



## ORGANISATIONAL BASED FRUSTRATION IN MANUFACTURING COMPANIES: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY OF INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOUR AND WORK FAMILY CONFLICT

<sup>1</sup>Oguebe, Tochukwu Matthew, <sup>2</sup>Ezeh, Leonard Nnaemeka and <sup>3</sup>Iloke Stephen Ebuka.

. <sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Anambra State Nigeria (Corresponding author)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Anambra State Nigeria

<sup>3</sup>Department of Psychology Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Anambra State Nigeria

**Abstract:** The study examined the relationship between innovative behavior, work-family conflict and organizational frustration in a sample of workers drawn in Enugu State Nigeria. The participants comprised of Two hundred and twelve 212 workers which consisted of one hundred and thirty nine (139) males and seventy three (73) females. The Innovative behavior scale, Work-family conflict scale and Organizational frustration scale were used for the study. The study adopted a correlational design and consequently, pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used as the study statistics. The study tested two alternate hypotheses. Findings indicated that workers who exhibited innovative behaviors within the work setting, had a reduced form of frustration in the organization  $r(1, 212) = -.437^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$ . Secondly, Work-family conflict significantly correlated organizational frustration at  $r(1, 212) = -.435^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$ . The study recommends among others, that management should avail workers opportunity to allow their innovative ideas bear in the work process as this gives workers the confidence to avoid the feeling of frustration.

**Keywords:** Organisational Frustration, Innovative Work Behaviour , Work-family Conflict

### 1.0 Introduction

As the hallmark of organisational productivity, the essence of workforce in contemporary organizations cannot be over emphasized. In Nigeria, workplace complexities, current economic situation and the challenges of maintaining competitive global advantage have predisposed workers to various dimensional feelings that could be anti productive. There are reported cases of workers perceived threat to their wellbeing through supervisory behaviours and workplace complexities which inadvertently leaves them with the feeling of frustration towards achieving organizational goals. Andalip, Darun and Azizan (2013) reiterated that human

beings especially in the workplace, experience diverse emotions ranging from happiness, depression, sorrow, frustration to mention but a few. As such, the emotional state of these workers determines their disposition with the organization and assigned responsibilities. Ntsiful, Ahiakpor and Damoah (2018) in confirming the above, submitted that human beings are goal-oriented with the likelihood of feeling frustrated when these goals are impeded by events beyond their control. Overtime, research has shown that organizational frustration is positively correlated with several negative behavioral reactions-aggression, sabotage, hostility, complaining, withdrawal and intent to quit (Storms and Spector 1978).



The current study examined innovative behavior and work-family conflict as correlates of organizational based frustration.

Frustration occurs when there is an inhibiting condition that obstructs the realization of a goal (Lazar, Jones, & Shneiderman, 2006). Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears (1939) cited in Lazar, Jones and Shneiderman (2006) define frustration as an interference with the occurrence of an instigated goal response at its proper time in the behavior sequence. Frustration is due to the expectation and anticipation of a goal not the actual attainment of the goal (Berkowitz, 1978). If the goal is unfulfilled, frustration is experienced because satisfaction was not achieved and hopes were suddenly thwarted.

The basic idea of organizational frustration is twofold: one is that there are organizational or situational factors associated with constraint that contributes to individual frustration with the organization and, two, that individual reaction to frustration can take the form of withdrawal behavior, altered task performance and abandonment of goal (Heacox and Sorenson, 2004). Besides task performance, studies on frustration have been concerned with aggression (Spector, 1978; Storms and Spector, 1987). In an organizational setting, an employee may not show outward aggression in response to frustration, but rather might display it privately in acts of sabotage (Spector, 1975).

In the light of the above, it could be understood that frustrated events may be due to situational constraints in the immediate work situation that block individuals from achieving valued work goals or attaining effective performance (Peters and O'Connor, 1980) and as well be a function of events outside the workplace which the individual faces.

## 2.0 Theoretical Framework

The study adopted the Organisational Support Theory by Rhodes, Eisenberger and Armelli (2002). According to this theory, the development of organizational support is encouraged by employees' tendency to assign the

organization humanlike characteristics (Eisenberger, 2002). Sowa (2002) suggested that employees tend to attribute the actions of organizational representatives to the intent of organization rather than solely to the personal motives of its representatives. According to Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002), there are three common antecedents of perceived organizational support. These are fairness, supervisor support and organizational rewards and job condition. When employees perceive that they are receiving fair treatment in comparison with their coworkers, they perceive more support. Fairness can be perceived even if the reward differs in size based on employee rank.

