

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Social exclusion in academia: A critical examination on workplace ostracism and turnover intention among early career academicians (ECAs)

Umi Nazira Rafie¹, Norzanah Mat Nor², Shaliza Alwi^{2,*}, Muhammad Farhan Shuhaimi³, Suriana Ramli^{2,*}

¹ Faculty of Business Management and Professional Studies, Management and Science University, Shah Alam, 40100 Malaysia

² AAGBS, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam 40450, Malaysia

³ Leaderonomics, 46350, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia

* Corresponding author: Suriana Ramli, surianaramli@uitm.edu.my; Shaliza Alwi, shalizaalwi@uitm.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Workplace ostracism is theoretically conceptualised as a social stressor capable of depleting an individual's psychological and emotional resources, often leading to heightened withdrawal cognition. This phenomenon, often characterised by feelings of social exclusion, may leave the profound thought of leaving the organisation. However, its influence in the academic environment, specifically among early-career academicians (ECAs), remains insufficiently explored. Faculty members' responses to workplace ostracism often differ in the corporate sector, reflecting the dynamic nature of academia. Hence, the core purpose of this paper is to determine the relationship between workplace ostracism and turnover intention among ECAs by drawing on the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory. Using structural equation modelling (SEM), the findings reveal a negative relationship between workplace ostracism and turnover intention that is statistically insignificant. Although counterintuitive to prior research in general organisational settings, this result highlights the distinctive nature of academic careers and the resilience of ECAs. This finding offers an invaluable insight that ECAs possess a higher level of maturity, professional autonomy, and personality robustness, enabling them to disengage from ostracised colleagues or environment without allowing such experiences to dictate their career progression, research productivity, and academic achievement. Organisations should aim to create inclusive and supportive environments through positive psychology strategies to minimize the impact of ostracism.

Keywords: workplace ostracism; turnover intention; early career academicians (ECAs); collectivist culture; higher education institutions (HEIs)

1. Introduction

Retaining early-career academicians has become a critical challenge for higher education institutions worldwide. Universities increasingly rely on young academicians to drive research productivity, curriculum innovation, and academic continuity. Due to higher expectations and limited institutional support during the formative years of their careers, early-career academicians are more prone to heightened stress and

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 11 December 2025 | Accepted: 29 January 2026 | Available online: 28 February 2026

CITATION

Rafie UN, Nor NM, Alwi S, et al. Social exclusion in academia: A critical examination on workplace ostracism and turnover intention among early career academicians (ECAs). *Environment and Social Psychology* 2026; 11(2): 4451. doi: 10.59429/esp.v11i2.4451

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2026 by author(s). *Environment and Social Psychology* is published by Arts and Science Press Pte. Ltd. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

professional uncertainty. As competition intensifies in academic environment, collegial relationships and departmental climates play a critical role in faculty members' intention to stay. The ongoing transformation is driven by technological advancements and the widespread integration of digital tools into educational instruction and learning. This shift poses challenges for young individuals aspiring to academic careers. Technology has significantly reshaped the teaching and learning landscape, and the demands on students are continually evolving. As a result, new educators require strong support from their institutions, administrators, and colleagues^[1]. Among the interpersonal challenges reported in academic settings, workplace ostracism, which is a subtle form of social exclusion in which individuals feel ignored, excluded, or marginalized, has emerged as a pervasive yet understudied phenomenon affecting employee turnover intention, especially in the Asian context.

Consequently, turnover intention has become ubiquitous despite rigorous research spanning centuries. Human Resource and organizational behavior (OB) practitioners have paid close attention to it, and it has been a particular focus among them^[2,3]. High employee turnover led to a meaningful labor shortage, which reduces workplace productivity and harms an organization's bottom line^[4]. Employers incur costs due to decreased employee commitment and investment in company-specific skills among those planning to leave, as well as the need for wide-ranging recruitment, selection, and training of new hires^[5]. Previous findings by Menon et al.^[2] reported it would take 42 days to recruit and train, which would cost 6 to 9 months of an employee's salary. Reina et al.^[6] reported that economic losses associated with turnover can range from 90 % to 200 % of the annual wage due to recruitment, selection, and training expenses.

The education industry is among the top five in the U.S. for employee turnover. Kusy and Driscoll^[7] found that about 30 percent of educators left their jobs within five years, and 84 percent would leave voluntarily. Malaysia's education system reflects a similar situation, with a turnover rate of 29.2 percent in the education sector recorded in 2020^[8]. The turnover rate for public HEIs was 11 %, while the turnover rate in private HEIs was over 26 %^[9]. In line with this, Badiozaman^[10] found that the turnover rate in private HEIs was double in public HEIs.

