



The Moderating Role of Psychological Capital in the Relationship Between Workplace Ostracism and Turnover Intention

Khalidatul Rafi'ah¹, Zamralita^{2✉}

^{1,2,3} Tarumanagara University
zamralita@psi.untar.ac.id

Abstract

Turnover intention, or employee intention to leave an organization, has become a significant concern in the modern workplace. This phenomenon can be detrimental to organizations by causing the loss of competent workers, increasing recruitment costs, and disrupting team productivity. One factor contributing to *turnover intention* is *workplace ostracism*, which is the exclusion or neglect experienced by individuals in the workplace. This study aims to examine the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention*, as well as the moderating role of *psychological capital* in this relationship. Workplace ostracism is defined as the neglect or ostracism experienced by individuals in the workplace. This study involved 288 employees from various industrial sectors in Indonesia, selected using a *convenience sampling method*. Data were collected through a questionnaire with standardized measuring instruments, including the *Workplace Ostracism Scale*, *Turnover Intention Scale*, and *Psychological Capital Questionnaire* (PCQ-24). The results showed a significant positive relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention* (coefficient 0.77, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the higher the *workplace ostracism*, the greater the employee's intention to leave the organization. However, *psychological capital* was shown to moderate this relationship negatively and significantly, with a moderation coefficient of -0.10 ($p < 0.001$), so that high psychological capital can reduce the negative impact of *workplace ostracism* on *turnover intention*. This finding provides insights for organizations to address the impact of *workplace ostracism* by improving employee *psychological capital*. The practical implications of this study emphasize the importance of organizational strategies in creating an inclusive and supportive work environment, while also developing programs to strengthen employee *psychological capital* to effectively reduce *turnover intention*.

Keywords: *workplace ostracism*, *turnover intention*, *psychological capital*, employees, Indonesia

Psyche 165 Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License.



1. Introduction

Employees or human resources (HR) are the main assets owned by an organization, where the progress of the organization is greatly influenced by the role of employees as invaluable assets [1]. Employee participation not only supports the success of the organization, but also supports the achievement of the company's vision and mission [2]. Organizations that successfully empower employees effectively can encourage innovation and creative collaboration [3]. However, negative situations such as *workplace ostracism* often occur and remain a significant issue that threatens employee welfare and organizational stability [4], [5].

Workplace ostracism is defined as the extent to which employees feel ignored or alienated in the workplace [6]. This phenomenon can be seen in the form of coworkers systematically ignoring them, leaving the area when employees enter, not returning greetings, unknowingly

sitting alone in a crowded lunchroom, avoiding them, not looking at them, refusing to talk, not being invited, or being treated as if the employee is not there [6].

Studies show that as many as 66% of employees have experienced the silent treatment in the past 5 years and as many as 29% reported that others intentionally left the workplace area when they entered or arrived [7]. Meanwhile, another study also revealed that among 1,300 employees, as many as 71% of employees reported themselves as targets of *workplace ostracism* [8]. This shows that *workplace ostracism behavior* has been around for a long time. *Workplace ostracism* like this is often difficult to report because of its invisible nature [9].

The impacts of *workplace ostracism* include decreased self-esteem, increased stress, and psychological adjustment disorders [10], [11]. Many workplaces experience these negative consequences, which can jeopardize organizational effectiveness and ongoing management processes [12]. Consequently, these factors

encourage employees to develop *turnover intention* as a self-protection mechanism [13]. Furthermore, *turnover intention* is one of the most widely considered variables because it can lead to lower productivity due to a decrease in skilled labor, loss of experienced employees, and organizational investment, ultimately reducing profits [14].

It has been explained that *turnover intention* is at the root of the organization and is quite difficult to detect [15]. Therefore, it is important for organizations to determine the right way to retain the right employees when the employee has *turnover intention*, because *turnover intention*, which is the employee's intention to leave the organization, has various negative impacts on the company and employees [16]. The negative impacts for the company involve costs incurred to recruit and train new employees, changes in communication patterns and social dynamics, decreased work morale, and delays in operational processes [17]. The impact on employees can be in the form of teamwork that can become difficult for employees when there are changes in team members, such as reductions or replacements [18].

Workplace ostracism leads to *turnover*, as employees tend to avoid sources of ostracism and the experience of being ostracized. Employees who experience *workplace ostracism* typically dislike reconnecting with people who reject them and tend to flee situations where ostracism occurs [19], [20]. This leads to employees being unwilling to return to work because they feel unwanted by others [21]. If employees attempt to rebuild social relationships with coworkers but fail, they may develop *turnover intentions* [22].

