Chapter II

Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

In this chapter, the investigator has covered existing literature on emotional intelligence, psychological capital, and workplace ostracism and work attitudes. The research studies and literature described here is based upon objectives, mentioned in the first chapter. Firstly, plenty of literatures on emotional intelligence and psychological capital have been reviewed till getting a research gap concerning nature and structure of these in Indian samples. Related studies from India and other countries have been discussed. Secondly, a lot of literature on workplace ostracism and its work related outcomes have also been reviewed. After going through those extensively, two research gaps were originated - (a) study on workplace ostracism in Indian context and (b) workplace ostracism with work related attitudes like job involvement, organizational commitment and organizational cynicism. Thirdly, related studies have also been accumulated to examine the moderating effect of emotional intelligence and psychological capital on the relationship between workplace ostracism and work attitudes.

2.1 Emotional Intelligence: Operationalization in Organization

The origin of emotional intelligence has been emerged mainly from two model of social intelligence (Gardner, 1993). These are interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence. Interpersonal intelligence is a kind of intelligence where an individual is capable to understand other’s moods, feelings, temperaments, motivations and intentions. In contrast, intrapersonal intelligence refers to an individual’s level of understanding towards the self which symbolizes complex and highly differentiated sets of feelings. These two models of social intelligence help the individual to develop skills to understand and monitor the emotions of self and others as well. The meaning of emotional intelligence has been articulated by Salovey & Mayer (1990) and Mayer & Salovey (1997). They theorized emotional intelligence is composed of four distinct dimensions namely self emotional appraisal (SEA), others emotional appraisal (OEA), regulation of emotion (ROE) and use of emotion (UOE). According to them, emotional
intelligence refers to an individual’s interrelated skills concerning the ability to appraise and regulations of emotions in the self and others. But in the year, 1998, Gross defines emotional intelligence as “adaptive behavioral and physiological response tendencies which can be modulated, regulated and, managed.” According to him, for regulating emotion, people should have at least good understanding of his/her emotion. In addition, he also states that identifying own emotion is related to understand others emotion which sometimes helps to modulate and use emotional responses. The same constructs have also been replicated in the theory of emotional intelligence by Wong and Law (2002).

Though there were many operationalizations of emotional intelligence in organizational context, no suitable scales had been developed. In the year 1995, Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey and Palfai developed trait meta-mood based emotional intelligence scale with 30 items and used on staffs of two public elementary schools including parents, teachers and administrators. Similarly, a short version EI questionnaire was developed without any validation evidence (Goleman, 1995; Weisinger, 1998). For improving the psychometric property, BarOn (1997) designed an emotional intelligence scale with 133 items, popularly known as BarOn EQ-I inventory to measure EI constructs. Some researchers were not satisfied with BarOn’s EQ inventory on two reasons. Firstly, this inventory’s validation provided by the developer and secondly, this inventory explains a different view of emotional intelligence. It measures different factors of emotional intelligence, some of them like problem solving and social responsibility which may not be linked directly to emotional intelligence. Another 14 items based EI questionnaire (Carson, Carson & Phillips, 1997) was designed to find a relationship with career commitment on 76 nurses (Carson and Carson, 1998). It has not been considered due to lack of psychometric properties of the measure. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (1997) designed Multifacet Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS), consisting 400 items to measure overall emotional intelligence. This test has also been criticized for ‘longer time consumption’, around one to two hours, to complete and nonexistence of psychometric property. On the contrary, Schuttee and his associates (1998) developed and validated a self-report questionnaire within the trait framework, a homogenous construct of emotional intelligence. For the first time, Wong and Law (2002) developed scale which is highly enriched in terms of practically short measures and psychometric property. In fact
they have used the definition of emotional intelligence driven by Mayer & Salovey, 1997 (Wong and Law, 2002). This test became very popular in organizational context as it was intended for using in leadership, job performance and job outcomes. Initially, they prepared 36 items and employed exploratory factor analyses through maximum likelihood method with varimax rotation resulting in four factors. For improving psychometric properties, four items were selected on basis of largest factor loading from each dimension. They checked this again in second factor analysis and found clear four factor structure of emotional intelligence. Each factor reported high internal consistency with the range of reliability coefficients between .83 to .90. All dimensions of this scale were mildly correlated with the range of between .13 to .42. Then they conducted confirmatory factor analysis on 16 items with the help of LISREL statistical software to check whether four factors model fitted the data of different samples or not. For assuring the factorial validity of 16 items used in emotional intelligence, they used the data from two groups and obtained four factor model which fitted reasonably with the first sample of 72 respondents ($\chi^2$: 132.41; df: 98; CFI: .95; TLI: 0.93; RMR: 0.08) and with the second sample of 146 respondents ($\chi^2$: 179.33; df: 98; CFI: .91; TLI: 0.89; RMR: 0.07) respectively.

