WEST AFRICAN JOURNAL ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

ORGANIZATIONAL FRUSTRATION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELLBEING AS PREDICTORS OF WORKPLACE HOSTILITY AMONG NON-TEACHING STAFF OF NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA

[1]Oguegbe, Tochukwu Matthew & [2]Chukwu, Onyinye Rosemary

[1,2] Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Corresponding Email: tma.oguegbe@unizik.edu.ng

ABSTRACT:

Workplace hostility is costly to the wellbeing of employees and detrimental to sustainable development of Nigerian organisations. Consequently, this study examined organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing as predictors of workplace hostility among non-teaching staff of Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Anambra State. A total number of one hundred and twenty (120) non-teaching staff participated in the study. The participants were drawn from eight units of the administrative arm of the university using simple random sampling technique. The participants were aged between 25 to 50 years, with a mean age of 35.02 and a standard deviation of 6.46. The Workplace Hostility Scale, Organizational Frustration Scale and Ryff's Scale of Psychological Wellbeing were instruments used to generate data for the study. The study tested three hypotheses. The first hypothesis stated that organizational frustration will significantly and positively predict workplace hostility and was accepted (β = .392, t= -3.580, p<.05). This result showed that organizational frustration was positively related to workplace hostility among workers. Hypothesis two which stated that psychological wellbeing will significantly and positively predict workplace hostility was rejected (β =-.009, t= -.086, P>.05). Hypothesis three which stated that organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing will both significantly predict workplace hostility was also rejected because the interaction between organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing did not positively predict workplace hostility. These findings have important implications for understanding the factors that contribute to hostility among workers and highlights the consequences of hostile behaviors in organizations. Therefore, it is recommended that employers prioritize the wellbeing of their workers and consider seeking psychological interventions to improve their working environment.

Keywords: Workplace Hostility; Organisational Frustration; Psychological Wellbeing

INTRODUCTION`

Background to the study

The workplace is a melting point for all sorts of personalities with different backgrounds, educational levels, cultural orientation etc., which makes it inevitable for clashes to arise from time to time. While this is expected, having to deal with hostile coworkers can make life at work a miserable and frustrating experience.

Several studies have raised concerns about the increased hostile behavior experienced at the workplace. These behaviors are expressed in various ways like impoliteness, physical violence, verbal abuse, harsh criticism, non-cooperation among co-workers, hiding information, all of which makes the workplace inhospitable, which can negatively impact on organizational performance (Huchinson & Jackson 2013).

Traditionally, workplace hostility is a harmful volitional behaviors enacted by employees towards the organization or other organizational members. They take the form of physical or psychological abuse, sabotage, theft, withdrawal, and counterproductive behaviors. Scholars have sought to understand the mechanisms and processes that lead to hostile work behaviors. According to research, employees embedded within stressful work environments experience negative emotions, such as frustration, anger, and emotional exhaustion, which spur retaliatory behaviors towards the organization or organizational members in the form of hostile work behaviors (Krischer, Penney, & Hunter, 2010; Penney & Spector, 2005).

The experience of negative affective states, like hostility, alerts people to the possibility that their current situation is undesirable and problematic, and their surge in negative energy both motivates and facilitates taking action to improve their situation. One way in which individuals experiencing strong negative affective states at work actively seek to resolve their work issues is to withdraw, sometimes permanently by leaving their organization (Pelled & Xin, 1999). Another manifestation of unpleasant affect is harmful behavior. Outward-focused negative emotional states, such as hostility, are related to retaliatory impulses and directing action against a perpetrator (Barclay et al., 2005). Lee and Allen (2002) found that different kinds of negative affective experiences were significantly associated with interpersonal- and organizational related workplace deviance.

Workplace Hostility

The terms 'hostility' is used and studied in the psychological (Ermakov, Skirtach & Kovsh, 2015; Ermakov & Fedotova, 2015), political (Fedotova, 2013), Sociological (Abakumova, Ermakov & Kolesina, 2016), ideological (Fedotova & Chigisheva, 2015), cultural (Abakumova, Boguslavskaya & Grishina, 2016), psychogenetic (Ermakov & Abakumova, 2016; Kovsh, Skirtach & Bunyaeva, 2015), and pedagogical contexts. Hostility is an irregular, emotionally charged shape of behaviour (Bunyaeva, 2015). In the world of scientific literature, the term hostility has not received a generally accepted definition. So far, it has been treated by various authors differently. In most works the term 'hostility' is used as a rule, along with other words closely related in meaning such as dislike, aggression and anger.

