RELATIONSHIPS AMONG JOB INSECURITY, INCIVILITY, INTERPERSONAL CONFLICTS AND SOMATIC SYMPTOMS: A MODEL TOWARDS HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
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1. INTRODUCTION

Policing is a stressful occupation as they are required to deal with death decisions, abused children and human misery, following strict legal norms and burden of societal responsibilities (Violanti et al., 2017). According to Shane (2010), “job context” and “job content” can be considered as two major sources of stress in policing. Job content includes long-work hours, traumatic events, court work, over time, change of shifts and threats to psychological and physical health. Whereas, job context includes job insecurity, interpersonal conflicts and bureaucracy. This study argues that both the stressors came with a price. For example, job context related stress increase job insecurity and interpersonal conflicts among police, whereas, job content related stress disturbs police workers sleep and family related activities because of change in shifts (Bond et al., 2013; Kirschman et al., 2014). One important aspect of both job context and content related stress is physical health (i.e. somatic symptoms), which has not been examined by the previous researchers.

In South Asia, the police job is considered as politically influenced regarding daily incentives, promotions, training, transfers and recruitment, though this category was not represented for Pakistan, exactly portray Pakistani police (Siddiqi, 2014). Because of these issues Police job is...
considered as insecure by most of the lower scale employees. Further, the biggest challenge that
Pakistani police is facing include “decision by coercion rather consent”, unfortunately, this
culture has changed the mindset of many of the police employees and officers as they have to
“enforce the writ of the state” (Ahsen, 2018). Higher officers exercise of powers can lead to
workplace incivility (WI) among lower officers (Pearson et al. 2000) and this may consequent
low-intensity to high-intensity interpersonal conflicts in the organization (Andersson and
Pearson, 1999), which is not suitable for Policing. Working in such situations negatively impacts
the worker's physical health such as pain, depression, fatigue and headache etc. (called somatic
symptoms). However, positive or negative emotions may reduce or strengthen the intensity of
“job content” and “job context” association.

Therefore, based on Social power theory that, “lower ranked workers are more experienced to
incivility by their seniors (French and Raven,1959)” and broaden-and-build theory that, “positive
emotions not only broaden an individual’s awareness but also encourage exploratory, novel and
varies thoughts (Fredrickson, 2004)” this study aim to examine the associations among job
insecurity, incivility, interpersonal-conflicts and somatic symptoms considering affectivity as a
moderator on the associations between insecurity and incivility among lower-ranked police
employees.

2. HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Job Insecurity, Somatic Symptoms, Incivility and Interpersonal Conflicts

Incivility is “low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in
violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude
and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others (Andersson and Pearson, 1999, p.457).”
Workplace incivility (WI) may lead to serious aggressive workplace behaviors, even if low in
intensity (Torkelson et al., 2016). Andersson and Pearson (1999) described WI as coiled
reciprocal interpersonal-conflicts to portray it as social exchange. Such reciprocal interpersonal-
conflicts escalate from low-intensity to high-intensity forms with a clear intention to harm. In
organizations, incivility cascade downwards to the extent that a third party directly or indirectly
start following the same behavior (Pearson et al., 2000), thus impinges on the entire organization.
Given that, incivility can affect observers and exposures (Lim et al., 2008), this study argues that
a supervisor with uncivil behavior can become a role model for others.

According to Pearson et al. (2000), incivility is related to the leader/supervisor’s power position
and supervisors/leaders hold a higher position in the organizational hierarchy. Therefore, Cortina
et al. (2001) argued that “… incivility can serve as a means of exercising power.” This argument
is in line with French and Raven’s (1959) Social Power Theory (SPT) such that, employees
lower in the organizational hierarchy are more likely to experience incivility from those higher in
the hierarchy. Literature suggested that almost 60 percent of WI was originated by a high-ranked
employee directing a low-ranked employee (Pearson and Porath, 2009). Thus, it can be inferred
that the process of incivility starts with top-ranked employees. However, few of the studies that
have noted the opposite direction of this process (i.e. from low-rank towards high-rank) reported
sabotage as its consequence, though it merely happens (Torkelson et al., 2016).

