attitudes that contribute to better performance, even in the face of incivility (Jang et al., 2020). Organizational commitment can also enhance employees’ ability to cope with workplace incivility. Committed employees may develop effective coping mechanisms, seek support from colleagues or supervisors or find ways to manage the impact of incivility on their performance (Azeem et al., 2021). So, the following hypothesis was proposed:

**H10.** Organizational commitment mediates the link between workplace incivility and performance.

**Methods**

**Participants**

The study population represented employees in Egyptian travel agencies, category (A), in Cairo Governorate. The number of travel agencies category (A) in Cairo Governorate is 1,254 agencies (Al-Azab and Al-Romeedy, 2023). The questionnaire was prepared
electronically, and the study sample was contacted through groups of employees of travel agencies in Egypt on social networking sites (Facebook) and LinkedIn. The link was sent with a request for help in a private message to the private accounts of the sample and those who are members of these groups. Confirming the confidentiality of the data and that the names of the participants will not be requested, nor any other personal data be requested (Girish et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2022; Lim et al., 2022). The recommended sample size for a study should be 10–20 times the number of latent constructs as suggested by Hair et al. (2010). Based on this guideline, a sample size of 300–600 was determined to be appropriate for our study, considering the inclusion of five latent constructs. Generally, it is preferred to have a larger sample size to minimize the possibility of objective bias (Hair et al., 2010). The questionnaire link was sent to 854 employees in travel agencies who were contacted through social networking sites, with 644 obtained responses from January 2023 to the end of March 2023, producing a response rate of 75.4%. Only 586 responses were suitable for further investigation.

**Measures**

The study relied on collecting its primary data on the questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into six main parts. The first part included workplace incivility (INC) that was assessed by 7 items developed from Cortina et al. (2001). Sample items included “My co-workers put me down or are condescending to me” and “My co-workers show little interest in my opinions.” The second part included performance (PER), which was measured by 7 items adopted from Abbas et al. (2014). For example, “I adequately complete assigned duties” and “I perform tasks that are expected of him/her.” The third part included innovation (INV), which was measured by 4 items prepared from Farmer et al. (2003). For example, “I try new ideas or methods first” and “I seek new ideas and ways to solve problems.” As well, the fourth part included organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), which was measured by 6 items adopted from Coyle-Shapiro (2002). For example, “I help others who have heavy workloads” and “I help others who have been absent.” The fifth part included organizational commitment (OC) that was measured by 6 items adopted from Meyer et al. (1993). For example, “I talk up this organization to my friends as a great company to work for” and “I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this company.” The full variables’ items were indicated in the Appendix. The sixth part included the demographic characteristics of participants in terms of gender, age, educational level and years of experience.

**Data analysis**

The SmartPLS method combined with structural equation modeling (SEM) was chosen for data analysis for several reasons. First, SmartPLS is a statistical technique that falls within the broader framework of SEM. Second, SEM is a powerful method for analyzing complex relationships among variables, testing theoretical models and evaluating causal pathways. Third, PLS-SEM is well-suited for prediction and exploration, especially when a theory is still developing or the model structure is not well-defined. Fourth, unlike traditional covariance-based SEM, PLS-SEM is effective with smaller sample sizes, making it advantageous when data collection is challenging or resources are limited (Hair et al., 2010). Fifth, PLS-SEM is robust against assumptions of multivariate normality, which is often required in traditional covariance-based SEM, making it suitable for data that might not follow a normal distribution. Sixth, it can handle multicollinearity among variables, which can be problematic in traditional regression models and covariance-based SEM. Seventh, PLS-SEM enables researchers to conduct various analyses, including assessment of the measurement model, evaluation of the structural model, path analysis and mediation analysis for hypothesis testing (Legate et al., 2023).
Results

Demographic characteristics of the participants

Table 1 indicates that the number of males slightly exceeded half of the sample, by 51.5%, while the percentage of females reached 48.5%. With regard to age, the table reveals that the majority of participants are between the ages of 30 and less than 40 years by 45.9%, followed by those between the ages of 40 and less than 50 years by 31.9%. As for the educational level, most of the participants hold a bachelor’s degree by 77.6%. Regarding the number of years of experience, there are 28.8% of the participants with years of experience ranging from 10 to less than 15 years, followed by those with years of experience ranging from 5 to less than 10 years by 24.9%, then those with years of experience ranging from 15 to less than 20 years by 22.7%.

