

Enterprise and Innovation

Enemies at Work

Rachel Morrison

**Research Paper Series
Faculty of Business
ISSN Number 1176-1997**

Paper 32-2007

ENEMIES AT WORK

Rachel Morrison

2007 © - Copyright of the Author(s)

Rachel Morrison
Business School
Auckland University of Technology
Private Bag 92006
Auckland 1142
New Zealand
Tel: +64-(0) 9-921-9999 x5457
Fax: +64-(0) 9-921-9990
e-mail: rachel.morrison@aut.ac.nz

The opinions and views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of AUT of the General Editor or Review Panel of *Enterprise and Innovation*.

Printed by PrintSprint, Wakefield St., Auckland, NZ

AUT AUTHORS

RACHEL MORRISON

Dr Rachel Morrison currently teaches and researches in the areas of Management and Organisational Psychology within the Business School at AUT. Rachel is also affiliated with Te Kura Hinengaro Tangata/ the School of Psychology at Massey University (Albany, Auckland, NZ.). Her degrees are in Psychology and Organisational Psychology and she has taught psychology at Auckland University, Massey University and AUT. Rachel's research interests include gender and equity issues in the workplace, relationships in the workplace and friendship formation and she has published in journals such as the *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management* and the *University of Auckland Business Review*.

ENEMIES AT WORK

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the link between perceptions of negative workplace relationships and organisational outcomes. Respondents (n=412) spanned a wide range of occupations, industries and nationalities. Data were collected using an Internet based questionnaire. Results indicated that those with at least one negative relationship at work were significantly less satisfied, reported less organisational commitment, were part of less cohesive workgroups and were significantly more likely to be planning to leave their job.

INTRODUCTION

Relationships characterised by rude and uncivil behaviour are becoming increasingly common in the work-place (Pearson & Porath, 2003). According to Cortina, Magley, Williams and Langhout (2001) 71 percent of workers have been insulted, demeaned, ignored, or otherwise mistreated by their co-workers and superiors. Much of the research in this area has examined direct aggression with a clear intent to physically harm (for reviews of workplace violence, see Griffin, O'Leary-Kelly, & Collins, 1998; Leather, Brady, Lawrence, Beale, & Cox, 1999). There has also been some work with a focus on psychological aggression, or behaviours that inflict psychological, rather than physical harm (e.g., Baron, 1989; Baron & Neuman, 1996; Folger & Baron, 1996). Other research has examined an even milder (but possibly far more prevalent) form of negative behaviour; focusing on rudeness and incivility at work (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001; Johnson & Indvik, 2001; Pearson & Porath, 2003). Regardless of the intensity of the behaviour, relationships characterised by violence, rudeness, aggression and / or incivility are almost certainly negative relationships.

The impact of social relationships on employee well-being has long been of interest to researchers, often in the form of research with a focus on the positive impact of social support (e.g., Allen, McManus, & Russell, 1999; Bowling et al., 2004; Buunk, Doosje, Liesbeth, Jans, & Hopstaken, 1993; Francis, 1990; Koniarek & Dudek, 1996; Lindorff, 2001; van Daalen, Willemsen, & Sanders, 2006; Viswesvaran, Sanchez, & Fisher, 1999). The impact of *negative* social relations, or enmities, is a topic that has received less attention, particularly in the work environment. This impact of negative relationships with co-workers on organisational outcomes such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment and intention to turnover has seldom been examined previously and is the focus of the current study. In addition, the question of which organisational variables are *most strongly* associated with the presence of negative relationships is addressed.

The primary question posed in the current study is; how are negative relationships in the workplace related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment, workgroup cohesion and intention to turnover? While there is little empirical research

to date documenting the effects of negative relationships at work, the literature on negative workplace behaviours such as aggression, injustice, unfairness bullying and incivility will be briefly reviewed here. Although these constructs do not completely overlap with that of the negative workplace relationship, they are sufficiently related to inform hypotheses on these relationships.

CONCEPTUALISING NEGATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Although no standard definition of negative relationships yet exists they can be defined in terms of the verbal interaction within a dyad; with communication ranging from “...passive to active dislike, animosity, disrespect, or destructive mutual interaction” (Dillard & Fritz, 1995, p. 12). Andersson and Pearson (1999) define incivility as low intensity deviant behaviour which violates organisational norms for mutual respect. A negative relationship is one where interactions such as concealment, manipulation, conflict, disrespect, disagreement, incivility and / or animosity are frequent, and these relationships have been shown to affect both individuals (Moerbeek & Need, 2003; Rook, 1984) and organisations (Dillard & Fritz, 1995) adversely, causing stress and turnover (Leather, Beale, Lawrence, & Dickson, 1997; Miner-Rubino, 2004). The lack of respect and courtesy which exemplifies negative relationships often results in conflict and incivility which can be both time consuming and stressful to resolve. Dealing with conflict between workers may account for as much as 13 percent of a managers’ time, or nearly seven weeks per year, per manager (Johnson & Indvik, 2001).