It seems possible that emotional intelligence scale by Wong and Law (2002) and Schuttee’s et al (1998) are similar. It is because of two aspects, both have originated from the theory of Salovey & Mayer (1990) and Mayer & Salovey (1997) which explain trait model of emotional intelligence. Some studies have also reported positive relationship between these theories (Shi & Wang, 2007; Fukuda, Saklofske, Tamaoka, Fung, Miyaoka & Kiyama, 2011). Following this theoretical substantiation, the present investigator has reviewed relevant studies to understand the nature of Wong & Law emotional intelligence scale. To the best of researcher’s knowledge, few studies have reported four factor structure while administering Wong and Law emotional Intelligence scale in East Asian countries like China (Shi & Wang, 2007), Japan (Fukuda, Saklofske, Tamaoka & Fung, Miyaoka & Kiyama, 2011) and Korea (Fukuda, Saklofske, Tamaoka, & Lim, 2012). At the same time, researchers have checked factor structures of Schuttee’s emotional intelligence scale in Britain (Petrides & Furnham, 2000), Canada (Saklofske,
Austin and Minski, 2003), Australia (Gignac, Palmer, Manocha and Stough, 2005) and Asian countries like India and Japan (Sharma, Deller, Biswal and Mandal, 2009).

In the year 2004, Thingujam, provided a framework for understandings emotional intelligence in the context of India. He suggested ability model of emotional intelligence like MSCEIT can be applied effectively to Indian population and suggested for factor examination to future Indian researchers. Because this scale has been developed in the West where it’s psychometric property almost unknown in Indian context. He didn’t emphasize the importance of trait model of emotional intelligence which was becoming a popular measure among Indian researchers at that time especially the scale of emotional intelligence by Wong and Law, 2002 (Mulla, Premarajan & Shukla, 2008; Jain, 2009; Ramachandran, Jordan, Troth & Lawrence, 2011; Mandip, Ali, Barkha, Godulika & Kamna, 2012; Rathi, Bhatnagar & Mishra, 2012). No one has examined the factor structure of WLEIS in Indian context.

2.2 Nature and Structure of Emotional Intelligence

Saklofske, Austin and Minski (2003) have examined factor structure of Schuttee’s emotional intelligence scale on a sample of 354 Canadian undergraduate university students. Their main purpose was to investigate whether one factor or four factor model is explained better or not. According to the result obtained through principle component analysis with oblimin rotation they reported the relationship between all pairs of items is positive and significant. It means that the factors of emotional intelligence will be positively inter-correlated. When they used confirmatory factor analyses with the same data through EQS package, they found agreed to four factor model was good than one-two- and three factor model of emotional intelligence. The fit statistics of four factor model had reasonable fit indices ($\chi^2$: 798.74; df: 455; CFI: .90). They also checked second order factor which is slight better fit than the four correlated factor. It is cleared that schuttee’s emotional intelligence have four independent factors as represented by authors which confirms the previous findings of Petrides & Furnham (2000).

Austin, Saklofske, Huang & McKenny (2004) have examined the factor structure of both Schuttee’s original (41 items) and revised emotional intelligence scale (33 items).
They collected responses from 500 Canadian undergraduate students. According to their result using factor analyses, four factor solutions of emotional intelligence were poorly fitted in both the cases. Interestingly, unlike previous study (Saklofske’s et al., 2003), three factors have been extracted when they used oblique rotation method. For 41 items scale, the three factors are regulation of emotion, utilization of emotion and appraisal of emotion with sound internal reliabilities such as .78, .68 and .76 respectively. On the contrary, for 33 items scale, the three factors are regulating and using emotion, optimism or positivity and appraisal of emotion correspondingly with good internal reliabilities like .73, .72, and .71. One of the drawback of this work found by the present investigator that they have not examined this three factor structure through confirmatory factor analysis. It is still a question mark for the present researcher to accept validity of Schuttee’s emotional intelligence scale.

For improving psychometric property of Schuttee’s self measure of emotional intelligence scale, some researchers like Gignac, Palmer, Manocha and Stough (2005) have investigated factor structure with a sample of 367 participants. The sample of this study includes general population from different states of Victoria and New South Wales of Australia. They used confirmatory factor analysis technique. The outcomes of the CFA analyses suggested that the speculated six-factor model of emotional intelligence projected by Salovey and Mayer, 1990 could not be fully reflected in the Schutte Self-Report Emotional Intelligence scale (Schutte et al., 1998). In particular, a nested factors model with a first order general factor, and four nested factors corresponding to Appraisal of Emotions in the Self, Appraisal of Emotions in Others, Emotional Regulation of the Self, and Utilization of Emotions in Problem Solving were identified, in conjunction with a first-order acquiescence factor.

