



## A REVIEW OF LITERATURE OF WORKPLACE OSTRACISM THROUGH DIFFERENT ASPECTS

Amit Kumar\*, Reeta Yadav\*\* and Samiksha Juneja\*\*\*

---

### ABSTRACT

The term "workplace ostracism" originally meant being ostracized, neglected, or disregarded by coworkers. Ostracism at work is a form of "cold violence" that has received a lot of attention. The primary emphasis of this review article was workplace exclusion and its repercussions as documented in the literature. Initially, we examine several perspectives and characteristics of workplace exclusion. Second, by reviewing numerous empirical studies, we can primarily focus on the impacts of workplace ostracism. Finally, we highlight the potential flaws in earlier research and note that there are still certain concerns that merit further investigation.

**Keywords:** Workplace Ostracism, POS, CWB, Workplace Incivility, OCB, Abusive Supervision.

---

\* Associate Professor, School of Commerce and management, Om Sterling Global University, Hisar (Haryana), India. E-Mail: [hodscm@osgu.ac.in](mailto:hodscm@osgu.ac.in)

\*\* Assistant Professor, School of Commerce and management, Om Sterling Global University, Hisar (Haryana), India. E-Mail: [reetayadavscm@osgu.ac.in](mailto:reetayadavscm@osgu.ac.in)

\*\*\* Research Scholar, School of Commerce and management, Om Sterling Global University, Hisar (Haryana), India. E-Mail: [samikshacom201@osgu.ac.in](mailto:samikshacom201@osgu.ac.in)

---

### 1. Introduction

Many organizations face lots of problems that need to be taken care of so that their overall impact can be cured of further repercussions. Fewer years ago, Ostracism was responsible for gaining popularity because of its negative consequences on the employees and organizations. Ostracism has been derived from the word "Ostrakismos", which Athenians first used in 500 B.C. to ostracize the people, especially the political parties, at least for ten years. However, on the organization, its effect is quite different and impactful.

### 2. DIFFERENT ASPECTS

#### 2.1. Workplace Ostracism

As expressed by Ferris's coworkers, workplace ostracism is the deliberate disregard for another individual or group while in the workplace. Everyone has their own set of emotional goals that they'd like to achieve, but on the other hand, most people only interact with those in their own social circles (Wu, Yim, Kwan & Zhang, 2019). The fact that everyone reacts to at least one episode daily shows a striking similarity (Williams, 2018).

It's a way to make a place feel safe in more ways than one, say Brunning & Turner (2020), Neal & Griffin (2018), and Iverson (2017). Both workers and businesses place a premium on it. Ostracism, as defined by Ferris, Brown, Berry, & Lian (2019), occurs when an individual feels increasingly alienated from their work teams, departments, and fellow employees.

But it occurs when an individual or a group of individuals fail to take preventative measures against something that they know they cannot stop (Robinson et al. 2019). These meanings show that ostracizing someone can be done on purpose, either because of a desire to exclude them or because of a necessity to include them. Occupational ostracism is a feature that has been extensively studied in the field of industrial theory.

The practice of ostracizing others, which Williams (2017) defines as "having neglected and ostracized," dates back millennia. There was a time in Greek mythology when outcasts were banished from society, usually as a result of some type of retribution. While extreme cases of ostracism like dismissal and abduction may garner more attention, the truth is that we've all been on either end of the ostracism spectrum at some point. Think about the silent signals sent by loved ones or the calming hand extended to a colleague when we are disregarded in a heated dispute (Williams, 2020). We are completely aware of the ostracism that permeates our culture and acknowledge its existence. When someone makes someone feel ignored, it's hard for humans to dismiss the feeling. As both Eisenberger et al. (2017) and MacDonald and Leary (2019) point out, the ostracism effect can be devastating. Brain scans show that ostracism triggers the same pain centers as actual physical pain. This would imply that the feelings of extreme discomfort and "social misery" are always present.

Four basic human needs—relationships, self-esteem, authority, and meaning in life—are put in jeopardy by workplace bullying, according to studies (Williams, 2017, 2021). These requirements, which appear fundamental to human existence (e.g., Baumeister et al., 2019; Baumeister and Leary, 2015; Branden, 2021; Taylor and Brown, 1988; Tesser, 2020), are now at the centre of a wide variety of social activities. Ostracism has been studied extensively by personality scientists for its effect on the Big Four. Isolation from the group, which ostracism entails, can lead to negative emotions like sadness, fear, and stress, as stated by Williams (2019).

Causes of ostracism in the workplace range from fear of retaliation to a desire to be forgotten (Williams and Sommer, 2019). Both the ostracized and the ostracizer believe that the victim is at fault for the ostracism: in the former case, the victim is seen as having done something wrong, while in the latter, the ostracizer does not recognize the victim, does not see him or her as deserving consideration, and ignores him or her.

Researchers Sommer and colleagues (2019) ask participants to think back on a time when they felt or were the target of social exclusion. Most people who ostracize say they do it out of discipline or to prevent disagreement, but those who are shunned view it as a form of punishment or forgetfulness. This study would shed light on how people experience social exclusion, even though it does not explicitly assess the validity of identifying private activities as public ones. As so, it proves that there is now a valid justification for stigmatizing certain people (punishment or confrontation avoidance). Nonetheless, the ostracized often view ostracizing activities as cruel and unreasonable (external attribution). These results are consistent with the ego bias, in which people are more likely to credit themselves for their achievements and blame others when they fail (Miller & Ross, 2018).

Occupational ostracism research, however, suggests that it's not always the case that the people around you are to blame for your rejection. Poulsen (2016) found that women, more so than men, draw striking inferences regarding the motives for social exclusion. For those who internalize the stigma of being an outcast, the rejection only increases (Poulsen, 2016). When people attribute ostracism to themselves, they may feel guilty about the acceptance and may even regard it as justified punishment, but when they attribute it to others, they may not always feel accountable for the acceptance and may not see it as legitimate and may not feel as bad about it.

In addition, a lack of communication with other members of an organization, institution, or society is characterized as ostracism (Robinson et al., 2019), making it an intrinsic aspect of the concept of workplace ostracism. Contrarily, deviance and interpersonal weakening make engagement possible, albeit in a negative way (Duffy et al., 2021; Fox and Stallworth, 2015; Neuman and Baron, 2018).

Some examples of socially damaging behavior include verbal or physical attack (as in ostracism) and criticism (as in shaming). These unpleasant behaviors occur in the context of group activities. Also, those who avoid connecting with others feel the anguish of ostracism, which is where organizational exclusion differentiates from bullying (Ferris et al., 2018). Research (Williams, 2021) shows that humans prefer the risk of physical harm to that of being ostracized. This is because being cut off from social ties severely impacts humans' basic needs for belonging, identity, and agency (Zadro et al., 2004). It's important to separate workplace ostracism from ideas of social deviance, social undermining, and hostility in general.

The effect of social exclusion on performance has been studied extensively in academic contexts. Organisms have suffered from organizational isolation, or being "ignored and outcast" (Williams, 2017). For as long as there have been stories, people have been banishing undesirables from their communities as an act of revenge. Abduction and ejection may seem like the extreme ends of social rejection, but in reality, everyone has experienced or inflicted social rejection at some point in their lives. Ignoring us in a heated dispute or subjecting us to the negative reinforcement of loved ones or coworkers is a prime example (Williams, 2021). We are perfectly aware of the ostracism that permeates our culture. As social beings, we find it challenging to block out the feeling that we're being ignored.

### **2.1.1. Ostracism and Perceived Organisational Support (POS)**

We used quality of work life to gauge how employees felt the company treated them. Employees are driven by the organization if they feel that it respects, values, and cares about them. From a human perspective, the POS concept evaluates if a company has shown adequate regard for its employees, or even if the business's system is capable of supporting employees' religious and physical demands, which have an impact on emotional reactions and personal interests. Another study that has been done in the past just looked at how committed the employees were to the company, ignoring how committed the company was to its employees.

Technically speaking, perceived organizational support is defined as employees' "world opinions more about how much the organization company cares for overall fellow human" (Eisenberger et al., 2016). Contrary to earlier research, which mostly focused on employees' team spirit, perceived organizational support put out the idea that people may have various

ideas about the organization as it relates to them. This point of view needs to be carefully considered because employers and employees interact on a reciprocal level. It wasn't enough to consider just one aspect of this relationship (by each the firm), therefore we also needed to consider how the business supported its employees. After all, how loyal employees are to the company is influenced by their impressions of the firm's commitment to them (Eisenberger et al., 2016; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 2018; Shore & Shore, 1985).

