STUDY OF WORKPLACE OSTRACISM, EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND INTERACTING EFFECT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL (PSCAP): A CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES THEORY PERSPECTIVE

Muhammad Ashraf¹, Riaz Ahmed Mangi² and Minhoon Khan Laghari³

Abstract

The intention of this study is to investigate the influence of Workplace ostracism on Employee Engagement, among the people working in the health care sector. Using Conservation of Resource Theory (COR), the research seeks to understand the moderating role of Psychological Capital. The data for the study has been gathered from leading private hospitals of Karachi, Pakistan. The sample size for the study was 345 full-time health care employees. After screening and the analysis of data, it was revealed that Workplace Ostracism negatively and significantly influences Employee Engagement. The intervening influence of Psychological Capital was estimated by PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2013). The psychological capital exhibited significant moderation between workplace ostracism and employee engagement. The study discusses the theoretical and practical implication.
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Introduction

The behavior of the people in the working environment, particularly of the knowledge workers is very much important in discharging the duties. The organizations are doing their utmost to inculcate the positive work attitude among people working for them. However, developing an ideal condition is next to impossible, when the work involves excessive sensitivity such as health care sector. The
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diversity of behaviors among the people working in a group nurtures numerous negative behaviors; workplace ostracism is one such factor. Ostracism refers to the behavior, in which an individual start to perceive that s/he is being excluded, ignored, or being received cold attitude from his/her team members. Hence his/her contribution towards the task is not being recognized. The moment, when such attitude is translated into the work behavior the engagement toward the work is disengaged. People working in the health care sector are not exceptional. Moreover, the effective and efficient survival of organizations in a dynamic market arena heavily depends on congenial social interaction among the people working for them. The amount of devotion and dedication contributed from the part of employees making the organizations achieve a competitive edge constitutes the employee engagement (Bakker, 2009). According to Achor (2011), the individuals became successful in achieving excellence both for themselves and for organizations, when they are happy. Hence the more we are hopeful, the more we are efficacious, the more we are resilient and the more we are optimistic, the more likely are the chances to muscle the challenges in the organization. When efficacious, resilient and optimistic behavior is combined, the concept of psychological capital emerges. Psychological Capital is very much important both for individuals and groups in the working environment. The Conservation of Resources Theory (COR) Hobfoll (1989), narrates that several types of resources (Managerial, Job and Personal Resources) are the inspirational resources that promote the engagement to tasks being performed and reduce the feelings of being socially and psychologically excluded while work interaction. Besides numerous factors, workplace ostracism is the most important element having a significant negative effect on employee engagement (Kaya, Ataman, & Aydin, 2017).

Workplace ostracism has also been studied as positively related to counterwork behavior among hospitality employees (Zhao, Peng, & Sheard, 2013). Workplace ostracism is a phenomenon being experience silently by the people that they are being ignored or excluded. Workplace ostracism has been studied as counterproductive both for individuals and organizations. It causes to drain of the social resources, hence can be treated as a source of stress (Williams, 2001). The ostracized individuals in a work setting can feel the stress, which in turn can lead to psychological disorders (Williams, 1997). One of the most important negative outcomes of social exclusion is reduced Employee engagement which makes the organization suffer adversely (Kaya, Ataman, & Aydin, 2017). The research concluded by Luthans and Youssef (2007) organization should keep on suggesting, focusing prominently on Positive Organizational Behavior (POB) in the workplace. Such positive psychological methods have been developed with the intention to evaluate “what is right with people” instead of conventional approaches of “what is wrong with people” (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). This way of approaching has emerged the concept of psychological capital (Avey et al., 2010).