In order to get proper validation of trait measures of emotional intelligence scale, for the first time, Sharma, Deller, Biswal and Mandal (2009) have conducted a cross-cultural study upon India and Japan. The objective of their research was find out the similarities and variations in the factor structure of emotional intelligence between two countries. Their sample was 200 (each 100 from two countries) adult participants including middle managers in IT organizations and graduate management students.
Through exploratory factor analyses (EFA), they found four factors extracted and cumulatively explained 40.4% in Japan and 54.3% in India respectively. Afterward, they investigated these four structures in both countries by means of confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). Interestingly, they got two different goodness-fit indexes for each model. Based on goodness-fit indexes, their result reported poor fit with the data in both Indian varimax model for German sample ($\chi^2 = 1433.6; \text{df} = 516; \chi^2/\text{df} = 2.78; \text{GFI} = .54; \text{RMS} = .13; \text{TLI} = .151; \text{NFI} = .12; \text{CFI} = .17$) and German varimax model for Indian sample ($\chi^2 = 2678.8; \text{df} = 516; \chi^2/\text{df} = 5.19; \text{GFI} = .41; \text{RMS} = .21; \text{TLI} = .17; \text{NFI} = .16; \text{CFI} = .18$). By analyzing the above fit statistics for both models, researchers concluded that Schutte’s emotional intelligence scale cannot be judged as being cross-culturally valid in India and Japan.

While covering these literature, the present investigators noticed two major drawbacks. Firstly, some researchers employed factor structure of emotional intelligence on university students as a major sample in their studies. Secondly, most researchers have not applied exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Thus it is worrisome to support their findings especially when we talk about the factor structures of EI scale upon employees. Therefore two points of view are being highlighted by the present researcher.

Firstly, exploring validation of any psychological scale is not a new attempt particularly the scale of emotional intelligence. However, it has become the interest among researchers especially in non-Indian cultures. There are many researchers who were unable to get clear factor structure when they applied EI measures in different cultural settings including Emotional Quotient Inventory (Bar-On, 1997), Emotional Competence Inventory (Boyatzis, Goleman & Hay/McBer, 1999), Emotional Intelligence based IPIP Scale (Barchard, 2001), Emotional Intelligence Self Regulation Scale (Martinez - Pons, 2000), Dulewicz & Higgs Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2001), Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (Palmer & Stough, 2002), Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile - version 3 (Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel & Hooper, 2002), Emotional Intelligence Scale (Van der Zee, Schakel & Thijs, 2002) and Lioussine Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Lioussine, 2003). These evidences suggest that culture can influence the emotions. Supporting to this, some
researchers have argued that cultural differences could affect psychological constructs of human behaviour (Hofstede, 2011; House et al., 2004). It is also a cross culturally embedded construct (Sibia et al., 2003). Secondly, the samples they used in their studies were mostly restricted to students in academic settings. So it would be unwise to generalize to other types of samples.

2.2.1 Structure of Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS).

Shi & Wang (2007) have examined the factor structure on the Wong and Law emotional intelligence scale among 1458 Chinese University students belonging two cities of Beijing and Shandong. The prime objective of their research is to examine facture structure, reliability and concurrent validity to this sample. They confirmatory factor analysis supported four-factor model ($\chi^2 = 381.42; \text{GFI} = .97; \text{AGFI} = .96; \text{CFI} = .96; \text{RMSEA} = 0.05$) than one-factor model ($\chi^2 = 15792.61; \text{GFI} = .42; \text{AGFI} = .33; \text{CFI} = .02; \text{RMSEA} = 0.30$). To evaluate the concurrent validity, the researchers found significant correlations (.79, p<.01) between the scores of Wong and Law emotional intelligence scale and Schutte’s emotional intelligence scale. The findings of this study are moreover replicate a stable four-factor structure and multi dimensional construct obtained by Wong and Law (2002).

Fukuda, Saklofske, Tamaoka, Fung, Miyaoka & Kiyama (2011) conducted a study which was based on factor structure and relationship towards the Japanese versions of two emotional intelligence scales among Japanese university students. The two scales are Wong and Law emotional intelligence scale (2002) and Schutte’s emotional intelligence scale (1998). They investigated this study on two phases. First, they employed Japanese version of WLEIS upon 310 Japanese students of one university located in the Hiroshima prefecture and second, they employed Japanese version of SEIS upon 200 Japanese students of another university located in the Chiba prefecture. Through confirmatory factor analyses, they examined three different factor models like one-factor, four-factor and second order four-factor model in both scales. According to their study findings of both scales, four-factor model and second order four-factor model described a good fit (WLEIS four-factor model: NNFI = .96; CFI = .97; RMSEA = .06;
WLEIS second order four-factor model: NNFI = .96; CFI = .98; RMSEA = .06; SEIS four-factor model: NNFI = .90; CFI = .91; RMSEA = .07; SEIS second order four-factor model: NNFI = .90; CFI = .91; RMSEA = .07) than one-factor model (WLEIS one-factor model: NNFI = .42; CFI = .49; RMSEA = .24; SEIS one-factor model: NNFI = .79; CFI = .81; RMSEA = .09 ). From these fit indices, a four-factor model replicated for both WLEIS and SEIS. They also found a high correlation between these two scales ($r = .76$, $p < .01$) which indicates that both scales are quite similar trait measures.