Measurement model

Reliability assessment was conducted using composite reliability (CR) and Cronbach’s alpha. Factor loadings above 0.7 were retained, following the recommendation by Hair et al. (2010). The values of average variance extracted (AVE) and CR are crucial in determining the validity of the scale. According to Rubia (2019), an AVE value of 0.5 or higher is considered appropriate, and our results met this requirement. The CR values for each variable should exceed 0.7, and our findings also met this criterion. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to be 0.7, and the values for all variables significantly surpassed this threshold (Table 2). The goodness-of-fit indices indicated that the model and data were well-fitted, as evidenced by $\text{CMIN/DF} = 1.985$, $\text{GFI} = 0.947$, $\text{CFI} = 0.955$, $\text{IFI} = 0.943$, $\text{NFI} = 0.958$, $\text{TLI} = 0.938$ and $\text{RMSEA} = 0.037$, all suggesting a satisfactory fit between the model and the data (Hair et al., 2010).

To ensure discriminant validity, the study used the heterotrait–monotrait (HTMT) ratio, which suggests that values should be below 0.90. The findings presented in Table 3 indicate that the HTMT ratio values across all variables were well below 0.90. This signifies that the relationships among items from different constructs are weaker compared to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Demographic characteristics of the participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 30 to less than 40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 40 to less than 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 years and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>Medium level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 5 to less than 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 10 to less than 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 15 to less than 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table by authors
relationships among items within the same constructs, thus confirming the presence of discriminant validity. In addition, the Fornell–Larcker criteria, as shown in Table 4, were used to assess discriminant validity. The results reveal that the square roots of the AVE for all variables are greater than the highest correlations with any other variable, further supporting the presence of discriminant validity.

**Structural model assessment**

Table 5 is used to analyze the impact of INC on INV, OCB, OC and PER, using path coefficient analysis ($\beta$), standard error (S.E.), critical ratio (C.R.) and $p$-values. The findings revealed significant and negative effects of INC on INV ($\beta = -0.498, p$-value = 0.000), OCB ($\beta = -0.498, p$-value = 0.000), OC ($\beta = -0.498, p$-value = 0.000) and PER ($\beta = -0.498, p$-value = 0.000). Therefore, $H1$, $H2$, $H5$ and $H8$ are supported. In addition, the results demonstrated a significant and positive relationship between INV and PER ($\beta = 0.636, p$-value = 0.000), supporting $H3$. Likewise, $H6$ is supported, as OCB significantly and positively influence PER ($\beta = -0.476, p$-value = 0.000). Hence, $H6$ is supported. Furthermore, PER is significantly and positively affected by OC ($\beta = -0.528, p$-value = 0.000). Therefore, $H9$ is supported.

**Mediation analysis**

According to Table 6, a mediation analysis was used to examine the role of INV, OCB and OC as mediators in the connection between INC and PER. The findings revealed that INV acts as a
Discussion

The aim of this study was to examine the impact of workplace incivility on innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment and performance. In addition, the study sought to explore the relationship between workplace incivility and performance, and the mediating roles of innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment. In terms of the effect of workplace incivility on innovation, the results indicated a significant and negative relationship. This finding aligns with previous research by Aljawarneh and Atan (2018), who also demonstrated the adverse impact of workplace incivility on innovation. Abid et al. (2015) highlighted a decrease in innovation among employees who experience workplace incivility. Similarly, Smith et al. (2021) revealed that workplace incivility behaviors decrease employees’ inclination to be innovative in their work.

Regarding the impact of workplace incivility on performance, the results indicated a significant and negative association. This finding is consistent with the findings of Wang and Chen (2020), who highlighted the negative relationship between workplace incivility and performance. Jiang et al. (2019) also found that workplace incivility has a detrimental effect on performance, while Ramzy et al. (2018) demonstrated significantly lower performance in the presence of workplace incivility. Similarly, the findings demonstrated a significant and positive relationship between innovation and performance. This finding aligns with the conclusions of Raad et al. (2023), who found that performance is positively influenced by innovation. Tajeddini et al. (2020) emphasized the substantial impact of innovation on performance, while Verreyne et al. (2019) revealed that firm performance is based on innovation.