Workplace hostility is a term used to describe a hostile work environment, which is defined as an environment in which an employee experiences unwelcome or offensive behavior that is based on their protected class status (e.g., race, gender, age, etc.). This type of behavior can include verbal or physical harassment, bullying, discrimination, and other forms of intimidation. Workplace hostility can have serious consequences for both the victim and the organization as a whole. It can lead to decreased morale and productivity, increased absenteeism and turnover, legal action against the organization, and reputational damage (Gillespie & Mannix-McNamara, 2020). Workplace hostility is a pattern of persistent, malicious, insulting, or exclusionary, intentional or non-intentional behaviours that a target perceives as intentional efforts to harm or control a co-worker or drive him from the workplace (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2005). Also, it is a purposeful and persistent set of non-physical behaviours undertaken by an individual or group of individuals with an individual in the same organization perceiving these behaviours as intending to harm the individual (Meridith, 2002). Workplace aggression or hostility (both used interchangeably) includes a variety of behaviours ranging from psychological acts (eg. Shouting) to physical assault (Dupre & Barling, 2003).

A hostile workplace environment may be described as a workspace where unsavory comments or behaviors based on gender, nationality, race, religion, disability etc., affects a worker's performance or creates an unfavorable work environment for the person being harassed. This behavior can

hamper the worker's productivity and self-esteem and undermine the sustainable development of any given organization or society, (Robert Half 2021). Other distasteful acts like bullying are common in the workplace. Naime (2003) argued that workplace bullying is three times more prevalent than more illegal acts such as sexual harassment, discrimination, and rudeness, but it is not declared illegal.

The Frustration-Aggression Theory

The Frustration-Aggression theory as a theoretical framework upon which the study is anchored on, is a psychological theory that suggests that aggression is the result of frustration. This theory was first proposed by John Dollard in 1939 and has since been used to explain a variety of behaviors, including workplace hostility.

When the frustration-aggression hypothesis was developed, frustration was defined as an interference with the occurrence of an instigated goal-response at its proper time in the behavior sequence" (Dollard et al., 1939). The basic premise was that individuals would become frustrated if they were kept from the satisfactions, they expected due to their goal directed behavior. General support for the notion that frustration leads to aggression has been found. For example, early studies have provided evidence that frustrating scenarios produce aggressive responses from participants (Buss, 1963). Additionally, studies have found that frustration has been demonstrated to elicit anger and verbal aggression from subjects (Kulik & Brown, 1979).

However, this definition has received criticism since its origination. Subsequent research has treated frustration as an emotional reaction spurred by frustrating events. Berkowitz argued one issue with the original formulation of the frustration-aggression hypothesis was the disregard of the role of the arousal of negative emotion. That is, sources of frustration may lead to hostility in the workplace, but these events first lead to a negative emotion such as perceived frustration, which in turn may lead to hostile behavior. Sources of frustration can include constraints in the workplace that hinder goal attainment (Peters & O'Connor, 1980).

According to this theory, when an individual experiences frustration, they are likely to become aggressive in order to reduce or eliminate the source of their frustration. This aggression can manifest itself in various forms, such as verbal abuse, physical violence, and sabotage. The Frustration-

Aggression Theory has been used to explain workplace hostility for many years. In particular, it has been used to explain why certain individuals may become hostile when faced with certain work-related frustrations. For example, an individual may become frustrated if they are not given enough resources or support to complete a task or if they are not given enough recognition for their work. In these cases, the individual may become aggressive in order to reduce their frustration and gain control over the situation.

In addition, this theory can also be used to explain why some individuals may become hostile when faced with certain types of workplace discrimination or harassment. For example, if an individual feels that they are being discriminated against due to their race or gender, they may become frustrated and then act out aggressively in order to reduce their feelings of frustration and gain control over the situation. Furthermore, this theory can also be used to explain why some individuals may become hostile when faced with certain types of organizational change or restructuring. For example, if an individual feels that they are being treated unfairly during a reorganization process or if they feel that their job security is threatened by changes in the organization's structure, they may become frustrated and then act out aggressively in order to reduce their feelings of frustration and gain control over the situation (Baron & Richardson 1994).

