2006

Predictors and outcomes of perceived race and accent discrimination

Guhapriya N. Margam
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Margam, Guhapriya N., "Predictors and outcomes of perceived race and accent discrimination" (2006).
Master's Theses. 2963.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.4k8b-vsaw>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2963

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

**PREDICTORS AND OUTCOMES OF PERCEIVED RACE AND
ACCENT DISCRIMINATION**

**A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychology
San Jose State University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science**

**by
Guhapriya N Margam**

August 2006

UMI Number: 1438578

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI Microform 1438578

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

Guhapriya N Margam

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Dr. Megumi Hosoda

Dr. Nancy Da Silva

Pamela M. Wells

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

08/08/06

ABSTRACT

PREDICTORS AND OUTCOMES OF PERCEIVED RACE AND ACCENT DISCRIMINATION

by Guhapriya N Margam

The purpose of this study was to examine both the predictors and outcomes associated with perceived race and accent discrimination in the workplace. In particular, the study examined organizational justice and work group composition as predictors and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions as outcomes of perceived race and accent discrimination. Data were collected from 119 respondents of Indian origin, i.e., born in the sub-continent of India, working in a wide range of organizations in the Bay Area, California. Results indicated that as predicted, organizational justice, and in particular interactional justice, was a predictor of both perceived race and accent discrimination. In terms of outcome variables, perceived race and accent discrimination were significantly and negatively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. Implications of the study are discussed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Megumi Hosoda, my thesis advisor, who deserves a special mention not only for her continued guidance and support but also for her indefatigable enthusiasm and her unbridled passion for research work. Her interest in my thesis work fired in me the passion and motivation to complete my research and she has truly inspired me to undertake research work in future.

I would also like to thank Dr. Nancy Da Silva for her assistance and guidance provided at all stages of my research work and during my entire graduate program. I would be failing in my duty if I don't mention my sincere gratitude to her for helping me unravel the mysteries of statistics and for helping me get rid of my fear of numbers.

My sincere thanks to Pamela Wells for being part of my thesis committee and for her bountiful guidance and encouragement. Her cheerful disposition has always provided me the motivation to go forward and I thank her for showing keen interest in my thesis work.

I thank my friends for their support and motivation and for always being there for me. My deepest gratitude to my family – my parents, in-laws, sisters and brothers who have all been a pillar of support and I thank each one of them for their encouragement.

Finally, my husband, Arun, deserves a special mention for his patience and understanding during my graduate school years and during the writing of this thesis. Words will never do justice to his untiring patience, his effervescent spirit, his tangible and intangible support, and the unfailing trust he has in me. I could have never undertaken this venture and successfully completed it if not for him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
Perceived Discrimination and Social Identity Theory.....	5
Predictors of Perceived Race and Accent Discrimination.....	6
Outcomes of Perceived Race and Accent Discrimination.....	11
Indians and Indian Immigrants.....	16
Method.....	20
Participants.....	20
Procedure.....	23
Measures.....	23
Results.....	28
Descriptive Statistics.....	28
Correlations among Measures.....	31
Test of Hypotheses.....	32
Additional Analysis.....	38
Discussion.....	41
Implications of the Study.....	47
Limitations and Directions for Future Research.....	49
References.....	53
Appendixes.....	62
Appendix A: Survey Items.....	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Summary of sample's demographic characteristics.....	21
Table 2. Means, standard deviations, correlations, and internal consistency reliabilities.....	29
Table 3. Summary statistics for multiple regression analysis on perceived race discrimination.....	34
Table 4. Summary statistics for multiple regression analysis on perceived accent discrimination.....	36