Trading relationships and prosaically are the two types of interpersonal contacts that Mills and Clark (2021) identify. An exchange relationship exists whenever one person offers another a service - regardless of its value - with the expectation that they would return the favor.

The benefits offered in a network are more like human relationships where each participant is concerned for the welfare of the other, rather than strictly being a transaction (Mills & Clark, 2021). It is not always possible to categorize an owner's relationship with their employer as either commerce or communal. Employees may think that the length of their relationship with their employer is due to the fact that they treat people and get compensated for it. Other employees interact with their employer on a more personal level. They believe they are more than "just another employee" and contribute significantly to the growth and success of the company.

Workers believe they are more than "just another worker" and contribute to the health and development of the organism. Such workers are more likely to show up for work even when they are not feeling well, assist a colleague even when it is not officially related to the job obligations, and offer helpful recommendations during meetings to run the business effectively. The aforementioned instances of links to the community are typical of employees who feel valued by their firm and are concerned about its goals.

The discovery that employees would worry about the rules and regulations pertaining to them if executives were concerned about their loyalty to the company served as the foundation for the research of psychological empowerment. Perceived organizational support shows an employee's perception that the organization values his or her continuous existence, cares more about him or her, and is mostly concerned with his or her health (Findik and Celik, 2021).

Perceived organizational support refers to how much employees believe the company values their contributions and is concerned about their general well-being (POS). POS has previously been shown to significantly affect employee health and productivity, Krishnan and Sheela (2018). The teamwork theory states that due to substantial organizational and societal values, norms, attitudes, practices, and functional institutions, employees assume how much their employers care about their well-being (Salminen & Gyekye, 2019).

Even though POS is connected to a number of significant work-related processes and attitudes, the relationship between POS and voluntary turnover as well as the variables that lead to the development of POS are two topics that need to be further addressed (Shore & Shore, 2019 and Shore & Tetrick, 2015 are two of the most well-known authors in the field). Eisenberger et al. (2020) claim that individuals with high POS are unquestionably less likely to look for and accept opportunities at other firms due to ostracism. Although there is some evidence that POS is associated with thoughts of leaving, Wayne et al. (2017) found that only one study specifically looked at the association between POS and turnover behavior

(Rhoades, Tannenbaum, and Armeli, 2021). Further study is required to show the connection between POS and turnover (Hom & Gaertner, Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, Griffeth, Hom & Gaert, 2020).

Strangely, the effect organizational HR strategies have on turnover rates has recently attracted a lot of attention. How these procedures effect individual departure decisions, however, has not received much attention. To the degree that HR policies have a direct impact on POS, POS may be able to explain these relationships. Hence, Allen et al. [WU1] create and test a model to explain relationships between Human Resource practices, and POS is preferred since employees or the people working in an organization feel that the premises is thinking about and caring for them. The environment reacts favorably to them as well. Employees who feel that their employer values them will have a more intimate relationship with them than those who work for an inanimate business that only pays them. Institutions can take on human traits when people project their own traits onto them (Levinson, 2015).

Eisenberger et al. (2017) claim that the reciprocity norm serves as the foundation for employees who experience organizational support to display positive workplace behaviors. In other words, it is in our nature to believe that if someone shows kindness to us, we should somehow show our gratitude.

According to Gouldner (2018), perceived organizational support is giving back to people who have benefited you and avoiding doing harm to them. A person feels obliged to perform something for someone else's advantage in return. If an employee feels compelled to do so because of the advantages they have gained from their employer's efforts, they are more inclined to return the favor. Perceived organizational support states that if a corporation does something extraordinary for a worker, like give them a set of golf clubs, the worker will feel bound to pay the company back for the benefit received. It's possible that an employee may put in more effort at work to deliver the greatest results for their employer in exchange for a set of golf clubs.

According to Wayne (2019), formal or informal appreciation is one-way supervisors can demonstrate their support for their team members and lessen isolation. People can be highly motivated by praise, encouragement, and support in both their personal and professional life. Official acknowledgment shows the organization's support, such as a plaque for the highest sales or an employee of the month award. The CEO's handshake or a manager's "well done" can also be used as a less formal gesture of support. If the organization (or a representative of the organization) communicates happiness and gratitude for the employee's efforts, the individual will feel more supported by the organization.

Further study has revealed that an organization's impact on the sense of organizational support increases with how often and honestly it is praised (Eisenberg et al., 2016). Researchers Wayne, Shore, and Liden (2017) found that a range of developmental experiences had a beneficial impact on a person's view of an organization's support.

Allen (2020) looked at how using human resource practices to reward and develop staff members shows a company cares about its workers and may prevent social exclusion. Such initiatives or policies may send the impression to staff members that the organization is doing more than is necessary to demonstrate its appreciation for them. Employee views of support from the company were positively correlated with human resource policies like tax equalization or child care subsidies (Guzzo, Noonan, and Elron, 2019).

Shore and Griffeth (2019) assert that engagement in judgement, humane treatment, and job progression are the three key influences on POS. Shanock and Tannenbaum (2020) claim that work engagement and POS are related and that this relationship has a big impact on employees' POS. Some experts think that, in addition to the three previously mentioned elements, the person's characteristics may affect the POS.

People can affect the POS because they can change how participants perceive the company's concern for human reception and how that procedure emerges in their behavior, according to Rhoades and Eisenberger's (2021) analysis. According to Xiong (2018), employees who feel responsible put in significantly more effort at work and are well-treated by management.

There is a connection between employees' perceptions of support within the corporation, their desire to leave, and how depressed they are.

Scholars also investigate how "ostracizing" conduct affects the effectiveness of organizational units (POS). Politics, as contrast to ostracism, inevitably involves treating the organization unfairly. Because they are uncertain of which activities will be rewarded, the organization's members will feel even more perplexed as a result. As a result, Harris and Harvey (2017) concluded that POS is negatively impacted by corporate governance.

The various factors that led to the establishment of POS in a particular Mandarin cultural context were outlined by Zhang, Farh, and Wang (2019) using an inductive analysis. These factors included therapeutic benefits, pay and benefits, welfare payments, freedom and respect, and future growth prospects (Wang, Zhong, Farh, & Aryee, 2020). Rong (2014) carried out an empirical investigation to look at how HR affected POS. According to the results of the confirmatory factor analysis, there are seven human resource management factors that affect the POS of an employee's career advancement, on-the-job training, job security, and materialism care.

According to theories, workers from diverse cultural backgrounds will react differently to "organizational ostracism," which was the subject of a study by Zhang, Farh, and Wang (2018) that examined the history of POS in China. Personnel from different cultural origins will therefore have different viewpoints on the same strategic HRM strategy. It makes sense to assume that, depending on the era in which it is utilized, POS may have had different forebears. According to ancient Chinese beliefs, "following with authority" increases one's level of confidence in their workplace. The study on POS outcomes factors focuses on continuity performance (O.C.). An O.C. refers to a deeper psychological connection and group membership (Allen & Meyer, 2022; Meyer & Allen, 2018, 2017).

According to Meyer and Smith (2020), organizational HR practices and the occupational milieu of the company are mediated by employees' perceptions of perceived fairness and POS.

Higher POS employees are more likely to have high A high link between POS and the O.C. constructs of loyalty and continuous commitment was found by O.C. Eisenberger et al. in 2011. For the other two constructs, however, there was no such correlation found for POS.

Moreover, POS has been linked to workplace ostracism, according to research by Hochwarter, Kacmar, Perrewé, and Johnson (2019). According to Stingl Chamber and Vandenberghe (2019), high POS social persuasion's work engagement can be attributed to three factors: first, POS would support productivity improvements' felt a duty to help the organization meet its goal, so they will try harder for the organization and strengthen their

intrinsic motivation; second, POS can meet coworkers' needs and thus increase their work engagement; and third, POS can make employees more satisfied with the work they are doing. Support has been found to have a soothing influence on the relationship between stressors and anxiety symptoms, such as anxiety, despair, irritation, wellbeing, job unhappiness, tension, and individual effectiveness.

