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Abstract

This study seeks to reveal the relationship between nurse job performance and gossip level. The data were collected from 211 nurses working in training and research hospitals and public hospitals affiliated with the Provincial Directorate of Health in Sakarya province of Turkey between April and June 2018. The data collection tool was a scale consisting of three sections that are Nurse Performance Scale, Gossip Questionnaire, and Introductory Information Form. For analysis, independent sample t test, one-way variance analysis, and correlation and regression analyses were employed. The study showed that there is a negative, insignificant relationship between nurses’ gossip perceptions and performance perceptions ($r = -0.134; p>0.05$). It is possible to say that despite the negative relationship between influences, one of the sub-dimensions of gossip, and nurse performance, informal communication among nurses does not create a negative effect on nurse performance.
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Dedikodu Hemşirelerin İş Performansı Algıları ile İlişkili midir?

Öz

Bu çalışma hemşirelerin iş performansı ile dedikodu düzeyleri arasındaki ilişi belirlemek amacıyla gerçekleştirilmişdir. Çalışmanın verileri Nisan-Haziran 2018 tarihleri arasında Sakarya ilinde faaliyet gösteren İl Sağlık Müdürlüğü'ne bağlı eğitim ve araştırma hastanesi ve kamu hastanelerde çalışan 211 hemşireden toplanmıştır. Veri toplama aracı olarak; hemşire performansı ölçüğü, dedikodu ölçüğü ve tanıtı bilgi formu olmak üzere üç bulunmaktadır. Verilerin analizinde bağımsız örneklem testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi; korelasyon, regresyon analizleri kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada, hemşirelerin dedikodu işlev algıları ile performans algıları arasında negatif yönlü olması rağmen anlamlı ilişki olmadığını tespit edilmiştir ($r=-0.134; p>0.05$). Dedikodu alt boyutundan etkileme boyutu ile hemşirelerin performansları arasında olumsuz yönde etkileşim olsa bile hemşireler arasındaki informal iletişim ağının performansları üzerinde olumsuz oluşturmadığını söyleyebiliriz.
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1. Introduction

Under the increasingly competitive conditions, organizations aim to make better use of “human” factor and aspire to gain advantage in this way. Hence, while organizations demand a better performance from employees, employees expect better working conditions and support from organizations (Eşkin Bacaksız et al., 2017: 251).

The concept of performance refers to quantitative and qualitative representation of what an employee can achieve with regards to his job in accordance with the objectives specified by the organization (Şehitoğlu and Zehir, 2010: 95). In other words, performance is the degree of achievement regarding a planned activity (Tutar and Altınöz, 2010: 201). As for job performance, it is defined as the level of accomplishing a task or the employee’s behaviors in accordance with the specified conditions (Bingöl, 2003: 273).
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Given the characteristics of health services, it is clear that healthcare professionals’ job performances are important for offering effective, efficient, and continuous health services in the face of busy, long, and stressful working conditions (Tengilimoğlu et al., 2017: 73; Şantaş et al., 2017: 869; Top et al., 2010: 73).

Enhancing nurses’ performance levels is important for both health institutions and patients as they are among the healthcare professionals who are in direct contact with patients (Eşkin Bacaksız et al., 2018: 53; Baykal et al., 2006: 51). In other words, employees with high performance increase the performance of organizations, which leads to a rise in the competitive power of institutions (Turunç, 2010: 254; Wang and Netemeyer, 2002: 217; AeroLeads, 2017).

Nurses’ job performances are defined as actions that can be observed and measured based on certain standards (Mrayan and Al-Faouri, 2008: 104). Another definition states that nurse’s job performance refers to effective implementation of tasks in a process (Hayajneh, 2000: 12). Therefore, job performance contributes to improve several aspects in nurses such as behavior, attitudes and traits which help to increase the productivity of an organization. (Gabr and Mohamed, 2016: 60).