Pearson et al. (2005) noted that organizational pressures are the most vital predictors of WI.
They found organizational pressures such as new technologies, high demands, deadlines and
compressed time, poor leadership, information and work overload, and uncertain changes at the
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workplace consequent incivility. One of the aspects of uncertain changes is downsizing, which has not been shed light on a frequent basis. Organizations that are involved in downsizing experience more workplace aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996) because their employee feels job insecurity. Job insecurity (JI) is “powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 1984, p. 438).” Such threaded job situations negatively affect worker’s health (Baumeister and Leary, 1995) which sparks the concept of somatic symptoms. Somatic symptoms include physical issues like pain, depression, fatigue and headache. Few of the researchers have identified that exclusion or belongingness is directly linked with many health-related outcomes like physical pain, depression and anxiety (Eisenberger, Lieberman, & Williams, 2003; Hagerty & Williams, 1999). However, hardly a single study has attempted to examine the association between job insecurity and somatic symptoms. This study argues that supervisor’s perceptions of job insecurity threatened them which affect their physical health, result in continuous headaches, anxiety, depression and physical pain (i.e. somatic symptoms).

Job insecurity not only affects an individual’s health but also affects their attitudes and behaviors (Vander Elst et al., 2014). Several studies have suggested job dissatisfaction, counter-productive behavior, deviant behavior, intention to leave and organizational cynicism as outcomes of job insecurity (Westman et al., 2001; Sverke et al., 2002). However, the literature on the association of job insecurity with incivility is scant (Torkelson et al., 2016). As discussed earlier, the process of incivility cascade from high-rank (i.e. supervisor/leader) towards low-rank (i.e. subordinate) employees (Cortina and Magley, 2009), therefore, this study argues that supervisor’s perception of job insecurity leads towards aggressive behaviors which ultimately develop incivility among their subordinates.

In the presence of aggressive behaviors at the workplace, individuals thought negatively about their social interactions and such perceptions lead towards interpersonal conflicts. Interpersonal conflict arises “when one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party (Wall and Callister, 1995).” Literature has identified swear psychological consequences of perceived interpersonal conflicts such as frustration, anger and anxiety (Liu et al., 2007). No doubt about the fact that dropping a job is a stressful event and may have an impact on an individual’s health, however, threatened of job loss (i.e. job insecurity) is perhaps more alarming comparing actual job loss. Literature suggested that an individual’s perception of job insecurity consequent negative outcomes that ultimately affect an entire organization (Sverke et al., 2002).

Dollarde et al’s (1939) frustration and aggression theory help in understanding the association between job insecurity and interpersonal conflicts. This theory states that “frustration causes aggression, because of which negative outcomes are generated.” Similarly, the pressure of job insecurity frustrates individuals to behave aggressively, which ultimately gives rise to interpersonal conflicts (Dollarde et al., 1939). The limited literature on job insecurity suggested poor communication, burnout and conflicts as its outcomes (De Witte, 2005; Hoel & Cooper, 2000). Based on the above discussion, this study proposes that:

*H1:* Supervisor’s perception of job insecurity will enhance their somatic symptoms.

*H2:* Supervisor’s perception of job insecurity will increase their uncivil behavior as an aggressive response.

*H3:* Supervisor’s perception of job insecurity gives rise to interpersonal conflicts.
2.2 Relationship among Incivility, Interpersonal Conflicts, Somatic Symptoms

Uncivil behaviors without considering others at the workplace are known as incivility. Indeed, the intent to harm is not always obvious, hence hard to provide evidence. However, hampering respectful workplace norms (such as writing demeaning emails, involving others in negative talks, reprimanding others in public, treating others’ as a child and spreading gossip etc.) are often reported and identified (Trudel and Reio, 2011). Whatever the case would be, uncivil behaviors are problematic to healthcare, higher education and law enforcement industries (Leiter et al., 2010; Cortina et al., 2004) and its pessimistic impact have extensive effects. Incivility is “more insidious, taking hold in such an ambiguous and stealthy manner that it is difficult to identify, manage, and prevent (Cortina, 2008, p. 71)”, thus it presents a unique challenge.

A profound look at literature evident the occurrence of incivility at the workplace, however statistics about costs associated with it are not clear. Theoretically sexual harassment, workplace deviance, bullying and violence overlap with incivility (Namie, 2003). Therefore, statistics regarding costs provided relating to these concepts may be used for incivility. According to Speer (1998), workplace violence (i.e. damaged goodwill, productivity, security and insurance etc.) costs between 6.4-36 billion US dollars to the organizations. According to Sexual Harassment (2010) statistics, 48.4 million US dollars were awarded to 11,717 registered cases. On the other side, the literature on the targets of incivility is well documented. Targets of uncivil behavior are more likely to leave their organization and engage in organizational theft, while less likely to be committed, satisfied and involve in helping activities (Pearson et al., 2000). According to Trudel and Reio (2011), “the negative effects of workplace incivility are consistent with the poor outcomes of ineffectively managed conflict. And there is a need to shed light on it (P. 398).”

