Chapter V

Discussion

This section draws the threads jointly by recapping the research objectives of the present study and its relevant findings. Particularly, the researcher has focused the salient findings and discussed in terms of theoretical backgrounds. This chapter includes various valuable explanations about the nature, factor structures of psychological capital and emotional intelligence, relationship between workplace ostracism and work attitudes and moderating role of emotional intelligence as well as psychological capital towards the relationship between workplace ostracism and work attitudes.

For emotional intelligence, three factors (instead of four factors) explained 57.09% of the total variance. Three factors are Appraisal and Regulation of Self emotion (ARSE), Others Emotional Appraisal (OEA) and Use of Emotion (UOE). Two dimensions of EI scale, namely self emotional appraisal (SEA) and regulation of emotion (ROE) are clubbed together. Therefore, the researcher gives a new nomenclature as appraisal and regulation of self emotion (ARSE) as one factor. For Psychological capital, three factors also (instead of four factors) explain 57.23% of the total variance. Factors are self efficacy, hope & optimism. Some items of resiliency merge with self-efficacy and optimism. According to SEM technique, the effect of workplace ostracism towards job involvement is significant and negative ($\beta = -0.27$). It means employees who undergo more ostracism, display lower job involvement in their workplace. The effect of workplace ostracism towards organizational commitment is significant and negative ($\beta = -0.22$). It means, employees who are having more ostracism feeling display lower organizational commitment in their workplace. The effect of workplace ostracism towards organizational cynicism is significant and positive ($\beta = 0.17$). It means employees who are having more ostracism, display more cynical behavior to their organization. As per the moderated regression analyses, the negative relation between workplace ostracism and job involvement becomes weaker for employees with high level of emotional intelligence than those with low level of emotional intelligence. The negative relation between workplace ostracism and organizational commitment is weaker for employees
with high level of other emotional appraisal (OEA), use of emotion (UOE) and overall emotional intelligence than those with low on this level. The positive relation between workplace ostracism and organizational change cynicism is stronger for employees with low level of appraisal and regulation of self emotion (ARSE) and other emotional appraisal (OEA) than those with high. The negative relation between workplace ostracism and job involvement is weaker for employees with high level of psychological capital than those with low level of psychological capital. The negative relation between workplace ostracism and organizational commitment is weaker for employees with high level of optimism and psychological capital than those with low level of optimism and psychological capital. The positive relation between workplace ostracism and organizational change cynicism is stronger for employees with low level of psychological capital than those with high level of psychological capital.

As per the first objective of this study, the present investigator examined the nature and factor structure of 16 items based Wong and Law emotional intelligence scale (2002) by applying two methods of factor analysis namely exploratory factor analyses (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Through EFA, three structures namely appraisal and regulation of self emotion (ARSE), other emotional appraisal (OEA), and use of emotion (UOE) contributing sum of 57.09 percent to the total variance. Next to this, the present investigator checked factorial validity by applying CFA techniques. It has been found out that the first order three -factor model suggested a better model than one-factor model of WLEIS scale. According to the findings of both EFA and CFA for WLEIS, the three-factor structure rather than four-factor structure is more suitable for this study samples. A similar finding has been reported earlier in the sample of Canadian under graduate students on Schuttee’s emotional intelligence scale (1998). However, till date, previous findings in other countries have corroborated the four - factor structure of WLEIS (Shi & Wang, 2007; Fukuda et al., 2011; Fukuda et al., 2012; Libbrecht et al., 2014). The internal reliability of overall emotional intelligence scale was also found to be relatively similar to those found previously. The findings regarding the three -factor structure of WLEIS for this sample is a new and unique as well but at the same time it becomes more questionable and worrisome for present researcher. In connection with
this, the researcher tries to find out the probable explanation against the emergence of	hree-factor structure for WLEIS in Indian sample.