Fukuda, Saklofske, Tamaoka & Lim (2012) have examined factor structure of WLEIS in Korea culture with sample of 161 Korean university students. Korean version of WLEIS was used. The purpose of this study was to investigate the structural validity of Korean version of WLEIS through full (four-factor model) and restricted model (second order four factor model). Results from confirmatory factor analysis confirmed full model (NNFI = .95; CFI = .96; RMSEA = .06) was slightly a better fit than restricted model (NNFI = .94; CFI = .95; RMSEA = .06). This study also represented a four factor model of emotional intelligence, a replicated model already done by Wong and Law in the year 2002. The researchers identified a weak relationship between self emotional appraisal (SEA) and regulation of emotion (ROE) in their data. This may due to the cultural factors in processing emotion and sampling nature, they said.

Despite the propagation of the WLEIS in international perspective, it is difficult to know whether the factor structure of this scale is invariant across culture or not. Though this scale is very popular in terms of research and applicability in last decade, some researchers feel a gap of research concerning the scale invariance across culture. Therefore, Libbrecht, Deuchelaer, Lievens & Rockstuhl (2014) have investigated factor structure of WLEIS to a sample consisting 339 graduated students from Belgium, a far Western European country and 505 students from Singapore, a far Eastern country. They extracted factors by applying exploratory factor analysis with an oblique (promax) rotation. Then they assessed this scale with minimally one factor and maximally five factors through measurement models analyses. Their results showed four-factor model was a better fit (Belgium: $\chi^2/df = 3.15; \text{RMSEA} = .07$, Singapore: $\chi^2/df = 2.23; \text{RMSEA} = .06$ ) compared to one (Belgium: $\chi^2/df = 64.79; \text{RMSEA} = .36$, Singapore: $\chi^2/df = 37.76$;
RMSEA = .33), two (Belgium: χ^2/df = 45.05; RMSEA = .30, Singapore: χ^2/df = 21.36; RMSEA = .25), and three factor (Belgium: χ^2/df = 25.14; RMSEA = .22, Singapore: χ^2/df = 13.22; RMSEA = .19) of WLEIS in both countries and there was conceptual difference on the dimension of ‘use of emotion (UOE)’.

The present study entails the factor structure of EI measures on employees from manufacturing companies of India. In addition, no study has examined factor structure upon Indian employees. Based on literature, the researcher believes that there is a need to examine the nature and structure of emotional intelligence in Indian context.

**Research Question 1:** How many factor structures will emerge in support of emotional intelligence in Indian context? Then which factor structure will be more acceptable?

**Hypothesis 1:** Factor structure of Emotional Intelligence as advocated by Wong and Law (2002) will vary in Indian context.

### 2.3 Psychological Capital: Theoretical Background

Psychological capital is an important construct of positive organizational behavior which primarily stress upon “strength based approach” and avoids “deficits based approach” (Fineman, 2006). Positive organizational behavior plays a vital role for developing a conceptual and ideological foundation of positive constructs for psychological capital. Such positive constructs include hope, optimism, self-efficacy and resiliency (Luthans, 2002; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Luthans & Youssef, 2004; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). These four dimensions are state-like rather than trait like approach which can be measured, developed and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace. It can be conceptually defined (Luthans et al., 2004; Luthans & Youssef, 2004; Luthans, Youssef, 2007) and empirically applied (Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007).

### 2.4 Nature and Structure of Psychological Capital

In support of the theoretical explanations, Luthans and his associates (2007) performed convergent and discriminant validity and found four PsyCap constituents, namely
optimism, hope, resilience and self efficacy which were independent to each other. Through the confirmatory factor analyses, all four components gave clear representation in single measurement model. However, one previous finding suggests the presence of shared variances among four components of psychological capital (Law, Wong & Mobley. 1998). Prior to this, researchers attempted to validate the psychological capital questionnaire empirically through measurement model analyses, with twenty four indicators, representing six for each components (Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007). To date, this is the best fitted measurement model where each of the four dimensions connects to the respective indicator with appropriate factor loading, taken as single overall core factor i.e., psychological capital. For employees at work, it became very popular tool and has been used by many researchers at various parts of the world.