Kuo and Wu^[11] opined that employees in collectivistic cultures are more sensitive to negative interpersonal cues and more likely to be shunned at work than those in individualistic cultures, where cultural contexts may influence workplace exclusion. Nevertheless, Ahmad and Kalem^[12] found that individualistic employees are more likely to experience workplace ostracism. These mixed findings in the literature prompt further investigations in a collectivist culture. Moreover, understanding the impact of workplace ostracism on turnover intention in a collectivistic culture is highly intriguing. Malaysia is one of the prime countries in the South Asian region with a strong collectivist culture and moderate power distance^[14]. Hofstede Insight^[14] suggested that Malaysia is generally a collectivist society, where the group is considered the most important unit and manifested in a long-term commitment to the "member" group, be it family or relationship. Given these considerations, this study seeks to address a critical, yet overlooked question: Does workplace ostracism influence early-career academicians' turnover intention in their academic institutions? By focusing on the turnover intention, this study contributes to the understanding of how personal experiences shape the attitude and behaviour of the early career academicians. Therefore, the core objective of this paper is to examine the direct relationship between workplace ostracism towards turnover intention in the education sector.

2. Literature review

Workplace ostracism is possibly one factor that might affect employees' psychological functioning, diminish organisational commitment and contribute to withdrawal-related outcomes. The term workplace

ostracism has been conceptualised by William et al.^[15] as the act of ignoring or excluding an individual or groups by an individual or group. Prior research in the service sector has consistently reported that workplace ostracism is a major reason for employee voluntary turnover^[16]. It is pervasive across cultures, age groups, and species^[17]. A study conducted by Reilly et al.^[18] found that 70% of 1,300 surveyed employees would experience ostracism. Similarly, findings by Fox and Stallworth^[19] in their five-year follow-up study revealed that 66% of the respondents were socially ignored by their coworkers. Preliminary work conducted by Norzannah et al.^[20] with seven early-career faculty members from various HEIs in Malaysia has revealed the existence of ostracism in their workplace. The findings also revealed a sequential pattern of being unable to voice opinions, being rejected by seniors, or being ignored by colleagues, which may have led to the intention to leave the institutions.

Several employees feel isolated at work, which limits opportunities for broad social interaction and significantly impedes the satisfaction of basic needs. Frequent ostracism limits positive interactions with other people. It considerably and deeply influences their physical and mental well-being^[21]. O'Reilly & Robinson^[18] opined that ostracism is the least deviant form of behaviour, along with bullying, aggression, and harassment. In the education sector, the work environment is commonly characterised by high demands^[1], given heavy teaching loads, administrative tasks, and the need to disseminate research under tight deadlines^[22]. The lack of interpersonal relationships among staff can lead to many conflicts that escalate into workplace ostracism^[23]. For instance, heavy concentration on grading the assessments, lecturing, and meeting the research publication target may lead to disregarding the colleague, and ultimately lead to workplace ostracism. Such behaviour may trigger isolation and harm the collaborative ethos among colleagues which is central to academic success. Fatima et al.^[24] revealed that a form of ostracising behaviour in academia includes biased treatment from colleagues, where they had good and cooperative behaviour with some of their favoured colleagues, and vice versa besides having a lack of emotional and social needs for their colleagues.

Drawing on Conservation of Resources (COR) theory^[25], this study understands individuals as inherently motivated to acquire, maintain, and protect resources they value. COR theory posits that individuals strive to accrue resources to bolster their survival, including the establishment and maintenance of social bonds. Resources are deployed to manage stressful challenges and strategically conserved for future exigencies. As Hobfoll et al.^[26] elaborate, resources encompass valued physical objects, conditions, personal characteristics, and energies, extending to social support mechanisms such as supervisors, colleagues, spouses, and clients^[27,28].

Central to COR theory is the proposition that stress arises when individuals perceive a threat of, or experience actual loss of, resources, or when resource investment fails to yield anticipated gains^[25]. Such resource depletion, particularly in stressful work environments, can precipitate withdrawal behaviors. In the context of workplace ostracism, an employee experiencing a diminished sense of belonging due to social exclusion may experience a substantial drain on their emotional resources. As articulated by Hobfoll et al.^[26], this resource depletion can manifest as a loss of self-esteem, a reduced sense of group belonging, and a deprivation of social connection, potentially leading to further resource erosion.