As well and unpleasant *verbal communication*, negative relationships may also be characterised by poor *behaviour* (Johnson & Indvik, 2001). In the workplace behaviour within negative relationships can include sending a nasty note, undermining credibility, sabotaging another’s work, unfairly withholding or distributing valued resources or giving dirty looks. Einarsen (2000) add to this, describing a hostile work environment as one where behaviours such as insulting, teasing, offensive remarks, or silence and hostility when entering a conversation take place; they describe workers being socially excluded from their work group and having their work and efforts devaluated. Some individuals are even subjected to physical abuse,

or threats of such abuse, from co-workers or supervisors (Einarsen, 2000). Some behaviour may be interpreted differently by different individuals or by those from other cultural backgrounds (for example, behaviour interpreted by one individual as rude or brusque may be viewed by another as efficient or no-nonsense) (Johnson & Indvik, 2001). Thus, as workplaces become more diverse the potential for misunderstandings and hostility increases, along with the number of negative relationships.

Moerbeek and Need (2003) have published one of the few studies specifically looking at the effects of negative relationships in work environments, providing an alternate conceptualisation of negative workplace relationships. Rather than focusing on interactions between individuals, Moerbeek and Need define negative relationships in the context of social capital. The people a person knows, their social network, can be either helpful or harmful to their future career. Moerbeek and Need term relationships which have a negative effect 'sour social capital', and they use the term *foes* to refer to a person's sour social capital, stating that almost anyone in a person's social network can become a foe.

Moerbeek and Need (2003) state that the one major difference between friends and enemies is that people do not choose to have foes in their social network; relationships with foes will be involuntary relationships. When a relationship degrades or turns sour in a workplace the individuals concerned often have to continue to interact. The workplace is one of the few environments where people are 'forced' into relationships with others and, as a result, it is an ideal environment to examine these negative relationships. Negative interactions, along with the involuntariness of the relationship comprise the two aspects of the definition of negative relationships used in this study.

WHAT ARE THE CAUSES OF NEGATIVE RELATIONSHIPS?

Although it is the outcomes, rather than the causes, of negative relationships that are the focus the current study, some antecedents of these relationships are worth noting. An important study was conducted by Sias, Heath, Perry, Silva and Fix

(2004). These authors outline five specific causes of deteriorating relationships; personality, distracting life events, conflicting expectations, promotion and betrayal. People are seldom in a position to choose who they work with, so if an individual continually has to interact and work with a person with whom they do not get along the potential for increasingly antagonistic behaviour exists (Dillard & Fritz, 1995).

Organisational environments may provide other elements conducive to the development of negative relationships. Work demands, particularly in situations where workers are in direct competition with one another, can create situations where negative relationships are likely to form. In addition, the demands of electronic communication, which many feel obliged to respond to immediately, creates pressures that may encourage workers to behave rudely (Johnson & Indvik, 2001). Thus, aspects of work (such as overload and stress) can cause people to behave in ways likely to create negative relationships. Downsizing and rapid organisational growth create situations where fewer people are doing more work. If employees are unable to handle the increasing pressure and are under stress they are less likely to exercise good judgement in terms of their interactions with others and more likely to view others as enemies (Johnson & Indvik, 2001). Combined with other factors, such as personality or an unhealthy organisational climate, the workplace can cause a previously benign relationship to escalate into a hostile one.

Additionally people may obstruct each other for reasons of jealousy or envy (Cohen-Charash, 2001). Envy is common in businesses and organisations, and may be defined as an emotion occurring when a person begrudges another for having something that he or she does not have, or seeing another individual gain advantage and viewing it with displeasure (Bedeian, 1995). The way that limited resources are distributed creates an environment where envy is not only possible but almost inevitable. For example, people may have to compete for resources or individuals might have incompatible goals. Envious people are likely react with hostility and violence towards the other (Cohen-Charash, 2001).

WHAT ARE THE EFFECTS OF NEGATIVE WORKPLACE RELATIONSHIPS?

It is reasonable to expect that the presence of a negative relationship will adversely affect an individual's experience of work. If someone is experiencing rudeness, undermining and / or incivility in the workplace, they are likely to be less satisfied, committed or happy in their job than someone not having to deal with interpersonal negativity.

Job satisfaction

Previous research with a focus on negative behaviours including unjust treatment (Donovan, Drasgow, & Munson, 1998; Moorman, 1991), verbal abuse and bullying (Einarsen, 2000), psychological aggression and harassing (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997) has linked these behaviours with lowered satisfaction with work, supervision and / or co-workers. Although it has not been examined previously, negative relationships are likely to be differently related to the extrinsic and intrinsic aspects of job satisfaction. It is probable that intrinsic satisfaction (satisfaction with aspects of the job itself i.e., positive evaluations of the variety in one's job or the opportunity to use one's abilities) will be less affected by negative relationships than satisfaction with the more extrinsic factors, such as 'immediate boss' or 'fellow workers'.

Turnover intentions

Donovan, Drasgow, and Munson (1998) report that turnover intentions would be increased with the presence of negative workplace behaviours. This finding was supported by Moerbeek and Need (2003), who found that people who experience a bad atmosphere at work leave more quickly than people who experience a good atmosphere. If the negative relationship was with a supervisor, however, people tended to stay longer in their jobs, as having a high-status foe in a job is a barrier to finding another job (probably because the supervisor is less likely to give a good reference and, within the company, they might make decisions about internal promotions). Moerbeek and Need found that negative relationships with superiors at work would seriously hinder the success of future job-hunting efforts. In general however, having enemies at work is likely to increase an individual's intention to turnover.