According to Luthans and Youseef (2004), psychological capital is classified into four distinct classes, namely hope, optimism, efficacy, and resilience. Hope refers to persistent with the goals and flexibility in approach to redefining the paths to goals whenever necessary. Optimism: refers in the light of attribution theory developed by Heider (1958) is an approach that enables a person to make internal or dispositional attribution for positive events (both situational and external). Efficacy: refers
to the quality and extent of self-confidence exhibiting by the people in their capability to achieve predetermined objectives in a particular situation. Resilience: refers to the adaptation of a positive approach to meet the challenges of distress and adversities.

Ostracism has been studied as an outcome of interpersonal interaction which ushers the negative work behavior (Williams, 1997, 2001). Hence, it becomes very important to analyze the influence of workplace Ostracism on employee engagement. Besides that, it is also important to evaluate the significance of psychological capital to moderate the affect of ostracism. The study while investigating the role of psychological capital in future endeavors, with the intervening influence of job crafting documented positive relationship (Cenciotti, Alessandri, & Borgogni, 2017), however the psychological capital as moderating variable in Pakistani context is yet to receive the attention of the researchers. Particularly using the conservation of resource theory (COR) (Hobfol, 1989). Thus this research is an empirical endeavor to test the moderating role of psychological capital.

The focus of this study is health care sector, reason being the positive behavior of health givers, while discharging their duties is very much essential (Sendawula et al., 2018). the earlier studies have focused on the workplace ostracism among nurses, but ignored the other medics (Fatima et al., 2017; Imran et al., 2019) The positive attitude of employees working in the health care sector is very much important in discharging their duties (Abdullah et al., 2009). More of the engaged employees higher the chances of quality services. This study, therefore, targeted to investigate the nature of the relationship of workplace ostracism and employee engagement of people engaged in various private owned hospitals of Karachi, Pakistan.

Theoretical Substantiation

Employee Engagement

Employee engagement has been referred to as a passionate attachment that a person (in work setting) feels about his/her organization which in turn affects him/her to put forth the superior discretionary effort to his/her assigned task (Gibbison, 2006). An individual is said to be engaged in work, when s/he feel himself or herself involved, dedicated, authorized and passionate and exhibit such feelings in work-related behavior (Richardson, 2010). In a work setting the human resources department is always mandated to inculcate the sense of engagement among the people constituting the work settings, such enthusiastic behavior is then translated into higher organizational interest (Berens, 2013). Employee engagement has been evidenced in literature as engagement (Crawford et al., 2010), Job Engagement (Kong, 2009), Organizational engagement (Saks, 2006), Personal Engagement (Kahn, 1990) and Work Engagement (Saks, 2006). Work engagement refers to the extent of attachment with work, whereas employee engagement may also refer to the passionate attachment of an employee with an organization (Rout, 2017).
Employee engagement as a research construct has been extensively investigated and established an association with several job-related outcomes in the working environment. For example, according to Salanova et al. (2005) that employee engagement is positively and strongly related to the climate of service, worker contribution, and consumer attachment. Employee engagement was studied as affirmatively aligned to the creativity of an employee (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Employee engagement has been also being found to be negatively related to job quitting tendencies among employees (Caesens et al., 2016).

The studies provide ample pieces of evidence, lauding the significant and positive influence of engagement on productivity, the performance of both employee and organization, and it has negative effects on turnover intention (Truss, Alfes, Delbridge, Shantz, & Soane, 2014). The Hewitt (2014) describes that an engaged worker persistently exhibits three conducts: namely (1) Say - always talk about the firm positively with colleagues, probable workers, and clients; (2) Stay - cherish a desire to be the part of the firm even in availability of placement for the work somewhere else; (3) Strive - contribute extra effort, time and dedication to work in the success of the organization. Employee engagement has been extensively studied along with its positive impact on various job-related outcomes. Such as job performance, organizational commitment (Cesário & Chambel, 2017), it has been studied as a major predictor of organizational performance (Otieno, Waiga, & Njuru, 2015). Business executives around the world are of the firm belief that employee engagement enhances the retention attitude among employees, satisfaction with the job and higher-order commitment towards organizational productivity (Wiley, Kowske, & Herman, 2010).