Furthermore, the results indicated a significant and negative impact of workplace incivility on organizational citizenship behaviors. This finding is consistent with the findings of Mubarak and Muntaz (2018), who reported a negative association between workplace incivility and organizational citizenship behaviors. Salman Chughtai and Ali Shah (2020) also highlighted the detrimental effect of workplace incivility on organizational citizenship behaviors.

Table 5: Direct effect results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Workplace incivility → Innovation</td>
<td>−0.528</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>−9.103</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Workplace incivility → Performance</td>
<td>−0.498</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>−11.857</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Innovation → Performance</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>8.368</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Workplace incivility → Organizational citizenship behaviors</td>
<td>−0.463</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>−9.646</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Organizational citizenship behaviors → Performance</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>8.032</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Workplace incivility → Organizational commitment</td>
<td>−0.543</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>−8.758</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: Organizational commitment → Performance</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>−9.154</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table by authors

Table 6: Indirect effect results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4: Workplace incivility → Innovation → Performance</td>
<td>−0.244</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>−6.595</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Workplace incivility → Organizational citizenship behaviors → Performance</td>
<td>−0.287</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>−6.523</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10: Workplace incivility → Organizational commitment → Performance</td>
<td>−0.167</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>−4.912</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table by authors

partial mediator in the relationship between INC and PER, with a β coefficient of −0.244 and a p-value of 0.000. This supports H4. In addition, OCB were found to partially mediate the relationship between INC and PER, with a β coefficient of −0.287 and a p-value of 0.000, thus supporting H7. Furthermore, the findings confirmed the partial mediating role of OC in the relationship between INC and PER, with a β coefficient of −0.167 and a p-value of 0.000, thereby supporting H10.
behaviors. In addition, Liu et al. (2019) found that employees are reluctant to assist their colleagues or undertake extra tasks when subjected to workplace incivility. Moreover, the results underscored the significant and positive impact of organizational citizenship behaviors on performance. This result is supported by Liu et al. (2018), who emphasized how organizational citizenship behaviors contribute to employee performance. Taamneh et al. (2018) added that organizational citizenship behaviors can enhance performance.

In relation to the impact of workplace incivility on organizational commitment, the findings revealed a significant and negative relationship. This finding aligns with the study conducted by Guo et al. (2020), which demonstrated a negative association between workplace incivility and organizational commitment. Furthermore, the results indicated that organizational commitment has a significant and positive effect on performance. This finding is supported by Ahmed (2019), who asserted that organizational commitment serves as a source of enhanced performance. In addition, Arasanmi and Krishna (2019) demonstrated that higher levels of commitment among employees within the organization result in significant improvements in performance and the efficient completion of work tasks.

The study also found that workplace incivility has a negative impact on performance, and this effect is partially mediated by factors such as innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment. Innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment only partially mediate this relationship, indicating that there may be other factors at play as well. As well, this implies that these factors play a role in mitigating the adverse influence of workplace incivility on performance. Specifically, employees who exhibit high levels of innovation, engage in organizational citizenship behaviors and possess strong organizational commitment are better equipped to cope with workplace incivility and maintain their performance levels.

Theoretical implications

This study contributes to the existing theoretical literature in several ways. First, the study contributes to the JDR model by expanding its application to the context of workplace incivility and travel agency performance. It highlights the importance of considering both job demands (such as incivility) and job resources (such as innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment) when examining the impact on employee outcomes. This deepens our understanding of the complex dynamics within the JDR model and provides valuable insights for organizations aiming to enhance performance and employee well-being. Second, the study’s conceptual framework expands the current knowledge in the tourism and hospitality literature, as well as in the fields of human resource management and organizational behavior. Third, the study’s findings provide a better understanding of the consequences of workplace incivility in the context of tourism and hospitality. Finally, this study is the first attempt to develop and analyze a comprehensive structural model that incorporates workplace incivility, innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment and performance in one of the Middle Eastern countries, Egypt. This underscores the importance of studying these factors in the context of tourism and hospitality institutions in the Middle East.