Organisational commitment

Both intentions to turnover and job satisfaction are strongly related to organisational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Blau & Boal, 1989; Bluedorn, 1982; Cohen, 1993; Irvine & Evans, 1995; Mobley, 1977; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). If negative relationships are associated with lower satisfaction and increased intention to turnover it is also reasonable to assume that organisational commitment will be reduced. Barling and Phillips (1993) found a link between perceptions unfair treatment and decreased organisational commitment, and Leather et al. (1997) examined violence at work, also finding (perhaps unsurprisingly) that those on the receiving end of these behaviours experienced lowered commitment to the organisation.

Cohesion

Odden and Sias (1997) found that climates perceived as high in cohesion are associated with larger proportions of collegial and special peer relationships, i.e., more friends. The cohesion dimension in the workplace reflects a general liking of one's co-workers, as well as perceptions that an employee shares a great deal of common ground with his/her colleagues. Although Odden and Sias did not examine a link between negative relationships and cohesion, the fact that cohesion reflects friendly relations and liking of others as well as cooperation and positive communication, suggests that the presence of negative relationships would mitigate perceptions of a cohesive workgroup.

RESEARCH QUESTION

The question posed in the current study is; how are negative relationships in the workplace related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment, workgroup cohesion and intention to turnover? The discussion above, on the relationship between negative relationships and these variables, is the focus of hypotheses a – e.

Hypothesis a: That the presence of negative relationships within the workplace will be associated with reduced job satisfaction.

Hypothesis b: That the presence of negative relationships within the workplace will be more strongly associated with extrinsic job satisfaction than intrinsic job satisfaction.

Hypothesis c: That the presence of negative relationships within the workplace will be associated with lower organisational commitment.

Hypothesis d: That the presence of negative relationships within the workplace will be associated with less workgroup cohesion.

Hypothesis e: That the presence of negative relationships within the workplace will be associated with increased intention to turnover.

METHOD

Participants

Data were collected from 412 individuals; the demographic data indicated that the respondents were very diverse, there was a wide range of ages and industries and 31% were male. Most respondents were from New Zealand (68%) with 13% being from the United States. Respondents ranged in age from 19 years to 64 years, with a mean age of 35. There was a great deal of variety in the industries/sectors respondents reported working in. The largest reported sector was tertiary education (universities and polytechnics, $n = 92$) followed by health care (including psychology, psychiatry and physiotherapy $n = 53$) (refer Table 1). As there were no exclusion criteria (other than having a job) the variety in responses to the question asking what job type individuals had, was almost as varied as the number of respondents. Respondents were from almost every type of profession, from medical doctors, to secretaries, to academics, to police officers.

Variable	Frequency (n)	Valid percent
Sex (6 missing)		
Males	127	31.3
Females	279	67.7
Age (mean 35.23, s.d. 11.07) (6 missing)		
>20 years	8	2.0
20-29 years	150	37.0
30-39 years	116	28.6
40-49 years	70	17.2
50-59 years	57	14.0
Over 60 years	5	1.2
Country of origin (5 missing)		
New Zealand	277	68.1
U.S.A.	52	12.8
United Kingdom	33	8.1
Australia	20	4.9
Canada	5	1.2
Other	20	4.9

Table 1: Demographic Data of respondents

Note: Values are presented in percentages excluding respondents who declined to answer

Materials

1. Negative relationship questionnaire. To establish if respondents had negative relationships in the workplace they were given the definition below, and were asked if there were any people who they work with, with whom they would consider to have a negative relationship, and if so how many. As discussed earlier, negative interactions and the involuntariness of the relationships comprise the two aspects of the definition of negative relationships. The definition was written by the researcher to include these two characteristics of negative relationships, and was based on Kram and Isabella's (1985) definitions of organisational peer types:

This person is not one of your friends. You do interact with this person on a fairly regular basis but you would definitely not continue the relationship if you did not work here. Your interactions with this person are

characterised by disrespect, disagreement, dislike, conflict and/or animosity. You would rather not have to interact with this person.

2. Workgroup cohesion scale. Cohesion was measured using a nine-item workgroup cohesion scale rated on a 5-point Likert type scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree (e.g. *Members of my team are very willing to share information with other team members about our work*). Items measuring cohesion were selected from a 54 item Work Group Characteristics Measure developed by Campion et al. (1993). Only those items from the Work Group Characteristics Measure relating to cohesion were used in the current study. The items used are termed process characteristics by Campion et al. and are those relating to (1) Social Support, (2) Workload Sharing and (3) Communication/Co-operation within the work group. Campion et al. provided evidence that a composite of these items reliably predicted effectiveness criteria (productivity and manager judgements of effectiveness, ($p < .05$)). In addition Campion et al. found the sub scales had adequate internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .78, .84$ and $.81$ respectively).

3. Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). This is a commonly used measure of employee's affective attachment to an organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The OCQ is a 15-item scale, designed to assess acceptance of organisational values, desire to remain with the organisation and willingness to exert effort (e.g. *I am proud to tell others I am part of this organisation*). Items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) have provided strong evidence for the test-re-test reliability, convergent validity, internal consistency, and predictive validity of the OCQ, finding the overall measure of organisational commitment to be relatively stable over time ($r = 0.53, 0.63$ and 0.75 over 2-, 3- and 4-month periods), demonstrating test-re-test reliability. Mowday et al. calculated internal consistency using coefficient α , item analysis and factor analysis, finding coefficient α to be consistently high, ranging from $.82$ to $.93$ with a median of $.90$. Item analysis¹ indicated that each item had a positive correlation with the total score for the OCQ, with the range being from $.32$ to $.72$. In

¹ Correlation between each item of the commitment scale and the total score, less the item

addition, factor analysis resulted in a single factor solution. Internal consistency results suggest the 15 items of the OCQ are relatively homogeneous with respect to the underlying attitude construct they measure. Significant correlations were found between the OCQ scores and 'intention to remain with the organisation' across several studies, illustrating convergent validity. In addition, Mowday et al. found the OCQ to correlate significantly with scores from the Organisational Attachment Questionnaire (convergent validities across six diverse samples ranged from .63 to .74).

4. Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS). The JSS used was one part of a larger battery of eight scales devised by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979). Only the 15-item scale relating to job satisfaction was used for this study. Respondents indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied they feel with each of 15 aspects of their job (e.g. *The recognition you get for good work*). Items are rated on a 7-point Likert type scale from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. The JSS has been found to be reliable, Warr, Cook and Wall (1979) reported that the test re-test correlation co-efficient of the JSS was .63. Warr et al. found, using cluster analysis, that items clustered together into intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction subscales.

5. Measure of intention to turnover. Intention to turnover was measured with three items theorised to be important precursors to turnover; thinking of quitting, intention to search for alternative employment, and intention to quit (Chang, 1999; Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978) (e.g. *I will probably quit my job in the next year*). Answers to each item were recorded on a seven-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Procedure

Initially two email lists, EMONET (an international list of academics and practitioners working in the field of emotions in organisations) and IOnet (a list of Industrial Organisational psychologists) as well as 60 people employed in professional roles in New Zealand and Australia, were sent an email inviting them to complete an online questionnaire, which included a link to a data collection site. These groups were selected for their interest in this research and for their opportunities to forward

information about the research to other professionals and employees. The snowball technique was used with all recipients being encouraged to pass it on to friends and colleagues. As with most online data collection there is no way of knowing the total number of people to whom the survey links were sent, so it is not possible to calculate a response rate.

RESULTS

Measurement models of the scales

Prior to beginning the factor analysis and subsequent partial correlations and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), the data were “cleaned”; the inversely worded items from the various scales were reversed, the scales were saved as separate files in SPSS and missing items were imputed, using the ‘missing value analysis’ feature of the program². Finally the scales were recombined into a master document and, using the data from the newly formed master document ($n = 412$), each of the scales was factor analysed.

Although the scales used were previously validated (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993; Mobley, 1977; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Nielsen, Jex, & Adams, 2000; Warr, Cook, & Wall, 1979), the samples used by the original authors are likely to be somewhat different from the group of individuals who responded in the current study. Thus, it is necessary to validate these original scales for use with this new sample. This procedure described by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) who recommend the estimation and respecification of measurement models prior to using them in later analyses. Thus, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was carried in AMOS (Arbuckle, 1999) in order to confirm the factor structure of the measurement models used.

A two stage approach was adopted to model the data (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). First, measurement models were constructed using confirmatory factor

² The percentages of missing values from each scale are as follows: Cohesion Scale (4.4%), Intention to Leave questions (1.2%), Needs Scale (1.3%), Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (1.3%), Job Satisfaction Scale (1.4%).

analysis (CFA) to obtain the best fitting set of items to represent each measure. The second stage involved the specification of the full baseline structural models.

Assessment of model fit was based on multiple criteria, reflecting statistical, theoretical and practical considerations (Byrne, 2001). There have been numerous articles, both criticising existing indices and proposing new ones (Pedhazur, 1982). Although there is little agreement about the value of various fit indices, Pedhazur states that there does seem to be unanimity that no single fit index should be relied upon. The indices used in the current study were (a) the χ^2 likelihood ratio statistic, (b) the Comparative Fit Index (CFI: Bentler, 1990) (c) the Parsimonious Comparative Fit Index (PCFI: Mulaik et al., 1989), and (d) the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA: Browne & Cudeck, 1993). Each is described below.

The χ^2 value divided by the degrees of freedom should be below 5 to indicate good fit (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). The CFI is a revised version of the Bentler-Bonnet (Bentler & Bonett, 1980) normed fit index that adjusts for degrees of freedom. It ranges from zero to 1.00 and provides a measure of complete covariation in the data; a value $>.90$ indicates a good fit to the data (Byrne, 1994, 2001). The PCFI is calibrated from the CFI; it weighs the parsimony of the model against its use of the data in achieving goodness of fit. Mulaik et al. state that PCFI values are often lower than what is generally considered acceptable on the basis of normed indices of fit; goodness of fit indices in the .90s accompanied by PCFI indices in the .50s are considered adequate. Byrne (2001) maintains that the RMSEA is one of the most informative indices in SEM. The RMSEA is sensitive to the complexity of the model; values less than .05 indicate excellent fit, and values less than .08 represent a good fit.