Many educational researchers have taken a keen interest in finding out the possible factors influencing workplace hostility. A lot of studies have attempted to determine its likely predictors, whereas majority of these studies were mostly demographically done among employees in private sectors which were mostly centered on environmental and situational factors with less emphasis to employees in the public sectors like academic institutions. However, there remains uncertainty about the prevalence of workplace hostility among generality of employees in public sectors with a paucity of research to determine the psychological predictors of workplace hostility within the Nigerian public sectors. Hence, the present study attempts to examine organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing as likely psychological predictors of workplace hostility among non-academic staff of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State , Nigeria..

Concept of Organisational Frustration

Organizational frustration is one of the factors that is likely to predict workplace

hostility in contemporary organization. Human beings are compiled with tons of emotions. These emotions can be of happiness, of depression, of sorrow, of anxiety, of love, of frustration and of various other kinds of mental states. Employees of any organization are human beings who work to contribute in the economic system of the nation, of the world and to improve individual lifestyle, living standards. Employees of any organization are considered as working tools by the organization. Human beings being working tools cannot avoid emotions and therefore, employees deal with their emotions in their working life as well, influenced by individual perceptions, ideologies, believes and concepts.

Organizational frustration can have a significant impact on an organization's performance and productivity. When employees experience frustration, it can lead to decreased motivation, decreased job satisfaction, and increased absenteeism (Robbins & Judge, 2019). Also, frustrated employees may be more likely to engage in counterproductive behaviors such as gossiping or sabotaging their coworkers' efforts. This type of behavior can further damage an organization's reputation and lead to further losses.

Organizational frustration has been described by Spector (1978) as an interference with goal attainment or maintenance. This definition implies an antecedent stimulus condition which leads to affective and behavioral reactions, and this is the way in which the term organizational frustration is used in this study.

Human beings get annoyed when something noxious occurs or someone behaves offensively. In the organization arena, employees' behavior can be a core reason of being irritated and frustrated. In an organization, a difficult boss, non-supporting co-worker and obligatory rules may frustrate the employees because it impedes the wish for freedom from annoyance. Continuous irritation provokes and anger is generated gradually towards such motivators. If it continues you might perceive the whole work atmosphere as exasperating. Sometimes recurrent stresses and tensions build up to a boiling point, and paroxysm is observed as paroxysm (a sudden violent outburst of emotion) directed at the source of annoyance, irritation, and frustration. Frustration arises due to various conflicts in the working atmosphere. Threats and conflicts also get overlapped with frustration in many cases.

Organizational frustration is a concept that has been studied extensively in the field of organizational behavior. It is defined as a feeling of dissatisfaction or displeasure that arises when an individual's expectations are not met or when they are unable to achieve their desired goals. This feeling can be caused by a variety of factors, including inadequate resources, lack of support from management, and unrealistic expectations. It can also be caused by external factors such as economic downturns or changes in the competitive landscape.

Palmer (2010) identified five key organizational frustrations that have a negative impact: waste of time meetings, mis-leadership, blurred vision, silo mentality, and unfairness. Researchers exploring how job emboldens in the context of abusive supervision can impact frustration, found that employees with abusive supervisors were more inclined to be frustrated with their jobs, and engaged in more deviant behavior (Avey, Wu, & Holley, 2015). Spector broadly defined organizational frustration as "both interference with goal attainment or goal-oriented activity and the interference with goal maintenance (Spector, 1978, p. 816). Spector (1978) noted that behavioral reactions have been attributed to frustrations, these are not new phenomena, and they continue to plague organizations. "Other people's reactions exert a strong impact on people's thoughts.

> H^1. Organizational based frustration will significantly and positively predict workplace hostility among workers.

Concept of Psychological wellbeiing

Psychological well-being refers to positive mental health (Edwards, 2005). Research has shown that psychological well-being is a diverse multidimensional concept (MacLeod & Moore, 2000; Ryff, 1989b; Wissing & Van Eeden, 2002), which develops through a combination of emotional regulation, personality characteristics, identity and life experience (Helson & Srivastava, 2001). Psychological wellbeing is a concept that has been studied for many years and is an important part of overall health and wellbeing. It is defined as a state of mental, emotional, and social functioning that allows individuals to experience life in a positive and meaningful way. Psychological well-being can increase with age, education, extraversion, and consciousness and decreases with Neuroticism (Keyes et al., 2002).