Research evidences suggests that the use of psychological capital questionnaire with four factor model was familiar in developed countries of USA (Avey, Luthans & Youssef, 2010; Luthans, Norman Avolio & Avey, 2008; Paterson, Luthan & Jeung, 2014), Canada (Laschinger & Grau, 2012) Australia (McMurray, Pirola-Merlo, Sarros & Islam, 2010; Roche, Maree and Haar, Jarrod & Luthans, 2012), and the United Kingdom (Nigah, Davis & Hurrell, 2012). Research evidences confirm that the use of psychological capital questionnaire was common and popular among people in different countries of Europe like, Turkey (Cetin, 2011), Greece (Epitropaki, 2013). Moreover, researches on psychological capital have been conducted using PsyCap questionnaire by researchers in Asian countries like China (Han, Brooks, Kakabadse, Peng, Zhu, 2012; Luthans, Avey, Clapp-Smith, Li, 2008; Liu, Chang, Fu, Wang & Wang, 2012) and Sri Lanka (Kappagoda, Othman & Alwis, 2014). Few studies have also been found in India (Shahnawaz & Jafri, 2009; Singh & Mansi, 2013). However, from these studies, the present authors could not find any statistical application used for ensuring the factor structure of the construct. When reviewed these articles rigorously, it was noticed that each study has used its own way to measure psychological capital. For example, Shahnawaz & Jafri (2009) measured psychological capital through four independent scales such as ‘state hope scale’ for hope (Snyder, Sympson, Yabasco, Babyak & Higgins, 1996), resilience scale for resiliency (Neill & Dias, 2001), general perceived self efficacy scale for self efficacy (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1993) and Life Orientation Test
for optimism (Scheier & Carver, 1985). Khan (2011) used 24 items based psychological capital scale developed by Luthans and his associates (2007) without assessing factor structure upon the sample of management students. Singh & Mansi (2013) assess psychological capital by optimistic - pessimistic scale (Parashar, 1998) and self efficacy scale (Schwarzer, 1999). In order to improve validity of this construct, Gupta and Singh (2014) prepared a new scale of psychological capital adapted from different works like Scheier and Carver (1985), Wagnild and Young (1993), Snyder et al. (1996) and Tierney and Farmer (2002). To author’s knowledge, they are first researchers in India who have performed both exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on Indian sample. The results of their study confirmed first order factor for psychological comprising four independent dimensions such as hope, optimism, self efficacy and resilience.

An important query arises whether four factors model would fit well invariantly to all nations in the world or not. Based on the need, researchers like Luthans, Avolio, Avey & Norman (2007) have performed confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) of psychological capital among employee sample for factor construction. They have found five model, for example, (1) in baseline model 1 hold up four factor model which include hope, efficacy, optimism and resilience, (2) model 2 hold up three factor model which include combined hope with resilience, efficacy and optimism, (3) model 3 hold up three factor model which include hope and optimism (merged), efficacy and resiliency, (4) model 4 hold up three factor model comprising hope, self-efficacy and a merged factor consisting optimism as well as resilience; (5) fifth model hold up one factor comprising all 24 items. When they were analyzed according to the model fit indices, it was found that the four factor model fitted somewhat well compared to all three factors model. The differences were reported more between four factors model and one factor model. In the same line, Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson (2010), conducted a study on psychological capital among managers and also got the same five models through confirmatory factor analyses. But unlike Luthans et al., (2007), they found all five models were fitted well with lower RMSEA (0.06) and higher CFI (0.90). In a multinational study upon 56, 363 employees belonging to 12 nations including India, Wernsing (2013) found a better fit for three factor simplified model of psychological capital than that of four factor model. Moreover, it’s interesting to see the work of Du Plessis & Barkhuizen (2012), when they applied
exploratory factor analyses (EFA) for psychological capital in South African context, only three factor model were described by the South African Sample. Keeping independence with optimism and resilience, South African sample could not differentiate between hope and self efficacy. Thus, it is evidently noted that the nature and factor structure of psychological capital may change from one culture to another culture. However, to authors’ knowledge, no study in India has been administered so far to identify the nature and factor structure of psychological capital. Therefore, the author inclined to stay with the following research question and hypothesis, -

**Research Question 2:** How many factor structures will emerge in support of psychological capital, in Indian sample? Then which factor structure will be more acceptable?

**Hypothesis 2:** Factor structure of Psychological Capital as advocated by Luthans et al (2007) will vary in Indian context.

### 2.5 Relationship between Workplace Ostracism and Work Attitudes

Though very few direct studies exists on workplace ostracism and work related attitudes but the present investigator found lots of studies between related constructs of workplace ostracism and work attitudes in the organizational context. Ferris et al (2008) works on workplace ostracism renders the real image of how both employees and organizations are influenced. According to him, employees having experience of workplace ostracism may show unfavorable work related attitudes like lower job satisfaction, affective commitment, less interpersonal justice, high on turnover intention or job seeking behaviour etc. Studies also found the negative association between perceived exclusion with supervisor and coworker satisfaction (Hitlan, Cliffton & DeSoto, 2006), emotional abuse with job satisfaction (Spratlen, 1995), workplace bullying with job satisfaction (Loh, Restubog & Zagenczyk, 2010), or found positive associations between emotional abuse with leaving or changing jobs (Keashly, 1998), turnover (Leymann, 1990; Ryan & Oestreich, 1991), cynicism and distrust (Stavrova, & Ehlebracht, 2015).
2.5.1 Workplace Ostracism and Job Involvement

There are no enough studies between workplace ostracism and job involvement conducted so far in Indian and abroad context. Though workplace ostracism is a new notion but it has been followed by other forms of behavior in the workplace. Such behaviors include interpersonal injustice. Recent important study conducted on diverse set of employees which indicated that daily interpersonal justice is positively related to daily self esteem (Ferris, Spence, Brown & Heller, 2012). Self esteem is found to be positively related to job satisfaction (Alavi & Askaripur, 2003).