In addition, there are factors that influence job performance. These are individual, organizational, and environmental factors. Individual factors are competitive characteristics (ability, knowledge, experience, personality), psychological characteristics (interest, belief, values, expectations, motivation, and attitude), and demographic characteristics (age and gender). Organizational factors are management and manpower policy, job definition, business processes and organizational structure, working conditions, and relations with superiors, colleagues, and subordinates (communication). Environmental factors are social factors, economic factors, political factors, and cultural factors (Özdemir, 2007: 4). There are many studies in the literature dealing with these factors (Khanjankhani et al., 2017; Sharma and Dhar, 2016; Tesfaye et al., 2015; Thulth and Sayej, 2015; Yaghoubi et al., 2013; Top, 2013; Awases et al., 2013; Makunyane, 2012; Jankingthong and Rurkkhum, 2012; Boon et al., 2012; Caillier, 2010; Gider et al., 2009; Al-Ahmadi, 2009; Yumuşak, 2008; Fort and Voltero, 2004).

Communication, one of the organizational factors that influence job performance, is an indispensable element of human life and has an important place in organizational structure (Şenturan, 2014, s. 46). Communication is considered as an important behavioral process that provides organizational functioning. It is divided into two parts, namely formal and informal, based on the structure of group relations within the organization (Tengilimoğlu et al., 2017: 357; Koçel, 2015: 610).

Formal communication takes place between the top hierarchy within the organization and other members or people outside the organization (internal notes, reports, meetings, written proposal reports, oral presentations, interviews, speeches, press releases, press conferences, etc.). Informal communication is outside the hierarchical structure of the organization and involves gossips, rumors, etc. (Solmaz, 2004: 120).

Informal communication makes up more than 75% of communication within an organization (Agarwal and Garg, 2012; Boyaci et al., 2000; Atak, 2005; Eroğlu, 2005). It is argued that gossip, one of the common types of informal communication, results from weak formal communication network within the organization (Grosser et al., 2012: 56). To Dunbar (2004: 105), gossip constitutes nearly 65% of one’s conversations in a work place. Cole and Dalton (2009)
state that 14% of coffee break chats is gossip, and nearly 66% of communication among employees is about social issues regarding other people (cited in Kuo et al., 2015: 2288).

As a natural social phenomenon, gossip is inevitable in social environments including but not limited to work places (Tian et al., 2018, s. 2). People feel better when they see other people’s flaws and weaknesses. If these flaws and weaknesses are shared by a third person, it is called gossipping (Michelson et al., 2010, s. 382).

Gossip refers to informal and judgmental conversation about an absent employee within a group generally comprising several people (Kurland and Pelled, 2000: 429). To Altuntaş et al. (2014: 109), gossip is a common way of communication between at least two people or in small groups for praising or accusing people and sharing valuable or important information. Gossip is a critical social conversation about individual and specific behaviors in a sense (DiFonzo and Bordia, 2007: 25). Therefore, Kuo et al. (2015: 2289) state that three contextual principles are required for gossip to emerge: sociability, shared frames of reference, and privacy protection.

Gossip functions are getting information, gaining influence, releasing pent-up emotions, providing intellectual stimulation, fostering interpersonal intimacy, and maintaining and enforcing group values and norms (Grosser et al., 2012: 53).

Gossip is divided into two as positive and negative (Bulduk et al., 2016; Kuo et al., 2015; Abbajay, 2013; Grosser et al., 2012; Foster, 2004).

Positive gossip involves functions such as employees’ social satisfaction and completion of mostly unknown or incomplete information (Bulduk et al., 2016: 308). Positive gossip facilitates cooperation among group members and increases the tolerance, trust, and prestige levels among the members (Sommerfeld et al., 2008: 2530). Hence, gossip may help increase the effectiveness of the organization and help employees make sense of limited information that serves as an early warning signal for organizational change (Crampton et al., 1998: 570). In addition, positive gossip is better for individuals as it creates a sense of belonging and being a part of a group. It helps people to make friends and socialize (Altuntaş et al., 2014: 110). By creating diversity and difference at work, it may increase motivation and make the work place more bearable (Solmaz, 2004: 122). McAndrew et al. (2007: 1571, 1572) argue that positive gossip facilitates conveying information and group dynamics. These results indicate that gossip and employee behaviors are somehow associated with one another.