Where the fit indices did not indicate a good fit to the model, the modification indices³ and expected change statistics related to the covariances for each model were inspected for evidence of misspecification associated with the pairings of items. Large modification indices represent misspecified error covariances, indicating

³ Modification indices are a measure of model misspecification; a large MI would argue for the presence of factor cross-loadings.

systematic, rather than random measurement error in item responses. A high degree of overlap in item content can trigger correlated errors, which occur when two items, although worded differently, ask the same question (Byrne, 2001). Thus, if there was evidence that the model was misspecified, the “problem” items (i.e., those which had overlapping content with other items) were first examined to ascertain if there was a substantive justification for respecification and, if there was, the items were either removed in a post hoc analysis, or respecified with the overlapping parameter being freely estimated. For example, the parameter in the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire exhibiting the highest degree of misfit represented correlated error between items 10 (*I am extremely glad that I chose this organisation to work for over others I was considering at the time*) and 15 (*Deciding to work for this organisation was a definite mistake on my part (R)*). Clearly there is a substantive rationale for allowing relationship between these two items to be freely estimated. The indices of fit for the measurement models used in the current study are presented in Table 2. All indices indicate good fit of the data to the models. The consistency reliability (coefficient alphas) of all the scales was acceptable, ranging from .73 (job satisfaction subscale) to .91 (organisational commitment questionnaire) (refer Table 2).

Both the cohesion scale and the satisfaction scale were also found to have two distinct factors. The two factors in the satisfaction scale were, (1) satisfaction with interpersonal interactions and workplace, and (2) satisfaction with aspects of actual job performed; variety/fulfilment. The two satisfaction factors relate closely to the ‘extrinsic satisfaction’ and ‘intrinsic satisfaction’ clusters of items, identified by Warr et al. (1979). The two cohesion factors were, (1) social support and cooperation and (2) workload sharing. The workload sharing factor is identical to that described by Campion et al (1993), while the remaining items loaded together as a single factor, combining Campion’s ‘social support’ and ‘communication/co-operation’ factors.

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Number of factors</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>χ^2/df</i>	<i>CFI</i>	<i>PCFI</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>
Job satisfaction scale	2	.80 .73	/ 2.53	.97	.66	.06
Cohesion Scale	2	.83 .81	/ 3.15	.97	.66	.07
Organisational Commitment Questionnaire	1	.91	2.53	.96	.79	.06
Intention to Turnover	1	.87				

Table 2: Fit Indices for the measurement models (n=412)

Note: The measurement model for Intention to Turnover was not tested here as it has only three items and therefore 0 df

Prevalence of negative relationships

The number of negative relationships respondents reported having is presented below in Table 3. Fifty-six percent of respondents reported having at least one negative relationship.

Negative relationships	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8+
Number of respondents	181	106	54	34	10	11	3	2	11

Table 3: Prevalence of negative relationships

Relationship with organisational variables

To assess whether there were mean differences in the variables of interest in terms of the presence of negative workplace relationships, a MANOVA was conducted using negative relationships as the independent variable and all the organisational outcome variables as dependent variables. The data was divided into those who had no negative relationships ($n = 181$) and those who had at least one ($n = 231$) to perform the MANOVA. Justification for grouping the data in this way is that (a) it is the presence of negative relationships, rather than the number of “enemies” an individual has, that is the variable of interest in this study and (b) there are some groups with very few cases (70% of respondents have either one negative relationship or none).

The results from the MANOVA showed a statistically significant difference in terms of the presence of negative relationships on the combined dependent variables: $F(6, 405) = 10.56, p < .001$; Wilk's Lambda = .865; partial Eta squared = .135. To control for the increase in the family-wise Type I error, a Bonferroni correction was used, and the significance level was adjusted to $p = .008$.

Table 3 shows the F values, the significance levels and partial Eta squared values (a measure of effect size). There was support for hypothesis a; a significant difference was found between those who did and did not have at least one negative relationship at work in terms of their extrinsic $F(1, 410) = 55.42, p < .008$ and intrinsic $F(1, 410) = 7.97, p < .008$ job satisfaction scores. The partial Eta squared values indicate that the relationship between having negative relationships is weaker for intrinsic satisfaction than extrinsic satisfaction (.120 and .017 respectively) supporting hypothesis b (that the presence of negative relationships within the workplace will be more strongly associated with extrinsic job satisfaction than intrinsic job satisfaction scores). As expected, the relationship between negative relationships and the remaining dependent variables were significant, $p < .008$, supporting hypotheses c-e (see Table 4).

<i>Dependent Variable</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared</i>
Extrinsic Job satisfaction	1	55.792	.000	.120
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	1	7.278	.007	.017
Organisational Commitment	1	32.739	.000	.074
Cohesion (social support)	1	10.633	.001	.025
Cohesion (workload sharing)	1	14.416	.000	.034
Intention to leave	1	8.328	.004	.020

Table 4: Univariate F tests comparing respondents with and without negative relationships at work

The F tests the effect of the presence of negative relationships at work. This test is based on the linearly independent pairwise comparisons among the estimated marginal means.