Managerial implications

To reduce the prevalence of workplace incivility behaviors, and to protect employees from exposure to these behaviors, travel agencies should promote awareness of the politeness and respect importance in the workplace through workshops and awareness sessions that highlight the values of respect, cooperation and effective communication. There is also a need to review the policies and processes to ensure that they promote politeness and respect and to amend them if necessary to ensure a healthy and respectful work environment. In addition, managers of travel agencies should set clear policies and rules
that include directing employees toward acceptable and unacceptable behavior and the consequences of inappropriate behavior. As well, there is also a need to adopt a positive work culture that encourages respect and cooperation, appreciating and honoring civilized behaviors and the respect shown by employees and encouraging them to interact positively with each other. Managers should encourage the employees to respect the opinions of others and to avoid the method of arguing, criticizing and mocking the opinions of colleagues, because this may increase the problems between the management and the employees and between the employees with each other, and lead to their withdrawal from work, and their unwillingness to share their opinions and suggestions.

Besides, managers should promote effective communication among employees, encouraging them to express their needs and concerns directly and respectfully by providing means of open and transparent communication such as meetings, suggestion boxes and inquiries. When feeling the prevalence of these negative behaviors, management must intervene immediately and decisively when improper behavior occurs in the workplace, clarify unacceptable behavior, apply appropriate penalties and work to resolve disputes promptly and fairly. Senior leadership need to set an example of courtesy and respect in the workplace. Agency leaders must display civil behavior and adopt positive practices that encourage employees to follow politeness in their dealings. These behaviors can also be reduced in the workplace by conducting periodic evaluations and reviews of employee performance, provided that these evaluations include assessing the employee’s degree of respect for management and colleagues. Furthermore, there is also a need to create a reliable and easy mechanism for employees to report the prevalence or exposure of uncivil behavior in the workplace. This mechanism must be confidential and protected, and reports must be dealt with promptly and seriously. Given the positive impact of creativity and organizational citizenship behaviors on performance, travel agencies should provide a work environment that encourages participation, cooperation and mutual support. Employees should feel that they are part of a team and that their voice matters. This environment should also foster innovation, experimentation and creative thinking. Employees must feel motivated and supported to think new and innovative ideas without fear of failure. Employees can be encouraged to try out their innovative ideas without sticking to the traditional methods. They may need to feel free and confident to try their own new and different ideas.

Limitations and future studies

Like any study, this research has some limitations. While it examined the impact of workplace incivility on performance, innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment, future research could explore the effect of workplace incivility on other variables such as sustainable competitive advantage, strategic performance, strategic agility and organizational voice. In terms of the mediators studied, this research examined the mediating role of innovation, organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment between workplace incivility and performance. However, other variables such as human resource management practices, leadership style, managers’ narcissism and psychological empowerment could also play a mediating role, and further research is needed to examine these variables. In addition, this study did not investigate the causes and forms of workplace incivility in travel agencies. Future studies should identify the most important forms and causes of workplace incivility in tourism and hospitality organizations, including travel agencies, hotels and airlines. Furthermore, future research could assess the forms, causes and effects of workplace incivility in other contexts in the MENA region, such as Saudi Arabia, UAE and Qatar, to compare the results and explore potential differences in the forms, causes and effects of workplace incivility in different contexts.
References


### Table A1 Questionnaire items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Workplace incivility (INC)    | 1. My coworkers put me down or are condescending to me  
2. My coworkers show little interest in my opinions  
3. My coworkers make demeaning or derogatory remarks about me  
4. My coworkers address me in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately  
5. My coworkers ignore or exclude me from professional camaraderie  
6. My coworkers doubt my judgment on matters over which I have responsibility  
7. My coworkers make unwanted attempts to draw me into a discussion of personal matters |
| Performance (PER)             | 1. I adequately complete assigned duties  
2. I fulfill responsibilities specified in his/her job description  
3. I perform tasks that are expected of him/her  
4. I meet formal performance requirements of the job  
5. I engage in activities that will directly affect his/her performance evaluation  
6. I fulfill all aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform  
7. I successfully perform essential duties |
| Innovation (INV)              | 1. I try new ideas or methods first  
2. I seek new ideas and ways to solve problems  
3. I generate groundbreaking ideas related to the field  
4. I am a good role model for creativity |
| Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) | 1. I help others who have heavy workloads  
2. I help others who have been absent  
3. I try to avoid creating problems for others  
4. I participate in activities that are not required but that help the image of the organization  
5. I tell outsiders that the organization is a good place to work  
6. Regardless of circumstances, I produce the highest quality work |
| Organizational commitment (OC) | 1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected to help this company be successful  
2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great company to work for  
3. I would accept almost any type of job assignment to keep working for this company  
4. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this company  
5. This company really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance  
6. I really care about the fate of this company |
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