Richardson also found a significant correlation between ostracism and employees' opinions of organizational support. For both cognitive and emotional pressures, it was shown that the connection was significantly greater. In the context of social preservation, sympathy might be seen as a resource.

A crucial job advantage that might offset the early capacity loss brought on by stressful work environments (such burnout and abnormal reflection practices) is perceived organizational support. Being aware of organizational assistance might be beneficial.

According to Shore and Shore, workers who receive incentives regardless of their production do not feel supported by their employers (2018). Employees may believe that their effort and ability to perform have been rewarded with salaries and raises. Their supervisors give their coworkers cash raises and promotions as a sign of appreciation for their hard work. In this instance, the business is not making an extra effort to be a decent person.

These results make it quite evident that any action taken by the company to appreciate and recognize the employee will almost certainly result in more organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 2016). The worker's perception of the company's objectivity is the final factor to consider when assessing how a worker views his or her employers' descriptions of a variety.

While supervisory interactions and company policy can demonstrate employees how much their employers' value and support them, research indicates that employees' perceptions of how helpful their employers are influenced by how fair their employers are (Fasolo, 2019; Moorman et al., 2018). According to Greenberg (2019), an ongoing basis's "organizational justice" serves as a barometer for its equity. The terms distributive justice and operational justice are most frequently used to convey this idea. Examples of results that might be dispersed in accordance with the interactional fairness of a company's distribution of those results include training and merit pay.

According to equity theory, it describes whether or not the techniques used are thought to be just. According to Moorman, Blakely, and Niehoff, a corporation can show its employees that it values their efforts by implementing fairness and justice (2018). According to the authors of the article, businesses that uphold due process convey a signal to their staff that they appreciate and support their cause by doing so.

According to studies, employees' perceptions of corporate commitment and fairness are congruent.

Staff turnover may be influenced by employees' discontent with the amount of support they receive from their employers (Eisenberger et al., 2017; Eisenberger and colleagues, 2019; Guzzo and colleagues, 2016; Wayne and colleagues, 2017). Nonetheless, by implementing business policies that foster a sense of teamwork, the costs of hiring and training staff can be kept to a minimum. Another evidence that staff retention might be advantageous to businesses comes from the circumstance of talented coworkers who have built deep working connections with clients. It is conceivable for employees who are very highly skilled in their

respective industries to obtain similar employment at other organizations when they are hired by one company. The business can improve the perception of organizational support in order to retain these workers, which can be an effective tactic for reducing turnover intentions and rates.

## **2.2. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)**

According to Shore and Shore, workers who receive incentives regardless of their production do not feel supported by their employers (2018). Employees may believe that their effort and ability to perform have been rewarded with salaries and raises. Their supervisors give their coworkers cash raises and promotions as a sign of appreciation for their hard work. In this instance, the business is not making an extra effort to be a decent person.

These results make it quite evident that any action taken by the company to appreciate and recognize the employee will almost certainly result in more organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 2016). The worker's perception of the company's objectivity is the final factor to consider when assessing how a worker views his or her employers' descriptions of a variety.

While supervisory interactions and company policy can demonstrate employees how much their employers' value and support them, research indicates that employees' perceptions of how helpful their employers are are influenced by how fair their employers are (Fasolo, 2019; Moorman et al., 2018). According to Greenberg (2019), an ongoing basis's "organizational justice" serves as a barometer for its equity. The terms distributional justice and operational justice are most frequently used to convey this idea. Examples of results that might be dispersed in accordance with the interactional fairness of a company's distribution of those results include training and merit pay.

According to equity theory, it describes whether or not the techniques used are thought to be just. According to Moorman, Blakely, and Niehoff, a corporation can show its employees that it values their efforts by implementing fairness and justice (2018). According to the authors of the article, businesses that uphold due process convey a signal to their staff that they appreciate and support their cause by doing so.

According to studies, employees' perceptions of corporate commitment and fairness are congruent. Staff turnover may be influenced by employees' discontent with the amount of support they receive from their employers (Eisenberger et al., 2017; Eisenberger and colleagues, 2019; Guzzo and colleagues, 2016; Wayne and colleagues, 2017). Nonetheless, by implementing business policies that foster a sense of teamwork, the costs of hiring and training staff can be kept to a minimum. Another evidence that staff retention might be advantageous to businesses comes from the circumstance of talented coworkers who have built deep working connections with clients. It is conceivable for employees who are very highly skilled in their respective industries to obtain similar employment at other organizations when they are hired by one company. The business can improve the perception of organizational support in order to retain these workers, which can be an effective tactic for reducing turnover intentions and rates.

## **2.3. Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB)**

Spector (2021) introduced the term CWB for the first time in the field's history. The term

"misbehavior" was used to explain damaging emotions within aberrant behavior in organizations as early as Hollinger (2019) and as late as Robinson and Bennett (2015). The idea was originally discussed in publications during that time. It was "self-defeating" in light of the organizations' harmful behavior.

According to Spector and Fox's concept for conducting research (2019), CWB refers to actions made by employees who have the power or desire to hurt their organizations' stakeholders. Stakeholders and supervisors include, for example, superiors and subordinates, coworkers, clients, and others. This includes time wastage, sabotage, and absenteeism.

There have been delays, rumors have been disseminated, and resources have been wasted. The word definition is employed in this study. It will be based on the work of Spector and Fox from 2019. They view CWB as uninvited, possibly dangerous, or negative behaviors that injure individuals, members of groups, or organizations. There are some exceptions to this rule, according to Rotundo & Spector (2019).

So, he pretended to be CWB to express to his boss how unhappy he was with his workplace. An employee might take a brief leave of absence due to a family emergency. This would not be a case, according to CWB. Even though a coworker may be CWB, an employee's absence can nonetheless have a detrimental effect. Second, they might be harmless. Nonetheless, there is a chance that harm could be done by the Organization or its representatives. For instance, casual conversation regarding a coworker's personal life. Coworkers and organizations are unaffected by life.

But it might also be. If the rumor spreads, it might not be good. You can locate the final CWB category (CWB towards). Later in our inquiry, we will consider important components of the CWB, including workers' sentiments about their employers and the CWB (Fox & Spector, 2021).

The term "CWBs" refers to an organization member's intentional activities that are at odds with the Organization's legitimate objectives, according to Martinko et al., 2020; Spector & Fox, 2017.

The bottom line of a business can be negatively impacted by CWB wrongdoing due to lost or damaged property, a loss in production, a high insurance premium, an increase in attrition, unhappy employees, and stress from the job (Penny & Spector, 2018). Regardless of the wording, there is no such thing as an organized "destructive" act.

Eventually, a thorough literature review was done by Spector and Fox (2018). 64 CWB actions were compiled from a variety of studies. Finally, they classified the CWB as a threat into five different categories. Abuse was the first category, which was defined as any unpleasant and damaging behaviors or attitudes towards other people. The second factor that was considered was product deviance, which is defined as deliberately carrying out a task improperly.

The categories were espionage and exclusion (2019). They separated these actions into "production deviations" and "property deviances," which include things like sabotage by stealing office supplies and taking them home.

CWB at work is defined by Hollinger and Clark (2020) as "the consumption of alcoholic beverages or illegal drugs while at work." It was a game-changer when Bennett and Robinson (2015) released 4p's typology in the literature.

Also, they included two new categories in addition to property and production deviations:

Two things spring to mind: personal aggression and political departure.

According to this typology, political deviance is described as engaging in social engagement with others to learn firsthand about a benefit or a drawback. It involves displaying partiality, blaming colleagues, and other strategies, as well as disseminating erroneous information about the Organization. According to Robinson and Bennett (2015), the issue of personal aggression includes aggressive behavior such as verbal and sexual harassment. Actively counterproductive Within corporations, behavior is the deliberate destruction of property, whereas theft is the taking of goods.

According to Schuler and Schuler (2020), it is crucial to comprehend that CWB can be broken down into a number of dimensions. These dimensions might each have a unique set of antecedents. These measurements were made by showing numerous points, yet each one is useful. Regardless of how a researcher classifies CWB, there are many different varieties. Participation in CWB is influenced by a number of factors.