Hall argues (1977) that peoples’ attitude can be shaped or even misrepresented from low-context (western nation countries) to high context culture (eastern nation countries). He also states that people in low-context cultures are more or less individualistic in nature where as in high-context culture, majority of information is rooted in the physical framework or internalized in the person (Dsilva & Whyte, 1998; Hall, 1997). The present researcher attempted a link between internalization and appraisal that both are self-oriented which possesses thoughts, principles, standards and the opinions of others into one's own distinctiveness or sense of self. It can be assumed that the internalized people may show more self evaluation. A study on Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1986, 1991), Schunk (1996) reflects that both self evaluation and self appraisal are skills for learning which takes place together. He has addressed that self evaluation is a process happens only when the individual is fully aware of his thought, feeling and action. Adding to this, Bandura’s social cognitive theory defined self regulation as three inter related processes including self observation, self judgment and self reaction. These three processes of self regulation are similar to self appraisal as it indicates a proper internalization regarding one’s strength and weaknesses. These similar characteristics reflected in items of both SEA and ROE dimensions of WLEIS. Another issue which has also been stressed by the present investigator is about the psychological issues involved in the process of self appraisal and self regulation like motivation and individual’s will. Self regulation skills are also an essential facilitator towards appraisal (Salomon, 1998). Looking at the items of SEA and ROE dimensions of WLEIS, the researcher is now in a position to clarify that these items are completely self perspective involving some psychological issues like motivation and will. For example, items of ROE “I am quite capable of controlling my own emotions” states an individuals’ motivation and will to act while items of SEA “I always know whether or not I am happy” states an individuals’ internalizations of inner self via motivation and will. This theoretical evidence perhaps explains the fact about why the sample in this study was not able to
differentiate between items of self emotional appraisal and Regulation of self emotion.

If we look at the past findings cautiously about the factor structures of WLEIS, the scale in India is supposed to produce four factors instead of three. Because earlier researchers employed this scale for factor structures in Asian countries which consistently produced four-factor structures while results for the present study reported three-factor structures in Indian sample.

To the researchers’ knowledge, there is not enough study in Indian context regarding the nature and factor structure of psychological capital in Indian sample except one by Gupta & Singh (2014). They observed four first-order factors of psychological capital which showed a good fit to their data. But the present researcher is not in agreement with this study for two reasons, first, they have not used the original PsyCap questionnaire of Luthans et al., (2007) and second, the nature of sample for the present study is different from that of their study. The main intention of the investigator was to explore the manner in which psychological capital would be reflected in Indian sample. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was employed upon psychological capital questionnaire of Luthans, Youssef et al. (2007). Three factors, instead of four factors, emerged accounting 57.23% of the total variance. These factors are self efficacy, hope and optimism which support the first hypothesis. This finding is in tune with some previous empirical studies carried out in other countries depicting variation in nature and structure of psychological capital (Luthans et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2010; Plesis & Barkhuizen 2012; Wernsing, 2014). In EFA, out of 24 items of PsyCap questionnaire, 19 items were significantly loaded and it was found out that two resiliency items merged with self-efficacy dimension and another one with optimism. No previous study has found the merged effect of self efficacy and resiliency, which comes out as a new finding in this study. Through measurement model analysis of psychological capital, earlier researchers have observed the merged effect of resiliency with hope and optimism (Luthans et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2010). Besides that, by EFA, self efficacy has been found to be merging with hope (Plesis & Barkhuizen 2012). Thus the researcher is in position to argue on behalf of the merged effect between resiliency and self efficacy. As this study
shows, the participants in this study are not showing differences in resiliency, one important constructs of psychological capital. Expected reason might be the influence of hope and social support. According Horton and Wallander (2001), these two factors act as resilience to overcome psychological distress. They found hope as significant contributor towards coping style or problem solving behavior and giving a new path towards adjustment process. Hence, present researcher assumes that the resilience could not be experienced because of hope and social support among employees might have served to trim down distress in challenging situation. Further studies are needed to reach at a definitive conclusion.

Thirdly, the researcher inspected the relationship between workplace ostracism and work attitudes namely job involvement, organizational commitment and organizational cynicism. As rightly pointed earlier in the hypothesis based upon literature review the result from correlation demonstrates the negative relationship between workplace ostracism and job involvement. In addition, structural equation modeling (SEM) technique also exhibited a stronger negative effect of workplace ostracism on job involvement, supporting $H3a$ for the present study. It’s absolutely a new effort in establishing such kind of relationship so far in Indian context. This result is supported by some earlier related findings (Craighead, Kimball, & Rehak, 1979; Ferris et, al. 2008; Kerr, Seok, Poulsen, Harris, & Messe, 2008; Maslach et al. 2001; Ram & Pravakar, 2011; Wu, Yim, Kwan, & Zhang, 2012).