In an attempt to conceptualize, Employee engagement has been characterized by two distinct perspectives namely psychological perspective (Rout, 2017), and organizational perspective (Georgiades, 2015). In organizational behavior research, the concept of employee engagement is not strange; it has been under empirical investigation since its inception (Khan, 1990). The originator of the concept of employee engagement has classified it into three interrelated elements namely physical engagement, cognitive engagement and emotional engagement (Khan, 1990). Employee engagement may also be conceptualized as an affirmative frame of mind, taking into the work environment which is signified by “meaningfulness, safety, and availability” Kahn (1990); has been studied as an academic pioneer of employee engagement. Employee engagement is radically different than the work engagement. Employee engagement is an exhibition of behavior (Physical, Cognitive and Emotional). When an employee passionately involves exerting his/her physical capabilities in job excellence; it has been referred as his/her physical engagement. Whereas cognitive engagement refers to the essence of knowing the organizational strategy and develop the skill accordingly so that optimal contribution can be made in work. Emotional engagement, on the other hand, refers to the feelings of an employee pertaining to the passionate attachment with an organization and the members. Employee engagement is a synchronized execution and exhibition of an individual’s chosen self in work-related behavior which improves the relationship with job and others, individual existence (physical, cognitive and emotional) and energetic, complete role performances. Whereas work engagement can be described
as opposites because the exhaustion is considered as mediocre enthusiasm and cynicism as considered as stumpy recognition, whereas the vigor is considered as greater enthusiasm, commitment and high identification (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002).

Work engagement along with its dimensions has been studied extensively, by investigating its nature of association with various job-related outcomes. Such as a positive and significant association between work engagement and job performance has been documented (Yongxing, Hongfe, Baoguo, & Lei, 2017). The Employee engagement also investigated in association with leadership (Gözükara & Şimşek, 2015), Employee engagement counterbalances the work-related stress among health professionals of Intensive Care Unit (ICU) (Mol, Nijkamp, Bakker, Schaufeli, & Kompanje, 2017). A significant link between employee engagement and job performance among IT professionals was found in India (Sekhar, Patwardhan, & Vyas, 2017). This confirms that the more the engaged person higher the job performance will be. Studies concluded an affirmative relationship between engagements and inter role distance among nurses (Seada, 2017).

Since the people in the health care sector are always vulnerable to various work-related challenges, therefore the chances of anxiety during executions of various job tasks are very much high. Substantial evidence is available regarding epidemic diseases havoc (Raven, Wurie, & Witter, 2018; Manyisa & Aswegen, 2017). Employee engagement in this regard can buffer the stigma experienced by people working in the health care sector particularly dedication (Raven, Wurie, & Witter, 2018). People enriched with personal and professional skills required to carry out job-related tasks are happened to highly engage (Schaufeli, 2017). This has endorsed the COR theory of Hobfoll (1989). The COR theory states that people maintain their existing resources and pursue new resources (Hobfoll, 1989). From this point of view, resources can be defined as objects or things that one values, more specific objects, states and conditions (Halbesleben, Sam, Paustian-Underdahl, & Westman, 2014). These resources which are valued by individuals started to drain, and perceive that there are chances of losing more resources, they are haunted by stress. Hence the subsequent resources investment is required to fight back (Hobfoll, 1989). People, therefore, keep strives on to maintain their existing resources, with the intention to cope up with emotional and physical fatigue. Contrary to that they will drain out their energies, in terms of the low level of Physical, Cognitive, and Emotional engagements. One of the most challenging dilemmas to cause the resource drain and low level of Employee engagement is ostracism in work settings (Kaya, Ataman, & Aydin, 2017).