#### **2.4. Workplace Incivility and Ostracism**

Low-intensity deviant behavior is described as "workplace incivility" when it includes work-related habits and practices as well with vague intent to harm the target (Anderson and Pearson 2019). Making derogatory statements, interfering with or failing to respond to others, and using condescending and disdainful body language are a few examples of uncivil behavior (Leskinen, Huerta, and Magley) (2019, p. 1). These activities vary in severity and some may be both intentional and unintentional (Anderson 2021).

Workplace studies have a long history of inquiry in occupational health psychology, as well as the consequences of workplace deviance on employee morale (Robinson & Bennett, 2015) and a lack of regard for concepts like aggression and bullying (LeBlanc & Barling, 2014). Since the publication of the seminal paper written in 2019 by two management professors Anderson and Pearson, workplace incivility has been researched.

According to Anderson and Pearson (2019), office politics can spread and take root in the workplace. Some have coined the phrase "incivility spirals" to describe how workplace social interactions affect company culture. If uncivil acts become more purposeful and severe, the workplace will eventually deteriorate as a result of the social process of the culture (e.g. Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2022; Schneider, Gonzalez-Roma, Ostroff, & West, workplace culture [Pearson, Anderson, and Porath, 2015]).

The workplace incivility scale (WIS) and a questionnaire were created in a study by Lang out (2021). Many of the concepts identified in that study are still widely accepted.

The concept of workplace rudeness was developed in this study. This tiny nuisance or stressor can be perceived as such because it is so common. Only a few literature evaluations have been published due to the field's relative youth regarding workplace incivility and how it is operationalized into things like condescending and belittling behavior, and social isolation from groups like the spirit of unity.

analyses the origins and repercussions of rudeness at work. The literature saw the publication of the first review article focusing only on rudeness at work. The causes and repercussions of incidences of workplace incivility that were observed, experienced, or initiated were the subject of a 2018 online study by Schilpzand et al., which was later published in print in 2019. This review paper included a summary of the first ten years of workplace research. A

rise in the number of publications on civility can be attributed to the internationalization of academic endeavors.

Future research can use the direction McDonald, Smittick, and Lomeli (2017) gave. Vasconcelos submitted a strategy to prevent rudeness in the most recent workplace contribution (2019). A thorough review of the literature from 2010 to 2019 on workplace disrespect.

The literature on incivility has changed in a variety of ways, including the inclusion of cyber-civility in the discussion (Lim & Teo, 2019) and rudeness on the part of the client (Sliter, Jex, Wolford & McInnerney, 2011). They are getting this in return for their rude behavior online or in jobs in the service sector.

Although though studies on workplace rudeness have exploded in the past two years, there is still plenty to be discovered about the topic. More specifically, study has concentrated on how it may affect the workplace. Each situation is handled differently (i.e., how people handle rudeness). When coworkers engage in civil disobedience, others are present and are termed spectators. Three studies will examine rudeness, concentrating on possible consequences on the coping mechanisms, behavior, and mental health of bystanders. A number of Anderson and Pearson's theories include (2019). The current thesis will therefore concentrate on incivility spirals.

## **2.5. OCB and Ostracism**

According to Bateman and Organ (2021), organizational citizenship is defined as voluntary individual behavior that increases an organization's success even if it is not explicitly rewarded (Organ, 2015). OCB is supported by the Social Exchange Hypothesis. Gaining goodwill helps people build helpful connections and perform well within companies. Those who enjoy their professions want to help the organization achieve its goals (Blau, 2014). An individual is prepared to collaborate and increase engagement for greater goals (Cinar, Karcioglu, & Aliogullari, 2022). A coworker helping a fellow coworker without expecting anything in return is another example of OCB.

OCB is based on a person's attitude towards their employment demands and desire to go above and beyond corporate norms in order to increase productivity. Organ claims that OCB is the "good soldier syndrome" (2018).

Employee involvement in extracurricular activities that assist the company is a sign of positive OCB. Over 30 different types of OCB have been developed as a result of numerous studies on organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2019). OCB antecedents include self-efficacy, employee engagement, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and embedding, and employee engagement.

Individuals that are more committed to their organization are more inclined to go above and beyond what is required of them. Compassion and compliance are correlated with high organizational commitment (Zheng, Zhang, & Li, 2021). Also, those who have self-confidence are more inclined to take the initiative and perform volunteer activity (Brown, Hoyer, & Nicholson, 2021).

Organizational justice and fairness have an impact on OCB, particularly in job performance evaluation and reward (Fu et al., 2016). People are motivated to perform their tasks well and with integrity when their workplace values meet their needs, attitudes, and objectives

(Milliman, Czaplewski, & Ferguson, 2022). Human resources (HR) are one of the most important components of OCB, according to Ocampo et al.

Characteristics People frequently look towards personality traits as antecedents. According to Organ (2019), being conscientious means being orderly, reliable, on time, and disciplined. Tolerance, decorum, and prosociality are all characteristics of agreement. They are more inclined to volunteer, and they are less inclined to blame corporate civic behavior for their misfortunes (Skarlickiet al., 2019).

According to Goldberg (2019), people who experience a lot of rejection are more prone to see themselves as victims of organizational citizenship behavior (Skarlickiet al., 2021). Together with extraversion, extraverts share 24 other qualities. Extraversion and job happiness are positively correlated, say Seibert and Kraimer (2021), and this relationship involves being open to new experiences, curious, and Openness and OCB were not related.

The following dimensions—vision, direction, intellectual stimulation, high performance standards, role and process clarification, and supportiveness—are associated between racism and OCB, according to Podsakoff (2021).

Workers are a crucial component of hospitality products and have a big impact on superiors and subordinates, according to OCB in the education sector. Due to their propensity for high performance, employees are most likely to participate in OCB. Gonzalez et al. (2016) discovered a connection between OCB and service encounters. Both superiors and subordinates benefited from OCB in the education sector. The work burden is decreased and working relationships are improved with this type of employee. Work satisfaction, job attitude, leadership support, perceived organizational support, and manager trust are the OCB aspects that Wang et al. (2019) advise. Wang et al. suggested a model for quantifying OCB in the education sector (2018).

OCB is aided by professional growth, management assurance, perceived organizational support, and leadership support. It is a cognitive evaluation of the social exchange's fairness between input and reward from colleagues, managers, and organizations. In other words, people give credit to their companies, bosses, and coworkers for how well they do their jobs. A career-satisfied individual is therefore more dependent on other people. Social exchange theory states that OCB rises with job satisfaction. When individual skill and effort are acknowledged and suitably rewarded, positivity can be felt.

The "feel good, do good" effect has been demonstrated by positive psychologists like Fredrickson (2022; Isen & Levin, 2021). We can infer that someone with OCB is more fulfilled in their profession. Valentine et al. (2019) found a link between OCB and job satisfaction. Some businesses appear to care about their employees, according to the organization.

The majority of service jobs are low status, low visibility jobs. Professional pride among store employees in a trendy apparel section is explained by organizational and personal factors. According to Larson, employees of high-quality but personally oversaw businesses are more motivated to surpass their clients' expectations (2019). Working for a unique company or organisation gives one a great sense of professional pride. Workers who value customer relationships are more likely to go above and above, improving organizational citizenship.

## 2.6. Structural Empowerment and Ostracism

Encouraging employees to take ownership of their work is known as empowerment. It is possible to empower subordinates to make their own decisions by allowing them to take charge of their work and make them the ultimate decision-makers. There are many ways to empower people, but structural empowerment (SE) focuses on providing and facilitating access to job-related resources (Havens and Laschinger, 2016).

An organization's ability to provide access to resources, support, information, and opportunity in the workplace is structural empowerment (SE) (Kanter, 2022). An organization's overall effectiveness is enhanced when employees have access to information, power, support, and opportunity, which can help them feel more empowered (Keller & Dansereau, 2015). The pragmatic impact, which is just as essential as the psychological impact, has been largely ignored despite the enormous and spectacular work that recent studies have made in investigating workplace maltreatment components like exclusion.

There are two key reasons why researchers should pay special attention to the practical effect, according to Robinson et al. (2022). Firstly, the target's pragmatic work-related resources (access to resources and knowledge, the potential for power, influence, and seeking counsel) will be affected by this carelessness. As a result, the target's social and behavioral contributions to the workplace may be reduced due to the practical effect. As a second point, different forms of interpersonal abuse, such as Ostracism or incivility and bullying or interpersonal conflicts, have a variety of practical impacts that need to be examined further.