The dynamics of personal resource caravans can be effectively understood through the lens of Conservation of Resources (COR) theory as proposed by Hobfoll^[25]. When individuals face personal losses, they often experience a decline in job satisfaction, which may force them to leave their organization in search of relief from stress and a restoration of work engagement. This relationship illustrates how the

depletion of personal resources can adversely affect overall well-being, potentially leading to frustration, distress, and energy depletion.

Although COR theory predicts that workplace ostracism would reduce positive organisational attitudes, early-career academicians may experience competing pressures. Even when ostracized, they may attempt to conserve resources such as job security, professional standing, and long-term career prospects, resulting in a weaker relationship between ostracism and turnover intention.

3. Methods

Research by Howard et al.^[29] indicates that any form of workplace mistreatment, including ostracism, significantly increases professionals' intentions to leave their organizations. This finding aligns with existing literature, which consistently shows that employees who experience ostracism are more likely to consider exiting their current roles^[30-33]. Moreover, when employees face isolation due to ostracism, they often respond with withdrawal behaviors. According to COR theory, substantial resource depletion leads employees to isolate themselves from peers to prevent further loss. Consequently, they may intend to quit to preserve their remaining resources^[34].

The detrimental impact of resource damage triggers stress^[35] further exacerbating turnover intentions. Employees are particularly inclined to leave when they perceive a failure in securing their social relationships^[36]. These insights are corroborated by Bilal et al.^[37] who found that the psychological ramifications of ostracism adversely affect faculty performance and contribute to workplace deviance and withdrawal behaviors.

Individuals who endure ostracism from colleagues are likely to detach emotionally from the organization, leading to cognitive withdrawal. For ostracized employees, transitioning to a new organization can be an effective way to alleviate stress^[38,39]. Thus, the intention to leave becomes a cognitive mechanism that diminishes the perceived value of their current job, prompting them to seek alternative opportunities where they can better utilize their remaining resources. Hence, it is postulated that workplace ostracism has a significant positive relationship with employee turnover intention.

Since this study employed a positivist and deductive approach, a quantitative research strategy was adopted to generalize the findings to the targeted population as generalisation is one of the main features of quantitative research^[40]. This study is designed to investigate the cause-and-effect interactions that influence employee turnover intention (TI) based on the theoretical framework developed.

Non-probability sampling was utilized in this study. Due to the inaccessibility of the ECAs database, the researchers opted for quota sampling as the sampling frame was deemed unattainable. Memon et al.^[41] stressed that effective probability sampling necessitates a complete sampling frame, for such a frame is fundamentally important to the process. Clarification requires a complete list of all target population members^[42,43]. The inability to reach the ECA target population led researchers to use quota sampling. The universities in the Klang Valley were divided into three categories: large, medium, and small. A higher quota was assigned to a bigger-scale university. The number of programs offered in the university determines the scale of the university.

In this study, the questionnaire was distributed via liaison officers to selected ECAs at 20 full-fledged private universities in the Klang Valley. Prior to commencing data collection, each university's liaison officer was briefed in detail regarding the inclusion criteria for targeted respondents. The sampling criteria required that eligible participants be academicians at the early stage of their academic careers (within 5 years of appointment) and employed full-time at a private educational institution registered with the Ministry of

Higher Education (MOHE). Full-time employees typically spend more time at work and interact with colleagues more frequently, exposing them to both positive and negative social dynamics. This increased level of interaction can make the effects of ostracism more pronounced and easier to observe in comparison to part-time employees who may have limited exposure. Senior lecturers, associate professors, and professors were excluded from this study.

To begin data collection, the authors contacted university human resources managers and university liaison officer and invited them to participate in the study. The cover letter outlined the study's purpose and questionnaire instructions and stated that participation was voluntary. Researchers distributed a higher proportion of questionnaires to large universities, followed by medium and small universities, to ensure adequate representation from all participating universities. The number of programs and faculty members found on the respective universities' websites determined the university's size.

Quota sampling was employed to ensure the sample adequately reflected variation in university size, an important contextual factor influencing the representation of ECAs. The 20 participating private universities were classified into three categories based on institutional size: large (Category A), medium (Category B), and small (Category C). Specifically, 5 universities were classified as large, 10 as medium and 5 as small.