Workplace Ostracism

The pieces of evidence of ostracism can be traced back from ancient Greek when they used to ostracize a person from communities once s/he is convicted (Williams, 1997). The term ostracism is used in various senses in the literature for example exclusion, isolating, ignoring, deprivation and sending exile, etc (Williams, 2001). Ostracism has been defined as the conscious and intentional deprivation of an individual by groups of persons, others’ conscious separation from a person.
Yang (2012) is of the opinion that ostracism has devastating influences on communal and cognitive roles of the peoples, and intimidates the feelings of belonging, which is of basic need. Lustenberger and Jagacinski (2010) the sense of being exclusion, makes the people suffer prolong unhappiness and mental stress, thus makes them compromise the assigned tasks. Ostracism can be observed as an extensive phenomenon, even in diversified demographics like age and gender (Williams, 1997). According to Fox and Stallworth (2005), the cultural and social context is very much important precursor of forming the ostracism. It is an individualistic perception, emerges when a person experiences a professional, and social exclusion in the work setting (Leung et al., 2011). People working together may deliberately ignore their colleagues while going to lunch together, they may turn deaf ear to their coworker’s input in meetings, or they may intentionally turn down the compliments from them (Balliet & Ferris, 2013).

Workplace ostracism hinders the sense of belongingness among workers and compromises the contribution towards the job (O’Reilly & Robinson, 2009). It is mostly accepted that ostracism can make people suffer physically and mentally, deteriorate the level of satisfaction with the job and reduce the commitment level among them (Ferris et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2012). Leung et al. (2011) studied workplace ostracism and employee engagement, concluded that workplace ostracism is negatively related to employee engagement. Workplace ostracism has been studied as a mitigating factor to subvert the employee creatively and passionate attachment with the work, which indicates employee disengagement (Kwan, Zhang, Liu, & Lee, 2018). An ostracized employee in a work environment physically, cogitatively and emotionally disengagement (Söderberg & Fry, 2016). The reason may be workplace ostracism causes resource drain and left the victims to suffer. Lacking sufficient resources to respond to job demands results in disengaging. Hence the following hypothesis is formulated:

\[ H_1: \text{Workplace ostracism negatively and significantly influences employee engagement.} \]

**Psychological Capital**

The primitive concept of Positive Organizational Behavior can be traced from the empirical findings of Luthans (2002) and Wright (2003) as a means to usher the positive psychology among the people in the work setting (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Psychological Capital may be conceptualized as the knowledge and execution of affirmatively produced human resources strengths and cognitive capabilities that can be evaluated, nurtured and efficiently controlled for performance grooming (Luthans, 2002). The literary pieces of evidence on positive psychological capital, it is revealed four classes of Psychological Capital namely *efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism* (Stajkovic, 2006; Luthans et al., 2007).

In the work setting organizations normally ignore to grasp the positivity among the people working for them (Joya & Edan, 2016). Positive psychological capital is one such positive domain, by applying which negative behavior can be changed into positive. Martin Seligman (1998) is of
this opinion, that management should not waste energies to identify “what is wrong with the people” rather appreciate in ushering the positivity (Seligman, 1998). Psychological capital has been studied to influence multifarious organizational outcomes (Stam, Laschinger, Regan, & Wong, 2013). The outcome of each dimension of psychological capital has been diversified. For example, people with higher self-efficacy may exhibit to have a belief in their capabilities to accumulate the inspiration, personal resources and plan to action necessary (Luthans et al., 2007). Eventually, positive outcome results such as satisfaction with job and engaged in the work (Hwang, Lee, & Shin, 2016; Durrah & Khan, 2016). Hopeful workers normally exhibit a state of pleasure while attaining predetermined organizational goals. The hopeful individuals are initiatives in their nature and dare to take a risk even in the presence of multiple threats and challenges of possible failures. Hence the sense of “Hope” to achieve the goal, promote the level of contentment with the job; and employee engagement (Avey et al., 2011; Majid, 2018). The positive expectations are normally an outcome of hope, which in turn usher the sense of responsibility while in job and mitigate the negative work behavior like workplace ostracism (Zheng et al., 2016), satisfaction with the job (Mishra et al., 2016), higher-order Employee engagement (Sihag, 2014).