Introduction

Workplace diversity is no longer an abstract concept, but rather a reality faced by many organizations in the United States as evidenced by the growing number of foreign-born workers, ethnic minorities, and women in the U.S. labor force. The United States Department of Labor estimated that in 2004, 21.4 million employees or 14.5 percent of the total labor force were foreign-born, an increase of about 1.2 million since 2002. According to the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (US EEOC, 2003) report, in 2003, 30% of the work force were minorities and 48% were women. This burgeoning diversity in the workplace has posed numerous challenges to organizations as they struggle to manage diversity effectively. Organizations that have leveraged workplace diversity have shown to increase productivity (Bantel & Jackson, 1989; Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991) and to enhance levels of creativity and innovation (Bantel & Jackson, 1989; De Dreu & West, 2001). Alternatively, organizations that have failed to manage diversity effectively have been caught in a web of class action discrimination lawsuits costing them millions of dollars (Jayne & Dipboye, 2004). The main purpose of this study was to examine the predictors and outcomes associated with discrimination and in particular, perceived race and accent discrimination.

The rise in race discrimination, i.e., treating someone unfavorably because they are of a certain race or because of characteristics associated with race such as certain facial features or skin color (Goffman, 1963; Westhoff, 1993) in the workplace, is evident from the number of charges filed with the US EEOC. For example, recent statistics indicate that 27,696 charges were filed under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

alleging race-based discrimination, and 8,361 charges were filed alleging national origin-based discrimination including accent discrimination (US EEOC, n.d.). Monetary damages that can run into millions of dollars arising from such lawsuits and out-of-court settlements have made organizations aware of the potential costs of discrimination practices in the workplace. For example, in 2000, Coca-Cola Ltd. settled a class action race discrimination lawsuit for \$192.5 million as African-American employees filed a suit claiming that the Coca-Cola company imposed a racial "glass ceiling" by discriminating against them in pay and promotions (Selmi, 2003).

The lawsuit described above is based on objective discrimination. Objective discrimination in the workplace refers to differentials that exist on measurable employment decisions such as selection, evaluation, promotion or reward allocation (e.g., Gutek, Cohen, & Tsui, 1996). In addition to objective discrimination, organizations also need to be wary of their employees' perceptions of discrimination, irrespective of whether such perceptions are consistent with reality. This is because employees' such perceptions can affect their attitudes and behaviors (Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998; Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). Therefore, perceived discrimination must be distinguished from objectively measurable discrimination as the former relates to an individuals' interpretation of events as discriminatory (Floyd & Gramann, 1995).

Given that perceived discrimination impacts employees' psychological well-being and work behavior (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001; Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998), it is imperative to study the factors contributing to and the outcomes associated with perceived discrimination in a work setting. Thus, the major purpose of

this study was to examine both the predictors and outcomes associated with perceived race discrimination in the workplace. In particular, the study examined organizational justice and work group composition as predictors and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions as outcomes of perceived race discrimination.

There exist numerous literature and research studies on perceived race discrimination in the social-psychological literature. These studies have examined psychological variables (e.g., self-esteem, mastery, anxiety) as predictors (Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998) and emotional and psychological variables (e.g., depression, intergroup competence, psychological well-being) as outcomes of perceived race discrimination (Cassidy, O'Connor, Howe & Warden, 2004). However, the topic of perceived discrimination has not received much research attention in the field of Industrial/Organizational (I/O) psychology until recently (Ensher et al., 2001; Harris, Lievens & Hoyer, 2004; Sanchez & Brock, 1996). When empirical evidence is available, researchers have paid more research attention to the examination of the consequences of perceived discrimination than the examination of its predictors (Ensher et al., 2001; Sanchez & Brock, 1996). Though research has been conducted on predictors and outcomes of perceived discrimination separately, to the author's knowledge, no study has focused on both the predictors and the outcomes of perceived discrimination simultaneously.