University size was operationalised as the total number of academic programs they offered, including undergraduate, postgraduate, and professional degrees. The criterion was selected because it serves practical proxy for university scale and academic diversity, which are relevant for capturing the representation of ECAs work environments. Information on program numbers was obtained from each university's official website by reviewing faculty directories and the program listings. Based on this data, Category A universities offered between 80-100 academic programs, Category B universities offered between 60 and 79 academic programs, and Category C universities offered fewer than 60 academic programs. Restricting the sample to private institutions ensured consistency in social context and enhanced the comparability of the participating universities.

Additionally, only early-career academicians (within their first five years of appointment), holding the rank of lecturer or equivalent, and employed full-time, were included in the study. Senior lecturers, associate professors, and professors were excluded. The university liaison officers were responsible for identifying eligible participants in accordance with these departmental and university-size quotas, ensuring adherence to the inclusion criteria and proportional representation across all sampled universities and departments.

A total of 400 questionnaires were distributed to early-career academicians across 20 private universities in the Klang Valley, with 200 allocated to large universities, 150 to medium universities, and 50 to small universities. The distribution was coordinated by the respective university liaison officers, who either emailed the electronic survey link to eligible participants or distributed printed questionnaires during departmental meetings, depending on the institution's preference and logistical considerations. The liaison officers were instructed to send follow-up reminders one and two weeks after the initial distribution to encourage participation. In total, 220 questionnaires were returned.

After screening for outliers, inconsistencies, and abnormal values, 45 responses were deemed invalid and excluded, resulting in 175 valid questionnaires and an effective response rate of 43.8%. This response rate is considered acceptable, as previous studies have reported rates as low as 10%^[43] and response rates among the professional population are often below 40%^[44]. One plausible explanation for the moderate response rate is that employees' demanding work schedules may limit their availability to participate in survey research^[44]. The final sample of 175 valid responses exceeded the minimum required sample size of 140 for 14 survey items^[49] and was therefore deemed sufficient for subsequent data analysis.

Turnover Intention. Respondents were asked to rate the five-item scale used by Mobley et al.^[45] to assess turnover intentions. Example responses include "I will quit this company if the given condition gets even a little worse than now," and "I am seriously considering leaving my current job to work at another company." This study used Mobley et al.'s^[45] 5-item scale, which was based on their initial 3-item scale measuring the participant's self-reported intention to leave the job and another 2-item scale from their modified version, expressing turnover intention. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was 0.9.

Workplace Ostracism. Items on workplace ostracism were adapted from previous research by Ferris et al.^[31]. Items were evaluated on a scale based on 5-likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Examples of queries include "I perceive my office mate ignored me at work" and "I perceive my greetings have gone unanswered at work". Cronbach's coefficient alpha was 0.918.

IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 29.0) was used to perform descriptive analysis. Meanwhile, PLS-SEM was performed for further inferential analysis. PLS-SEM's primary aim is to develop theories or to predict and explain the relationships in a study. Whereas CB-SEM is primarily used to confirm or reject theories^[46,47]. Harman's single-factor test was performed in this investigation to overcome CMV. To ensure the outcomes are not influenced by common method variance, it is recommended that the variance explained by a single factor less than 50%^[48]. This study revealed that the factor 23.31% of the covariance, suggesting that CMV was not a significant concern and unlikely to affect the results of this investigation.

4. Results

Table 1 demonstrates the demographic profile of the respondents. Female respondents make up 64.0% of the sample, while male respondents account for 36.0%. The respondents' age distribution shows that most are in the 25-34 age group, followed by the 35-44 and 45-54 age groups, with the smallest group being those over 55 years old. Approximately 98.3% of respondents have completed at least a master's degree, indicating a very high literacy in the sample. Most respondents hold academic positions, with varying work experience in academia; the majority have worked for 49 to 60 months.

Table 1. Demographic profile of respondents.

Profile	Frequency (N=175)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative (%)
Gender			
Female	112	64.0	64.0
Male	63	36.0	100.0
Age Group			
25-34	92	52.6	52.6
34-44	66	37.7	90.3
45-54	12	6.9	97.1
Above 55	5	2.9	100.0
Educational Level			
Bachelor's degree	3	1.7	1.7
Master's degree	119	68.0	69.7
PHD/DBA	53	30.3	100.0
Tenure in the Current Organization			
Less than one year	44	25.1	25.1

Profile	Frequency (N=175)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative (%)
1-2 year	40	22.9	48.0
2-3 years	20	11.4	59.4
3-4 years	21	12.0	71.4
4-5 years	50	28.6	100.0

Table 1. (Continued)

Table 2 shows the turnover intention items with mean scores. The findings indicate that a significant minority of academicians are seriously considering leaving their current jobs, actively looking for new opportunities, and expressing a high likelihood of leaving within the next 6 months. This implies dissatisfaction or discontent with their current workplace. The score of 3.22 suggests that responses vary, with some academicians feeling more compelled to quit than others. However, the average score indicates a somewhat neutral position suggesting others may be more satisfied and engaged in their current roles.