These findings indicate that those with at least one negative relationship at work are significantly less satisfied, report less organisational commitment, are part of less cohesive workgroups and are significantly more likely to be planning to leave their job. The strongest associations are those between negative relationships and satisfaction with the work environment (extrinsic job satisfaction) and organisational commitment.

DISCUSSION

The Research Question asked: How are negative relationships in the workplace related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment, workgroup cohesion and intention to turnover? The results supported hypotheses a – e and indicated that those with at least one negative relationship at work were significantly less satisfied, reported less organisational commitment, were part of less cohesive workgroups and were significantly more likely to be planning to leave their job. Further, extrinsic job satisfaction is more closely related to the presence of negative relationships than intrinsic job satisfaction. The results also lend support to the validity of the measure of negative relationships created for, and used in, this study. The frequency of negative relationships (over half of the respondents in this study had at least one, and many had several) means that examining how negative relationships form, looking at the impact of negative relationships and determining how they might be managed are certainly areas that warrant attention within workplaces.

Turnover represents one of the most important issues for any organisation. The money and time invested in hiring and training an individual who leaves the organisation is lost forever. These costs are considerable, recent research by Waldman, Kelly, Arora and Smith (2004) within the medical industry, revealed that the minimum cost of turnover represented a loss of more than five percent of the total annual operating budget. In addition, the costs of turnover increase further up the

organisational hierarchy, i.e., replacing a senior manager or a surgeon represents a more significant cost than replacing a secretary or a nurse (Richer, Blanchard, & Vallerand, 2002). If negative relationships cause people to leave, and over half of the respondents had at least one negative relationship, the importance of these relationships should not be underestimated.

Targeting interventions aimed at improving workplace relationships, towards workgroups or dyads where negative interactions such as concealment, manipulation, conflict, disrespect, disagreement and/or animosity are frequent may be a way to improve job satisfaction and commitment. In addition, it is possible that creating a friendlier and more supportive work environment may also be an effective way to reduce turnover.

The findings in the current study suggest that the effect of enemies on an individual's experience of work can be profound; both in terms of their subjective sense of well-being and in terms of measurable organisational outcomes. The results also indicated that some organisational outcomes are more strongly related to negative relationships at work than others. It is perhaps not surprising that 'extrinsic satisfaction' (employees' satisfaction with their work environment and colleagues) is more profoundly affected by enemies than satisfaction with the work itself (intrinsic satisfaction). Organisational commitment is variable that has a strong affective or emotional component, and commitment too, is strongly related to the presence of negative relationships at work.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND DIRECTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The nature of the data analysis in the current study means that causality not clear, i.e., are dissatisfied individuals more likely to engage in negative behaviours towards others, creating negative relationships or do negative relationships reduce job satisfaction? Although this can not be answered with certainty, it seems reasonable to propose that frequently it is the negative relationship that causes dissatisfaction and intention to turnover and not the other way around. This may be a worthwhile direction for future research in this area.

The fact that enemies at work have negative outcomes is not really surprising; this study suggests however, that these relationships are very common, and their impact profound. Delving more deeply into how to avert the formation of negative relationships and, failing that, how to address issues arising from them would be an area which might provide strategies and interventions to reduce both their impact and frequency.