Negative gossip is a damage to relationships at work as well as to people’s prestige and personality (Kurland and Pelled, 2000: 431). It has a negative influence as it infamizes people and makes the gossiper waste time (Eşkin Başaksız and Yildirim, 2013: 37). These negative effects appear when gossip is blended with the fantasies of jealous, antagonist, or over-eager people (Kuo et al., 2015: 2290). Negative gossip within an organization may lead to conflicts among colleagues and decrease employee motivation (Bulduk et al., 2016: 308). Moreover, the sense of trust among people may deteriorate due to these negative effects (Ellwardt, 2012: 543, 544).

Grosser et al. (2010: 177, 185) argue that when two gossipers have a close or intimate friendship, they can gossip both positively and negatively. On the other hand, if the gossipers are colleagues or have an instrumental relationship such as social relations, they are more likely to engage in a positive gossip. People compare themselves with others through gossip and social relations. They may become more motivated and increase their performance as they learn the achievements of others through gossip. In addition, gossip may help people compete...
effectively and increase their performance efficiently. However, gossip may also decrease people’s performance.

This shows that how performance is affected depends on gossip level. Hence, this study seeks to reveal the relationship between nurse job performance and gossip level. To this end, the conceptual model in Figure 1 was developed.

Figure 1. Research Model

The hypotheses below were developed based on the conceptual model in Figure 1.

H₁: There is a correlation between gossip as well as its sub-dimensions and nurse performance.

H₂: Gossip and its sub-dimensions have an effect on nurse performance.

H₃: There is a significant difference between gossip and socio-demographic characteristics.

H₄: There is a significant difference between nurse performance and socio-demographic characteristics.

2. Method

2.1. Aims

The purpose of this study is to reveal nurses’ perceptions regarding their performance and their attitudes towards gossip. In addition, this paper seeks to reveal whether there is a significant relationship between nurse performance and gossip level.

2.2. Sample/Participants

The population of the study covers the nurses working in training and research hospitals and public hospitals affiliated with the Provincial Directorate of Health in Sakarya province of Turkey. The population consists of 680 nurses working in the relevant hospitals within the relevant period. The sample of the study was not determined. The study aimed to contact all the nurses within the population. The data were collected from 211 nurses who accepted to participate in the study. The rate of contacting the population is 31%.
2.3. Data collection

The data were collected between April and June 2018 in the hospitals through face-to-face interviews. A scale consisting of three sections was used for data collection. The first section was an Introductory Information Form to collect data about socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. The second section consisted of Nurse Performance Scale, and the third section consisted of Gossip Questionnaire.

*Nurse Performance Scale*: The scale was developed by Greenslade and Jimmieson (2007) to measure nurses’ performances. It was adapted into Turkish by Harmancı Seren et al. (2018). The original form of the scale has two dimensions with propositions affecting the performance directly or indirectly. It has 41 items. Direct performance dimension has 23 items and four sub-dimensions, whereas indirect performance dimension has 18 items and four sub-dimensions. In the Turkish adaptation, the scale has six sub-dimensions and 32 items. These sub-dimensions are coordination of care, assisting and supporting patients, interpersonal support, compliance, information, and job-task support.

*Gossip Questionnaire*: The “Gossip Functions Questionnaire” developed by Foster (2004) was employed in the study. The questionnaire consists of 24 questions and four functions that are information, friendship, influence and entertainment. Information is about one’s collecting and spreading information about the developments and events in his close environment. Friendship is a function to bring groups together through sharing of norms. Influence refers to control over other people’s behaviors and actions. Entertainment is about observing people who are nice to chat, making inferences, and taking pleasure from gossip. The Turkish study regarding the questionnaire in medical area was conducted by Şantaş et al. (2018). The employed measurement tools have a 5-point Likert type structure.