Table 2. Mean score of turnover intention.

Code	Items	Mean
T11	I will quit this company if the given condition gets even a little worse than now	3.76
T12	I am seriously considering leaving my current job to work at another company	3.25
T13	I will probably look for a new job in the next year.	3.47
T14	Within the next 6 months, I would rate the likelihood of leaving my present job as high.	3.22
T15	I sometimes feel compelled to quit my job in my current workplace	3.28

Table 3 presents the mean scores for workplace ostracism items. According to the table, the average scores for items related to workplace ostracism range from 4.45 to 4.60, indicating a relatively high level of perceived ostracism among early-career academicians (ECAs) working in Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs). These findings suggest that a significant proportion of ECA perceive being ignored, avoided, and excluded by their office mates or colleagues. Furthermore, they report feeling left out, ignored, and excluded from group activities.

Table 3. Mean score of workplace ostracism.

Code	Items	Mean
WO1	I perceive my office mate ignored me at work	4.45
WO2	I notice my office mate left the area when I entered.	4.56
WO3	I perceive my greetings have gone unanswered at work.	4.58
WO4	I perceive my office mate avoided me at work	4.57
WO5	I notice my office mate would not look at me at work.	4.57
WO6	I notice my office mate ignored my opinions in discussions.	4.51
WO7	I notice my office mate at work treated me as if I were not there.	4.60
WO8	I notice my office mate did not want to include me in the group	4.54
WO9	While in a group, I notice that I am not one of them	4.48

Table 4 demonstrates the convergent validity evidence, presenting factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha (α), composite reliability (CR) and average variance extracted (AVE). These values were computed using the PLS-SEM algorithm. The outer loadings for all measurement items exceeded the recommended threshold of

0.708, indicating adequate indicator reliability^[47]. Cronbach’s alpha values exceeded the minimum acceptable level of 0.50^[50], while AVE values were above 0.50^[51], and composite reliability values exceeded 0.7^[47]. Collectively, these results confirm that the measurement model satisfies the established criteria for convergent validity instrument.

Table 4. Convergent validity.

Construct	Outer loadings	Cronbach’ alpha	Composite reliability	AVE
Turnover Intention		0.916	0.929	0.891
TI 1	0.740			
TI 2	0.867			
TI 3	0.890			
TI 4	0.892			
TI 5	0.921			
Workplace Ostracism				
WO1	0.797	0.951	0.957	0.628
WO2	0.741			
WO3	0.804			
WO4	0.758			
WO5	0.778			
WO6	0.769			
WO7	0.756			
WO8	0.807			
WO9	0.849			

The purpose of the structural model assessment is to look at how the variables relate to one another. The bootstrapping process is used in this regard. **Table 5** presents the path coefficients and p-value, indicating direct relationship between turnover intention and workplace ostracism. A threshold t-value greater than the critical value of 1.645 (≥ 1.645) at a 0.05 level of significance was one of the requirements for significance. Additionally, this study also reveals the predictive accuracy of the proposed model. The coefficient of determination, or R2, is calculated for this purpose. R2 is defined by^[49], as the independent variable's predictive power to the dependent variable. This study found that the model predictive power for turnover intention is 10.4%. In other words, it demonstrates 10.4% of predictive accuracy in the structured model.

Table 5. Structural model.

Direct effect	Confidence level	Std. Beta (β)	t value	p-value	Decision
WO \rightarrow TI	[-0.258,0.06]	-0.137	1.505	0.066	Not supported

This study followed Cohen’s (1998) guidelines to assess effect size (f^2), where effect size of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 indicates small, medium, and large effects, respectively. The effect size (f^2) for the relationship between workplace ostracism and turnover intention is 0.012, which falls below the threshold for a small effect. This result indicates that workplace ostracism explains only a limited proportion of the variance in

turnover intention. Predictive relevance of the structural model was further assessed using blindfolding procedures to obtain the (Q^2) value. According to^[49], a model demonstrates predictive relevance when the Q^2 value exceeds 0. The Q^2 value for turnover intention ($Q^2 = 0.003$), indicates the presence of predictive relevance. However, the magnitude of this value is minimal, suggesting that although workplace ostracism contributes marginally to explaining turnover intention within the sample, its predictive capability for turnover intention in out-of-sample contexts is limited. Small effect size is not uncommon in behavioural and organisational research, particularly when complex phenomena such as turnover intention are influenced by multiple contextual and individual factors.