The journey of individuals experiencing *workplace ostracism* to the level of *turnover intention* involves important stages. *Workplace ostracism*, which is an act of exclusion, can cause stress in individuals because it threatens basic needs for belonging and self-esteem [4]. *Workplace ostracism* originates from various motives, ranging from no malicious intent to malicious intent, which creates ambiguity for victims [4]. In addition, *workplace ostracism* can also be triggered by organizational culture factors, where the perpetrator and victim's workplace perceive *workplace ostracism* as normal and common behavior that does not violate morals or even the perpetrator was previously a victim of *workplace ostracism* [23]. Based on this, victims will engage in cognitive processes to find meaning in the events they experience [10]. Furthermore, studies show that internal attributions to *workplace ostracism* can damage an individual's self-esteem because it signals that there is something about them that is undesirable. This can influence a decrease in an individual's self-esteem.

When individuals experience stress due to *workplace ostracism*, this can affect their psychological adjustment. High levels of stress can negatively impact an individual's psychological adjustment [11]. Finally,

individuals who consistently experience *workplace ostracism* and the resulting stress may decide to consider *turnover intention* as an effort to protect their psychological and emotional well-being.

Studies show a significant positive correlation between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention* [24], [25]. In addition, another study conducted, where researchers surveyed 256 employees, found that *workplace ostracism* had a significant positive influence on *turnover intention* [26]. Therefore, *workplace ostracism* can cause employees caught in this dilemma to consider leaving their jobs [20].

Based on the aforementioned, it is interesting to see whether there are factors that can help reduce *turnover intention* or not. According to *the conservation of resources (COR) theory*, individuals will strive to maintain, protect, and build the resources they need and then remain in stressful situations because *workplace ostracism* causes depletion of personal resources [27]. If employees have other resources that can be used to compensate for the losses caused by *ostracism*, they are less likely to suffer as a result of *workplace ostracism* [27].

Work environment, if there are moments such as *workplace ostracism*, it can in turn cause negative feelings or unhappiness. From previous studies, it was found that someone who has *psychological capital* can reduce *turnover intention* because *psychological capital* is an important factor in overcoming *workplace ostracism* [28]. The existence of *psychological capital* as a resource is crucial to overcome these obstacles when employees try to achieve certain goals [29]. The use of *psychological capital* as an individual characteristic resource is important to maintain self-balance, prevent physical fatigue and stress, and maintain a positive mood and emotions, so that they are ready to face challenges in the work environment [29].

Psychological capital is defined as a person's positive psychological development in facing problems or obstacles that occur in their life, consisting of *hope*, *optimism*, *resilience*, and *self-efficacy*. This is an important form of personal resources [30]. It is possible that employees who have *psychological capital* can adjust the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention* significantly [28], [31].

Studies show that *workplace ostracism* is a serious problem for employees with low *psychological capital* [31]. Researchers assume that *psychological capital* functions as a compensatory resource in dealing with *workplace ostracism* and helps reduce the negative impact of *workplace ostracism* on *turnover intention* [32]. If someone has a high level of *psychological capital*, they will be able to manage stress effectively, which ultimately reduces the urge to leave the organization.

By applying the principles of *conservation of resources (COR) theory*, *psychological capital* is a resource variable that functions to protect individuals from psychological stress during work. The existence of this variable is expected to explain how new assets needed by employees can influence how they deal with the pressure of *workplace ostracism* and its relationship with *turnover intention*. Therefore, the researcher proposes to examine the moderating effect of *psychological capital* on the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention* in employees. Thus, this study will dig deeper to answer the main research questions. First, does *workplace ostracism* play a role in *turnover intention*? Second, can the presence of *psychological capital* moderate the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention*? The proposed hypothesis is that *workplace ostracism* has a positive and significant effect on *turnover intention*, while *psychological capital* negatively and significantly moderates the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention*.

Through this study, researchers hope to provide deeper insights into the impact of *workplace ostracism* on *turnover intention* and understand the moderating role of *psychological capital* in this context. Furthermore, this study is expected to make a significant theoretical contribution by complementing previous research findings. In this context, a deeper understanding of the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention*, as well as the moderating role of *psychological capital*, can provide a new dimension to the organizational psychology literature.