Another area that has not been addressed or researched is perceived accent discrimination. Accent discrimination occurs when an employer discriminates against

certain individuals because of their strong accents. Discrimination on the basis of accent and language ability constitutes national origin discrimination and is covered by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. National origin discrimination involves treating individuals unfavorably because they are from a particular country or part of the world, or because they appear to be of a certain ethnic background, or because they speak English with an accent. There has been a rise in accent discrimination lawsuits in the recent past. For example, in 2003, in the private sector, Asian Americans lodged 838 discrimination charges based on national origin, including accent discrimination (US EEOC, 2003), and this trend is likely to continue. This is mainly because the U.S. labor force is becoming even more diverse and the number of non-native English speakers are increasing. For example, the United States Census Bureau (2000) estimates indicate that 18% or 47 million of the population reported that they spoke a language other than English at home. This necessitates research in the area of accent discrimination and particularly in perceived accent discrimination, as when individuals perceive that they are discriminated against because of their accent, it is likely to impact their work attitudes and behaviors.

Therefore, given the importance of the topic and the paucity of research in this area, this study examined both the predictors and outcomes associated with perceived race as well as perceived accent discrimination in the workplace.

In the sections that follow, the construct definition of perceived discrimination is reviewed, followed by a literature review on the proposed predictors and outcomes of perceived discrimination and research hypotheses.

Perceived Discrimination and Social Identity Theory

Research on discrimination in I/O psychology has focused primarily on real or objective discrimination in the workplace in terms of racial and gender differences in pay, performance ratings, and employment opportunities (e.g., Frieze, Olson, & Good, 1990). Although numerous studies on objective discrimination exist, little research attention has been paid to the issue of perceived discrimination.

Perceived discrimination is an individual's perception that he or she is treated differently or unfairly, or that selective treatment is occurring because of his or her group membership (Ensher et al., 2001; Mirage, 1994; Sanchez & Brock, 1996). A question then arises as to why certain individuals think that they are discriminated against while others do not.

Social identity theory provides a framework for understanding perceived discrimination. According to social identity theory, individuals categorize themselves and others into social categories based on their salient characteristics such as race, sex, age, skin color, or accent (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1985). Stigmatizing characteristics that distinguish ethnic minority and immigrant groups from the majority group would include skin color, language differences in terms of accent, and physical features (e.g., Phinney et al., 1998; Westhoff, 1993).

Historically, ethnic minority groups have been discriminated against because of the above mentioned stigmatizing characteristics. Therefore, individuals, who identify with their ethnic group, might perceive that they are also treated unfairly because of their ethnic group membership.

Predictors of Perceived Race and Accent Discrimination

Organizational justice

Organizational justice refers to the extent to which people perceive organizational events as being fair (Greenberg, 1987). Several studies show that justice perceptions do predict perceived race- and sex-based discrimination (Foley & Kidder, 2002; Frieze, Olson, & Good, 1990; Goldman, 2001). Most of these studies have examined three distinct types of justice, namely distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, and their relationships with perceived discrimination.

Distributive justice is based on Adam's equity theory (1963, 1965) and refers to the perceived fairness of decision outcomes (e.g., pay). Frieze et al. (1990) studied perceived and actual discrimination in the salaries of male and female managers and found that women perceived more discrimination in pay than men, and in fact they were actually discriminated against as evidenced by their lower salaries. This occurred even when controlling for work experience. Goldman (2001) found distributive justice to be an important predictor of perception of discrimination and his study showed a negative relationship between distributive justice and the worker's filing of a discrimination claim. According to Goldman, when employees perceived that they were terminated unfairly because of their race, they resorted to restoring equity by filing a discrimination claim. Gutek et al. (1996) assessed the relationship of perceived discrimination with an individual's reaction to the job and to the organization, and found that women perceived that their organization favored men in hiring and promotion and that they had less power and prestige on their jobs.