5. Discussion

The results showed that workplace ostracism did not have a statistically significant direct effect on turnover intention among early-career academicians ($p = 0.066$); therefore, H_1 was not supported. These findings suggest that workplace ostracism may not directly translate into turnover intention in this context, but may instead be shaped by cultural, organisational and job-related factors. One possible explanation relates to cultural values. Malaysia is characterized with a strong collectivist culture and a moderate power distance^[13]. Individuals with a strong sense of collectivism value their organisational ties and interpersonal relationships and may therefore tolerate workplace ostracism, even when they feel excluded^[52]. Prior research suggests that such employees are more likely to endure workplace ostracism, as maintaining group cohesion and ethical obligations to the organisation is often prioritised over individual dissatisfaction^[52].

Consistent with this view, studies conducted in collectivist contexts have shown that employees may respond to ostracism by remaining silent rather than considering exit. For example, De Clercq et al.^[13], Bilal et al.^[37] reported that faculty members in hierarchical and collectivist cultures refrain from voicing concerns or leaving their organisation after experiencing exclusion, as respect for authority and organisational structure is deeply ingrained. Similarly, Ozkan et al.^[53] found no significant relationship between coworkers' ostracism and turnover intention in the Turkish healthcare setting, suggesting that peer exclusion does not necessarily prompt immediate withdrawal behaviour.

Furthermore, prior studies indicate that ostracism or mistreatment by a supervisor may have stronger implication to turnover intention than exclusion from co-workers^[53,54]. According to^[53], exclusion or neglect by co-workers does not necessarily prompt employees to consider leaving their jobs. Individuals may overlook such behaviours or fail to interpret them as a deliberate act of ostracism. However, this tolerance tends to diminish when exclusion is accompanied by abusive supervision. Ozkan et al.^[53] further demonstrated that while employees may endure mistreatment from colleagues, experiences of mistreatment by supervisors are more likely to trigger turnover intentions. Consistent with this distinction, Cheng^[54] suggested that individuals respond differently to exclusion depending on its source, with supervisor-related ostracism having a more pronounced impact on withdrawal-related outcomes than peer ostracism.

In addition, the evolving nature of academic work may further explain the non-significant finding. Advances in digital technology have reduced academicians' dependence on face-to-face interactions with colleagues and supervisors. Technology-enabled communication and task autonomy allow academicians to perform their duties independently, thereby limiting the social impact of ostracism^[55,56].

Within Malaysian private higher education institutions, academicians typically devote a substantial portion of their time to teaching, supervision and student-related activities rather than peer interaction. Research by Razalli et al.^[57] indicates that academicians spend a significant number of weekly hours on student supervision and instructional duties. As a result, limited interaction with colleagues may reduce the

salience of workplace ostracism, thereby weakening its influence on turnover intention. Given the nature of the academicians' work in Malaysia, contextual and occupational factors provide plausible explanations for the absence of a statistically significant direct relationship between workplace ostracism and turnover intention among early-career academicians.

6. Conclusion

This study found that workplace ostracism did not have a statistically significant direct relationship with turnover intention among early-career academicians. This non-significant finding suggests that the relationship between workplace ostracism and turnover intention may be more complex than a simple direct association. Future research could explore this study found that workplace ostracism did not have a statistically significant direct relationship with turnover intention among early-career academicians. This non-significant finding suggests that the relationship between workplace ostracism and turnover intention may be more complex than a simple direct association. Future research could explore potential mediating or moderating variables, such as psychological resilience, organisational support, job embeddedness, or career adaptability, which may help explain under what conditions. Workplace ostracism influences turnover intention. In addition, the use of a cross-sectional and quantitative research design may have limited the ability to capture the experiences of ostracised employees. Future studies could adopt qualitative approaches, such as in-depth interviews or focus groups, to explore how early-career academicians interpret and cope with workplace ostracism, and how these experiences shape their career-related decisions over time. Longitudinal designs may also be valuable in examining the delayed or cumulative effects of workplace ostracism on turnover intention.