The reason behind the negative relationship between workplace ostracism and job involvement must be specified by the present author. One possible ground for this relationship may be the employees’ sense of belongingness, a quality which encourages engagement (Ryzin, Gravely & Roseth, 2009). Perhaps, need to belong among employees could be a major indication about how connected the employee is to his/her group. In line with previous study on ostracism by Williams et al. (2000) it is interpreted that ostracism affects negatively the individual’s sense of belongingness by intimidating to eliminate the individuals from the group. Thus it would lower individual’s interest to be engaged in his or her job and in turn may experience low level of perceived importance and satisfaction. Adding to this, another study has also confirmed stronger relationship among job
involvement, perceived importance and satisfaction (Kanungo, Misra & Dayal, 1975). Taken together from these literature, the researcher opines that existence of belongingness is utmost required in order to get involved in the job. Besides sense of belongingness, workplace ostracism can also become a threat towards building self esteem. Employees may experience inadequacy and helplessness by losing their self confidence and worth (Korman, 1996; Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach & Rosenberg, 1995). Besides this, researchers also found a positive relationship between self esteem and job involvement and at the same time they found that people with low self esteem are liable to be persuaded by situational, external, and transitory circumstances (Weiner, Muczyk & Martin, 1992) which play a critical role in determining attitudes and behaviour (Korman, 1996; Dipboye, 1977).

Since the present research is about workplace ostracism among employees in the organizations, poor work relationship would be a frequent trouble as expected. Employee’s work relationship is nothing but an overall satisfaction in acquaintance with his or her supervisor or manager in an organization. It is well documented in an Indian study that work alienation influences negatively work relationships (Nair & Vohra, 2010). Work alienation is a relatively similar construct like workplace ostracism. Therefore, it can be argued that workplace ostracism can also influence the work relationship negatively. Furthermore, this study was conducted on non-odia and female employees. These employees are few as proportionate to total employees. Poor interpersonal relationship and high disturbances among employees are quite common which may affect work relationship. In addition, most participants in this study are laborers, specific to odia female and technical skilled workers, specific to non-odia male. Traditionally, female in Odisha have been considered as submissive group where they cannot express their stance and opinion to the authority. Same thing might have happened in the case of non-odia employees. Another major worry to non-odia employees is that they are ostracized on the basis of language, often termed as linguistic ostracism. According to some sociolinguists, language shows a power to create boundaries between local group and host group. Due to linguistic ostracism, experience of anger, lower perceptions of team potency and lower attraction to co-workers are frequent (Dotan-
Eliaz, Sommer, Rubin, 229). The author predicted similar situation in the organizations of Odisha, which acts as an obstacle towards job involvement, thus showing negative relations between workplace ostracism and job involvement.

This finding can be justified through explanation of collective effort model (Karau & Williams, 1993). This model argues about how individual will work tough inside groups to the extent that they join together strong shared performance with desirable effects, including the sense of belongingness in the group. In the long run, people who are more ostracized felt more rejected and disengaged from their groups. For them, to be involved in their work becomes difficult. However, use of creative thinking becomes impaired. It disturbs to perform creative tasks. One research states that social exclusion weakens thought and intelligence (Baumeister, Twenge, & Nuss, 2002). It can cause lack of motivation and concentration among employees in the work.

Workplace ostracism has many negative impacts upon individuals which include a series of threats as explained by Williams (1997, 2001, & 2007) like need to belong, self esteem, need for control and need for meaningful existence. These threats may influence some psychological issues like wellbeing and anxiety. Prior studies suggest social exclusion is negatively associated with wellbeing (Saunders, 2008) and positively with anxiety (Baumeister & Tice, 1990). Moreover, Psychological resources in organizations have also been part of employees’ requirement in order to bring psychological well being and job attitudes. Studies suggest workplace ostracism is a vital factor for depleted psychological resources among employees (Hobfoll, 1989; Williams, 2001). So it can be presumed that the employees whoever experience greater anxiety and reduced wellbeing won’t be involved in job and perform satisfactorily in the organization.

Fourth, the current study suggests the negative relationship between workplace ostracism and dimensions of organizational commitment. Before exploring such relationship, the present author performed confirmatory factor analysis of the organizational commitment scale by Mowday et al (1979). The findings reveal that two
factor model instead of three is adequate to measure. Through CFA, interestingly the whole items of continuance commitment low $\beta$ weight ($\leq .40$) which means that it does not project variation in Indian sample. The result is also substantiated by the findings of Aven (1988). It can be argued that continuance commitment has no relevance in order to get the complete meaning of organizational commitment and at the same time, it is sufficient to explain organizational commitment in terms of affective and normative commitment. As mentioned earlier, the author emphasizes that workplace ostracism is negatively related to affective and normative commitment which support $H_{3b}$.