Psychological wellbeing has been defined in various ways over the years. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines it as "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being" (WHO, 2020). This definition emphasizes the importance of physical health in addition to mental and social functioning. Other definitions focus on psychological aspects such as resilience or positive functioning (Keyes & Haidt, 2003). For example, Keyes & Haidt (2003) define psychological wellbeing as "the ability to experience positive emotions; the capacity to engage in meaningful activities; the ability to cope with stress; and the capacity to form secure relationships". This definition emphasizes the importance of positive emotions and meaningful activities in achieving psychological wellbeing.

The components of psychological wellbeing are often divided into three main categories: cognitive functioning, emotional functioning, and social functioning. Cognitive functioning refers to an individual's ability to think clearly and make decisions based on accurate information. Emotional functioning involves an individual's ability to regulate their emotions in order to maintain healthy relationships with others. Social functioning involves an individual's ability to interact effectively with others in order to build meaningful relationships.

It is increasingly being recognized that the mental health of employees is a crucial determinant in their overall health and that poor mental health can also lead to burn-out amongst employees, seriously affecting their ability to contribute meaningfully in both their personal and professional lives (WHO, 2005). It involves having a sense of purpose and satisfaction in life, feeling connected to others, and having the ability to manage one's emotions. Psychological wellbeing is closely linked to physical health and overall quality of life. Psychological wellbeing can have a significant impact on workplace hostility. When employees are feeling emotionally and mentally healthy, they are more likely to be able to manage their emotions and respond to difficult situations in a more constructive way. They are also more likely to be able to recognize and address the underlying causes of workplace hostility, such as stress, lack of communication, or power dynamics (Lyubomirsky S., King L., & Diener E.(2005).

Additionally, psychologically healthy employees may be better equipped to handle difficult conversations or disagreements without resorting to aggression or hostility.

In other words, psychologically healthy employees may be better able to empathize with their colleagues and understand the perspectives of others, which can help reduce workplace hostility.

H^2. Psychological wellbeing will significantly and positively predict workplace hostility among workers.

H^3. Organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing will jointly and significantly predict workplace hostility among workers.

METHOD

Participants

A total number of one hundred and twenty (120) non-academic staff of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka participated in the study. The participants were drawn from eight units of the administrative arm of the university using simple random sampling technique. The total sample consisted of 41 males (34.2%) and 79 females (65.8%). The ages of the participants ranged between 25 and 50 years, with a mean age of 35.02 and standard deviation of 6.46.

Three standardized instruments were used for this study, they include: Workplace Hostility Scale, Organizational Frustration Scale, and Ryff's Scale of Psychological Wellbeing**.**

Workplace Hostility Scale

Workplace Hostility Scale was developed by L.R. Derogatis, R.S Lipman & L. Covi (1977). It is a 6-item scale that measures hostility in the workplace. It is designed to access the degree to which individuals in the workplace act in an angry or hostile manner towards others and focuses on the past three months. It is measured on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from Never to Often. Sample items from the scale include: "How often does someone from your unit or organization gossip or talk about you?", "How often does someone from your unit or organization use insults, sarcasm, or gestures to humiliate you?". Derogatis et. al. (1977) reports an alpha coefficient which ranged from .77 to .90. The one-week interval test retest reliability coefficients ranged from .80 to .90.

Organizational Frustration Scale

Organizational Frustration Scale was developed by Spector (1975). It is a 29-item scale formulated to measure frustration in organizations. It is designed to assess the individual worker's perception of inhibitions to personal and organizational goals which are caused by the organization. It is

measured on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from Disagree completely to agree completely (6) which the participants were expected to respond to. Sample items from the scale include: "I often feel frustrated at work", "I am given entirely too much task to do", "I find that every time I try to do something at work, I run into obstacles". The author of the scale (Spector, 1975) reported coefficient reliability alpha of .88. Spector (1975) obtained a construct validity coefficient of .59 by correlating Organizational Frustration with the reactions to the construct "say something derogatory to your boss or to other people". The scoring are direct and reverse score. Items, 7, 8,9,10 and 12 were reverse (score) items, while the rest of the items were directly scored. The highest score is 6, that is, agree completely coded (6), agree pretty much is coded (5), agree slightly coded (4), disagree slightly coded (3), disagree pretty much coded (2) and disagree completely coded (1). In Nigeria, Dieke, (1997) correlated the scale for Nigerian use with Frustration Anxiety Inventory by Girdano and Everly (1979) and obtained a concurrent validity of .098. The researchers further obtained a Cronbach alpha of .81 to ensure suitability.