It is a generally accepted phenomenon that, conflicts are usually occurring in the presence of people. Simply, conflict is an argument, clash or disagreement. Literature has suggested poor performance and productivity, less organizational commitment, sickness and absenteeism as consequences of poorly managed conflicts (Thomas et al., 2005; Giebels and Janssen, 2005). Therefore, these costs of conflicts generate the need to highlight this variable in this study. According to Barskey and Wood (2005), individuals have a consistent tendency to involve in cross arguments and this leads to major issues, therefore, conflicts are required to manage. Further, the exchange of arguments starts when an individual perceives himself/herself as the target of other’s rude behavior (Van de Vliert, 1984). However, Brockman et al.’s (2010) thought strikes that, behavioral and cognitive training may be helpful for the management in handling conflicts.

Further, both uncivil behaviors and interpersonal conflicts are found to have a negative impact on an individual’s psychological health. For instance, in a recent study Claire (2016) noted that individuals involved in interpersonal conflicts are more likely to have experience headaches, anxiety, muscle strain and stomach pain (i.e. somatic symptoms). Whereas, those who have not experienced psychological health diseases are found in somatic complaints, depressive moods and job dissatisfaction (Meier et al., 2014). According to Abas et al., (2018) subordinates may dissolve or amplify their interpersonal conflicts and can shape their workplace destructive or support. However, such conflicts ultimately affect their emotional stability, cognitive and somatic strain. Similarly, Eisenberger et al., (2003) noted that targets of mistreatment or
discrimination socially exhausted that cause physical pain. Working on American employees, Cortina et al., (2001) noted that mistreatment is directly associated with individuals' psychological health, specifically pain, headache and anxiety (Blasé & Blasé, 2003). Literature is well documented about the associations among incivility, interpersonal conflicts and somatic symptoms in isolation. This study contributes to the existing literature by considering all variables in a single model. Therefore, it is argued that supervisor’s perceptions of job insecurity cause uncivil behavior at the workplace that leads to conflicts and somatic symptoms, a neglecting relation in the literature. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

H4: Incivility at the workplace gives rise to interpersonal conflicts.
H5: Incivility at the workplace cause somatic symptoms.
H6: Interpersonal conflicts cause somatic symptoms.
H7: Supervisor’s job insecurity leads towards incivility at the workplace that further causes interpersonal conflicts and somatic symptoms.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

According to George (1989), moods or affective states are the feelings induced by situational factors and workplace events. Considering the fact that modes are situational-oriented, a large number of researchers have identified two dimensions of mood i.e. positive affectivity (PA) and negative affectivity (NA). Both the dimensions are found to relate to an individual’s psychosocial states and are considered as “the key dispositional determinants of affective reactions” (George, 1992, p.185). Individuals with PA are not only found to be alert, active and enthusiastically engaged but are also found to be in good moods, thereby, largely have a positive outlook across various situations. Similarly, individuals with NA are found to be careless, reactive, suffering from their thoughts, thereby are more likely to involve in bad moods in various situations (Watson et al., 1988; George, 1992). As the current affective state is largely dependent on situational factors, therefore, NA and PA traits are considered as main predictors of an individual’s mood (Watson and Clark, 1997).

Individuals with PA display full concentration, high energy and enthusiasm to evaluate situations positively rather negatively, thus may have intrinsic motivation. Keaveney (1992) describes intrinsic motivation as a “feeling of challenge”. Individuals with such feelings are more likely to sort out their problems by searching for new knowledge and alternative ways (Hon, 2012). As literature has suggested, Individuals that work in threatened workplace situations and high organizational pressure (i.e. job insecurity) are more likely to involve in aggressive behaviors (i.e. incivility). In such situations, this study argues that PA may help to reduce the negative strength of this association. These arguments can further be supported by Fredrickson’s (2004) broaden-and-build theory. This theory states that positive emotions not only broaden an individual’s awareness but also encourage exploratory, novel and varies thoughts. Conversely, individuals with NA may strengthen the negative association between job insecurity and incivility.

The literature on the empirical investigation of affectivity is scant. Karatepe and Tezabi (2011) work on the frontline employees working in UAE’s five-star hotels and found individuals with greater PA in experiencing low emotional exhaustion. In another study, Karatepe (2015) noted PA as a mediator between perceived organizational support and job-related outcomes among UAE’s frontline employees. Whereas, Abraham’s (1998) work noted NA moderating the
association between emotional dissonance and job dissatisfaction. However, none of the studies have attempted to examine the moderating role of PA and NA between job insecurity and incivility. Thus, based on the limited findings and broaden-and-build theory of positivity this study hypothesized that:

H8: Positive affectivity will weaken the negative association between job insecurity and incivility.
H9: Negative affectivity will strengthen the negative association between job insecurity and incivility.