2.4. Ethical considerations

Before distributing the forms to the hospitals, consent numbered 24404279-702.99-63 and dated 27/03/2018 was received from Sakarya Provincial Directorate of Health, at the same time consent numbered 83 and dated 02/05/2018 was received from the Ethics Committee of the Rectorate of Sakarya University.

2.5. Data analysis

As validity analyses of the scales used in the study had been made previously, only the reliability analyses were performed in this study. To analyze the data, descriptive statistics as well as correlation analysis and regression analysis were used. The analyses were carried out within the reliability range of 95%.

2.6. Reliability Analyses of the Measurement Tools

To test the reliability of the scales used in the study, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients were calculated. Table 1 shows that Cronbach’s alpha values of Nurse Performance Scale is 0.960. The values for the factors are as follows: coordination of care: 0.893; assisting and supporting patients: 0.957; interpersonal support: 0.926; compliance: 0.874; information: 0.927; and job-task support: 0.816. Cronbach’s alpha for the whole of the original scale was not calculated. The value for the direct dimension was found to be 0.94. Cronbach’s alpha values for the sub-dimensions range from 0.85 to 0.94. The value for the indirect dimension was found to be 0.91. Cronbach’s alpha values for the sub-dimensions range from 0.80 to 0.90 (Greenslade and Jimmieson, 2007: 609). Cronbach’s alpha value for the whole of the scale was found 0.95 by Harmancı Seren et al. (2018: 31) who tested the scale for reliability after its adaptation into
They found the values for the factors as follows: coordination of care: 0.93; assisting and supporting patients: 0.93; interpersonal support: 0.88; compliance: 0.82; information: 0.79; and job-task support: 0.65.

Cronbach’s alpha value for Gossip Questionnaire is found to be 0.910 while the reliability values for the factors are as follows: information: 0.856; friendship: 0.920; influence: 0.921; and entertainment: 0.862. Cronbach’s alpha value for the original scale was found to be 0.64 whereas the values for the factors are as follows: friendship: 0.81; information: 0.80; entertainment: 0.80; and influence: 0.64 (Foster, 2004: 99). In the study conducted by Şantaş et al. (2018: 67), Cronbach’s alpha value for the whole questionnaire was not calculated. However, the values for the dimensions are as follows: information: 0.83; friendship: 0.80; influence: 0.84; and entertainment: 0.83.

Based on the information given above, it is seen that the reliability values of the original measurement tools and of their Turkish adaptations are in line with the reliability values of the measurement tools used in this study.

Table 1 also shows that the participants’ nurse performance perceptions are high (4.15±0.53) while their gossip perceptions are moderate (2.50±0.49).

Table 1: The Reliability Analysis Findings and the Mean and Standard Deviation Values of the Measurement Tools (n=211)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Scales and Sub-Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of Care</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting and Supporting Patients</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Support</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Task Support</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Performance</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Results/Findings

3.1. The Participants’ Socio-Demographic Characteristics (n=211)

The socio-demographic characteristics of the participating nurses are as follows: 78.7% are females while 21.3% are males. Most of the participants (54.5%) hold BA degree. This rate is followed by high school degree (23.2%), associate degree (16.6%), and graduate degree (5.7%). The ages of the participant nurses range from 19 to 59. The age average is 30.18. The distribution of the participants by positions is as follows: 91% are nurses while 9% are administrative nurses. 59.2% of the participants work in inpatient services; 23.2% work at emergency; 8.1% work in polyclinic services; and 4.3% work in administrative services. The average tenure in the organization is approximately 5 years while tenure as a nurse is approximately 9 years.
3.2. The Findings Regarding the Relationship between Gossip and Nurse Performance

Pearson’s correlation analysis was used to reveal the correlation between gossip and nurse performance (Table 2). Analysis results show that there is a negative, insignificant correlation between nurse performance and gossip ($r = -0.134$) ($p>0.05$). Also, nurse performance has a negative correlation with the influence sub-dimension of Gossip Questionnaire ($r = -0.198$) while gossip has a negative correlation with only the coordination of care sub-dimension of Nurse Performance Scale ($r = -0.263$). Accordingly, H1 hypothesis is rejected except for the “influence” sub-dimension.