It is ironic that workplace ostracism diminishes the individuals’ perceptions of control and current emotional state. These two aspects are important especially when one cope with ostracism. It can be further added that the workers who are ostracized from host groups have low power and influence over controlling resources (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). Responses have been collected from below managerial employees who are basically included in low power group. Compared to low power employees, employees with high power bases possibly experience greater control over other people and work environment. Therefore, it can be expected that emotions for low power group employees will be affected more when they confront ostracism. Vince (2001) pointed out that power in organizations could well be embedded through different kinds of emotional expression. It might influence the employees’ consistencies over their attachments in the workplace, resulting in poor affective commitment. Hence the finding in the present study about negative relationship between workplace ostracism and affective commitment corroborated.

Sometimes workplace ostracism can also be labeled as an emotional abuse. In this study, some employees are women, daily waged laborers, and middle level workers. They may be abused emotionally by their authority. Study support the positive link between emotional abusive behavior and disruptions in work behavior via employees’ job search behavior, attitude of job change, lowered productivity, and risk at interpersonal issues (Keashly, 1998). Employees encountering this kind of disruptions in work behavior may have poor organizational commitment especially the affective commitment since it deals
with emotion and its conflict. Thus it is expected to have negative relationship between workplace ostracism and affective commitment.

Owing to workplace ostracism, there may be lack of coordination and cooperation among employees in the organization. In together, ostracized employees become victim of poor social support which disturbs different kinds of emotional response. Study demonstrates that emotion is a significant contributor towards social support (Trobst, Collins & Embree, 1994). Inadequacy of this this has become a serious threat specifically to employees’ perception on their control over emotion which predominantly has a consequence on affective part of organizational commitment. Similar to this, previous work explicates the positive relationship between perceptions of social support and affective commitment (Ng & Sorensen, 2008).

The present author set two-fold argument upon the negative relation between workplace ostracism and normative commitment. This proceeds to examine the issues behind this relationship in terms of solidarity and participation in decision making. Essentially both processes involve encouragement and motivation at work. In fact, these traits cannot be sustained for employees who have feeling of ostracism in the organization. As a result employees lose their interest for group unity and agreement which in turn leads to lack of participation in decision making processes. Interestingly, some studies confirm that individuals loose solidarity when they are excluded either by class or by global conditions (Room, 1999; Silver, 1994) which corresponds the present study sample e.g., odia women and non-odia laborers are basically economically reliant and at the same time they belong to different cultures and languages. So work exclusion would be common for them which in turn causes workplace ostracism. At the same time, individuals who are excluded more either by group or by information, tend to experienced lack of participation in decision making processes. Some works have already pointed out that relationship between decision making power and work attitudes (Scott-Ladd, Travaglione, & Marshall, 2005; Spector, 1986; Witt, Andrews & Kacmar, 2000). None of works explored the association between participation in decision making and normative commitment. The author strongly argues that non-involving individuals in decision making processes is a kind of waywardness by the authority. A similar type of
circumstances might be expected in the case of workplace ostracism. Hence the finding from this study concerning a negative relationship between workplace ostracism and normative commitment is understandable.

The findings of current study also provides with strong support for $H_{3c}$ suggesting that workplace ostracism is positively related with organizational cynicism, which has also been confirmed by earlier researchers (Sulea, Filipescu, Horga, Ortan & Fischmann, 2012). To support this, the author highlights employees’ personality factors. These factors include neuroticism and agreeableness. According to Sulea and his associates (2012), both neuroticism and agreeableness are significantly related to cynicism. Prior to this, a previous study has already suggested a significant link between workplace ostracism and psychological distress (Wu et al., 2012). It is assumed that the employees, who posses higher neuroticism and lower agreeableness also experience psychological distress. It can be argued that people having the tendency to experience distress and negative affect also tend to experience their work environment as stressful and are therefore more vulnerable to burnout (Langelaan et al., 2006). In this study, people with high levels of workplace ostracism tend to be more mentally more distant from their work and feel less efficient in their job. On the contrary, agreeableness is significantly and negatively related to cynicism and professional inefficacy. People that are concerned with maintaining positive relationships with others tend be less distanced from their work and are usually more efficient at their jobs. These findings are consistent with our prediction that individual characteristics play a role in experiencing burnout. Thus the result showing positive relationship between workplace ostracism and organizational cynicism is justified.