2. Research methodology

This research was conducted using a quantitative approach with a non-experimental method. The collected data were analyzed statistically to produce objective and bias-free conclusions. This study used an explanatory design, namely a research design that aims to explain the cause-and-effect relationship between research variables [33]. This design helps researchers explore the relationship between factors that are the main focus of the study. Data collection was carried out by distributing an online questionnaire through the *Google Form platform*, which was written in Indonesian to make it easier for participants to understand the questions. Furthermore, data analysis was carried out with the help of three statistical software, namely *JAS*, *IBM SPSS 29.0*, and *LISREL*.

2.1. Research Participants

This study involved 288 employees as participants. To ensure control over participant characteristics, this study used a number of control variables, consisting of gender, age, employment sector, division, position or title, employee status, length of service, monthly wage or salary level, and educational background. These control variables were considered to reduce potential bias that could influence the research results. The research sample

was selected using *convenience sampling*, a non-probability sampling method that allows participants to be selected based on ease of access or their availability to participate in the research [34]. This technique was used because of its efficiency and ease in recruiting participants who fit the research criteria.

2.2. Research Instruments

The variable of *workplace ostracism* was measured using the *Workplace Ostracism Scale* [6], [35]. This scale consists of ten items, using a 5-point Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). One example of an item is "My coworkers ignore me." A reliability test was conducted on this scale, which resulted in a reliability value of 0.973. The higher the *Workplace Ostracism Scale score*, the more the employee experiences coworkers systematically ignoring him/her, leaving the area when the employee enters, not responding to greetings, employees unknowingly sitting alone in a crowded lunch room, coworkers avoiding employees, employees realizing that coworkers do not want to look at him/her, coworkers refusing to talk to employees, not being invited, or being treated as if they are not in the workplace.

In this study, the model fit test uses *Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)* to evaluate the suitability of the *workplace ostracism measurement model to the empirical data using JASP* statistical software. The *Comparative Fit Index (CFI)* value of 0.972 and the *Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)* of 0.965 indicate excellent model fit, as both values exceed the threshold of 0.90. Other indices such as the *Bentler-Bonett Non-normed Fit Index (NNF)* and *Normed Fit Index (NFI)* also show consistent values, respectively, of 0.965 and 0.963, confirming that this model has a high level of fit. Meanwhile, additional indices such as *Bollen's Relative Fit Index (RFI)* and *Incremental Fit Index (IFI)* show values of 0.953 and 0.972, respectively, supporting the finding that this model fits the data.

The *Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)* value of 0.098 with a 90% confidence interval in the range of 0.081 to 0.115 indicates a moderate level of fit. However, the *Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR)* value of 0.018 is below the threshold of 0.08, indicating a very small difference between the observed and estimated covariance matrices. The *Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)* of 0.954 and the *McDonald Fit Index (MFI)* of 0.845 support the overall model fit. *Hoelter's Critical N* shows a value of 111,790 at $\alpha = 0.05$ and 128,564 at $\alpha = 0.01$, indicating that this model is adequate for the sample used in this study. The *Expected Cross Validation Index (ECVI)* of 0.644 indicates that this model has good generalization potential to similar samples.

The contribution of each item to the *workplace ostracism construct* was measured through the *R-squared value* and *factor loading*. The *R-squared values* ranged from 0.756 to 0.830, indicating that the variance

explained by each item was quite large. The factor loadings of all items were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) with a value range between 0.756 and 0.911. This indicates that each item has a strong contribution to the construct.

The turnover intention variable was measured using the Turnover Intention scale [36], [37]. This scale consists of six items, using a 5-point Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). One example of an item is "I have decided to leave my job several times." A reliability test was conducted on this scale, which resulted in a reliability value of 0.894. The higher the Turnover Intention Scale score, the more often the employee thinks about leaving work, is actively looking for alternatives to his current job, and the employee will leave his organization as soon as possible.

In the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) for the turnover intention measurement model, an evaluation of the model's fit was conducted using JASP statistical software. In general, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) value of 0.997 and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) of 0.992 indicate excellent model fit because it is above the threshold value of 0.90. Indices such as the Bentler-Bonett Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) and Normed Fit Index (NFI) of 0.992 and 0.994, respectively, confirm that this model has an optimal fit. Other indices such as Bollen's Incremental Fit Index (IFI) and Relative Noncentrality Index (RNI) have high values (0.997), strengthening the good model fit.