Procedural justice refers to the fairness of the procedures or process used to determine organizational outcomes (Lind & Taylor, 1988). The criteria that individuals use to evaluate fairness of procedures include consistency, representativeness, correctability, accuracy, ethicality, and suppression of self-interests (Leventhal, 1980). Organizational procedures represent the way the organization allocates resources (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001) and individuals perceive unfairness when the organizational procedures are not consistently applied across all employees. This is especially true of ethnic/racial minority members who perceive that they are discriminated against because organizational policies and procedures are not consistently applied and they are treated differently from majority group employees in the organization. The famous Griggs v Duke Power Company (1971) case is a landmark example of procedural injustice wherein the organization set up procedures that restricted Blacks from being selected for certain jobs by requiring them to pass two aptitude tests and to possess a high school diploma. Whites, who were already employed in such jobs, however, did not have to meet these requirements (Stone-Romero & Stone, 2005). This represents a classic case of procedural injustice that violates several rules that Leventhal developed (i.e., ethicality, bias suppression, representativeness, consistency, and accuracy) (Leventhal, 1980; Stone-Romero & Stone, 2005).

More recently, Foley and Kidder (2002) examined perceptions of ethnic and gender discrimination in the legal profession among a group of Hispanic law school students and found that both perceived gender and ethnic discrimination had a significant negative relationship with perceptions of procedural justice. Another study conducted by

Foley, Kidder, and Powell (2002) examined the relationship between perceived glass ceiling and justice perceptions, and showed that Hispanic law associates' perceptions of a glass ceiling were negatively related to perceived fairness of promotion decision outcomes in their firm. Similarly, several studies have shown that employees are more likely to consider litigation or to file a claim for wrongful termination after perceiving that the organizational decision-making processes or the procedures used to make decision were unfair (Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Goldman, 2001).

Interactional justice refers to the quality of interpersonal treatment and communication by management to employees (e.g., politeness, honesty, respect). Greenberg (1990) conceptualized interactional justice as consisting of two components: informational justice (i.e., explanation of the procedures and decision-making) and interpersonal justice (i.e., amount of social sensitivity employees receive). Although there is a lack of research linking interactional justice to perceived discrimination, it appears to be an important justice component that needs to be researched. When minorities are not treated with respect, politeness, or dignity, they are more likely to perceive that they are discriminated against than when they are (Harris, Lievens, & Van Hove, 2004). Moreover, Gilliland (1993) suggests that perception of fair interpersonal treatment is likely to occur when one can avoid improper questions and prejudicial statements aimed at minority group members. For example, asking a woman whether she is pregnant in an employment interview, though illegal, would result in her feeling discriminated against because of her gender (Harris et al., 2004).

In summary, research shows that organizational justice does seem to impact perceived discrimination and the lower the distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, the greater the perceived discrimination. Extending this to perceived race and accent discrimination, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1a & 1b: Distributive justice will be negatively related to both perceived race (H1a) and accent discrimination (H1b).

Hypothesis 2a & 2b: Procedural justice will be negatively related to both perceived race (H2a) and accent discrimination (H2b).

Hypothesis 3a & 3b: Interactional justice will be negatively related to both perceived (H3a) race and accent discrimination (H3b).

Work group composition

The composition of the work group (i.e., work unit or team) in terms of the demography of the group members is also an important predictor of perceived discrimination (Kanter, 1977; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Kanter (1977), in her numerical proportion model, proposed that an individual whose coworkers and supervisors are of the same demography should perceive less discrimination than an individual who is a 'token' member in the environment. Research also shows that the composition of the leader-subordinate dyad or the similarity between a supervisor and an individual in terms of demography is of considerable interest (Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992). Ragins and Cornwell (2001) examined perceived workplace discrimination against homosexuals and found that gay employees perceived significantly less workplace discrimination when they had gay supervisors and when they had a higher

proportion of gay coworkers in their work groups. Consistent with the above findings, it is possible to expect that minority members who speak English with an accent will perceive less race and accent discrimination when their work group is composed of co-workers and supervisor who are similar to themselves in terms of race and national origin (i.e., relating to accent) than when compared to a work group composed of the host culture (i.e., Caucasian) co-workers and supervisor. The term “Caucasian” or “Caucasian Race” refers to a light-skinned race whose ancestry can be traced back to Europe (“Caucasian Race,” 2005). In the United States, Caucasians are commonly referred to as “White Americans” or “Whites,” as defined by the American government and the U.S. Census Bureau based solely on skin color (“Caucasian Race,” 2005). Consistent with the terminology adopted by the Census Bureau, in this study, the term Whites has been used to refer to Caucasians. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 4a & 4b: Individuals who work with a greater proportion of co-workers from their own ethnic culture perceive less race (H4a) and accent discrimination (H4b) than individuals who work with coworkers from the host culture i.e., Whites.