In the same line, one study also supports that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement (Wegge, Schmidt, Parkes & Dick, 2007). According to Mishra and Shyam (2005), social support is a positive indicator to job involvement. In their studies, they found social support was positively related to job involvement among prison officers in different jails of Lucknow. Though Social support is similar to interpersonal justice, we can assume that interpersonal justice will be positively related to job involvement. Organizational justice also plays a crucial role for strengthening performance at work. There are two types of organizational justice which has a functional relationship with employee engagement i.e., distributive justice and procedural justice. According to Ram and Pravakar (2011), both justices have found to be positively related to employee engagement. Both fairness and organizational justice are also one of the work conditions in the engagement model (Maslach et al. 2001). According to him, clear-cut perception of fairness can enhance engagement while absence of fairness can aggravate burnout. Perceived fairness is the similar construct of organizational justice. It can be assumed that those who have high perception of fairness may likely to engage more to their job and vice versa.

Recent study conducted on managers and found that performance was positively related to high organizational support (Jayawardana, O’ Donnel, & Joyakodi, 2013). Perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support also found to positively relate to employee engagement (Ram and Pravakar, 2011). Social exchange theory is a metaphor for perceived organizational support. Here an employee starts
relationship among colleagues with exchange of share and relationship. In connection with this idea, a research pointed out that there is a positive relationship between job involvement and social exchange (Jayawardana et al, 2013). Interpersonal justice, social support, organizational justice, perceived fairness, perceived organizational support, social exchange are positive constructs and these are contradictory to workplace ostracism.

Research evidence proclaim that individuals who have perception of ignorance tended to show disengagement (Craighead, Kimball, & Rehak, 1979). There is a negative relationship between ostracism and performance (Kerr, Seok, Poulsen, Harris, & Messe, 2008). Job involvement is the positive indicator of performance. Though, Workplace ostracism has tremendous negative consequence of organizational productivity but it is also playing a foremost part of psychological side among employees in the form of stress. A research indicated the positive relationship between workplace ostracism and psychological distress (Wu, Yim, Kwan, & Zhang, 2012). Psychological distress was found to be negatively related job satisfaction (Kafetsios, 2007). A studies conducted by Ferris et, al., 2008, found that there was negative relationship between workplace ostracism and job satisfaction. One Indian research pointed out that Employee engagement was to be found a significant role to improve job satisfaction (Swnalatha & Sureshkrishna, 2013). The researcher can assume that workplace ostracism can be negatively related to job involvement. By taking these literatures support and findings, the investigator proposed the following hypothesis,

**Hypothesis 3a: Workplace ostracism will be negatively related to job involvement**

2.5.2 Workplace Ostracism and Organizational Commitment

A small number of studies are available on the relationship between workplace ostracism and organizational commitment. Ferris and his associates (2008) for the first time examined the relationship of workplace ostracism with affective commitment during the time of developing workplace ostracism scale. The main objective of their research is to construct this scale with variety of samples and various measures. Affective commitment is one of the variables for their research. They found negative relation
between workplace ostracism and affective commitment among 161 Canadian participants including sales professionals, secretary, store manager, data analysts and engineers.

Ostracism and exclusion can be used interchangeably. Both are common in terms of their experience of being rejected, excluded, unnoticed or isolated” (Ferris et al., 2008). Having these experiences among individual can lead to poor organizational commitment. To support this, social undermining a kind of exclusion behavior negatively relates to positive affectivity (Ferris et al, 2008). It slows down positive interpersonal relationship. It may damage the perceived support among employees in the organizations which may lead to workplace ostracism. Perceived organizational support via perceived supervisor support and co-worker support can minimize the experience of workplace ostracism. Positive relationship between perceived organizational support and affective commitment has also been studied (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In addition, researchers developed a model which describes that organizational support is significantly influencing organizational commitment (Cho & Johanson, 2008).

Another interesting study examined the effect of participation in decision making towards commitment in the sample of Western Australia (Scott-Ladd, Travaglione, & Marshall, 2005). Findings suggest that employees’ participations in decision making processes positively influence affective commitment. The employees who are ostracized left isolated usually in the workplace. However, they can increase commitment if organization includes them in the group decision making processes. Support to this observation, employees who are alienated also found to be lower in organizational commitment (Kanungo, 1982; Michaels, Cron, Dubinsky & Joachimsthaler, 1988).