![Affective Model](image)

**Fig 1: Theoretical Model**

4. METHODS

4.1 Sample and Procedure

This study selected a sample of 560 low-ranked police employees following item response theory with the criteria of 20 responses against each item (28×20=560) and data were collected at two times based on convenience sampling. At time-1 information about positive and negative affectivity, job insecurity and incivility were collected and 389 police employees participated in the survey. At time-2 information regarding interpersonal conflicts and somatic symptoms was obtained and 358 police employees participated in the survey (see Figure 1). Therefore, the study has to consider data of 358 police employees for further analysis. The police employees were briefly explained the purpose of the research before collecting responses and they were ensured about the confidentiality of their answers.

Police employees were also asked about their age, gender, martial status and qualification. Most of them were between the ages 26-34 years (N=212), male (N=288), Married (N=189) with a master’s degree (N=268).

Measures:

The study used a six-item scale of Agho et al. (2002) containing three-items for each positive and negative affectivity. Spector and Jex’s (1998) four-item scale was used to measuring interpersonal conflicts. A seven-item scale of Cortina et al. (2001) was used to measure incivility at the workplace. A three-item scale of Hellgren et al. (1999) was used to measure job insecurity and Gierk et al’s (2015) eight-item scale was used to measure somatic symptoms (See Appendix-1).
5. RESULTS

5.1 Preliminary Analysis

First, the data were examined regarding missing values, outliers, normality and multicollinearity. Twelve questions were found to have missing values, however, those were treated following the instructions of Sekaran (2003). Further, fifteen questionnaires were noted to have extreme values (i.e. outliers) and were removed before the final analysis (Kline, 2005) and 343 responses were used in the final analysis. Normality of the data was examined through the values of skewness (with the standard value of ±1) and kurtosis (with the standard value of ±3) and data were found to be normally distributed (Byrne, 2010). Multicollinearity was examined following the instructions of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) and none of the correlational values was found to be more than 0.85 (see Table 1).

Table 1: Correlation, Mean and Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-JI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-PA</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-NA</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-WI</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-IPC</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>-0.41**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-SS</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Note: JI=job insecurity, PA=positive affectivity, NA=negative affectivity, WI=workplace incivility, IPC=interpersonal conflicts, SS=somatic symptoms, *P<0.05, **P<0.01”

The study used the standard value of 0.70 to examine the reliability of the scale (Hair et al., 2010) and the values of Cronbach Alpha were found between 0.79-0.88 (see Table 1). The values of Table 1 further show that job insecurity is positively related with positive affectivity (r=0.18, P<0.01), incivility (r=0.23, P<0.01), interpersonal conflict (r=0.25, P<0.01) and somatic symptoms (r=0.37, P<0.01), while negatively related with negative affectivity (r=-0.16, P<0.05). Further, incivility and interpersonal conflicts were also noted to have a positive relationship with somatic symptoms (r=0.48 & 0.37, P<0.01) respectively.

5.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Second, the data were examined regarding CFA. The main reason to examine CFA was that the scales used in the study were adapted from previous studies (Hair et al., 2010). The study followed the instructions of Kline (2005) and Byrne (2010) regarding model fit indices. Initially, the values of model fit were not as per the standard values i.e. $\chi^2/df=5.07$, $CFI=0.88$, $SRMR=0.092$, $RMSEA=1.03$, then modifications were made one by one and the model was found to be fit i.e. $\chi^2/df=2.52$, $CFI=0.953$, $SRMR=0.041$, $RMSEA=0.039$ (see Table 2).
### Table 2: Values of model fit for CFA and measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Index</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>χ²/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cut-off Values</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>≤ 3</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>&lt; 0.10</td>
<td>&lt; 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>421.124</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement Model</td>
<td>412.387</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "df = Degree of freedom, χ²/df = Normed χ², CFI = Comparative fit index, SRMR = Standard Root Mean Residual, RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation"

