

Reviewer Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 2

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this paper. See below comments.

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?
Overall, the paper has been fairly organized and presented.
2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?
The research gap according to the work carried out in the literature review must be clearly stated demonstrate the importance of the topic. Please explain the research gap in the introduction section.
3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?
The methodology needs to be much improved. Every step has to be explained clearly.
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?
The research results should show the impacts based on the research findings.
5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?
Conclusions are used to respond to the research questions presented in the introduction. Has the objective of this research been indicated in the introduction?
6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc. Some minor corrections can be made to several typo mistakes that were found in the paper.
Need to check again.

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your review of JOEPP-07-2022-0178.R2 entitled Empirical analysis of workplace incivility, Emotional Exhaustion, and Job outcomes. for Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance.

This paper has received a Major Revision decision.

Thank you for offering your expertise and on-going support. It is much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,
Maura Sheehan
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:

This improved version is better than before. I appreciate the author's hard work, and I hope this article can be published shortly.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: No. The issues presented by the author lack originality in terms of knowledge; however, they may be of practical use in the limited context of the education sector in India.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes. This improved version is better than before. Some literature has been added, and in my opinion, it is pretty good.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes. This section has been well rewritten by the author

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes. This section

has been well rewritten by the author

5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Yes. This section has been well rewritten by the author

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the fields and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Yes. This improved version is better than before.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this paper. See below comments.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Overall, the paper has been fairly organized and presented.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The research gap according to the work carried out in the literature review must be clearly stated demonstrate the importance of the topic. Please explain the research gap in the introduction section.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The methodology needs to be much improved. Every step has to be explained clearly.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The research results should show the impacts based on the research findings.

5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Conclusions are used to respond to the research questions presented in the introduction. Has the objective of this research been indicated in the introduction?

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the fields and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Need to check again

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

JOEPP-07-2022-0178.R2

OVERALL

Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript. The aim of this paper is to analyze the mediating role of working capital and cash.

After reading the paper, authors have tried to give an answer to the aim of the paper. However, below you will find some comments that should be considered to improve the paper quality and that must help enhance the outreach of the work.

TITLE

Please revise the title of your manuscript. I think the title needs to be reconsidered to catch the reader's attention and fit the content of the manuscript. Also, it is important that you include in the title the important keywords to make it easier for the reader to find the manuscript.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the 'introduction' section is to present the background to the study, set the context and justify the aim of the study of your paper. But authors do not achieve this purpose since do not fully follow a scientific structure. So, I suggest authors to include a 'Introduction' section in line with the scientific structure. Particularly, authors should clarify some issues:

- Authors should explain why the variables chosen are important. In other words, more theoretical reflection should be done around why workplace incivility, emotional exhaustion, job stress, job satisfaction and turnover intention have been chosen by authors. Are these variables appropriate in the Indian context than the Higher education context or both? has been the study context or the theoretical frameworks decisive to choose these variables? I do not think that the proposed theories or the specific study context are enough to justify the gap of a paper... So, more information is needed to better explain the gap of the paper.
- Authors should provide information about the samples and analysis technique used in this section, following the scientific structure.
- Authors should emphasize the gap of the paper. The authors should highlight the paper's contribution: why this paper is innovative in relation to previous research? and why this paper contributes to the advancement of the knowledge in the field?
- Authors should include at the end of the introduction a final paragraph that guides the

reader regarding the order of sections that will be followed in the manuscript.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical framework holds an overview of current knowledge, including the definitions of the variables, their relationships, and the gap of the study. Furthermore, all the theory should be supported by previous research. However, also in this case more explanation about some issues is needed.

- This section is quite confusing because it is not clear the theoretical support of the paper to explain its gap. As it was mentioned, there is no explanation about why these particular variables (workplace incivility, emotional exhaustion, job stress, job satisfaction and turnover intention) are relevant in this study. As mentioned, I think that it is not enough to include certain variables in theoretical framework to better explain the relationship between them. So, authors should (a) explain better the gap of the research and (b) deepen in the Higher education.

- Authors should be included the definitions of all variables involved in the study.

- Authors point out that “Workplace incivility and job stress have been found positively associated with each other by several research studies” (p. 6)... What studies?

- Authors point out that “A person who exhibits rude and unprofessional behavior at work is more likely to experience high job stress, absenteeism, dissatisfaction, low productivity, and distraction” (p. 6) or “One of the unfavorable effects of workplace incivility is emotional exhaustion” (p. 7). Authors should revise the manuscript to all the arguments of the text (or, almost all) are accompanied by cite-in-text (previous research).

- The references, included in ‘Literature review’ section, are rather dated. More recent empirical studies (2020-2021-2022) should be included to demonstrate what important and current is the topic of the paper.

- There are several recent developments exploring the mediating relationship of emotional exhaustion in stressful work environments. In this sense, new references should be included to better explain the potential of the main variables such as:

- * López-Cabarcos, M. Á., López-Carballeira, A., & Ferro-Soto, C. (2021). Is public healthcare healthy? The role of emotional exhaustion. *Baltic Journal of Management*.

- * López-Cabarcos, M. Á., López-Carballeira, A., & Ferro-Soto, C. (2021). How to moderate emotional exhaustion among public healthcare professionals? *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, 27(2), 100140.

- * Moon, C., & Morais, C. (2022). Understanding the consequences of workplace incivility: the roles of emotional exhaustion, acceptability and political skill. *International Journal of Conflict Management*.

- Authors should revise if figure 1 provide valuable information to be included.

METHOD AND RESULTS

- Were the data controlled as recommended by Podsakoff et al. (2003)? What procedures were undertaken to ensure that common method variance bias was not a problem in this study?

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-

903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>

- Which method was used to analysis the mediation effects? The technique used to test the variables are SEM but authors do not provide the main statistics for these techniques. Authors should provide the Means, standard deviations, correlations, estimated reliabilities Cronbach's α and the Goodness-of-fit of the structural model and measurement model in Model analysis. In the mediations, authors should provide the model-fit statistics and the path coefficients for each mediation. Even the authors should provide the results of the bootstrap percentile confidence intervals method for direct and indirect effects.

- Authors should include the Cronbach's α in the diagonal of table 3.

- Authors used a five-point Likert-type scale for all variables of the study. But, the original scale of MBI uses an scale of seven points Likert. Why? Does it have any implication on the results of the study?

LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS

I suggest authors to include in a single section called "Conclusions and future research" the "limitations" and "Conclusions" section. Furthermore, I suggest authors to include a paragraph about future research.

For all of this, my opinion is that in its actual version, this paper should be mayor revision.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes, although not much (see comments to the authors)

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: yes, but it needs to improve some issues

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: yes, but it needs to improve some issues

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The analysis strategy is unclear and the information on the estimation of indirect effects is incomplete.

5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Acceptable

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured

against the technical language of the fields and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Acceptable



Reply Reply all Forward