To verify the fourth objective, the present researcher checked emotional intelligence as a moderator on the relationship between workplace ostracism and work attitudes (job involvement, organizational commitment and organizational cynicism). The findings of this study supports $H_{4a}$ which states that the dimensions of emotional intelligence including appraisal and regulation of self emotion, other emotional appraisal and use of emotions moderate towards the association between workplace ostracism and job involvement. In any workplace, employees’ desirable work attitudes describe a joint
practice flanked by positive emotional expression (Pugh, 2001) and future emotional investment (Pennings & Woiceshyn, 1987). Both practices are essential to the work itself and organization which are very much connected with appraisal and regulation of self emotion. Impact of these can enhance positive emotions, likeability, power & expectations of positive relationships that are useful for maintaining social influence resulting in satisfaction of life. Similar circumstances would happen when employees evaluate their emotional expression correctly and control it in proper way in their workplace. In spite of having ostracism, these qualities may help employees to be motivated in connecting with the group and organization through continuous engagement. Emotional management ability has also been a pivotal attempt for employees’ growth and development. Because, to bring job involvement as expected, the employees need to be aware about their emotional talent to read others emotions and at the same time apply in a successful manner through moral development and clarity of self concept (Hartel & Panipucci, 2012).These internal qualities pull employees to be involved in their job, no matter whether they experience ostracism or not.

A finding from correlation states that the relationship between job involvement and emotional intelligence is positive. So there is a tendency to assume high level of wellbeing among employees as previous studies confirm the positive link of job involvement with well-being (Carmeli, Yitjhak-Halevy & Weisberg, 2007; Kulshrestha & Sen, 2006; Mavroveli, Petrides, Rieffe & Bakker, 2007). Consistently findings suggest the importance of emotional intelligence in wellbeing (Mavroveli & Petrides, 2010; Austin, Saklofske, & Egan, 2005). If we analyze critically the work environment of employees, it is observed that, high level of social support exists within in-group than support in out-group (Schutte, Malouff, Simunck, McKenly & Hollander, 2002) In order to defend ostracism, employees may focus emotion regulation successfully to be a part of out-group (Cohen et al., 2000; Salovey et al., 1999). Hence, we can interpretate that emotional intelligence may perform as a moderator on the relationship between workplace ostracism and job involvement. The relationship between these may differ at various levels of emotional intelligence. It is presumed that self emotion regulation is effective when the level of emotional intelligence is high. It can promote high level well
being which increases the strength of relationship between workplace ostracism and job involvement. On the contrary, lower self emotion regulation results in low wellbeing which decreases the strength of such relationship.

Consistent with the present findings, emotional intelligence has been shown to play as a moderator in looking at the relationship between stress and health (Ciarrochi et al., 2002; Slaski & Cartwright, 2002, 2003). Some studies posit that psychological distress is a common effect of workplace ostracism (Wu et al., 2012) and employees cannot maintain their desirable work attitudes unless until health is good. Following this judgment, the argument can be projected for this research that emotional intelligence can be a moderator towards the relationship between workplace ostracism and job involvement also.

Next to job involvement, the investigator checked moderating effect on the relationship between workplace ostracism and dimensions of organizational commitment. The outcome of current study partially supports $H4b$. The result suggests that high level of appraisal and regulation of self emotion and Use of emotion weaken the negative relationship between workplace ostracism and affective commitment than those who are low on this. Study has suggested that emotion regulation is a useful mechanism associating with social interaction and high likelihood of achievement at work and lead to affective attachment in organizations (Ashkanasy & Hooper, 1999). In addition to this, employees vary in their capability to control (appraise, adjust to modify feelings and monitor,) their emotions as well as in their capability to regulate and change the affective reaction of others (Salovey and Mayer, 1989-1990). It is expected that one’s emotional regulation combining self emotional appraisal might be an essential part for healthy relationship with co-workers and supervisors. The persistent presence of positive emotional condition of the workers will also lead to positive affection towards the work in the organization. As a result, these positive emotions make employees more committed to their work. Following the argument of Ashkanasy and Hooper (1999) and Salovey and Mayer (1989-1990), moderating effect of these two dimensions of emotional intelligence seem to be justified.
The finding of the present study gives surprising results on moderating effect of dimensions of emotional intelligence on workplace ostracism and normative commitment. It was found out that the negative relationship between workplace ostracism and normative commitment was undermined for employees with high level of only one dimensions of emotional intelligence i.e., use of emotion. Rest of the dimensions could not moderate significantly. The reason behind such findings is somehow inexplicable. As far as workplace ostracism is concerned, employees’ feel bad because of threat over inclusion in the group. That might be due to several factors including unfair treatment, being conveyed disrespect by words and manners, experience of hurt feelings etc. These can affect employees’ values and loyalty and at the same time they lose trust upon organizations and authority.