The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) value of 0.057 is in the good fit category because it is below 0.08. The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) of 0.010 also supports a high fit. In addition, Hoelter's Critical N shows a very adequate value (459,458 at $\alpha = 0.05$ and 705,762 at $\alpha = 0.01$), illustrating the stability of the model even in large sample sizes. The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) of 0.999 and the McDonald Fit Index (MFI) of 0.997 further confirm the high fit. The R-squared value for each indicator presented shows that all indicators have a fairly large proportion of variance explained by the turnover intention factor, with R-squared values ranging from 0.577 to 0.755. Meanwhile, the factor loading for each indicator on the turnover intention construct. All indicators showed significant values ($p < 0.001$) with estimates ranging from 0.972 to 1.125. Standardized values ranged from 0.760 to 0.869, indicating a strong contribution of each indicator to the construct.

Psychological capital variables were measured using the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ-24) scale [30]. This scale measures four main dimensions, namely hope, optimism, resilience, and self-efficacy. This scale consists of twenty-four items, using a 6-point Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree). Examples of items from each dimension include: for the hope dimension, "For me, there are many ways to get out of existing problems."; for the optimism

dimension, "In my work I always look on the bright side."; for the resilience dimension, "I usually face stress at work calmly."; and for the self-efficacy dimension, one example item is "I feel confident that I am able to examine unresolved problems until they are resolved." Reliability testing was conducted on this scale, which produced a reliability value of 0.941. The higher the Psychological Capital Questionnaire score, reflects the employee's ability to face challenges, maintain a positive outlook, and handle work situations with confidence.

The measurement model for the psychological capital construct was evaluated using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with JASP statistical software. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) value of 0.910 indicates excellent model fit, as it exceeds the threshold of 0.90. The Bollen's Incremental Fit Index (IFI) and Relative Noncentrality Index (RNI) recorded values of 0.911 and 0.910, respectively, supporting the validity of the model. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) value of 0.069, which is in the adequate fit category, with a 90% confidence interval between 0.061 and 0.076. The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) of 0.050, which is below the threshold of 0.080, indicates a good fit. The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) recorded a figure of 0.981, indicating adequate data representation by the model. The Expected Cross Validation Index (ECVI) is 2.083, which is within acceptable limits for the model.

R-squared results show that psychological capital indicators have varying proportions of variance, with the lowest value in item number 16 (0.262) and the highest value in item number 15 (0.635). Indicators with high R-square values show a strong contribution to the psychological capital construct, especially in dimensions such as hope and resilience. All indicators in the factor loading have significant estimated values ($p < 0.001$), with standard estimates ranging from 0.512 to 0.797. The hope and resilience dimensions tend to have a greater contribution to the main construct compared to other dimensions.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results

IBM SPSS 29.0 statistical software to check whether the residual data in the regression model was normally distributed, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Normality Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		288
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	.0000000
	Standard Deviation	1.07399264
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.044
	Positive	.044
	Negative	-.028
Test Statistics		.044
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) ^c		.200 ^d

Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed) ^d	Sig.	.205
--	------	------

Based on the results of the *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test*, the *Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)* value is 0.205 and the *Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)* value is 0.195, which is greater than the significance level ($p > 0.05$). Thus, it can be concluded that the residual data is normally distributed. This result is supported by the residual *mean value* of 0.0000000 and the standard deviation of 1.07399264, which indicates a stable distribution of residual data.

IBM SPSS 29.0 statistical software and using the *Pearson Product Moment method* to measure the relationship between the research variables, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Bivariate Correlation Test

		Workplace Ostracism	Turnover Intention	Psychological Capital
Workplace Ostracism	Correlation	1	.778**	-.561**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		< .001	< .001
	N	288	288	288
Turnover Intention	Correlation	.778**	1	-.497**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	< .001		< .001
	N	288	288	288
Psychological Capital	Correlation	-.561**	-.497**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	< .001	< .001	
	N	288	288	288

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results show that *workplace ostracism* has a positive and significant correlation with *turnover intention* ($r = 0.778$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the higher the *workplace ostracism*, the higher the *turnover intention* by employees. Meanwhile, *workplace ostracism* is negatively and significantly correlated with *psychological capital* ($r = -0.561$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that an increase in *workplace ostracism* is associated with a decrease in *psychological capital* by employees. On the other hand, *turnover intention* has a significant negative correlation with *psychological capital* ($r = -0.497$, $p < 0.001$). This indicates that *turnover intention* tends to be lower in employees with higher *psychological capital*.