Structure development can be described as how many employees feel they have exposure to these frameworks in their workplaces. Two organizational structures contribute to a positive work environment and can be accessed through official and informal power:

- The opportunity structures
- The power structures.
- The organization of available means

"The Organization's opportunity structure provides opportunities for advancement and development. To solve problems at work, employees in high-opportunity positions are more aggressive and imaginative than those in low-opportunity jobs, who are less driven and more productive. Within an organization, formal and informal power structures are used to establish a dynamic structure of authority and influence. Formal authority is derived from visible jobs, supports discretion, and is critical to achieving organizational goals. Informal power is a person's network and alliances within an organization, such as their relationships with their sponsors, coworkers, or other colleagues.

The ties one has within an organization, whether they be with sponsors, coworkers, or other colleagues, are examples of informal power. There are three mainstays of organizational hierarchy in the workplace: A) Knowledge, B) Help, C) Resources essential materials for accomplishing business goals.

- One definition of opportunity is the possibility of advancing one's career and learning new skills and knowledge.
- The term "resource availability" is used to describe an individual's access to the money, time, supplies, and other assets they'll need to carry out an endeavor.
- Information refers to having both formal and informal knowledge that is crucial for

success in the profession (technical knowledge and competence required to execute the work and a grasp of organizational rules and choices).

- Having access to help involves being able to seek advice and guidance from peers and superiors.

The discretion to make decisions, high public profile, and centrality to the Organization's mission and goals are all hallmarks of a position with formal power. Scale (Job Activities) (Job Activities). Informal authority is measured by the extent to which one is able to influence others in their workplace through social interactions and the establishment of communication channels with sponsors, coworkers, subordinates, and cross-functional groupings.

## 2.7. Abusive Supervision and WO

Nobody's reaction to a boss who abuses their power is the same (Tepper, 2019). It has been shown in a small number of studies that being under abusive supervision does not encourage workers to act in an antisocial or harmful manner.

Other workers reportedly do not react in such a negative fashion, as reported by Keashly, Trott, and MacLean (2018). Despite this, it's puzzling why some people act in such a way. When faced with harassment or abuse, some employees may react violently while others may simply keep quiet (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2021). There has been a paradigm change in the literature towards an appreciation for the role that context plays in shaping victims' responses to violence and oppression.

Organizational behavior has been impacted by both subtle and major contextual factors. The fear of reprisal has influenced the perception of supervisory abuse in the workplace, and is often cited as the missing link in comprehending anomalous findings (Goodman, 2016). During a break, employees' out-of-the-ordinary reactions are mitigated (Mitchell) by Scott and Zagenczyk (2011, page 3). (Ambrose, 2019).

Preliminary data also suggests that cultural influences outside of the workplace may moderate workplace behavior (Johns, 2016). Fairness judgements and deviant reactions to abusive supervision are affected. It's important to study workers' reactions to bullying in order to comprehend their actions. When supervising a subject, it's important to keep the whole picture in mind.

Personal circumstances outside of work, such as one's socioeconomic status, might have an effect on one's productivity in the workplace. Actions, to put it another way (Johns, 2018). Similarly, to how one's cultural perspective shapes their mental processes and subsequent actions, so too does one's social status shape one's very foundation. Individuals' choices and social norms are shaped by their socioeconomic status, as Kitayama wrote in 1991. Then, these corporate expectations for how to think and behave seep into one's personal relationships. Yet the group isn't as high-profile or obvious, so it's easy to misunderstand them. Since social class is a growing source of division, it is more important than ever to acknowledge its impact on employee actions and attitudes on the job (Cote, 2018).

Despite the abundance of evidence showing that supervisory abuse has a profound effect on relationships with others and responses to perceived threats in social contexts (e.g., Roberts, Kuncel, Shiner, Caspi, & Goldberg, 2018; Cote, 2017), employees' social class may play a role in determining how they react to a new policy. One could assume that the poor would

react more violently and negatively to maltreatment.

This widely held belief is predicated on the fact that people of lower socioeconomic status are statistically more likely to be unpleasant in face-to-face encounters (Kraus et al., 2019). The actual results were completely different from what was predicted. An alternative argument suggests that the lower classes could be in jeopardy, nevertheless. They are more likely to stick to company policy when their employers treat them poorly. Differences in acceptance of social standards between socioeconomic groups are the focus of this viewpoint.

One school of thought suggests that one's socioeconomic status can affect how they react to abusive supervision. To address this lack of conceptual consensus, researchers should conduct empirical studies to determine the extent to which socioeconomic status is a factor in how people respond to abusive supervision. As part of our research, we analyzed whether or not employees' social class affected their reactions to abusive management. The research makes a number of important contributions. The primary advantage of our method lies in its capacity to improve our comprehension. Knowing how social factors affect antisocial reactions to maltreatment is crucial.

It is only recently, however, that academics in the field of organizational studies have begun to recognize the explanatory capacity of social class as a factor in the field (Cote, 2018).

The Cote (2017) argues that one's socioeconomic standing (Kraus et al., 2011) has far-reaching repercussions that are visible on the job. Therefore, it is important to learn more about the link between abuse and antisocial behavior. Insight into these typical and costly reactions to different environmental stimuli can be gleaned by reading about socioeconomic classes in literature.

For instance, activities including organizational citizenship (OCB), supervisor-directed deviance (SDD), counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWB), and job insecurity performance, are all quite important. By doing so, we hope to better coordinate and invigorate our efforts to further our research. Looking at a person's socioeconomic status and past research can provide us more insight into how they will react to abusive supervision.

Our study has broader class-wide implications and also has real-world implications. Knowing how different pieces of information affect one another helps us better express our findings to managers and other stakeholders, who are likely to be practitioners with an interest in the topic (Johns, 2016). It's crucial to keep in mind the hierarchy of the company. The literary society tends to attract people from more affluent socioeconomic backgrounds (Cote, 2017). If we don't consider how this discrepancy may affect the literature, we limit the applicability of our findings.

Next, we give two conflicting theoretical justifications for the impact of socioeconomic status on health outcomes. In conclusion, they look at how socioeconomic class plays a role. Abuse of authority at work can be traced back to participants' reactions in two separate experiments. In the eyes of the staff, abusive supervision is any form of nonphysical maltreatment that is both intentional and ongoing (Tepper, 2017). Feelings of distress are a normal response to such treatment.

Interpersonal mistreatment and unfavorable comments from employees are problems in the workplace, with supervisors often being blamed as the root cause of such abuse (Bies, 2021). Dishonesty on the job is the primary factor (Robinson & Greenberg, 2018).

The term "deviance in the workplace" is used to describe employee behavior that is harmful

to the Company. A few forms of business deviance include employee theft and absenteeism. Planking and making disparaging remarks about people in other parts of the world are two examples of interpersonal deviance (2010). Deliberate actions of deviance in response to supervisory abuse owing to reciprocity norms or acts of deviance to seek vengeance for what is considered as an injustice are seen as the link between this relationship and traditional theoretical frameworks (CRP and CM, 2015).

There has been an uptick in research due to the prevalence of abuse. Both types of misconduct in the workplace can lead to a variety of other problems and painful outcomes (see, for example, Ambrose, Seabright, and Schminke, 2021). The staggering sum of \$15.1 billion lost annually by U.S. retailers due to theft from within the company continues to rise (Hollinger & Davis, 2003). Misconduct in the workplace has been linked to decreased productivity and efficiency, in addition to the monetary costs already mentioned (Dunlop & Lee, 2004). The components either intensify or dampen reactions to these traits as a result of their widespread renown.

Both businesses and academics are becoming increasingly aware of the risks associated with micromanagement. Many theoretical models have been developed to explain the link.

The two most common viewpoints on workplace misconduct are "abusive supervision" and "workplace misbehavior."

There has to be consideration of social exchange and interactional justice theories. In this context, "interactional justice" refers to the degree to which workers believe they have been treated with dignity and respect in the workplace. (2011). For those who have values founded on justice, injustice is likely to provoke anger. One's social status in the group may feel threatened (Lind & Folger, 2017).

According to this theory, these are what motivate retaliatory behavior. Skarlicki (2019), Tedeschi and Felson (2019, 2017), and the Folgers' (1989) research all find that people report feeling negatively when they experience unfairness (2017).