### 5.3 Hypotheses Testing

The study tested hypotheses using structural equation modeling (SEM) where the model fitness values were found to be as per the standard values i.e. χ²/df = 2.32, CFI = 0.962, SRMR = 0.058, RMSEA = 0.045 (see Table 2). The values in Table 3 show the path coefficients between variables. The results reveal a positive impact of job insecurity on workplace incivility (β = 0.29, CR = 4.87, t = 5.07), interpersonal conflicts (β = 0.35, CR = 8.23, t = 6.28), and somatic symptoms (β = 0.31, CR = 7.25, t = 4.23). These results support suggested hypotheses H1, H2 and H3. Similarly, workplace incivility was found to have a positive impact on interpersonal conflicts (β = 0.42, CR = 5.89, t = 6.02) and somatic symptoms (β = 0.39, CR = 4.56, t = 4.87), hence, support H4 & H5. Finally, interpersonal conflicts were found to have a positive impact on somatic symptoms (β = 0.41, CR = 5.34, t = 3.98), which supported H6. The study used path coefficients to examine the mediating effects. The results in Table 3 show that the direct path between job insecurity and interpersonal conflicts was significant (β = 0.35, t = 4.88), and the indirect path in the presence of workplace incivility was also noted as significant (β = 0.12, t = 2.05). Therefore, workplace incivility partially mediates the association between job insecurity and interpersonal conflicts and this supports suggested hypothesis H7.

### Table 3: Hypotheses testing using path coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JI ---&gt; WI</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>H2 is Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI ---&gt; IPC</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>H3 is Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI ---&gt; SS</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>H1 is Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI ---&gt; IPC</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>H4 is Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI ---&gt; SS</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>H5 is Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC ---&gt; SS</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>H6 is Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Path</th>
<th>Indirect Path</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JI ---&gt; WI ---&gt; IPC</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Moderating Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Workplace incivility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study examined moderating analysis using the hierarchical regression technique. First, job insecurity, positive affectivity and negative affectivity were treated as independent variables to regress with workplace incivility and noted to have a significant impact (i.e. $\beta$=0.27, -0.17 & 0.16, $t$=6.21, 4.38 & 3.76 respectively). Second, two interactional terms (i.e. Insecurity × Posit. & Insecurity × Negat.) were computed to see their significant impact. Both the interactional terms were found to have a significant impact on civility ($\beta$=-0.12 & 0.21, $t$=4.29 & 4.02 respectively). Thus, positive affectivity was found to weaken, whereas, negative affectivity was found to strengthen the association between job insecurity and incivility (see Table 4). These results support suggested hypotheses H8 & H9.

### 6. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Pakistani police are facing several challenges including poor community relationships, poor delivery services, policing by coercion. Suffice to say that Pakistani police lacks professionalism (Ahsen, 2018). According to Siddiqi (2014), Pakistani police are politically influenced regarding recruitment, training, promotions and transfers, hence most of the police employees feel insecure. Also, almost 90% of the police employees are found to be involved in somatic symptoms (i.e. anxiety, headache and stress etc.). Therefore, to address and cope with such issues this study developed a model based on social power theory and the broaden-and-build theory. The study comprised of nine hypotheses where first insecure employees were noted to involve in workplace incivility behaviors, interpersonal conflicts and are involved in somatic symptoms. These findings are in line with social power theory (French and Raven, 1959) that when the higher hierarchy of any organization feels insecure, they more likely to influence their subordinates and ultimately this impacts their somatic symptoms. Besides, the study noted that police employees with positive or negative moods and emotions matter while behaving uncivil with their subordinates and colleagues. This finding is unique as no previous study has examined the moderating role of emotions on the association between insecurity and incivility. Employees with positive affectivity are more likely to perform their duties comparing negative affectivity which motivates them intrinsically. Intrinsic motivation urge such individuals to find alternate ways to cope with such situations. These arguments are in line with Fredrickson’s (2004) broaden-and-build theory that positive emotions enable individuals to think novel and creative thoughts.

The findings of this study contributed to social power theory by considering workplace incivility as a mediating variable between job insecurity and interpersonal conflicts. Regarding the moderating role of emotions, this is perhaps the first study that contributed to the broaden-and-build theory that positivity may reduce the strength of insecurity and workplace incivility.
Practically, this study suggests policymakers recruit employees having positive emotions so that they may think creatively to cope with certain situations and problems. Second, this study suggests the government ensure transparency while recruiting police as it must not be on a political basis. After recruitment, police must be given cognitive training to develop/promote their positive emotions rather than negative emotions. Further, the interfere of politics must be insulted and all the transfers must be based on merits. Such policies may psychologically empower Police in the country and the issues of anxiety, headache and stress may be resolved. Another suggestion to the government is that Policing must be decentralized to the lower and middle level this may improve the service quality.

This study is not free from limitations. First, this study highlights the issue of somatic symptoms only in Pakistan but this is the issue of many developing and developed countries. The results in a country where policing is influenced by external factors may raise a question on its generalizability. Therefore, further studies are needed to address the issues of workplace incivility and somatic symptoms. Second, the majority of the participants of this study were male which may raise a question on gender biased results. Third, although the study tried to resolve the issue of common method biases by collecting data at two different times, still such data collection may not accurately answer cause and effect, therefore, further studies are suggested to collect longitudinal data.
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