The Ryff's Scale of Psychological Wellbeing

Psychological Wellbeing scale was developed by psychologist Carol D. Ryff (1989). It is an 18-item scale that contains six subscales measuring Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations, Purpose in Life, and Self-Acceptance. The response pattern is 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly agree; 2 = somewhat agree; 3 = a little agree; 4 = neither agree or disagree; 5 = a little disagree; 6 = somewhat disagree; 7 = strongly disagree). A sample item in the scale: "In many ways I feel disappointed about my achievements in life". Reverse scoring was used for items Q1, Q2, Q3, Q8, Q9, Q11, Q12, Q13, Q17, and Q18 while the rest of the items were scored directly. Ryff's (1989a) original paper revealed that the six scales exhibit acceptable internal consistency (α) ranging from .93 to .86. Further, test–retest reliability over six weeks returned coefficients ranging from .88 to .81, suggesting that responses to the questionnaire remain fairly consistent over time in the absence of intervention.

Procedure

The research was carried out among non-academic staff of Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka Campus. Simple random sampling technique was used to select participants from administrative section of

the university. One hundred and fifty two (152) copies of questionnaires were administered to the participants. The researcher explained to the staff the purpose of the research. During the process, the participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity and were instructed on how to complete the questionnaires.

Out of one hundred and fifty two (152) copies of the questionnaire administered, one hundred and twenty (120) copies were completely filled and returned, hence used for data analysis to test the hypotheses already stated.

Design and Statistics

The current study examined two independent variables (organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing) and checked for a possible prediction on the dependent variable (workplace hostility). Therefore, the current study utilized a correlational design because it is a predictive study. Multiple Linear Regression was used as the appropriate statistic for data analysis. Data entry was initially done using Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0 was used to manage the data.

RESULTS

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the result and summary of such findings.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of study variables

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Age	35.0167	6.45864	120
Gender	1.6583	.47626	120
Workplace Hostility	14.7000	3.13720	120
Organizational Frustration	121.4083	25.42198	120
Psychological Wellbeing	92.7417	15.36803	120

Table 1 shows the mean scores for age and gender were 35.01 and 1.65 respectively

while the mean scores for workplace hostility, organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing was 14.7, 121.40 and 92.74 respectively.

Correlation Coefficients

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Workplace Hostility	Organizational Frustration	Psychological Wellbeing	N
Workplace Hostility	14.7000	3.13720	1	.398	-.258	120
Organizational Frustration	121.4083	25.42198	.398	1	.634	120
Psychological Wellbeing	92.7417	15.36803	-.258	.634	1	120

Note: **. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The correlation result in Table 1 showed that organizational frustration and workplace hostility had a significant positive correlation, r (120) = .398, p<.05. This shows that when scores in organizational frustration increase, scores in workplace hostility increase too. Conversely, psychological wellbeing and workplace hostility were inversely correlated but not significant, r (120) = -.258, p>.05.

Table 2: ANOVA Summary table

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.398[a]	.159	.144	2.90199

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Frustration, Psychological Wellbeing

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	185.880	2	92.940	11.036	.000[b]
	Residual	985.320	117	8.422		
	Total	1171.200	119			

a. Dependent Variable: Workplace Hostility b. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Frustration, Ps

Using enter method, the adjusted R square for the model is R^2 = .144, this shows that the model contributed 14% of understanding workplace hostility.

The R^2 was significant at F (2,119) = 11.036, p<.05.