The impact of negative relationships on performance or productivity was not directly addressed in the current study. Although there is little research to date looking at the effects of negative relationships on productivity or performance it seems likely that they would interfere with co-operation and communication in work groups, and direct attention and energy away from the task at hand. The fact that Campion et al. (1993) found that a composite of the cohesion items used in the current study predicted both productivity and manager judgements of effectiveness, and that negative relationships are associated with lower cohesion scores, does suggest that negative relationships will indeed have a negative impact on performance at work. This is also an area that warrants further investigation.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-19.
- Allen, T. D., McManus, S. E., & Russell, J. E. A. (1999). Newcomer socialization and stress: Formal peer relationships as a source of support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(3), 453-470.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modelling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 411-423.
- 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.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (1999). *Amos 4.0 [Computer software]*. Chicago: Smallwaters.
- Barling, J., & Phillips, M. (1993). Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *Journal of Psychology*, 127(649-656).
- Baron, R. A. (1989). Personality and organizational conflict: Effects of the Type A behavior pattern and self monitoring. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 44, 281-296.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 161-173.
- Bedeian, A. G. (1995). Workplace envy. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23(4).
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indices in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 588-606.
- Blau, G., & Boal, K. (1989). Using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively to predict turnover. *Journal of Management*, 15(1), 115-127.
- Bluedorn, A. C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations*, 35, 135-153.
- Bowling, N. A., Beehr, T. A., Johnson, A. L., Semmer, N. K., Hendricks, E. A., & Webster, H. A. (2004). Explaining potential antecedents of workplace social support: Reciprocity or attractiveness? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(4), 339-350.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing Structural Equation Models* (pp. 445-455). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Buunk, B. P., Doosje, B. J., Liesbeth, G., Jans, J. M., & Hopstaken, L. E. M. (1993). Perceived reciprocity, social support, and stress at work: The role of exchange and communal orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*(65), 801-811.
- Byrne, B. M. (1994). Burnout: Testing for the validity, replication, and invariance of causal structure across elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(3), 645-673.
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS. Basic concepts, applications and programming*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Campion, M. A., Medsker, G. J., & Higgs, A. C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(4), 823-850.
- Chang, E. (1999). Career commitment as a complex moderator of organizational commitment and turnover intention. *Human Relations*, 52(10), 1257-1277.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. (2001). Envy at work: An exploratory examination of antecedents and outcomes. *Dissertation Abstracts International. Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 62(1-B), 584.
- Cohen, A. (1993). Organizational commitment and turnover: A metaanalysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(5), 1140-1157.
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the Workplace: Incidence and Impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(1), 64-80.
- Dillard, J. P., & Fritz, J. (1995). *Interpersonal relationships and organizational performance*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Western Speech Communication Association., Portland. OR.
- Donovan, M. A., Drasgow, F., & Munson, L. J. (1998). The Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment Scale: Development and validation of a measure of interpersonal treatment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 683-692.
- Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work. A review of the scandinavian approach *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 5(4), 379-401.
- Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, 12, 247-263.
- Folger, R., & Baron, R. A. (1996). Violence and hostility at work: A model of reactions to perceived injustice. In G. R. VanderBos & E. Q. Bulatao (Eds.), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions* (pp. 51-85). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Francis, D. (1990). The significance of work friends in late life. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 4(4), 405-424.
- Griffin, R. W., O'Leary-Kelly, A., & Collins, J. M. (1998). *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Violence and deviant behavior*. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis (5th ed.)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Irvine, D. M., & Evans, M. G. (1995). Job satisfaction and turnover among nurses: Integrating research findings across studies. *Nursing Research*, 44, 246-253.
- Johnson, P. R., & Indvik, J. (2001). Rudeness at work: Impulse over restraint. *Public Personnel Management*, 30(4), 457-465.
- Koniarek, J., & Dudek, B. (1996). Social support as a buffer in the stress burnout relationship. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 3(2), 99-106.
- Kram, K., & Isabella, L. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(1), 110-132.
- Leather, P., Beale, D., Lawrence, C., & Dickson, R. (1997). Effects of exposure to occupational violence and the mediating impact of fear. *Work and Stress*, 11, 329-340.
- Leather, P., Brady, C., Lawrence, C., Beale, D., & Cox, T. (1999). *Work-related violence: Assessment and intervention*. London: Routledge.
- Lindorff, M. (2001). Are they lonely at the top? Social relationships and social support among Australian managers. *Work and Stress*, 15(3), 274-282.

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Miner-Rubino, K. N. (2004). *Beyond targets: Vicarious exposure to hostility towards women in the workplace*. University of Michigan, Michigan, USA.
- Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*(62), 237-240.
- Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 408-414.
- Moerbeek, H. H. S., & Need, A. (2003). Enemies at work: Can they hinder your career? *Social Networks*, 25(1), 67-82.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? . *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-227.
- Mulaik, S. A., James, L. R., Van Alstine, J., Bennet, N., Lind, S., & Stilwell, C. D. (1989). Evaluation of goodness of fit indices for structural equation models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105(430-445).
- Nielsen, I. K., Jex, S. M., & Adams, G. A. (2000). Development and validation of scores on a two dimensional Workplace Friendship Scale. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 60(4), 628-643.
- Odden, C. M., & Sias, P. M. (1997). Peer communication relationships, psychological climate, and gender. *Communication Quarterly*, 45, 153-166.
- Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2003). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for "nice"? Think again. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), 7-18.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). *Multiple regression in behavioral research (2nd ed.)*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Richer, S. F., Blanchard, U., & Vallerand, R. J. (2002). A motivational model of work turnover. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(10), 2089-2113.
- Rook, K. S. (1984). The negative side of social interaction: Impact on psychological well being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1097-1108.
- Sias, P. M., Heath, R. G., Perry, T., Silva, D., & Fix, B. (2004). Narratives of workplace friendship deterioration. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 21(3), 321-340.
- van Daalen, G., Willemsen, T. M., & Sanders, K. (2006). Reducing work-family conflict through different sources of social support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(3), 462-476.
- 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.
- Waldman, J. D., Kelly, F., Arora, S., & Smith, H. L. (2004). The shocking cost of turnover in health care. *Health Care Management Review*, 29(1), 2-7.

Warr, P. B., Cook, J., & Wall, T. D. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 52, 129-148.