IBM SPSS 29.0 statistical software, as presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Linearity Test

		F	Sig.
Workplace Ostracism & Turnover Intention	Linearity	448,772	< .001
	Deviation from Linearity	0.218	< .001
	Linearity	100,805	< .001

Deviation from Linearity	0.065	< .001
--------------------------	-------	--------

Workplace *ostracism* and *turnover intention* showed significant results in the *Linearity* value ($F = 448.772$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that there is a significant linear relationship between the two variables. The *Deviation from Linearity* value of 0.218 ($p > 0.05$) indicates that the relationship does not deviate from linearity. In addition, the relationship between *psychological capital* and *turnover intention* also showed significant linearity with a *Linearity* value of $F = 100.805$ ($p < 0.001$). The *Deviation from Linearity* value of 0.065 ($p > 0.05$) indicates that the relationship does not deviate from linearity.

A heteroscedasticity test using the *Weighted Least Squares technique* was conducted to examine the presence of certain patterns in the residual variance. The results showed that no independent variables significantly affected the residual variance, with a p -value > 0.05 for all variables (*workplace ostracism* = 0.124 and *psychological capital* = 0.845). Thus, it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity problem in the model.

A multicollinearity test was conducted to examine the relationship between independent variables in the model. The results showed that all variables had a *Tolerance* value above 0.1 and a *Variance Inflation Factor* (VIF) value below 10, namely *workplace ostracism* (VIF = 1.583) and *psychological capital* (VIF = 2.171). Thus, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity problem in the model.

A heteroscedasticity test using the *Weighted Least Squares technique* was conducted to examine the presence of certain patterns in the residual variance. The results showed that no independent variables were significant to the residual variance, with a p -value > 0.05 for all variables (*workplace ostracism* = 0.124 and *psychological capital* = 0.845). Thus, it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity problem in the model. Hypothesis testing was conducted using LISREL statistical software. The results of the structural equation are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Structural Equation Analysis

Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention				
Independent Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-value	p-value
Workplace Ostracism	0.77*	0.066	11.75	< .001
Psychological Capital	-0.10*	0.051	-2.04	
Error Variance	0.71			
R-squared	0.29			

Based on the results of the structural equation analysis, the coefficient value for the *workplace ostracism* variable is 0.77 with a standard error of 0.66, a t -statistic of 11.75, and a p -value < 0.001 . This indicates

that *workplace ostracism* has a positive and significant relationship with *turnover intention*. This means that the higher the level of *workplace ostracism* experienced by employees in the workplace, the higher their tendency to have *turnover intention*.

Meanwhile, the coefficient for *psychological capital* shows a value of -0.10 with a standard error of 0.051 and a *t-statistic value* of -2.04, which is also significant at a certain level. This negative coefficient indicates that *psychological capital* has a decreasing effect on *turnover intention*. In other words, the higher the level of *psychological capital* an employee possesses, the lower their level of *turnover intention*, regardless of the level of *workplace ostracism* they experience. Furthermore, the error variance of 0.71 and the *R-squared value* of 0.29 indicate that *workplace ostracism* and *psychological capital* can explain approximately 29% of the variability in *turnover intention*.

Returning to the hypothesis, these results support the argument that *psychological capital* plays a significant role as a moderator in the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention*, with employees with high levels of *psychological capital* better able to utilize their resources to cope with the psychological stress caused by *workplace ostracism*. This may explain why the negative impact of *workplace ostracism* on *turnover intention* is smaller in employees with high levels of *psychological capital*. Therefore, the conclusion is that the hypothesis is accepted.

Table 5. Correlation Matrix of Independent Variables

	<i>Workplace Ostracism</i>	<i>Psychological Capital</i>
<i>Workplace Ostracism</i>	1.00	-0.60
<i>Psychological Capital</i>	-	1.00

Table 6. Latent Variable Covariance Matrix

	<i>Turnover Intention</i>	<i>Workplace Ostracism</i>	<i>Psychological Capital</i>
<i>Turnover Intention</i>	1.00	0.84	-0.57
<i>Workplace Ostracism</i>	0.84	1.00	-0.60
<i>Psychological Capital</i>	-0.57	-0.60	1.00

Based on the correlation matrix results in Table 5, there is a negative correlation between *workplace ostracism* and *psychological capital* (-0.60), indicating that higher levels of *workplace ostracism* tend to be associated with lower levels of *psychological capital* perceived by employees. In Table 6, the covariance matrix results show a relationship consistent with the correlation results. The strong negative covariance between *workplace ostracism* and *psychological capital* (-0.60) supports the argument that both serve as protective resources against the negative impacts of *workplace ostracism*.