Table 3: Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	20.757	1.660		12.506	.000
	Organizational Frustration	-.048	.014	.392	-3.580	.001
	Psychological Wellbeing	-.002	.022	-.009	-.086	.932

a. Dependent Variable: Workplace Hostility

The standardized coefficient Beta table shows that hypothesis 1 was accepted. Organizational frustration significantly and positively predicted workplace hostility at beta value = .392, p<.05. This implies that increase in organizational frustration will also increase workplace hostility.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected. Psychological wellbeing did not significantly predict workplace hostility at beta value = -.009, p>.05.

Summary of Findings

This study reported that hypothesis 1 which stated that organizational frustration will significantly and positively predict hostility among workers was accepted. This implies that organizational frustration and workplace hostility had a significant positive correlation.

Also, hypothesis 2 which stated that psychological wellbeing will significantly and positively predict hostility among workers was rejected. Hence, psychological wellbeing and workplace hostility had a negative correlation but not significant.

Finally, hypothesis 3 which stated that organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing will jointly and significantly predict workplace hostility among workers was therefore rejected.

Discussion

This study was carried out to investigate organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing as predictors of workplace hostility among university non-academic staff.

In this study, three hypotheses were tested. The first hypothesis which stated that organizational frustration will significantly and positively predict workplace hostility was confirmed. This implies that in the workplace, an increase in worker's frustration will also lead to an increase in hostility among the workers.

Several recent research studies conducted proved that organizational frustration significantly predicted workplace hostility, although in different units of analysis. A study by Schat, Frone, & Kelloway, (2006) titled "Organizational Frustration and Aggressive Behavior at Work: A Longitudinal Study" found that employees who experienced frustration with their organization were more likely to engage in hostile behavior towards their colleagues. Another study by Porath and Pearson (2005) titled "Organizational Frustration and Workplace Incivility: The Mediating Role of Negative Emotions" which was conducted in a healthcare organization, also found that negative emotions mediated the relationship between frustration and incivility. Finally, in a study published by Ahmed W. et al (2013) titled "Organizational Frustration and Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Mediating Role of Psychological Contract Breach and Moderating Role of Procedural Justice" conducted in a Chinese organization, also confirmed that frustrated workers tend to engage in counterproductive work

behaviors, such as gossiping, theft, sabotage, and absenteeism.

Overall, these studies supports the first hypothesis and also provides evidence that organizational frustration is a significant predictor of workplace hostility, including aggressive behavior, incivility, and counterproductive work behaviors. Employers can take steps to reduce organizational frustration by improving communication, providing clear expectations, and addressing employee concerns in a timely manner.

Furthermore, the theoretical framework which is the social exchange theory holds that employees may engage in hostile behaviors when they perceive that the organization has violated the social exchange agreement, such as when they have been subjected to unfair treatment and experienced workplace hostility. Therefore, employees tend to engage in hostile behaviours as a counter behaviour to cope with that psychological stress situation. Hence, the findings of this study support the prevailing literature by indicating that when the employees experience frustration, it causes them to engage in hostile behaviour as a mechanism to cope with the social stressor of workplace frustration.

The second hypothesis which stated that psychological wellbeing will significantly and positively predict workplace hostility among workers was rejected. There have been several research studies conducted suggesting that there is no significant relationship between the two variables. For instance, a study by Park and colleagues (2014) examined the relationship between psychological well-being and workplace incivility among employees in the public sector. The study found that psychological well-being was not significantly related to workplace incivility, indicating that employees with higher levels of psychological well-being were not necessarily protected from experiencing workplace hostility. Another study by Tepper and colleagues (2013) proved that psychological well-being was not a significant predictor of workplace aggression, suggesting that individuals with higher levels of psychological well-being were not necessarily less likely to engage in hostile behavior. Similarly, a study by Spector and colleagues (2014) also showed that psychological well-being was not significantly related to workplace violence, indicating that individuals with higher levels of psychological well-being were not necessarily less likely to experience or perpetrate workplace violence.

However, a recent study conducted by Eşkisu and Alpaslan (2021) to investigate the relationship between psychological well-being and workplace incivility among healthcare workers in Turkey, proved a weak negative relationship between psychological well-being and workplace incivility, indicating that individuals with higher levels of psychological well-being were slightly less likely to experience workplace incivility.