Table 2: Findings Regarding the Correlation between Gossip and Nurse Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting and</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Patients</td>
<td>.480**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.594**</td>
<td>.620**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (3)</td>
<td>.571**</td>
<td>.686**</td>
<td>.560**</td>
<td>.655**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (4)</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.654**</td>
<td>.436**</td>
<td>.580**</td>
<td>.713**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Task Support (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Performance (7)</td>
<td>.738**</td>
<td>.861**</td>
<td>.761**</td>
<td>.781**</td>
<td>.858**</td>
<td>.732**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level; * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

3.3. The Findings Regarding the Effects of Gossip and Its Sub-Dimensions on Nurse Performance

Regression analysis was used to reveal the effects of gossip and its sub-dimensions on nurse performance (Table 3). The analysis results show that the first model which was created for the effect of the influence sub-dimension on nurse performance is statistically significant ($F=8.499$; $p<0.05$). It was seen that influence has a negative effect on nurse performance ($β=-0.134$). In the model, the correlation coefficient of the influence sub-dimension to explain nurse performance is 0.198. The effect of explaining the nurse performance is 3.9%.

Table 3 shows the second model regarding the effect of gossip and influence on nurse performance together, which is also statistically significant ($F=4.315$; $p<0.05$). In the model, it is seen that the correlation coefficient of gossip and the influence dimensions to explain nurse performance together is 0.200. The effect of these two dimensions to explain nurse performance together is 4%. Accordingly, it is seen that gossip and the influence sub-dimension have an effect on nurse performance while the information, friendship, and entertainment sub-dimensions do not have effects on nurse performance. The H2 hypothesis was accepted but not in the information, friendship and entertainment sub-dimensions.
Table 3: The Findings Regarding the Effects of Gossip and Its Sub-Dimensions on Nurse Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.492</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
<td>-2.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>4.315</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Findings from Independent Sample T-Test and One-Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA)

The study seeks to reveal whether there is a significant difference in terms of gossip and nurse performance based on socio-demographic variables (Table 4). To this end, independent sample t-test and one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) were employed. In the findings section, the data regarding the demographic variables involving difference are given. Accordingly, there is a difference between nurses in terms of gossip and performance perceptions based on the service units they work in, but there is no difference based on gender, age, educational background, position, tenure in organization, and tenure as a nurse.

The analysis results regarding the service units they work in indicate a significant difference between nurses in terms of gossip perceptions (p=0.032, p<0.05) and performance perceptions (p=0.000, p<0.05). The difference in gossip perception by service unit was found to be between the nurses working in polyclinic services and the nurses working in inpatient services as well as administrative services. The gossip function perceptions of the nurses working in polyclinic services were seen to be lower than those of the nurses working in inpatient services and administrative services. The difference in performance perception by service unit was determined to be between the emergency nurses and the nurses working in inpatient, polyclinic, and administrative services. The emergency nurses have lower performance perceptions than those who work in inpatient, polyclinic, and administrative services. Based on the results, H3 and H4 hypotheses are rejected except for the “service unit” variable.

Table 4: The Findings from One-Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) Regarding the Service Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Units</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency (1)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.001</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>3-2 p=0.017; 3-4 p=0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inpatient services (2)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polyclinic services (3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative services (4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency (1)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>10.688</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1-2 p=0.000; 1-3 p=0.002; 1-4 p=0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inpatient services (2)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polyclinic services (3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative services (4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, a model was created to reveal nurse performance and gossip perception levels and whether there is a significant relationship between nurse performance and gossip level.