3.2. Discussion

The results of this study indicate that *workplace ostracism* has a significant positive influence on *turnover intention*. This finding is in line with various previous studies that confirm that *workplace ostracism* can trigger *turnover intention* in employees. For example, studies show that *workplace ostracism* is positively related to *turnover intention*, where employees who experience *workplace ostracism* tend to feel alienated and unappreciated at work, thus increasing their desire to seek job opportunities elsewhere (*turnover intention*) [38]. Another study revealed that *workplace ostracism* significantly increases *turnover intention* by worsening employee emotional conditions, such as feelings of anger and frustration, which accelerate the decision to leave the job [28].

The experience of *workplace ostracism* can lead to significant job dissatisfaction, reduce organizational commitment, and encourage individuals to seek alternative employment [39]. In addition, *workplace ostracism* not only directly influences *turnover intention*, but also influences it through psychological mechanisms, such as reducing employee attachment to the organization [40]. Employees who feel neglected tend to experience higher stress and decreased *self-esteem*, which exacerbates their desire to leave their jobs [41].

Workplace ostracism is often associated with low levels of social support and increased interpersonal conflict, which encourages individuals to withdraw from the organization [42]. *Workplace ostracism* often worsens employees' emotional states, such as feelings of anger and frustration, which accelerate their decision to leave their jobs [28]. Thus, the results of this study confirm that *workplace ostracism* has a significant negative impact on employee well-being, thus explaining its strong relationship with *turnover intention*.

Furthermore, the role of *psychological capital* as a moderator in the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover* shows that it has a negative and significant influence, with the higher the level of *psychological capital*, the lower the *turnover intention* experienced by employees, regardless of the *workplace ostracism* experienced. This supports previous findings stating that *psychological capital* as a psychological resource is able to reduce the negative impact of *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention* [28]. As a construct of positive psychology, *psychological capital* consists of *hope*, *optimism*, *resilience*, and *self-efficacy* [30]. These components enable individuals to remain optimistic, resilient, and confident in the face of stress, including *workplace ostracism* [41], [43]. Thus, employees with high *psychological capital* tend to be able to maintain emotional balance, thereby reducing the risk of *turnover intention* [44].

This finding is also in line with several other studies, which show that *psychological capital* functions as a

crucial personal resource in facing obstacles, maintaining self-balance, and managing stress [45]. This is relevant in the context of *workplace ostracism*, where employees with higher *psychological capital* are better able to use their resources to face social pressures, maintain work goals, and reduce the negative impact of *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention* [5], [8].

4. Conclusion

This study aims to analyze the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention*, as well as the moderating role of *psychological capital*. The results of the analysis indicate a significant positive relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention*. This indicates that the higher the level of *workplace ostracism* experienced by employees, the greater the *turnover intention*. *Psychological capital* is proven to negatively moderate the relationship between *workplace ostracism* and *turnover intention*, where higher *psychological* can reduce the negative impact of *workplace ostracism* on *turnover intention*. This study provides important insights for organizations to understand the impact of *workplace ostracism* and the importance of *psychological capital*. Therefore, organizations need to develop effective strategies to reduce *workplace ostracism* and increase *psychological capital* to reduce employee *turnover intention*.