Research in Organizational Psychology has shown that the level of professional frustration is associated with an unethical attitude at the workplace (Krejei, Kvapil & Semrad, 1996; Afolabi & Adesina, 2006), with counter-productive organizational behaviors and organizational constraints (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001; Fox & Spector, 1999; Spector 1997).

Although a lot of research has been done on organizational frustration in different contexts such as organizational support and tenure on organizational frustration, organizational support and self efficacy, (Katz & Kahn, 1978 and Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), organizational frustration stemming from lack of proper adoption of Innovative behaviors in organizations and conflicts arising from work-family roles has not been paid much attention to or largely neglected based on the researchers knowledge. Hence the present study examined organizational frustration by checking its relationship with Innovative behaviours of workers and their work-life balance.

### 2.1 Innovative Behaviour and Organisational Frustration

Innovation theory has repeatedly stressed that innovation is broader than only creativity and also includes the implementation of ideas (King & Anderson, 2002). Thus, innovative work behaviour does not only include idea generation, but also behaviors needed to implement ideas



and achieve improvements that will enhance personal and/or business performance. Following Farr and Ford (1990), innovative work behavior is seen as an individual's behavior that aims to achieve the initiation and intentional introduction (within a work role, group or organization) of new and useful ideas, processes, products or procedures. The measure of Innovative work behavior (IWB) developed here thus captures both the initiation and implementation of creative ideas. The construct of IWB is closely related to employee creativity.

More recent measures of IWB distinguish between various dimensions, which are often linked to different stages of the innovation process. For example, Scott and Bruce (1994) operationalised IWB as a multistage process. Drawing on Kanter (1988), they outline three stages relevant to IWB, namely idea generation, coalition building and implementation. Individual innovation begins with problem recognition and the generation of ideas or solutions, either novel or adopted. Next, an innovative individual seeks sponsorship for an idea and through coalition building tries to gain support for it.

Finally, the innovative individual contributes to idea implementation, for example, by producing a prototype or model of the innovation or working on the execution of the idea in other ways. Of the three forms of innovative behavior Scott and Bruce distinguish, idea generation is rather broad as it includes both generating ideas and the recognition of problems (Scott & Bruce, 1994). When these innovative ideas are built up in a worker eager to be implemented, the researchers contend that feelings of frustration is likely to set in when an interference is perceived. Hence the first hypothesis of the study.

H1 . Innovative behaviours of workers will significantly correlate with their organizational based frustration

## 2.2 Work-Family Conflict and Organizational Frustration

Work-family domains are two important spheres of an individual's life, whereby fulfillment and actualization of the two spheres require a lot of time and energy (Rathi & Barath 2013).

Work-family conflict is a form of inter role conflict in which role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible and inseparable in some respects. (Husu, 2011), implying that workers participating in the family roles find it difficult working because there is need to balance the two. Finding from Rathi (2013) shows that conflict in an organization arise when the two (work-family and family-work) interfere with each other. Barath and Rathi (2013) opined that work-family conflict is linked to reduced job satisfaction, low workers productivity and decreased workers commitment in the organizations. If work and family roles are not balanced, it can increase both interpersonal conflicts in the organization resulting in work-family conflict, this decreases workers' commitment (Erdwins, Buffardi, Casper, & O'Brien, 2001).

Work-family conflicts are on the rise in today's world and are not restricted to one organization. As a matter of fact, there are contradictory role expectations that a typical working mother or career woman experienced, while she is at work and at home. On the professional front, she is expected to be committed, dynamic, competitive, straight-forward and non-sentimental, act in a "business like" manner, and at home, she is expected to be sweet, soft, sensitive, adaptable, gentle and unassertive, and domesticated (Misra, 1998). Therefore, women that assume multiple roles result in work-family conflict because time and energy are shared across the two spheres of activity. Coping up with the situation requires not only additional physical strength, personal ability and intelligence on the part of working women but also requires the members of her 'role set' (i.e. husband and the employer) to simultaneously make necessary modifications in their expectations (Allen, 2000).

Although the association between family work conflict and other organizational outcomes such as employee commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior has been widely studied, nevertheless, this study departs from the previous studies



by considering the relationship between work-family conflict and Organizational frustration. Long working hours, pressures from both family and work setting, high rate of absenteeism, sickness and truancy at work place, leads to organizational frustration (Spurgeon, 2013). Hence the hypothesis below.