From the above literature covered, the investigator assumes that workplace ostracism can be related to organizational commitment negatively in Indian context. The following Hypothesis is,

**Hypothesis 3b:** Workplace ostracism will be negatively related to organizational commitment.
2.5.3 Workplace Ostracism and Organizational Cynicism

According to many researchers, ostracism is always associated with negative behavioral responses (Catanese & Tice, 2005; Williams, 2009). Organizational change cynicism is one of major reaction among employees when they are at threat towards exclusion. In workplace exclusion, employees may loss trust upon authorities and at the same time they may experience hopelessness, disgust and disappointment. Workplace exclusion is kind of negative work perception. In response to this, Dhar (2009), for the first time studied the causes and concerns of employee cynicism among IT employers in Western India. He found that workplace perception was a significant role to influence organizational cynicism. Poor leadership, politics within workplace and un-met opportunity influences negatively to cynicism, he added. These factors are positively related to organizational cynicism. However, he also found two positive aspects in organization are negatively influences organizational cynicism. They are decisive culture and facilities provided by the organizations. The researcher observes a research gap when reviewed a article “Cynicism in the Indian IT organizations: An exploration of the employee perspective (Dhar, 2009). There is a need to examine cynicism among minority employees in manufacturing sector. No such study has been conducted in India on the relationship between workplace ostracism and organizational change cynicism

Ferris and his associates (2008) have examined the relationship between workplace ostracism and undesirable work attitudinal behavior including job search behaviour (JSB) and turnover intention (TI). They found that the relationship of workplace ostracism with JSB and TI is positive and significant. In response, the researcher stays with an argument that workplace ostracism will be positively related to organizational cynicism. Organizational cynicism is a negative work attitudinal behavior which is positively related with TI (Çınar, Karçioğlu, & Aslan, 2014; Khan, 2014).

Workplace ostracism is a kind of interpersonal mistreatment at work where as cynicism comes under burnout dimensions (Sulea, Filipescu, Horga, Ortan & Fischmann, 2012). These researchers have conducted a study among Romanian teacher to explore the relationship between workplace interpersonal mistreatment and burnout. The finding of this study reveals the positive relationship between interpersonal mistreatment at work
and dimensions of burn out. This suggests that ostracism and cynicism will be positively related.

Another argument can be placed here in support of workplace ostracism and organizational cynicism. Previous study has revealed that ostracism often results in emotionally painful experiences in the form of distress, guilt and anxiety (Baumeister et al., 1993; Williams & Sommer, 1997). Similarly, individual with high cynic attitudes may show negative emotional reaction through suspicion and distrust towards his or her organization (Kanter & Mirvis, 1989; Reichers et al., 1997; Thompson et al., 2000). The researcher assumes that both will be related positively. Thus suggesting following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3c: Workplace ostracism will be positively related to organizational change cynicism**

Based on the literature and findings from various studies, the researcher prepared a hypothesized model linking between workplace ostracism and work attitudes.

![Figure 2.1: Conceptual model for relationship among workplace Ostracism, Job Involvement, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Cynicism.](image-url)
2.6 Emotional Intelligence as moderator between Workplace Ostracism predicting Work Attitudes

Emotional intelligence is a well-liked concept among researchers and practitioners in present period. It has been widely believed that emotional intelligence can improve employee’s job involvement. Supporting this, many studies have revealed that emotional intelligence has positive relations with job involvement (Carmeli, 2003; Akintayo & Babolola, 2012). In addition, emotional intelligence has also been found to be related positively with employee engagement (Murthy, 2015). Psychologists are increasingly accepting this fact that employee’s involvement in the job is nothing but an effect of emotional management skill. Hartell and Panipucci (2007) mention that emotional management skill is a useful mechanism among bad apple (people who are excluded unethically by others). It can help to understand group member’s thought pattern and feeling effectively which can influence for balanced interpersonal relationship. Interpersonal relationship has a direct effect towards job involvement (Dachner, 2011). Researchers often describe emotional intelligence as a coping mechanism to manage stress because it facilitates proficient self-regulations towards desired goals (Salovey, Bedell, Detweiler, & Mayer, 2000). Linking to this finding, Wu and his associates (2012), demonstrate that interaction of political skill and workplace ostracism predict psychological distress significantly. Political skill is also a kind of emotional management skill. Stress free employee can show better performance via job involvement. The researcher has assumed that the presence of emotional intelligence among ostracized employee will improve job involvement.

Plenty of studies have examined on the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment. Emotional intelligence has an influential link with organizational commitment (Abraham, 2000). Researchers and academicians found stronger associations between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment (Rathi & Rastogi, 2009; Rangriz & Mehrabi, 2010; Nordin, 2012; Seyal & Afzaal, 2013). Researchers claim that emotional intelligence is always a facilitating component towards job satisfaction, high capability to resolve the difficulties and problems, changing orientation which is
more preferable for organizational commitment (Carmeli, 2003; Vakola et al, 2004). A study proposed that person who has good emotional judgment are more successful to understand their thoughts, purpose and objectives effectively towards convince people (Zeidner et al. (2004). Gardner & Stough (2003) also reveal that emotional intelligence can predict organizational commitment. Emotional intelligence can also be a facilitator for employee’s loyalty in the workplace. Individual’s high self regulation can retaliate ostracism better (Nozaki & Koyasu, 2014). Therefore the researcher expects that that the presence emotional intelligence among ostracized employee will predict organizational commitment.