Reference List

- [1] Zulhasmi, FR, Zamralita, Z., & Saraswati, KDH (2021). The influence of psychological capital and job resources towards work engagement. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 570, 1154-1159. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210805.181>
- [2] Harahap, A., & Salendu, A. (2021). The role of perceived organizational support and psychological capital as moderators in the relationship between job insecurity and turnover intention. *Syntax Literate Indonesian Scientific Journal*, 6, 81-93. <https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v6i1.3775>
- [3] Jabeen, M., Naoreen, B., Ajmad, F., Shahzad, S., & Mehwish, K. (2023). Effects of workplace ostracism on stress and work engagement of university teachers. *Russian Law Journal*, 11(2), 2091. <https://doi.org/10.52783/rj.v11i2.2091>
- [4] Wang, L.M., Lu, L., Wu, W.L., & Luo, Z.W. (2022). Workplace ostracism and employee wellbeing: A conservation of resource perspective. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.1075682>
- [5] Choi, Y. (2020). Workplace ostracism and work-to-family conflict among female employees: Moderating role of perceived organizational support. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 29 (2), 436-449. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-04-2020-2143>
- [6] Singh, S., Subramani, A., David, R., & Jan, N. (2024). Workplace ostracism influences turnover intentions: Moderating roles of perceptions of organizational virtuousness and authentic leadership. *Acta Psychologica*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104136>
- [7] Dong, N., Zhang, Y., Ma, X., Yin, K., & Liu, Y. (2024). Carrying ostracism overnight: The cognitive mechanism underlying the effect of daily workplace ostracism on next-day work engagement. *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.3500>
- [8] Yan, J., Li, Y., Jia, J., & Liu, H. (2024). Self-reliance in the workplace: The curvilinear effect of workplace ostracism on subjective career success. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231220177>
- [9] University of Eastern Finland. (2023). Workplace ostracism clearly associated with health care workers' job satisfaction, stress, and perceived health: Study. *Medical Xpress*. <https://medicalxpress.com/news/2023-11-workplace-ostracism-health-workers-job.html>
- [10] Sarwar, A., Abdullah, M., Hafeez, H., & Chughtai, M. A. (2020). How does workplace ostracism lead to service sabotage behavior in nurses: A conservation of resources perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 850. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00850>
- [11] Arfa'i, IT & Anwar, U. (2022). The effect of stress levels on psychological adjustment in correctional inmates. *Undiksha Journal of Citizenship Education*, 10 (2), 39-49. <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JJPP>
- [12] Yikilmaz, İ., Sürücü, L. & Güleriyüz, İ. (2023). Workplace ostracism: Impact on psychological distress, counter-productive work behavior, and turnover intention. *3 SOCIAL ECONOMIC SECTOR DERGİSİ*, 58, 1718-1735. <https://doi.org/10.15659/3.sector-sosyal-economic.23.08.2136>
- [13] Li, B., Li, Z., & Wan, Q. (2019). Effects of work practice environment, work engagement, and work pressure on turnover intention among community health nurses: Mediated moderation model. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 75, 3485-3494. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14130>
- [14] Manninen, S. M., Koponen, S., Sinervo, T., & Laulainen, S. (2023). Workplace ostracism in healthcare: Association with job satisfaction, stress, and perceived health. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15934>
- [15] Aryani, R., Widodo, W., & Chandarwati, C. (2021). How adversity quotient and organizational justice reduce turnover intention empirical evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8 (6), 1171-1181. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no6.1171>
- [16] Yan, J., Li, Y., Jia, J., & Liu, H. (2024). Self-reliance in the workplace: The curvilinear effect of workplace ostracism on subjective career success. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231220177>
- [17] Saerang, YB, Zamralita, M., & Saraswati, KDH (2020). The role of psychological capital, quality of work life, and perceived job opportunity on turnover intention in millennials (Study on PT. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 439, 534-541. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200515.090>
- [18] Sari, FY, Saraswati, KD H, & Liu, D. (2023). The influence of person job-fit on turnover intention of employees in manufacturing industry X. *Jurnal Serina Sosial Humaniora*, 1 (1), 23-32. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jssh>
- [19] Deng, X., He, S., Lyu, P., Zhou, X., Ye, Y., Meng, H., & Kong, Y. (2021). Spillover effects of workplace ostracism on employee family life: The role of need for affiliation and work-home segmentation preference. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*. <https://doi.org/10.3724/sp.j.1041.2021.01146>
- [20] Singh, L. B., & Srivastava, S. (2021). Linking workplace ostracism to turnover intention: A moderated mediation approach. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 46, 244-256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.12.012>
- [21] Temizel, G. (2022). The effect of workplace ostracism on job satisfaction and turnover intention in hotel enterprises. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 53, 81-97. <https://doi.org/10.30794/pausbed.1076887>