According to the study results, there is a negative, insignificant relationship between nurses’ gossip function perceptions and performance perceptions. On the other hand, there is a negative, significant relationship between the influence dimension, one of the sub-dimensions of gossip, and nurse performance. Consistently with the findings of this study, Grosser et al. (2010: 195) state that though there is a negative relationship between gossip and performance, it is not significant. Lyles et al. (2003: 121) assert that though informal communication has a positive relationship with performance, it is not significant. Accordingly, it is possible to say that there is an adverse interaction between gossip and performance; yet, for nursing these two variables do not yield a significant result. However, it is possible to say that negative relations of nurses with one another may lead to a change in their performances.

The study showed that the influence sub-dimension has a negative effect on nurse performance. Despite the fact that gossip and the influence sub-dimension have a negative effect on nurse performance together, gossip does not have an effect on nurses’ performance perceptions. Contrary to the results of this study, Grosser et al. (2010: 201) revealed the negative effect of negative gossip on performance. Çekmeceloğlu and Pelenk (2015: 155) showed that organizational obstacles have negative effects on individual performance. As a result, it is possible to say that as nursing is a busy job that does not tolerate any faults and requires constant attention, nurses focus on their actions rather than their private lives while working. Therefore, by gossiping, nurses only share information and make their busy schedule somewhat entertaining. In this sense, it is possible to say that nurses engage in gossip not as an informal communication but as a motivating, performance-enhancing means of contribution to both themselves and their organizations. Otherwise, if nurses display negative attitudes and behaviors at work, this may influence their colleagues negatively, which may lead to the demonstration of counterattitudes. Thus, employees should support each other in a positive manner, and constructive behaviors should be encouraged.

The study showed that there is a difference between the nurses working in polyclinic services and the nurses working in inpatient and administrative services in terms of gossip functions. In addition, there is a difference between the emergency nurses and the nurses working in inpatient, polyclinic, and administrative services in terms of performance perceptions. Accordingly, it can be said gossip perceptions may change depending on the communication network in service units. This is because the nurses working in polyclinic services engage more in individual actions while the nurses working in inpatient services have stronger communication networks. As for the nurses working in the administrative services, they generally engage in formal communication. Different perceptions towards performance may stem from the fact that emergency nurses are more active and work in busier environments, and they need to move more quickly. In addition, it is possible to say that emergency nurses focus on their tasks, which hinders their support to colleagues. They carry out the instructions regarding patient care as ordered by doctors. Therefore, they focus more on patient care rather than contribution to organization. In other words, they pay the most attention to recovering patients in emergency condition. The nurses working in inpatient and polyclinic services focus on patient care and pay attention to their organization as well as to their colleagues. This is about paying closer attention to patients and establishing closer relationships with them. As for the performance
perceptions of the nurses working in administrative services, their performance levels may increase because they behave more professionally in their working lives; they are more formal; and they devote themselves to their tasks.

As a result, it is clear that informal communication networks of nurses, who are engaged in professional tasks, are at medium level. Their communication is more about friendship or sincere relationships, entertainment, and influencing one another regarding any issue rather than exchange of information. On the other hand, nurses who exchange information with one another may contribute to patients' treatment, provide more support for colleagues, and make more contribution to their organization and their work. In this sense, even if the influence dimension, one of the sub-dimensions of gossip, has a negative effect on nurse performance, it is possible to say that the informal communication network among nurses does not have negative effect on their performance.

The literature contains only a few studies dealing with the variables covered in this study together. Therefore, application of the variables of this study to different and larger sample groups is important to reveal employee attitudes. Moreover, when we consider the health institution as a social system, it is necessary for the managers to acknowledge that it is impossible to prevent gossip among employees. For this, managers should accept that strategies should be developed for better management rather than preventing gossip. However, it is recommended that they conduct meetings, training seminars and small group activities in order to make face-to-face communication efficient among employees. In this way, they can both increase the interaction between the employees and help them to increase their performance by providing motivation. Furthermore, this study has attempted to eliminate a gap in the literature, though partially.
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