ENTERPRISE AND INNOVATION
FACULTY OF BUSINESS RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

01-2003	SIMON MOWATT and HOWARD COX	<i>Innovation Networks and the Development of Consumer-Driven ICT-Based Management Systems</i>
02-2003	BILL DOOLIN, BOB MCQUEEN and MARK WATTON	<i>Internet Strategies for Established Retailers: Five Case Studies from New Zealand</i>
03-2003	ROGER BAXTER and SHEELAGH MATEAR	<i>Measuring Intangible Value in Business to Business Buyer-Seller Relationships: An Intellectual Capital Perspective</i>
04-2003	HOWARD COX and SIMON MOWATT	<i>Technology, Organisation and Innovation: The Historical Development of the UK Magazine Industry</i>
05-2003	CHRISTOPHER BOGGS, BRETT COLLINS and MARTIE-LOUISE VERREYNNE	<i>Examining the Effects of Referent Power on Intrinsic Motivation in Organisations: A Self- Concept Based Approach</i>
06-2003	MARK GLYNN, JUDY MOTION and RODERICK BRODIE	<i>Retailers' Perceived Value of Manufacturers' Brands</i>
07-2003	DERYL NORTHCOTT and LI-CHENG CHANG	<i>The Use of Performance Measurement as an Accountability Mechanism: A Case Study in the UK National Health Service</i>
08-2003	ROY SMOLLAN and JONATHAN MATHENY	<i>Emotions Experienced Through Organisational Events: An Exploratory Framework of Perceived Justice and Outcomes</i>
09-2003	ROBIN H. LUO and L. CHRISTOPHER PLANTIER	<i>The Persistence of NZ Dollar Misalignments Relative to Purchasing Power Parity</i>
10-2004	SIMON MOWATT	<i>New Perspectives on the Supply-Chain and Consumer-Driven Innovation</i>
11-2004	HELEN ANDERSON and JONATHAN MATHENY	<i>Paying Attention To The Construct Of Salience In Identity-related Literature and Beyond</i>

12-2004	AARON GILBERT, ALIREZA TOURANI-RAD and TOMASZ WISNIEWSKI	<i>The Impact of Regulatory Change on Insider Trading Profitability: Some Early Evidence from New Zealand</i>
13-2004	AARON GILBERT, ALIREZA TOURANI-RAD and TOMASZ WISNIEWSKI	<i>Do Insiders Crowd Out Analysts?</i>
14-2004	AARON GILBERT, ALIREZA TOURANI-RAD and TOMASZ WISNIEWSKI	<i>Insiders and the Law: The Impact of Regulatory Change on Insider Trading</i>
15-2004	JULIE DOUGLAS	<i>Wages and Conditions of Clinical Coders in New Zealand. A report of surveys conducted in 1998 and 2004</i>
16-2005	GLEN OLIVER and PETER MCGHEE	<i>In Search of Professional Identity: A Descriptive Study of New Zealand "Professional" Bodies' Codes of Ethics</i>
17-2005	PAUL WELLS	<i>The Supply of Accounting Graduates in New Zealand</i>
18-2005	PAUL WELLS and PETER FIEGER	<i>Accounting: Perceptions of Influential High School Teachers in the USA and NZ</i>
19-2005	RACHEL MORRISON	<i>Testing for the Invariance of a Causal Model of Friendships at Work: An Investigation of Job Type and Needs</i>
20-2005	MARTIE-LOUISE VERREYNNE	<i>Strategy-Making Process and Firm Performance in Small Firms</i>
21-2005	BART FRIJNS, AARON GILBERT AND ALIREZA TOURANI-RAD	<i>Insider Trading, Regulation and the Components of the Bid-Ask Spread</i>
22-2005	BELINDA LUKE AND MARTIE-LOUISE VERREYNNE	<i>Exploring Entrepreneurship in the Public Sector: Examining the Application of Strategic Entrepreneurship to SOEs</i>
23-2005	MING-HUA LIU, DIMITRI MARGARITIS AND ALIREZA TOURANI-RAD	<i>Monetary Policy Transparency and Pass-Through of Retail Interest Rates</i>
24-2005	HARDJO KOERNIADI AND ALIREZA TOURANI-RAD	<i>Accruals and Cash Flows Anomalies: Evidence from the New Zealand Stock Market</i>

25-2006	CHRISTOPHER SELVARAJAH, EDWINA PIO AND DENNY MEYER	<i>Assessment Preferences of MBA and MBus Students: A New Zealand Study</i>
26-2006	JEDRZEJ BIALKOWSKI, KATRIN GOTTSCHALK AND TOMASZ WISNIEWSKI	<i>Stock Market Volatility around National Elections</i>
27-2006	AARON GILBERT AND ALIREZA TOURANI-RAD	<i>The Impact of Regulations on the Informational Basis of Insider Trading</i>
28-2006	PHILIPPA WELLS	<i>Meridian Energy and Project Aqua: A Study in Stakeholder Identification and Salience</i>
29-2006	AILEEN NAMING AND NEVAN WRIGHT	<i>Performance Appraisal of Administrative Staff in a Tertiary Institution: Perception</i>
30-2006	JEDRZEJ BIALKOWSKI, KATRIN GOTTSCHALK AND TOMASZ WISNIEWSKI	<i>Political Orientation of Government and Stock Market Returns</i>
31-2007	MARGARET BLACKBURN AND PETER MCGHEE	<i>The Virtuous Entrepreneur: New Ventures and Human Flourishing</i>
32-2007	RACHEL MORRISON	<i>Enemies at Work</i>
33-2007	RACHEL MORRISON	<i>Gender Differences in the Relationship between Workplace Friendships and Organisational Outcomes</i>