H2. Work-family conflict will significantly correlate organizational based frustration among workers.

### 3 Method

#### 3.1 Sampling Procedure and participants

The study made use of two hundred and twelve (212) participants drawn from workers of Innoson Technical & Industrial Company Limited, Emene-Enugu, Enugu State Nigeria, using a simple random technique. Sample consisted of one hundred and thirty nine(139) males and seventy three (73) females.

#### 3.2 Measures

##### Organizational Frustration Scale

Organisational Frustration Scale was developed by Spector (1975). It is a 29-item scale formulated to measure frustration in organizations. It is measured on a 6-point Linkert scale ranging from Disagree completely (1) to agree completely (6) which the participants were expected to respond to. A sample item in the scale: "I often feel frustrated at work". The author of the scale (Spector, 1975) reported coefficient reliability 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". 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.

##### Innovative Behavior Scale

Innovative Behaviour Scale was developed by Jackson, Scott and Bruce, (1994). A 29-item scale formulated to measure workers' idea generation, idea search, idea

communication, implementing ideas, overcoming obstacles and innovation outputs. It is measured on a 5-point Linkert type scale ranging from fully disagree (1) to fully agree (5) which the participants were expected to respond to. Samples contained in the scale include: "I am interested in how things are done elsewhere in order to use the acquired ideas in my own work", "I try new ways of doing things while at work", "I develop suitable plans and schedule for the implementation of new ideas". The authors of the scale (Jackson, Scott and Bruce, 1994) reported a Cronbach alpha of  $r=0.88$  while the researchers obtained cronbach alpha coefficient of .84 and divergent validity coefficient of .59.

**Work-Family Conflict Scale** was developed by Carlson, Kacmar and Wilson (2000). It is an 18-item scale formulated to measure employees' perception of the extent of work interference with family roles. It is measured on a 5-point Linkert Scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5) which the participants are expected to respond to. A sample item in the scale include: "I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities/activities". The authors of the scale (Carlson, Kacmar and Wilson, 2000) reported a Cronbach alpha of  $r=0.82$ . Kelly and Bolly (2000) reported a test re-test of .82 over two weeks while averaged 0.81 split half reliability was obtained by Walker & Jacker, (2001). Additionally, Correlational Design and Pearson Product Moment Coefficient were adopted as the study design and statistics respectively.

#### 3.3 Data analysis

For the purpose of the present, work family conflict, innovative behaviour and organizational frustration were conceptualized and used for the analysis. Using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences(SPSS), Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to establish the relationship between the study variables.

#### 4.0 Results

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics



| Variable                | Mean    | Std. Deviation | N   |
|-------------------------|---------|----------------|-----|
| Work-to-family conflict | 47.1887 | 10.65941       | 212 |
| Org frustration         | 97.3396 | 17.81574       | 212 |
| Innovation behavior     | 83.3396 | 18.09396       | 212 |

**Table 2: Table of Correlations (Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient)**

|                                    |                                       | Work-to-family<br>conflict | Org frustration | Innovation<br>behavior |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| <b>Work-to-family<br/>conflict</b> | Pearson Correlation                   | 1                          | .435**          | -.513**                |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)                       |                            | .000            | .000                   |
|                                    | Sum of Squares and Cross-<br>products | 23974.453                  | 17423.415       | -20858.585             |
|                                    | Covariance                            | 113.623                    | 82.575          | -98.856                |
|                                    | N                                     | 212                        | 212             | 212                    |
| <b>Org frustration</b>             | Pearson Correlation                   | .435**                     | 1               | -.437**                |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)                       | .000                       |                 | .000                   |
|                                    | Sum of Squares and Cross-<br>products | 17423.415                  | 66971.547       | -29712.453             |
|                                    | Covariance                            | 82.575                     | 317.401         | -140.817               |
|                                    | N                                     | 212                        | 212             | 212                    |
| <b>Innovation behavior</b>         | Pearson Correlation                   | -.513**                    | -.437**         | 1                      |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)                       | .000                       | .000            |                        |
|                                    | Sum of Squares and Cross-<br>products | -20858.585                 | -29712.453      | 69079.547              |
|                                    | Covariance                            | -98.856                    | -140.817        | 327.391                |
|                                    | N                                     | 212                        | 212             | 212                    |

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

### Summary of Findings

The result in the Table 2 showed that the dependent variable (organizational frustration) had significant correlation with the independent variables (Innovative behavior and Work-to-family conflict). Whereas innovative behavior had significant and negative correlation with organizational frustration at  $r(1, 212) = -.437^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$  (2-tailed), work-to-family conflict had significant and positive correlation with organizational frustration at  $r(1, 212) = .435^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$  (2-tailed).