When people are treated unfairly, they may act out in vengeful ways, exhibiting "deviant conduct" (Duffy, Ganster, Mitchell, Ambrose, Schaubhut, Adams, 2007, 2017, respectively). Contrarily, Homans (1961) explains retaliatory transgression through theories of social trade. Both Gouldner (1960) and Cook & Emerson (1978) Concepts based on a lack of negative reciprocity (Cook & Emerson, 1978; Thau & Mitchell, 2010; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2015). Norms that set a standard of behavior, reciprocal duties to return the benefit, and insufficient treatment, which will result in negative returns all serve to foster the maintenance of mutually beneficial partnerships (2016).

The following guidelines should govern the interactions between managers and workers in every organization: it will cause a negative response from the group as a whole (including its leaders, employees, and members of the group as a whole) (Gouldner, 1960; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2017).

Retaliatory workplace misbehavior theories based on the idea of reciprocity (Thau & Mitchell, 2018) hold that negative social interactions and feelings arise from the conviction that one's interests will be better served by it. Some benefits of retaliation include restoring the exchange's equilibrium and preventing new exchanges, providing safety, demonstrating self-defense prowess, and experiencing satisfaction. Why victims of domestic violence often remain in relationships with their abusers can be seen through the lenses of social exchange

and justice theory. They are forced to answer your question. One must bear in mind, however, that in a hierarchical organization, this is not always practicable.

Abused relationships in the workplace are more likely to be targets of deviance because the abuser has more access to, and less power over, and threat to the victim's results objectives. Workers who experience abuse at the hands of their superiors are more likely to speak up about it, either to signal their disloyalty to other employees or to the Organization as a whole (Thau and Mitchell, 2018).

Workplace misbehavior and abusive supervision go hand in hand, but not every victim acts out. No one seems to know what drives abusive management to operate in such a way. Some people may be severely affected by it, while others may not be at all affected by it (2020). This study reflects a growing trend in the academic literature to focus on the role of context in shaping behavior; studies in this area aim to shed new light on the conditions under which supervisory abuse occurs and examine the impact of socioeconomic status on deviance.

## 2.8. Psychological Capital and Ostracism

"Psychological well-being" refers to the absence of mental illness (Edwards, 2015). According to studies by Ryff (1989b; Wissing & Van Eeden (2002), MacLeod & Moore (2010; Ryff, 1989a; Wissing & Van Eeden, 2021) and others, the concept of "psychological capital" is nuanced and multifaceted.

It uses characteristics like emotional control, personality traits, and background knowledge to pinpoint certain events in one's life (Helson & Srivastava, 2011). Keyes et al. (2021) found that one's level of contentment and extraversion improves with age, training, and irrationality. There is no significant difference in IQ between males and females, according to studies.

Men and women report different levels of psychological health. By 2022, Kirsten and Wissing had completed it. Spirituality can act as a mediator between one's mental and physical health, and the environment in which these concepts are understood is shifting (Temane & Wissing, 2016a, 2016b).

Quantitative and qualitative research into what constitutes mental health has progressed (Wissing & Van Eeden, 2018). Currently, there is no universally accepted definition. In theory, happiness in one's mental state is possible (Bradburn's, 2019).

The difference between positive and negative responses was graphically represented by knowledge of psychological health. This topic, along with subjective well-being and an upbeat attitude on life, has been the primary focus of early research. The Greek word eudemonia meant ecstatic or joyful outbursts of speech (Ryff, 2019b). "equilibrium" describes a state of contentment midway between a positive and negative response.

An early subjective definition of well-being (Conway) Diener et al. (1985) was used by Larsen & Griffen (2015) in their research on the Satisfaction with Life Scale. For the Satisfaction with Life Scale to be meaningful, respondents must be able to evaluate the world's problems objectively rather than react emotionally.

The Feeling of Coherence developed by Antonovsky (2021) has also been utilized for evaluation. Frenz, Carey, and Jorgensen are credited with creating the Fortitude Scale (2022). Social readjustment scales developed by Holmes and Rahe (2017) and by Beck (2018, 2019). The state of one's emotional health has long been held up as the gold standard of objective

measures.

The given psychological well-being components are related to Ryff's factors of psychological well-being. Improving one's mental performance requires exploring new areas of interest (Ryff, 2019b). A person's capacity for learning, development, and problem-solving is essential for this. A higher level of personal development is associated with persistent personal development.

A declining stock indicates a stagnant economy. Athletes have a development mindset, understanding that hard work pays off in the long term (Dweck, 2015). There needs to be more openness in one's thinking to taking in information from a wide variety of sources. Athletes have a unique combination of humility and confidence, a commitment to personal growth, and a global perspective. They use both positive and negative language often (Weinberg & Gould, 2017); they promote individual development by providing opportunities to reflect on and appreciate one's own efforts and successes. Maybe the most similar aspect of mental health is eudemonia from self-improvement.

One's capacity to control their environment is quantified by their level of environmental mastery. According to Ryff (2019b), a low level indicates a person has poor environmental control. Being able to regulate one's physiological and cognitive arousal levels and one's interactions with others and the environment are key components of peak athletic performance, and maturity in general facilitates effective communication and interaction with a wide variety of people in a variety of settings. Imagery.

Establishing and maintaining long-term, mutually beneficial relationships and taking part in a communication network are crucial to a person's success in life. The ability to relax and enjoy one's surroundings is a sign of maturity, which in turn fosters more fulfilling interpersonal connections and greater consideration for others. On the other hand, irritability, anger, and a failure to empathize with others might result from poor interpersonal connections (Ryff, 2019b). Building strong relationships with others is crucial.

The key to emotional health is learning to love and accept oneself. A key part of healthy functioning, and a defining feature of mental health, is that (Ryff and Keyes, 2015). Positivity flourishes when people have a good appreciation for themselves. It's a way of thinking that promotes serenity and increased happiness (Ryff, 1989b). The positive feedback of people in one's industry is a direct effect of one's self-confidence (Whitney and Gould, 2017).

## **2.9. Organizational Culture and Ostracism**

The idea of "organizational culture" originated in anthropology. In the 1980s, organizational studies rose to prominence as a subfield of sociology and psychology. Wilkins is mentioned multiple times (1985). This research was motivated by the desire of prosperous U.S. companies to expand their operations to Japan (Ouchi, 1981; Pascale & Athos, 1981).

Scholars began studying organizational culture in the 1980s to learn more about how businesses function (Peters and Waterman, 1982); now, managers and executives know they need to do the same in order to be successful at their jobs, maintain some semblance of order amid the inevitable chaos, and drive meaningful improvements in organizational effectiveness, employee engagement, and organizational performance and change (Trice and Beyer, 2019). Despite this, there has been substantial debate about the best way to characterize the background, values, and structure of a company.

Academics have debated how to pin down the nature of an organization's culture (Smircich, 1983; Smircich, 1985). Every company has its own unique culture, which is "intangible, implicit, and taken for granted as the definition of culture" (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 501). Culture, according to anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973), is a set of norms for social interaction that are passed down from generation to generation. When compared, the belief that symbols may express the meaning of culture is held by numerous authors (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1992; Trice & Beyer, 2019). The study of culture often returns to the concepts of norms and assumptions (Owens, 2019). Workers undergo a socialization process similar to that of a classroom to learn these norms and assumptions. Usually, this is the point at which they start engaging in such social activities for the first time. Workers pick up on the norms of the organization they work for and learn what is acceptable and what is not (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Imagine a scenario in which a new employee arrives late to a meeting and finds that everyone has already been seated.

According to Kuh and Whitt (1988), an organization's culture consists of "long-standing, persistent patterns of social norms and values that influence determine the conduct of students and groups in a postsecondary institution and offer the context within which events and activities can be understood," both during and outside of class.

Dennison (2019) defines culture as an institution's "common norms and values," which are "rooted in history, collectively" and are so deeply ingrained that they can defy repeated attempts at direct manipulation (p. 644). One definition of "climatology" is "a collection of conditions associated with members' emotional states and their behaviors in the workplace" (p. 644). The leaders' perspectives, together with those of other high-ranking corporate members, tend to have a significant impact.