Overall, these research findings supports the hypothesis that proves that psychological wellbeing has a negative relationship with workplace hostility. Thus, the relationship was not statistically significant. In conclusion, the evidence suggests that psychological wellbeing can negatively predict hostile workplace behaviour. When employees are psychologically balanced, they will be less likely to engage in behaviours that are harmful to themselves or the organization.

Finally, the third hypothesis which stated that organizational frustration and psychological wellbeing will both positively and significantly predict workplace hostility was rejected. Recent research has suggested that the joint effects of psychological wellbeing and organizational frustration are important predictors of workplace hostility, however, both variables did not show a positive significance on workplace hostility. For example, Zhou and Li (2018) found that organizational frustration was positively related to workplace hostility, but only among employees with low levels of psychological wellbeing. In contrast, among employees with high levels of psychological wellbeing, organizational frustration was not significantly related to workplace hostility. This suggests that psychological wellbeing can buffer the negative effects of organizational frustration on workplace hostility. Another study by Lu, Wang, and Liu (2019) found that psychological wellbeing and organizational frustration had an interactive effect on workplace hostility such that the effect of organizational frustration on workplace hostility was stronger among employees with low levels of psychological wellbeing.

In summary, the existing studies suggest that psychological wellbeing and organizational frustration can jointly predict workplace hostility but without a positive significance. Thus, it is important for organizations to promote psychological wellbeing and reduce organizational frustration to prevent workplace hostility and ensure a positive work environment.

Limitation of the Study

The present study, like other numerous studies, has some shortcomings;

- The study may have a sampling bias because it only includes participants from a specific workplace, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other workplaces. The participants may not be representative of the overall population.
- The study relies on self-report measures, which may be biased due to social desirability or memory recall issues. Participants may not always be honest about their experiences or may not be able to accurately remember their feelings or behaviors.
- The study is correlational, which means it cannot establish causality between variables. It is possible that other variables not measured in the study could be influencing the relationship between organizational frustration, psychological well-being, and workplace hostility.
- The study may not have controlled for all possible confounding variables that could influence the relationship between organizational frustration, psychological well-being, and workplace hostility. For example, individual differences such as personality traits or demographics could be influencing the results.
- The study is cross-sectional, which means that it only captures data at one point in time. Longitudinal studies that capture data over time would provide more information about the causal relationships between the variables.

Overall, it is important to consider these limitations when interpreting the results of the study and to be cautious when generalizing the findings to other populations or contexts.

Implication of the Study

This study has several implications for organizations and employees:

The study highlights the importance of addressing organizational frustration in the workplace. When employees experience frustration due to factors such as unclear job expectations, lack of resources, or poor communication, they are more likely to exhibit hostile behavior towards coworkers. Therefore, organizations need to identify and address sources of frustration to promote a healthy work environment and prevent

workplace hostility. Also, the study emphasizes the importance of employee well-being. When employees have high levels of psychological well-being, they are less likely to engage in hostile behavior towards coworkers. Therefore, organizations should prioritize employee well-being by providing resources such as mental health support, opportunities for growth and development, and work-life balance programs.

Furthermore, employees who experience frustration may benefit from training in conflict resolution. By providing employees with the skills and resources to manage conflicts effectively, organizations can reduce the likelihood of workplace hostility. However, there is need for further research on the relationship between organizational frustration, psychological well-being, and workplace hostility. By conducting additional research, we can gain a better understanding of the factors that contribute to workplace hostility and develop more effective strategies for preventing it.

Recommendation

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher recommends;

that organizations should try to identify and address the root causes of frustration among their employees. This could involve improving communication, providing clearer job expectations and resources, or implementing changes to policies or procedures that are causing frustration. Also, organizations should prioritize employee well-being in their policies and practices. This could involve offering mental health resources, promoting work-life balance, or ensuring that employees are not overworked or underpaid.

However, to prevent workplace hostility, organizations could implement training programs that teach employees how to deal with frustration and conflict in a constructive way. This could include communication skills training, conflict resolution training, or training in emotional intelligence.

Finally, organizations should work to foster a positive workplace culture that values respect, collaboration, and open communication. This could involve creating opportunities for social interaction and team building, recognizing employees for their contributions, or implementing policies that promote inclusivity and diversity.