Negative but significant correlation found in between organizational frustration and innovative behavior is indicative of inverse relationship which implies that less organizational frustration was felt by the participants when innovative behavior increased. In this case, hypothesis 1 was accepted. However, with work-to-family conflict, the result is indicative that the participants expressed more organization frustration with increasing work-family-conflict in their jobs. Hypothesis II was accepted.



## **5.0 Discussion**

The first hypothesis which stated that innovative behaviors will correlate significantly with organizational frustration among staff of Innoson Technical & Industrial Company Limited, Emene-Enugu, Enugu State was affirmed. This means that workers, who exhibited or were allowed expression of innovative behaviors within the work setting, had a reduced form of frustration in the organization. This finding is in line with the study conducted by Raiz, S., Xu, Y & Hussain S. (2018) in their research on understanding employee innovative behavior and thriving at work. The study demonstrated that employees' external contacts strengthened the relationship between organizational support of innovation and innovative behaviors and thus enhanced positive effects of thriving. On the contrary, Masrek, M., Noordin, S., Yusof, I & Shudan, S. (2017), found out that there was no relationship between skill variety, information and innovative work behavior. The differences in the findings could be attributive to variances in work conditions, number of years in service, company's policies and locality.

The second hypothesis which stated that work-family conflict will correlate significantly with organizational frustration among workers of Innoson Technical & Industrial Company Limited, Emene-Enugu, Enugu State was as well accepted. This means that work-family conflict correlates organizational frustration. The result is indicative that the participants expressed more organizational frustration with increasing work-family conflict in their jobs. The finding is in line with the result of (Ajala, 2017) who reported that there was a positive relationship between work-family conflicts, family work conflict and job performance of working among working mothers. Contrarily, Wei R., Hung M. & Chi K. (2015) conducted a research on the Relationship between Work-Family Conflicts and The Job Satisfaction of The Tour Leaders. The study aimed to explore the relationships between work-family conflict and the job satisfaction of

tour leaders. A self-administered questionnaire was designed to collect empirical data from tour leaders, and 233 valid questionnaires were collected. The study results indicated that when tour leaders' work interferes with their family life, it has no impact on their job satisfaction. On the contrary, when the tour leaders' family life interferes with their work, it has a negative impact on their job satisfaction. Finally, the study discusses managerial implications and research limitations, and proposes suggestions for future studies. The differences in the study could be linked to variance in location, relationship status of the differed participants, nature of jobs of the selected participants, among other factors.

## **Conclusion**

From this findings, one could say that organizational frustration can be caused by several factors; work-family and not allowing innovative behaviors inclusive. In other words, workers can experience frustration when faced with conflicting roles, and not allowing their innovative ideas to be expressed, among other factors.

Therefore, every organization must take initiatives to handle workers' frustration by dealing with them in appropriate manners. The frustration must be handled at a preventive level or at the very early stage of post-frustration level before letting it to get worst. They must ensure that workers are allowed to express their innovative ideas where applicable. Workers' frustration do not only reduce the health life of an individual but also decreases the revenue growth of the company, declines the economic growth of a country and creates a clustered and clumsy scenario in the global business world.

## **REFERENCES**

- Afolabi, A.O. & Adesina, A.A. (2006). Influence of Job Frustration, narcissism, and demographic variables on attitudes towards professional ethical behaviors among Nigerian police officers. *African Journal of Psychological Studies of Social Issues*, 9 (1), 37-45.  
[ir.library.ui.edu.ng/bitstream/](http://ir.library.ui.edu.ng/bitstream/)