Dennison (2019) argues that in some cases a hybrid strategy is the best option. Methodologies are crucial when trying to grasp an organization's culture. Semiotics is debatable whether we're talking about rituals, regressions, surveys, or anything else. Even the most reliable data regarding social events gleaned from sources and strategies, institutions and individuals can be obscured by the heated debate around their interpretation.

Schein (2012) defines three mechanisms for the development and establishment of culture. The Organization's founding beliefs and guiding principles are the first. When a firm expands, so too do its members' depths of knowledge and perspective (represented by the number 2). Three of these are brand-new to the firm and reflect the beliefs, values, and expectations of the people who have recently joined the team as paid workers or volunteers. Executives are One of the following three aspects of culture is most important for its growth: Creators make an impression at the start (p. 211). Together, an organization's leaders and its original founders provide the groundwork for its distinctive culture. Outcomes can range from zero to infinity. Socialization is the process through which new members are introduced to and educated on the underlying principles of society, such as the fact that "those who are aware of their beliefs and values can act on them; those who are not can only do so inadvertently and perhaps accidentally" (Schein, 1992, p. 229).

According to Tinker's findings, integrating temporary staff into the institution's corporate culture and educational missions is essential for improving classroom instruction. The research relied on Schein's previous work.

The notion of socialization as the process through which new members learn about and adopt

the values already held by the group provides evidence for the durability of the organization's culture (Schein, 1992, p. 13).

### **2.10. The cultural aspects of a situation**

There is a wide range of scholars' viewpoints on the meaning of cultural identity. Furthermore, there is some debate over what really constitutes a civilization in the context of an organization with clearly delineated roles. Simplifying typologies is risky since one might not have all of the relevant data " (Schein, 1990). Nonetheless, it's important to remember that dimensionality aids in organization, comprehension, and communication.

Schein (2021) identifies six distinct ways to investigate the interplay between human action and the natural world, each of which corresponds to a reality we can observe in the real world. We can't say with certainty that differences over relationships and homogeneity/diversity are at the heart of the debates.

Deal and Kennedy (1983) argue that the level of risk and the frequency with which it is fed back are the best indicators of a culture's character. A company's culture determines its most vital requirements (p. 502).

Given the importance Clan places on its own internal matters, the culture is accommodating and gives people the latitude they need to get their jobs done. There is a lot of opportunity to get involved, and there are many opportunities to work in multidisciplinary groups. Most decisions are reached through group consensus. All family members are welcome to attend and participate in these groups. People development and loyalty/dedication are highly valued. According to two studies, the Clan way of life works perfectly in four-year and two-year schools alike. Flexibility and adaptation are key to the Adhocracy way of life.

These businesses are continuously on the lookout for the next big thing to meet their customers' ever-evolving demands. In this setting, people are expected to multitask and take calculated risks.

The ability to make decisions quickly in response to external influences has led to the decentralization of power. Start-up companies often have ad hoc cultures that remain long after the company has stabilized (Cameron & Quinn, 2019).

Knowing the cultural type of a corporation is important because "organizational success" is "dependent on how well an organization's culture reflects the demands of its people in a highly competitive environment." (Cameron & Quinn, 2020, p. 71). Cultural and environmental elements may constitute a threat to the continued existence of an organization if they are at odds with one another. Leadership styles, and the styles required in a given culture, can be matched to the nature of a given culture. Leadership and management styles that adhere to these preferences are more likely to be effective and rewarded.

## **3. RESEARCH GAP**

When employees are shunned, their coworkers either stop talking to them or treat them poorly (Ferris et al., 2019). Several studies have looked into the effects of social exclusion in the workplace. Peng and Zeng (2020) investigated social deviation and altruism in the context of social exclusion in the workplace. Scott and his coworkers studied the impact of social exclusion in the workplace on workers' propensity to quit or engage in disruptive behavior (Scott, Tams, Schippers, & Lee, 2019).

Chung (2019A) ties poor interpersonal and organizational citizenship behaviors as well as harsh supervision to social exclusion in the workplace. Bad work habits like these are detrimental to the success of both the firm and its employees. According to Zhao, Peng, and Sheard (2020), workplace ostracism can set off a chain reaction of ineffective responses, which has negative effects on both the individual and organizational well-being of employees. Few researches have looked into how social exclusion at work can lead to unproductive patterns of conduct. So, there is ample room to investigate and clarify the suggested link.

There is evidence that shows both individuals and businesses are impacted by social exclusion in the workplace (Zhao, Peng & Sheard, 2019). Negatively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior, and positively correlated with quitting the company (Scott et al., 2020), abusive supervision has been connected to workplace ostracism (Scott, 2018). Integrity criticism is one type of organizational negative culture with the intent to do harm (Kalaan & Aksu, 2019). In this way, occupational stigma might lead to unfavorable actions. Shahzad and Mahmood (2021) argue that low psychological capital is the result of being socially excluded from the organization. Thus, additional research is needed into the connection between workplace ostracism and negative employment practices including workplace incivility and organizational bad performance.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The willful disrespect for another person or group at work is known as workplace ostracism. Ostracism occurs when a person feels increasingly isolated from their work teams, departments, and coworkers. Occupational ostracism research, on the other hand, suggests that the people around you are not always to blame for your rejection. We are well aware of the ostracism that pervades our society. As social beings, we find it difficult to ignore the feeling that we are being ignored. Employees will be motivated by an organization if they believe it respects, values, and cares about them. From a human standpoint, the POS concept assesses whether a company has shown adequate regard for its employees, or whether the company's system is capable of supporting employees' religious and physical needs. Employees have similar views on corporate commitment and fairness. Employee dissatisfaction with the amount of support they receive from their employers may have an impact on staff turnover. To retain these employees, the company can improve their perception of organizational support, which can be an effective tactic for lowering turnover intentions and rates. Any action taken by the company to show appreciation and recognition for the employee will almost certainly result in increased organizational support. Employee perceptions of their employers' helpfulness are influenced by their employers' fairness. CWB refers to actions taken by employees who have the ability or desire to harm the stakeholders of their organizations. According to Schuler and Schuler (2020), it is critical to understand that CWB can be divided into several dimensions. Each of these dimensions may have a distinct set of antecedents. A variety of factors influence CWB participation. When low-intensity deviant behavior involves workplace customs and rituals as well as a vague desire to hurt the target, it is referred to as "workplace incivility." A person's attitude towards the demands of their job and desire to go above and beyond company norms in order to increase productivity are the foundations of OCB. One experiences a great feeling of professional

pride when working for a distinctive business or organization. Employees who place a high value on client connections are more likely to go above and beyond, which enhances corporate citizenship. When employees have access to knowledge, power, support, and chance, which can help them feel more empowered, an organization's overall effectiveness is increased. For an organization to succeed, it is crucial to understand its culture. If cultural and environmental factors are at variance with one another, an organization may be in danger of ceasing to exist. So, all the aspects play an important role to understand the concept of Workplace Ostracism.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. A., Shibuya, A., Ihori, N., Swing, E. L., Bushman, B. J., Sakamoto, A., Saleem, M. (2010). Violent video game effects on aggression, empathy, and prosocial behaviour in eastern and western countries: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 151–173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018251>
- Aquino, K., & Thau, S. (2019). Workplace victimization: Aggression from the target's perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 717–741. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163703>

- Balliet, D., & Ferris, D. L. (2013). Ostracism and prosocial behavior: A social dilemma perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 120(2), 298-308.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Bashir, S., & Nasir, M. (2019). Breach of psychological contract, organizational cynicism and union commitment: A study of hospitality industry in Pakistan. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 61-65.
- Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco, N. J., & Twenge, J. M. (2015). Social exclusion impairs self-regulation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 88(4), 589.
- Fatima, T., Ilyas, M., Rehman, C., & Imran, M. (2017). Empirical investigation of relationship between workplace ostracism and employee silence: A test of mediating effects of self-esteem and meaningful existence in context of public sector universities in Punjab. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 10, 111–128.
- Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Berry, J. W., & Lian, H. (2018). The development and validation of the Workplace Ostracism Scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1348–1366. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012743>
- Ferris, D. L., Chen, M., & Lim, S. (2017). Comparing and contrasting workplace ostracism and incivility. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 315–338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113223>
- Ferris, D. L., Lian, H., Brown, D. J., & Morrison, R. (2019). Ostracism, self-esteem, and job performance: When do we self-verify and when do we self-enhance? *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 279–297. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0347>
- Ferris, D. L., Yan, M., Lim, V., Chen, Y., & Fatimah, S. (2019). An approach–avoidance framework of workplace aggression. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59, 1777–1800. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0221>
- Fiset, J., Al Hajj, R., & Vongas, J. G. (2017). Workplace ostracism seen through the lens of power. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1–19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01528>
- Gebhardt, S. T. (2019). The moderating effects of harmony enhancement and disintegration A avoidance on the relationship between workplace . Hofstra University, Long Island, New York.
- Grandey, A. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2019). The conservation of resources model applied to work– family conflict and strain. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 54(2), 350-370.
- Grandey, A., Cordeiro, B., & Crouter, A. (2015). A longitudinal and multi- source test of the work– family conflict and job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(3), 305-323
- Karau, S. J., & Hart, J. W. (2012). Group cohesiveness and social loafing: Effects of a social interaction manipulation on individual motivation within groups. *Group Dynamics*, 2, 185–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.2.3.185>
- Khair, Q., & Fatima, T. (2017). Interactive effects of workplace ostracism and belief in reciprocity on fear of negative evaluation. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 11, 911–933.