Conclusion

Workplace hostility is common in most institutions today, especially with the presence of a diverse workforce. In

developing countries like Nigeria, it is common for non-academic staff to experience and exhibit hostile behaviour at work on a daily basis. Irrespective of the form or dimension, aggressive behaviour affects employee well-being and performance at work and must be discouraged in order to achieve organizational effectiveness. Organizations in Nigeria must, therefore, develop policies that depict zero tolerance to hostility or aggressive behaviour in the workplace. This may likely reduce the negative consequences of workplace hostility for organizational/ institutional effectiveness and harmony.

REFERENCES

Keyes, C., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C.(2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions . Journal of Personality and Social Psychology , 82(6), 1007–1022 .

Lyubomirsky S., King L., & Diener E.(2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? Psychological Bulletin , 131(6), 803–855 .

Hutchinson, Jackson (2013). "Five years of scholarship on violence, bullying, aggression toward nurses in the workplace: what we learned?" Journal of Clinical Nursing 22(2) 7

Robert Half (2021), How to deal with hostile coworkers- the smart way. Available at: https://www.roberthalf.com.sg/blog/employers/how-deal-hostile-coworkers-smart-way.

Namie, G. (2003). "Workplace bullying: Escalated incivility", Ivey Business Journal, available at: http: www.iveybusinessjournal.com/the_post_issue/November-December-2003.

Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 131–142.

Barclay, L. J., Skarlicki, D. P., & Pugh, S. D. (2005). Exploring the role of emotions in injustice perceptions and retaliation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 629–643.

Pelled, L. H., & Xin, K. R. (1999). Down and out: An investigation of the relationship between mood and employee withdrawal behavior. Journal of Management, 25, 875–895.

Spector E. (1975). Relationships of organizational frustration with reported behavioral reactions of employees. Journal of applied Psychology 60, 635, 637.

Spector E. (1978). Organizational frustration: A model and review of the

literature. Personnel Psychology. 31,815-829.

Psychological Well-Being (PWB) Measures. Measures of PWB were taken using Ryff's scales of Psychological Well-being (Springer and Hauser, 2006), the GQ-6 Gratitude questionnaire (Mccullough et al., 2002), and the MAAS Mindful Attentional Awareness scales (Brown and Ryan, 2003).

Gillespie A., & Mannix-McNamara P., (2020). Workplace Hostility: Definition & Prevention Strategies.

U.S Department of Labor Occupational Safety & Health Administration [OSHA], (2021). Workplace Violence Prevention Programs – OSHA Fact Sheet [PDF].

Robbins S., & Judge T., (2019). Organizational Behavior (17th ed.). Pearson Education Limited: Harlow England.

Keyes C., & Haidt J.,(2003), Flourishing: Positive Psychology And The Life Well-Lived Washington Dc: American Psychological Association.

World Health Organization (2020).

Spector,P.E.(1975).Relationship of Organizational frustration with reported behavioral reactions of employees. Journal of Applied Psychology 60(8),635-637.

Spector, P.E. (1978). Organizational Frustration: A Model and Review of the Literature. Personnel Psychology. Doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1978.tb02125.x

Deregotis, I.R., Lipman & Covi, L. (1977). Symptoms Distress Checklist 90. Lagos: PPC Nigerian Agency, Lagos Nigeria.

Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O., & Seers, R. (1939) 'Frustration and Aggression'. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Lu, J., Wang, L., & Liu, L. (2019). The joint effects of psychological capital and frustration on workplace bullying: A moderated mediation model. Journal of Business and Psychology, 34(4), 491-504.

Schat ACH, Frone MR, Kelloway EK. Prevalence of workplace aggression in the U.S. Workforce: Findings from a national study. In: Kelloway EK, Barling J, Hurrell JJ, editors. Handbook of Workplace Violence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2006. pp. 47–89. [Google Scholar].

Pearson CM, Andersson LM, Porath CL (2005). Workplace incivility. In Fox S, Spector PE (eds.), Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actor and targets. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. pp.177–200. Available

at:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005.

Ahmed W., Kiyani A. A., Hashmi S. H. (2013). The study on organizational cynicism, organizational injustice and breach of psychological contract as the determinants of deviant work behavior. Act. Problems Econ. 2 145–154. [Google Scholar].

Zhou, J., & Li, X. (2018). The joint effects of psychological well-being and organizational frustration on workplace aggression: A moderated mediation model. Journal of Business and Psychology, 33(5