Hypothesis 5a & 5b: Individuals who report to supervisors from their own ethnic culture will perceive less race (H5a) and accent discrimination (H5b) than individuals who report to supervisors from the host culture i.e., Whites.

It is also noteworthy to examine the relative contribution of organizational justice and work group composition on perceptions of both race and accent discrimination. Would procedural justice contribute to perceived race and accent discrimination more

than distributive justice, interactional justice, and work group composition (i.e., co-worker and supervisor), or would co-worker group composition have a greater contribution than supervisor composition, distributive, procedural, and interactional justice in predicting perceived race and accent discrimination? There is a lack of theory and research in this area and thereby the following research question is posed.

Research Question 1: Which predictor makes the greatest contribution to perceptions of race discrimination?

Research Question 2: Which predictor makes the greatest contribution to perceptions of accent discrimination?

Outcomes of Perceived Race and Accent Discrimination

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the most extensively researched variables in the field of I/O psychology (Bono & Judge, 2003; Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction can be defined as how employees feel and think about different aspects of their job (Spector, 1997). Research on perceived discrimination has shown that job satisfaction is predicted by perceived discrimination (Ensher et al., 2001; Foley & Kidder, 2002; Sanchez & Brock, 1996). For example, Sanchez and Brock (1996) surveyed 139 Hispanic employees from multiple organizations in the United States and showed that perceived discrimination contributed to decreased job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and increased work tension over and above work stressors such as role conflict and role ambiguity. Ensher et al. (2001) examined the effects of perceived discrimination on work-related attitudes and behaviors and found that employees who perceived greater

organizational discrimination reported less job satisfaction, lower organizational commitment, and less organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Given these consistent findings on the relationship between perceived discrimination and job satisfaction, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 6a: Perceived race discrimination will be negatively related to job satisfaction.

Extending the above mentioned research to perceived accent discrimination, when employees with a foreign accent perceive that they are discriminated against because of their accent, it is likely that they might be less satisfied with their job. Thus, it is also hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 6b: Perceived accent discrimination will be negatively related to job satisfaction.

Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment refers to the psychological attachment and bonding that individuals feel for their organization (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986) and is distinguished into three types of commitment: affective, continuance, and normative (Meyer & Allen, 1984, 1991). Affective commitment refers to the emotional attachment that individuals feel for the organization, whereas continuance commitment refers to the perceived costs associated with leaving the organization. Normative commitment reflects a perceived obligation to remain in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1984, 1991). Of the three types of commitment, affective commitment reflects that individuals want to be involved in and identified with the company, and studies show that affective commitment

is positively correlated with desirable work behaviors such as job performance and OCB, and negatively correlated with turnover and turnover intentions (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002).

Research on perceived discrimination has shown that individuals who perceive greater discrimination report lower organizational commitment (Ensher et al., 2001; Sanchez & Brock, 1996). However, these studies examined organizational commitment as a whole and not just the affective component of organizational commitment. It is likely that affective commitment might be the expected outcome of perceived discrimination as opposed to continuance or normative commitment because the latter two might occur even when an employee feels that he/she is discriminated against. For example, a person does not leave the company because of lack of alternative jobs (i.e., high continuance commitment) or because the person believes that he/she ought to remain in the organization (i.e., normative commitment), even when they perceive that they are discriminated against. Extending the above research, it is likely that when individuals perceive that they are discriminated against because of their race or accent, their level of affective commitment to the organization would be less as they no longer want to be identified with or feel a bonding to the company. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 7a: Perceived race discrimination will be negatively related to affective commitment.