- Khan, A. (2017). Workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behaviours: Examining the mediating role of organizational cynicism and moderating role of neuroticism (Doctoral dissertation). Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Kim, Y., Cohen, T., & Panter, A. (2015). The reciprocal relationship between counterproductive work behaviour and workplace mistreatment: Its temporal dynamics and boundary conditions. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract2638429>  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2638429>
- Kouchaki, M., & Wareham, J. (2015). Excluded and behaving unethically: Social exclusion, physiological responses, and unethical behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 547–556. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038034>
- Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 518–530. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.3.518>
- Leung, A., Wu, L., Chen, Y., & Young, M. (2019). The impact of workplace ostracism in service organizations. *OSTRACISM META-ANALYSIS 17 Hospitality Management*, 30, 836–844. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.01.004>
- Li, C. F., & Tian, Y. Z. (2016). Influence of workplace ostracism on employee voice behaviour. *American Journal of Mathematical and Management Sciences*, 35, 281–296.
- Pereira, D., Meier, L. L., & Elfering, A. (2013). Short-term effects of social exclusion at work and worries on sleep. *Stress and Health*, 29, 240–252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smi.2461>
- Qian, J., Yang, F., Wang, B., Huang, C., & Song, B. (2019). When workplace ostracism leads to burnout: The roles of job selfdetermination and future time orientation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management. Advance online publication.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1326395>
- Quade, M. J., Greenbaum, R. L., & Mawritz, M. B. (2018). “If only my coworker was more ethical”: When ethical and performance comparisons lead to negative emotions, social undermining, and ostracism. *Journal of Business Ethics. Advance online publication.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3841-2>
- Quade, M. J., Greenbaum, R. L., & Petrenko, O. V. (2017). “I don’t want to be near you, unless . . .”: The interactive effect of unethical behavior and performance onto relationship conflict and workplace ostracism. *Personnel Psychology*, 70, 675–709. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/peps.12164>
- Turkmen, E., Dogan, A., & Karaeminogulları, A. (2016). The impact of ostracism on work effort: A comparison between Turkish and Azerbaijani employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 6, 110–128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v6i4.10300>
- Van den Noortgate, W., Lopez-Lopez, J. A., Marin-Martinez, F., & Sanchez-Meca, J. (2013). Three-level meta-analysis of dependent effect sizes. *Behavior Research Methods*, 45, 576–594. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13428-012-0261-6>
- Verbos, A. K., & Kennedy, D. (2019). Cleaning our houses: Gender equity in business schools. In P. Flynn, K. Haynes, & M. Kilgour (Eds.), *Integrating gender equality into business and management education: Lessons learned and challenges remaining* (pp. 93–108). London, UK: Routledge.

- Vevea, J. L., & Hedges, L. V. (2018). A general linear model for estimating effect size in the presence of publication bias. *Psychometrika*, 60, 419–435. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02294384>
- Viechtbauer, W., & Cheung, M. W. L. (2019). Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 1, 112–125. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.11>
- Ramirez, E. (2016). Discriminant validity testing in marketing: An analysis, causes for concern, and proposed remedies. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44, 119–134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0455-4>
- Walsh, B. M., Matthews, R. A., Toumbeva, T. H., Kabat-Farr, D., Philbrick, J., & Pavisic, I. (2018). Failing to be family-supportive: Implications for supervisors. *Journal of Management*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206318774621>
- Wan, E. W., Chan, K. W., & Chen, R. P. (2016). Hurting or helping? The effect of service agents' workplace ostracism on customer service perceptions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44, 746–769. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0466-1>
- Wang, Z., & Li, G. (2018). You don't actually want to get closer to the star: How LMX leads to workplace ostracism. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 12, 1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s11782-017-0023-5>
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (2018). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063–1070. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>
- Williams, K. D. (2017). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 425–452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085641>
- Williams, K. D., & Jarvis, B. (2016). Cyberball: A program for use in research on interpersonal ostracism and acceptance. *Behavior Research Methods*, 38, 174–180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BF03192765>
- Williams, K. D., & Sommer, K. L. (2017). Social ostracism by coworkers: Does rejection lead to loafing or compensation? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 693–706. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167297237003>
- Williams, M. S. (2019). Acculturation and immigrants: The moderating effect of cultural identity salience and harmony enhancement and the mediating effect of social support and ostracism on the relationship between acculturation demands and employee outcomes (Doctoral dissertation). Hofstra University, Long Island, New York.
- Wu, C. H., Liu, J., Kwan, H. K., & Lee, C. (2016). Why and when workplace ostracism inhibits organizational citizenship behaviors: An organizational identification perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 362–378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000063>
- Wu, L. Z., Ferris, D. L., Kwan, H. K., Chiang, F., Snape, E., & Liang, L. H. (2015). Breaking (or making) the silence: How goal interdependence and social skill predict being ostracized. *Organizational Behavior and Hu*, 131, 51–66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2015.08.001>
- Wu, L. Z., Wei, L., & Hui, C. (2017). Dispositional antecedents and consequences of workplace ostracism: An empirical examination. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 5, 23–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11782-011-0119-2>

- Wu, L. Z., Yim, F. H. K., Kwan, H. K., & Zhang, X. (2019). Coping with workplace ostracism: The roles of ingratiation and political skill in employee psychological distress. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49, 178–199. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2011.01017>
- Wu, W., Qu, Y., Zhang, Y., Hao, S., Tang, F., Zhao, N., & Si, H. (2018). Needs frustration makes me silent: Workplace ostracism and newcomers' voice behavior. *Journal of Management & Organization*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2017.81>
- Wu, W., Wang, H., & Lu, L. (2018). Will my own perception be enough? A multilevel investigation of workplace ostracism on employee voice. *Chinese Management Studies*, 12, 202–221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CMS-04-2017-0109>
- Xu, E., Huang, X., & Robinson, S. (2017). When self-view is at stake: Responses to ostracism through the lens of self-verification theory. *Journal of Management*, 43, 2281–2302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206314567779>
- Yang, J., & Treadway, D. C. (2018). A social influence interpretation of workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148, 879–891. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2912-x>
- Yang, L. Q., Caughlin, D. E., Gazica, M. W., Truxillo, D. M., & Spector, P. E. (2019). Workplace mistreatment climate and potential employee and organizational outcomes: A meta-analytic review from the target's perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19, 315–335. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0036905>
- Yang, Q., & Wei, H. (2018). The impact of ethical leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: The moderating role of workplace ostracism. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 39, 100–113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-12-2016-0313>
- Zhang, R., Ye, C., & Ferreira-Meyers, K. (2017). Linking workplace ostracism to interpersonal citizenship behavior: A moderated mediation model of work-to-family conflict and rumination. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 24, 293–320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/str0000056>
- Zhang, S., & Shi, Q. (2018). The relationship between subjective wellbeing and workplace ostracism: The moderating role of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 30, 978–988. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-07-2016-0139>
- Zhang, X., & Dai, L. (2015). The relationship between neuroticism and experience of workplace ostracism in new employees. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 3, 80–87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jss.2015.32011>