The results of current research also partially confirmed H4c. The findings reveal that the positive relation between workplace ostracism and organizational cynicism is stronger for employees with lower appraisal and regulation of self emotion and other emotional appraisal than those with high on these. Use of emotion and overall emotional intelligence score did not moderate significantly towards this relationship. Regulation of emotion sometimes helps the employees to understand how far they manage interpersonal emotions. This results in expected trusts and effective cooperation by allowing employees to realize and alleviate the harm created during the exclusion made by out-group members (Williams, 2007). In other words, appraisal of self emotions and others could help to access the physical reality in their organizational and personal level as well. Employees can think about their economic and social security, hence lessen the negative belief about authority and organization.

The findings reveal that overall emotional intelligence score moderates the relationship between workplace ostracism and desirable work attitudes like job involvement and organizational commitment and undesirable work attitude viz organizational cynicism. The researcher put forward two specified explanations including (a) perceived competence, and (b) co-worker support.

Perceived competence among employees might be an additional strength on behalf of sustaining effective work attitudes. It is a kind of believe where employees can
perform better than others in the group. Perceived competence can be considered as a part of self-evaluations like important, good, confident which can be developed even after exclusion (Leary, Tambor, Terdal, & Downs, 1995). Studies have reflected how perceived competence could be helpful in employees’ performance (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Ilardi, Leone, Kasser, & Ryan, 1993; Korman, 1970). A similar study recommends long years ago that employees’ job involvement is more or less determined by perceived self expression (Brown, & Leigh, 1996). Perceived self expression is a kind of emotional response that may possibly lead to employees’ competence in the organization which can be associated with high level of organizational commitment. With connection to this linkage, the researcher acknowledges the influence of emotional intelligence among employees in order to gain more work performance through job involvement and organizational commitment.

Organizational support, sometimes play an important role to sustain job involvement and organizational commitment in the present study. Since, employees are non odiya and female, it is expected that they are confined to their group because of language and culture. Co-worker support produces trust and expectations amongst which results better performance (Ferres, Connell, & Travaglione, 2004). Emotional intelligence can be a facilitator agent towards the formation of altruistic behaviour, a kind of act to realize the co-worker feelings and less of this feeling is associated with low emotional intelligence (Abraham, 1999). Another study also mentions that there is positive relationship between co-worker support and work attitudes (Ng, & Sorensen, 2008). Employees support each other in the form of work related information and positive suggestions that can be highly helpful for adjustments among new comers and at the same time give emotional support by empathy, care, love and understandings, comfort and encouragement to be attached in the organization. In total, the emotional support is a precious resource (Dubois et al., 2002; Hobfall, Johnson, Ennis, & Jackson, 2003; Okun & Lockwood, 2003; Taylor et al., 2004), smooth the progress of job (Viswesvaran, Sanchez, & Fisher, 1999), and improve work attitudes (Hochwarter, Perrewe, Ferris, & Brymer, 1999). So, high level of perceived co-worker support may weaken the workplace ostracism in one hand and improve job involvement and organizational commitment in
the other hand. Besides this high co-worker support can also reduce cynicism about organization.

For verifying the fifth objective, the researcher tested out whether the relationship between workplace ostracism and job involvement was moderated by psychological capital. The finding of this analysis confirms \textit{H5a} suggesting that the negative relation between workplace ostracism and job involvement is weaker for employees with high level of self efficacy, hope, optimism and over all psychological capital than those with low levels.