H2: There is a positive significant influence of psychological capital and employee engagement

The Moderating Role of Psychological Capital

Psychological capital has been researched as an interacting variable between ostracism and tendencies to quit the job (Zheng et al., 2016). Optimistic individuals single out the productive abilities in their being, which eventually promotes self-esteem and morale among them (Lyubomirsky et al., 2006). Optimistic individuals normally used to be in habit of showing tendencies of positive behavior even in the presence of workplace challenges, and contribute favorably in organizational productivity (Mishra & Mishra, 2016). The Resilient people possess the abilities to get rid of the muddy ditch of difficulties and try to find out new avenues of knowledge, skill, and capabilities. They manage to develop deeper alliances with fellow workers (Luthans et al., 2007). Such special qualities of individuals make them improve their positive behavior and overcome the challenges of ostracism, eventually, they become more engaged.

H3: Psychological Capital moderates the relationship of Workplace ostracism and employee engagement.
Methods

Figure 1: Theoretical Framework

Participants

The sample for this research was drawn from 10 private tertiary care hospitals of Karachi. The criterion for targeting hospitals was 100-bed accommodation facility, identified through their respective URLs. The data was collected from May 2018 to July 2018. Respondents were informed that the research was aimed to collect data on medical practitioners’ perception of the exclusion or isolation in the working environment. They have ensured the confidentiality and informed that response was voluntary. The questionnaires were recollected once they were filled. Since the population frame was made available therefore simple random sampling technique was applied to target the respondents for this study. The sample size for this study was 384 full-time health givers determined through Roscoe’s (1965) approach. Sixty-five percent of respondents were female doctors, with mean age group 40 years.

Measures

Workplace Ostracism

Five-point Likert scale measuring the workplace ostracism developed by Ferris et al. (2008) was used for the study. Sample items included: “Others excluded me at work”, “fellows leave the
place once I enter’, and “The greetings from my part have been un-responded in work setting”. For measuring internal consistency among the items of the construct, Chronbach’s alpha reliability test was conducted. Hence the reliability of the scale was .75.

**Employee Engagement**

In order to measure Employee engagement among the people working health care sector of Karachi, the predesigned scale (Kahn, 1990) was adopted for this study. The scale was modified to adapt to the conditions of research. After modification, the expert opinion was sought regarding the modified scale. The scale carries three forms of employee engagement namely physical, cognitive and emotional. The Chronbach’s alpha reliability test return the reliability of the scale was .80.

**Psychological Capital**

To measure the psychological capital, the PCQ of Luthans,Youssef et al. (2007) have been adopted for this study. The sample items for the study include “I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area” (efficacy); “If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it” (hope pathways); “When I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it, moving on” (Resilience); and “I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job” (optimism). The reliability statistics of the scale was 0.77.

**Results**

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to ensure the factor loadings of the measure. The fitness of the model was confirmed through the Chi-Squire test, CFI (Bentler, 1990), TLI (Tucker & Lewis, 1973), and RMSEA(Browne & Cudeck, 1993). The conventional threshold for the said fit indices is .90 of Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) and below .08 values for Root Mean Squire Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is acceptable (Ting, 2011). In our case the fit indices were, (Chi-Square=89.33, p < .01; RMSEA =.07; CFI=.95; TLI =.92). The Chi-Squire was required to be insignificant, as the test is sample sensitive it will always return a significant result when the sample size is greater than 200 (Hair et al., 2010). A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the constructs was performed to assess the reliability, validity both convergent and discriminant. Through the analysis, it was revealed that composite reliability (CR) of the constructs was between .70 to .80, higher than the generally accepted threshold value .60, which confirms the internal consistency reliability of the significance of factor loadings of all the constructs, confirmed the convergent validity of the model. The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) results of the constructs depicted between .60 to .70, which is fairly higher than the predetermined AVE threshold value .50 (Calvo-Mora et al., 2006), hence the convergent validity for the study was ensured. Besides that, the computed values of intercorrelations among the constructs were fairly less than the Squired Root of AVE, hence the discriminant validity is authenticated (Hair et al., 2010).
Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 given below shows the means, standard deviation and correlation analysis of variables of interest in the study. Table shows, workplace ostracism has negative association with employee engagement ($r=-0.33$, $p < 0.05$), negative correlation with psychological capital ($r=-0.27$, $p < 0.05$), whereas the psychological capital positively correlated with Employee engagement ($r=-0.627$, $p < 0.05$).
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Table 1  
Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ostracism</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Engagement</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>-.333**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PsCap</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>-.273*</td>
<td>.627**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Testing