To the best of researcher’s knowledge, fewer studies are available on the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational cynicism. One important study demonstrates this relationship among leaders and hypothesizes that higher emotional intelligence will predict lower organizational change cynicism (Ferres & Connell, 2004). According to them, leaders report less change cynicism when they are high on the dimensions of emotional intelligence including self awareness, self regulation, motivation, empathy and social skill. Dhar (2009), also claims that organizational cynicism is a major observation among IT employees in India. It is because of lower regulation of self emotion. So it is needed to examine the effect of emotional intelligence on organizational change cynicism in Indian sample. The present study is very much relevant as it is examining ostracism with organizational change cynicism. Employee-employer relations could be affected by some unwanted reasons. These are - long duration of work with colleagues, work load and ineffective leadership and supervision which may lead cynicism. It can be improved through meaning in the workplace which can be inculcated through emotional intelligence. It can enhance effective leadership and quality supervision by which employees can feel that organization is trustworthy. So it is hypothesized that the employees who are high in emotional intelligence will show lower organizational change cynicism.

Based on the synthesis of above literature, the researchers framed the following hypotheses with conceptual model.
**Hypothesis 4a:** Emotional intelligence will moderate the relationship between workplace ostracism and job involvement.

**Hypothesis 4b:** Emotional intelligence will moderate the relationship between workplace ostracism and organizational commitment.

**Hypothesis 4c:** Emotional intelligence will moderate the relationship between workplace ostracism and organizational change cynicism.

---

**Figure 2.2: Conceptual model for moderating role of Emotional Intelligence on the relationship between Workplace Ostracism and Work Attitudes**

2.7 Psychological Capital as Moderator between Workplace Ostracism and Work Attitudes

In organizational context, lots of works have been carried out on job involvement. Kanungo (1982) mentions that whose involvement in job is high, consider their job to be important for their self image. To date, no study has been conducted on the relation between psychological capital and job involvement. However, some researchers have examined the psychological capital with job engagement and they find positive relations between these variables (Bakker et al., 2006; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Avey et al., 2008; Hodge, 2010; Sweetman & Luthans, 2010; Simons & Buitendach, 2013; Sihag & Sarikwal, 2014). Interestingly, some studies are also available on the relationship between dimensions of psychological capital and work engagement including hope (Cogner & Kaungo, 1988; Harter, Schmidt & Hayed, 2002), optimism (Jensen, Luthans, Lebsack & Lebsack, 2007), resiliency and self efficacy (Kumar & Sia, 2013). From
findings, the researcher arrived at conclusion that psychological capital would be related positively with job involvement.

In many researches, psychological capital has been found to be positively linked, over and over again, with performance and work related outcomes (Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, 2010; Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007; Peterson, Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa & Zhang, 2011). Researchers have discovered the significant relationship between psychological capital and employee commitment (Larson & Luthans, 2006; Luthans & Jensen, 2005). Besides these findings, studies also point that employees who are having more psychological capital are more satisfied (Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007) and more committed to their work (Luthans, Norman, Avolio & Avey, 2008). Cetin (2011) stated in his study that, organizational commitment was predicted by states of hope, optimism and resilience. In addition to these, researchers like Simsons and Buitendach (2013), found significant associations between psychological capital and organizational commitment.

Psychological capital can slow down cynical attitude among employees. Several studies have reported the strong and negative relationship between psychological capital and cynicism (Snyder, Harris, et al., 1999; Avey, Wernsing & Luthans, 2008; Avey, Luthans & Youssf, 2010).

Psychological capital can be helpful for employees for their constant involvement in the job. High PsyCap people can easily achieve goal through willpower and way power. They are quite optimistic and confident what they want to do. Presence of resilience may help them to equip effectively with variety of difficulties and setbacks (Bass, 1998). Some researchers claimed that psychological capital was considered a best tool for stress reduction, turnover intention and job search behaviour (Avey et al., 2009). Stress, turnover intention etc are common warning signs of workplace ostracism (Ferris et al., 2008). The presence of high PsyCap may definitely lower these among ostracized employees and results positively to job involvement, organizational commitment and negatively to organizational change cynicism.
Based on the findings of these literatures, the researcher framed following hypotheses and conceptual model, -

**Hypothesis 5a:** Psychological capital will moderate the relationship between workplace ostracism and job involvement.

**Hypothesis 5b:** Psychological capital will moderate the relationship between workplace ostracism and organizational commitment.

**Hypothesis 5c:** Psychological capital will moderate the relationship between workplace ostracism and organizational change cynicism.
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Figure 2.3: Conceptual model for moderating role of Psychological Capital on the relationship between Workplace Ostracism and Work Attitudes