In relation to workplace ostracism, present researcher believed it as an environmental force within workplace where some employees in the group are targeted. Work environment can be changed when employees believe that they can handle ostracism by using different strategies. Self efficacy is kind of psychological state which resolves conflicts (Bettencourt & Farrell, 2013) and for changing another employee’s behavior, self-efficacious employee may develop the ability to utilize interpersonal skills. This in turn may result in positive outcomes like high job involvement. In addition, study has also highlighted that self efficacy facilitate better skill to manage with disputes (Leon-Perez et al., 2011). Earlier findings also suggest that employees’ self efficacy promotes better job involvement (Aderibigbe, Lgboanusi, & Gwaison, 2014; Blau, 1989; Yang, Kao, & Huang, 2006). Following these arguments, it is justifiable that self efficacy with workplace ostracism can contribute positively to job involvement, what the researcher found in this present study.

Further, regarding the moderation of hope and optimism, it may be inferred that an employee’s values are more or less associated with job involvement. Such values are internalized through employees’ hope to come across the importance of various work roles and work life. Employees tend to be motivated towards involvement and may believe to be out of exclusion. These similar arguments may be put forward the present study findings. Employees included in the sample of the present study are below managerial level and they know their existence and livelihood very well. On the contrary, the study has found that the experience of optimism among employees is sound, which resolves various divergences or conflicts in the organizations by emphasizing “positivity-
oriented expectations” (Carver & Scheier, 2002). In this approach, employees perceive that their activity will produce positive outcome. It may diminish the negative occurrences arising from ostracism in the place. One more reason can be added here that employees are strongly connected with their group because of similar ethnicities, traditions and speeches which may enhance optimism positively. So the finding in this regard that optimism as a moderator between workplace ostracism and job involvement is acceptable.

Overall psychological capital moderated the association between workplace ostracism and job involvement. This finding can be described with an argument proposed by the theory of Ong and his colleagues (2006). This theory suggests that variety of positive emotions are released as outcome when psychological resources like hope, optimism and self-efficacy are present. It will possibly have a healing function to reduce the stress level arising out exposure from the effect of workplace ostracism. Study also supports this finding that similar constructs of psychological capital like organizational based self esteem, self efficacy and optimism predicts work engagements (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). These might also influence inter-personal attachment, generating a constructive team environment, and joint effort thus preventing workplace ostracism in the long run.

The findings of the present study confirm $H5b$. The investigator examined psychological capital and its dimension as moderator between (a) workplace ostracism and affective commitment, (b) workplace ostracism and normative commitment and (c) workplace ostracism and overall organizational commitment score. In the first step, it was found out that self efficacy, hope and optimism and overall psychological capital moderated significantly on the relationship between workplace ostracism and affective commitment. People with self efficacy feel confident while performing task oriented performance (Judge, Shaw, Jackson, Scott & Rich, 2007). They might be at control towards the task performance. Most of the participants of the present study were lower grade employees who were more concerned with task and wages. So the researcher assumes that self-efficacy in employees have an important role in task performance. Some experts have considered self-efficacy as essential tool for lifestyle changes and
behaviors concerning long-term changes (Streeaher, DeVelLis, Becker, & Rosenstock, 1986). Besides that, employees need to improve their self protective behaviour in the workplace, since the present work environment is more prone towards the different kinds of threat and difficulties. Self-efficacy is one of the important construct of self protective behaviour (Cleveland, 1984; Terrell, 1984; DeJoy, 1986). Self efficacy has been found as useful moderator between job stress and mental wellbeing (Siu et al., 2007). Job stress is a common warning sign of ostracized employees. Researcher also argued that employees having high hope can alleviate the experience of ostracism. In actual fact, hopeful thinking helps employees to find the successful ways through which goals can be attained. If employees are optimistic, they will have strong belief that their contractual appointments can be transformed into regular appointment, if they work hard for organization. Corresponding with these, some researchers found positive relationship between affective commitment with self-efficacy, hope, and optimism. These psychological states are somehow helpful in maintaining performance and desirable work attitudes. So moderation of self efficacy, hope and optimism are justifiable on the relationship between workplace ostracism and affective commitment.

The researcher got interesting outcomes while performing psychological capital as a moderator between workplace ostracism and normative commitment. Only optimism successfully moderates between workplace ostracism and normative commitment and overall organizational commitment. This relationship is weaker for employees with high level of optimism than those with low levels. An individual high on optimism makes attributions that are positive to the organization that he is in and the negative to situational factors which are not dispositiona l to the organization. An optimist person believes there a better future being obliged to stay in the organization and believes that causes of ostracism will fade away in the coming future.