The path analysis using Amos was executed to test the hypotheses of the study. SEM enables
the investigation of all the variables in the given model (Byme, 2016). The fig 2 indicates the outcome of structural equation modeling. As shown in the figure workplace ostracism significantly and negatively predicts the change in Employee Engagement (β = -.68, p < 0.01). Workplace ostracism × Psychological Capital also significantly and negative change in employee engagement (β = -.85, p < 0.01). Whereas, psychological capital positively predicts the change in employee engagement (β = .72, p < 0.01). Thus all the hypotheses of the study are supported. Interactive path analysis was conducted through Amos (As if et al., 2018). As shown in figure 1 the indirect effect of workplace ostracism through psychological capital on Employee engagement significantly and negatively different (Δβ=-0.06, p < 0.01). The interaction effect is plotted and depicted in fig 2 using Aiken and West’s (1991) approach.

The findings in the given below table show the significant influence of psychological capital as an interacting variable. The interactive effect of psychological capital and workplace ostracism lie between LLCIs and ILCIs and corresponding probabilities are less than 0.05 (Hayes, 2013). Thus psychological capital is moderating the relationship between psychological capital.

Table 2
Moderation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁</td>
<td>Ostracism</td>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>-0.723</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-8.713</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.2316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>8.595</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.6454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃</td>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>Psychological X Ostracism</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-10.25</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.2317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Hypotheses Assessment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Weights</th>
<th>Sig: Value</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Workplace ostracism negatively and significantly influences employee engagement</td>
<td>β = -.68</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>Hypothesis Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: There is a positive significant influence of psychological capital and employee engagement</td>
<td>β = .72</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>Hypothesis Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Psychological Capital moderates the relationship of Workplace ostracism and employee engagement.</td>
<td>β = -.85</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>Hypothesis Retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The numerous studies pertaining to workplace ostracism have been concluded in the context of manufacturing concerns (Liu & Xia, 2016), among bankers (Javed, Shah, & Bashir, 2018), work to family spillover effect (Lee & Hui, 2011). A few studies focusing on the health care sector have been documented (Gkorezis, Panagiotou, & Theodorou, 2016). This research also highlights the significance of psychological capital which moderates the relationship between workplace ostracism and employee engagement. It was intended that the negativity of social and professional exclusion and employee engagement can be visualized by using the conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989). The findings of this study concluded that enriched with psychological capital can be more engaged in the work setting. The results of the research are the value added to the existing academic and professional literature about ostracism, engagement, and psychological capital. The findings of the Fatima et al. (2019) studying the workplace ostracism and its impact on the employee’s behavior, is the latest study on workplace ostracism. However, this study has focused the healthcare sector.

Future Research

The study can be extended by incorporating the public sector health care, and comparison between private and public sector dilemma. In the health care sector, it was observed, that in Pakistan the majority of employees were supporting staff like nurses, ward boys, etc. Therefore, the study focusing on the nurses’ attitude can bring unique outcomes and value-added information for health policymakers. By incorporating more psychological empowerment as a mediating variable between workplace ostracism and employee engagement, the unique policy input to health policies can be accumulated.
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