- Allen, F., and D. Gale (2000). Comparing Financial Systems. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ajala, E. (2017). Work-family and family-work conflict as correlates of job performance among work working mothers: implications for industrial social workers. *African Journal of Social Work*, 7 (1), 35-53.
- Andalib, T.W., Darun, M.R., & Azizan, N.A. (2013). Frustration of employees: Reasons, dimensions and resolving techniques, WCIK E Journal of Integration Knowledge, In: Proceeding of the World Conference on Integration of Knowledge (WCIK 2013), Langkawi, Kedah, 2013, 25-26 November, 1 (11), 15-25
- Carlson, D., Kacmar, K. & Wilson, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, (56), 249-276.
- Dieke, A.S. (1997). *Assessment And Management Of Frustrations Associated With University Admission*. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis Department of Psychology, University of Lagos, Lagos State.
- Erdwins, C. J., Buffardi, L.C., Casper, W. J., & O'Brien, A. S. (2001). The relationship of women's role strain to social support, role satisfaction, and self-efficacy. *Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 50: 230–238
- Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O. & Sears, J. (1939). *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S. & Sowa, D. (2002). Perceived Organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7(1), 500
- Farr, J., Ford, C. (1990). Individual innovation In West, M. & Farr J. (Ed.), *Innovation and creativity: psychological and Organizational strategies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., vol. 1, pp.63-80) Wiley: Chichester.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P.E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20 (8), 915-931. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-15586-008>
- Fox, S., Spector, P.E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some Mediator and Moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 20, (1) 915-931.
- Girdano, O., Everly G. (1979). *Controlling Stress and Tension: A Holistic Approach*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Heacox, N.J. & Sorenson, R.C. (2004). Organizational Frustration and Aggressive Behaviors. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 4 (3) 95-118. doi.org/10.10801/00336297.2004.936622.
- Hearn, J. & Husu, L. (2011). Understanding gender: Some implications for science and technology, *Interdisciplinary Science Review*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 103-113
- Jackson, M.R., Scott, S.G. & Bruce, R.A. (1994). determinants of innovative behaviour, *Academy of Management Journal*, (56), 249-276.
- Kanter, R. M. (1988). When a Thousand Flowers Bloom: Structural, Collective, and Social Conditions for Innovation in Organization; *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 10, pp 169 – 221.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The second Psychology of Organization* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- King, N., & Anderson, N. (2002). Organizational Innovation: a case study of perceptions and



- processes. *Work and stress*, 5, 331-339. doi=10.1.1.473.4566&rep=rep1
- Krejei, P., Kvapil, J., & Semrad, J. (1996). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Job frustration, narcissism and attitudes towards professional ethical behavior among police officers. In M. Pagon(Ed.), *Policing in Central and Eastern Europe*. College of Security Studies, Slovenia.
- Lazar, J., Jones, A. & Shneiderman, B. (2006) Workplace user frustration with computers: an exploratory investigation of the causes and severity. *Behavior & Information Technology*, 25 (3), 239-251.
- Masrek, N.M., Noordin, A.S., Yusuf, I.N., & Shudan, M.S. (2017). The effect of job on innovative work behavior. *International Journal Of Mechanical Engineering And Technology*, 8 (8), 33-328. <http://www.iaeme.com/IJMET/index.asp>.
- Misra, P. (1998), Predictors of Work-family Conflict among Indian Women. *Indian Journal of Psychology*, 25(1), 13-19.
- Ntsiful, A., Ahiakpor, L. & Damoah, J. (2018). Frustration at work, Developmental experience, perceived team support and employee performance: evidence from emerging economies. *Pan-African Journal of Business Management*, 2 (2), 1-36.
- Peters, L.H. & O'Connor, E.J. (1980). Situational Constraints and Work Outcomes: The Influences of a Frequently Overlooked construct. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3), 391-397. Doi/abs/10.1177/014920638401000305
- Raiz, S., Xu, Y. & Hussain, S. (2018). Understanding employee innovative behavior and thriving at work: A chinese perspective. *Journal of Administrative Science*, 3 (11), 17-33 <http://www.mdpi.com/journal/ad.msi>.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R. & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the Organization: The contributions of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (5), 852-836.
- Scott, S.G., & R.A. Bruce (1994), Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442-1465.
- 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
- Surgeon, P.C. (2013). An exploration of the psychological factors affecting remote e-workers' job effectiveness, wellbeing and work life. *Employee Relations*, 35 (5), 527-546.
- Storms, P.L., & Spector P.E (1987). Relationships of Organizational Frustration with Reported Behavioral Reactions. The Moderating Effect of Perceived Control. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60 (4) 227-234. Doi 10.1111/j.2044-1987.tb00255.x
- Walker, M., & Jacker, W. (2001). Minimax play at Wimbledon. *The American Economic Review*, 91, 1521–1538.
- Wei, R., Hung, M. & Chi, K. (2015). A study of the relationship between work-family conflicts and job satisfaction of the tour leaders. *Journal of Tourism and Recreation*, 8 (1), 41-52.]