Author contributions

Conceptualization, UN.R. and S.R.; methodology, S.R.; software, UN.R.; validation, N.MN., and S.A.; formal analysis, S.R.; investigation, S.A.; resources, UN.R.; data curation, UN.R.; writing original draft preparation, S.R.; writing review and editing, S.A.; visualization, MF.S.; supervision, S.R.; project administration, MF.S.; funding acquisition, S.R. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research was funded by ARSHAD AYUB GRADUATE BUSINESS SCHOOL, UiTM, grant number 100-AAGBS (PT.9/107) and The APC was funded by AAGBS, UiTM. Check carefully that the details given are accurate and use the standard spelling of funding agency names at <https://search.crossref.org/funding>. Any errors may affect your future funding.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Rafie UN, Nor NM, Alwi S, Shuhaimi MF, Ramli S. Social exclusion in academia: A critical examination on workplace ostracism and turnover intention among early career academicians. *Environment and Social Psychology*. 2024.
2. Memon MA, Salleh R, Mirza MZ, Cheah JH, Ting H, Ahmad MS, Tariq A. Satisfaction matters: the relationships between HRM practices, work engagement and turnover intention. *International Journal of Manpower*. 2021.

3. Oruh ES, Mordi C, Ajonbadi A, Mojeed-Sanni B, Nwagbara U, Rahman M. Investigating the relationship between managerialist employment relations and employee turnover intention: the case of Nigeria. *Employee Relations*. 2020;42(1):52–74.
4. Santhanam N, Srinivas S. Modeling the impact of employee engagement and happiness on burnout and turnover intention among blue-collar workers at a manufacturing company. *Benchmarking*. 2019.
5. Gan E, Voon ML. The impact of transformational leadership on job satisfaction and employee turnover intentions: a conceptual review. *SHS Web of Conferences*. 2021.
6. Reina CS, Rogers KM, Peterson SJ, Byron K, Hom PW. Quitting the boss? The role of manager influence tactics and employee emotional engagement in voluntary turnover. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*. 2017.
7. Kusy K, O’Leary-Driscoll S. Educator stress: Finding solutions to combat negativity, exhaustion, and burnout. *IMSAs Professional Learning Day Proceedings*. 2020.
8. Harun S, Ahmad IT. Determinants of intention to stay of higher learning institutions administrators: a review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 2021.
9. Wang G, Rashid AM. Relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention among lecturers in private higher educational institutions in Shandong Province in China. 2020.
10. Badiozaman IF. Early career academics’ identity development in a changing HE landscape: insights from a Malaysian private university. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*. 2021.
11. Kuo C, Wu C. Workplace ostracism and job performance: the moderated mediation model of organization-based self-esteem and performance goal orientation. *Career Development International*. 2022.
12. Ahmad S, Kaleem A. Zooming in on the workplace bullying and turnover intentions pathway. *Personnel Review*. 2019.
13. Hofstede G. Cultural dimensions theory. *Hofstede Insights*. 2022.
14. Hofstede Insights. Country comparison: Cultural dimensions of Malaysia. *Hofstede Insights*. 2022.
15. Williams KD. *Ostracism: The Power of Silence*. Guilford Press; 2001.
16. Srivastava S, Khan M, Kumari A, Jain AK. Does workplace ostracism lead to workplace withdrawal? Testing the moderating-mediating effects of rumination and mindfulness in Indian hospitality industry. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*. 2022.
17. Singh S, Subramani A, David R, Jan NA. Workplace ostracism influencing turnover intentions: moderating roles of perceptions of organizational virtuousness and authentic leadership. *Acta Psychologica*. 2024;243:104136.
18. O’Reilly J, Robinson SL, Berdahl JL, Banki S. Is negative attention better than no attention? The comparative effects of ostracism and harassment at work. *Organization Science*. 2015;26:774–793.
19. Fox S, Stallworth LE. Racial/ethnic bullying: exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2005;66:438–456.
20. Norzanah N, Umi R, Rick D, Suriana R. Ostracism amongst junior employees. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Economics and Finance*. 2023.
21. Heaphy ED, Dutton JE. Positive social interactions and the human body at work: linking organizations and physiology. *Health Care Management Review*. 2006.
22. Creagh S, Thompson G, Mockler N, Stacey M, Hogan A. Workload, work intensification and time poverty for teachers and school leaders: a systematic research synthesis. *Educational Review*. 2023.
23. Liu C, Li L, Li H, Bruk-Lee V, Ma J, Liu Y. Supervisor–employee task conflict and supervisor ostracism: the moderating effect of interpersonal harmony values. *Applied Psychology*. 2022.
24. Fatima T, Abbas M, Ming J. Linking ostracism with burnout: The role of psychological capital and workplace belongingness. *Current Psychology*. 2020. doi:10.1007/s12144-020-00731-x.
25. Hobfoll SE. Conservation of resources: a new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*. 1989;44(3):513–524.
26. Hobfoll SE, Halbesleben J, Neveu JP, Westman M. Conservation of resources in the organizational context: the reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. 2018;5:103–128.
27. Halbesleben JRB, Wheeler AR. To invest or not? The role of coworker support and trust in daily reciprocal exchanges. *Journal of Management*. 2015.
28. Liu J, Kwan HK, Mao Y. Abusive supervision and subordinate outcomes: The mediating role of psychological capital and the moderating role of power distance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*. 2013.
29. Howard MC, Cogswell JE, Smith MB. The antecedents and outcomes of workplace ostracism: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2020.