- [22] Farasat , M., Afzal, U., Jabeen, S., Farhan, M., & Sattar, A. (2021). Impact of workplace ostracism on turnover intention: An empirical study from Pakistan. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business* , 8 (11), 265-276. <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2021.VOL8.NO11.0265>
- [23] Omran, SKA (2024). Studying some of the consequences of workplace ostracism, bullying, cyber-bullying at the university context. *International Journal of Business and Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.37745/ijbmr.2013/vol12n96084>
- [24] Howard , M. C., Cogswell, J. E., & Smith, M. B. (2020). The antecedents and outcomes of workplace ostracism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 105 (6), 577-596. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000453>
- [25] Zhu , Y. & Zhang, D. (2021). Workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behaviors: The chain mediating role of anger and turnover intention. *Frontiers in Psychology* , 12 , Article 761560. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.761560>
- [26] Jiang, H., Jiang, X., Sun, P., & Li, X. (2020). Coping with workplace ostracism: The roles of emotional exhaustion and resilience in deviant behavior. *Management Decision* , 58(5), 1087-1101. <https://doi.org/10.1108/md-06-2019-0848>
- [27] Hobfoll , S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist* , 44(3), 513-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- [28] Haq IU (2014). Workplace ostracism and job outcomes: Moderating effects of psychological capital. *Human Capital without Borders: Knowledge and Learning for Quality of Life; Proceedings of the Management. Knowledge and Learning International Conference 2014* . ToKnowPress.
- [29] Rio , K., Zamralita, & Lie, D. (2022). The influence of psychological capital on the subjective well-being of start-up sales employees at PT. X. *PSIKODIMENSIA Scientific Study of Psychology* , 21 (2), 165-173. <https://doi.org/10.24167/psidim.v21i2.4649>
- [30] Luthans , F., & Youssef, C. M. (2004). Human, social, and now positive psychological capital management: Investing in people for competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics* , 33(2), 143-160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.01.003>
- [31] Mahfouz , Z., Arshad, A., Nisar, Q. A., Ikram, M., & Azeem, M. (2017). Does workplace incivility & workplace ostracism influence the employees' turnover intentions? Mediating role of burnout and job stress & moderating role of psychological capital. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* , 7 (8), 398-413. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v7-i8/3244>
- [32] Rahmah , AA, & Nurtjahjanti, H. (2020). The relationship between psychological capital and turnover intention among employees at Matahari Department Store Javamall Semarang. *Jurnal EMPATI* , 10 (2), 155-162. <https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.2020.27703>
- [33] Sugiyono . (2017). *Quantitative, qualitative and R&D research methods* . Alfabeta, Bandung.
- [34] Creswell , J. W. (2017). *Research design, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* . Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- [35] Risgiyanti , Suyono, J., Harmadi, & Istiqomah, S. (2023). The impact of workplace ostracism induced by co-worker envy on psychological empowerment and organizational commitment. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business* , 38 (3), 191-210. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jieb.v38i3.5075>
- [36] Jang, E., & Chen, X. (2022). How can we make a sustainable workplace? Workplace ostracism, employees' well-being via need satisfaction and moderated mediation role of authentic leadership. *Sustainability* , 14(5), 2869. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14052869>
- [37] Budiningsih , A.T., & Ernawaty, E. (2023). Job satisfaction and turnover intention of blud workers at Trosobo public primary health care. *Journal of Public Health Sciences* , 19 (4), 267-271. <https://doi.org/10.19184/ikesma.v19i4.44217>
- [38] Wang , Q., & Wang, C. (2020). Reducing turnover intention: Perceived organizational support for frontline employees. *Frontiers of Business Research in China* , 14 (6), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s11782-020-00074-6>
- [39] Sharma, A., Abdullah, H., & Bano, A. (2024). Workplace ostracism in the selected service sector organizations in Chhattisgarh: Implications for employee well-being and organizational performance. *ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts* , 5(1), 3243. <https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i1.2024.3243>
- [40] Zahid, A., Rehman, S., Rafiq, M., & Cheema, S. (2021). As study on workplace ostracism on work productive behavior of employees with mediating effect of emotional intelligence. *RAMSS Journal* , 4(1), 45-62. <https://doi.org/10.47067/RAMSS.V4I1.97>
- [41] Jiang, P., & Zhang, L. (2021). Does conformity lead to gains? The effect of workplace ostracism on performance evaluation from a self-presentational view. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*. <https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1041.2021.00400>
- [42] Robinson , S. L., O'Reilly, J., & Wang, W. (2013). Invisible at work: An integrated model of workplace ostracism. *Journal of Management* , 39 (1), 203-231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312466141>
- [43] Bilal , AR, Fatima, T., Imran, MK, & Iqbal, K. (2020). Is it my fault and how will I react? A phenomenology of perceived causes and consequences of workplace ostracism. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics* , 30 (1), 36-54. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-03-2019-0056>
- [44] Rahmah , AA, & Nurtjahjanti, H. (2020). The relationship between psychological capital and turnover intention among employees at Matahari Department Store Javamall Semarang. *Jurnal EMPATI* , 10 (2), 155-162. <https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.2020.27703>
- [45] Rio , K., Zamralita, & Lie, D. (2022). The influence of psychological capital on the subjective well-being of start-up sales employees at PT. X. *PSIKODIMENSIA Scientific Study of Psychology* , 21 (2), 165-173. <https://doi.org/10.24167/psidim.v21i2.4649>