30. De Clercq D, Haq IU, Azeem MU. Workplace ostracism and job performance: roles of self-efficacy and job level. *Personnel Review*. 2019.
31. Ferris DL, Brown DJ, Berry JW, Lian H. The development and validation of the Workplace Ostracism Scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2008;93(6):1348.
32. Lyu Y, Zhu H. The predictive effects of workplace ostracism on employee attitudes: a job embeddedness perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2019.
33. Scott KL, Duffy MK. Antecedents of workplace ostracism: new directions in research and intervention. 2015.
34. Zheng X, Yang J, Ngo HY, Liu XY, Jiao W. Workplace ostracism and its negative outcomes. *Journal of Personality Psychology*. 2016;15(4):143–151.
35. Hobfoll SE. The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 2001;50(3):337–421.
36. Ko KJ, Lee S-K. Influence of resilience and job embeddedness on turnover intention in general hospital nurses. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing Administration*. 2019;25(4):362–372.
37. Bilal AR, Fatima T, Imran M, Iqbal K. 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*. 2021.
38. Vui-Yee K, Yen-Hwa T. When does ostracism lead to turnover intention? The moderated mediation model of job stress and job autonomy. *IIMB Management Review*. 2019.
39. Wang Y, Lai J. Workplace ostracism and employee outcomes: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Psychology*. 2023.
40. Bryman AE. *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press; 2012.
41. Cooper DR, Schindler PS. *Business Research Methods*. 12th ed. McGraw-Hill; 2014.
42. Saunders MN, Bristow A, Thornhill A, Lewis PE. *Understanding research philosophy and approaches to theory development*. 2015.
43. Baruch Y, Holtom B. Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human Relations*. 2008;61:1139–1160.
44. Ali F, Ciftci O, Nanu L, Cobanoglu C, Ryu K. Response rates in hospitality research: an overview of current practice and suggestions for future research. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*. 2020;62:105–120.
45. Mobley W, Griffeth RW, Hand HH, Meglino BM. Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1979;86:493–522.
46. Ramayah T, Cheah J, Chuah F, Ting H, Memon MA. *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS 3.0*. 2nd ed. Pearson Malaysia; 2018.
47. Hair JF, Risher JJ, Sarstedt M, Ringle CM. When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*. 2019.
48. Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Podsakoff N. Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2012;63:539–569.
49. Hair JF, Sarstedt M, Hopkins L, Kuppelwieser VG. Partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM): an emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review*. 2014.
50. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 7th ed. Pearson; 2019.
51. Fornell C, Larcker DF. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 1981.
52. Li N, Xu H, Kwan HK. Feeling excluded yet staying engaged: Understanding the role of collectivism in workplace ostracism. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 2021.
53. Özkan AH. Abusive supervision climate and turnover intention: is it my coworkers or my supervisor ostracizing me? *Journal of Nursing Management*. 2021.
54. Cheng B. Differential impacts of coworker and supervisor ostracism on employee responses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2023.
55. Marsh E, Perez E, Spence AC. The digital workplace and its dark side: an integrative review. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2021;128:107118.
56. Pérez-Verdugo M, Barandiaran XE. Personal autonomy and (digital) technology: an inactive sensorimotor framework. *Philosophy & Technology*. 2023;36:1–28.
57. Razalli AR, Kamaruddin KF, Tek OE, Teck WK, Mohd Daud NA. Evaluating teaching workload of academic staff for optimum and effective use of expertise resources. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 2021.

58. Alessi EJ, Kahn S. A qualitative approach to understanding the lived experiences of marginalized individuals. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2022.