Hypothesis 7b: Perceived accent discrimination will be negatively related to affective commitment.

Organizational citizenship behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is an extra-role work related behavior which includes behaviors that extend beyond what is prescribed in the job description of an employee and are not formally enforced by the organization (Organ, 1988). Such behaviors include helping coworkers by providing guidance and suggestions related to their job, willing to help colleagues solve work-related problems, and volunteering to do activities that benefit the work group (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Little research attention has been paid to the examination of the relationship between perceived discrimination and OCB. An exception to this is a study by Ensher et al. (2001), who examined the potential consequences of perceived discrimination on work-related behaviors and found that perceived organizational discrimination was a significant predictor of altruism (e.g., helping a coworker) and conscientiousness (e.g., being punctual to work) at work (two types of OCB). Therefore, employees who perceived greater organizational discrimination reported less OCB.

In recent years, researchers have begun to differentiate OCB based on the targets of citizenship behavior (McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Williams & Anderson, 1991). In particular, Williams and Anderson (1991) draw a distinction between citizenship behavior targeted towards specific individuals within the organization i.e., co-workers (OCB-I) and citizenship behavior directed towards the organization (OCB-O). While the former is intended to benefit specific individuals in the organization, the latter is intended to benefit the organization as a whole. Given this distinction, it would be interesting to study which type of organizational citizenship behavior – behavior that benefits the

organization (OCB-O) or behavior that benefits individuals (OCB-I) – is most likely to be affected by perceived race and accent discrimination. As no study so far has looked into the relationship between OCB-I, OCB-O and perceived race and accent discrimination, the following research question is posed.

Research question 8a: What would be the relationship between perceived race discrimination and OCB-I and OCB-O?

Research question 8b: What would be the relationship between perceived accent discrimination and OCB-I and OCB-O?

Turnover intentions

Turnover intentions (i.e., intention to quit the organization) has been shown to occur when employees feel less satisfied with their job, experience less organizational commitment, or perceive organizational injustice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Meyer et al., 2002). Turnover intentions may occur when employees perceive that they are treated unfairly or unjustly. A study by Ragins and Cornwell (2001) demonstrated that perceived sexual orientation discrimination was positively related to turnover intentions, suggesting that when homosexual employees perceive that they are discriminated against, they are more likely to intend to quit the organization. Although the relationship between turnover intentions and perceived race and accent discrimination has not been examined in the past, extending the above mentioned research, it is hypothesized that when employees perceive greater race or accent discrimination they are more likely to intend to quit the organization. Thus,

Hypothesis 9a: Perceived race discrimination will be positively related to turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 9b: Perceived accent discrimination will be positively related to turnover intentions.

Indians and Indian Immigrants

This study examined the perceptions of professional immigrants and non-immigrants from India and also naturalized citizens (i.e., born in India) working in the Bay Area, California. Despite the growing number of professionally skilled immigrants and temporary workers from India in the United States, no research so far has focused on perceived race and accent discrimination using an Indian sample. Moreover, the Bay Area is a suitable place for surveying the work perceptions of professional Indians because of the large population of Indians employed in technology companies in the Bay Area.

This study mainly examined the perceptions of immigrants, non-immigrants, and naturalized citizens of Indian origin. Immigrants are lawful permanent residents who hold a Green Card issued by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, and are permitted to work and live in the United States (USCIS, n.d.). Non-immigrants are temporary workers employed in occupations that require highly specialized knowledge and are allowed to stay and work in the United States for a maximum period of six years (USCIS, n.d.). A naturalized citizen is one who becomes a citizen of the United States by the process of naturalization and not by birth. On the fulfillment of certain conditions (i.e., duration of stay in the country, nature of employment), a non-immigrant can become

an immigrant and eventually become a naturalized citizen of the United States (USCIS, n.d.).

Until 1965, immigrants into the United States came mainly from western countries (Krishnan & Berry, 1992). However, since the 1965 U.S. immigration policy, immigrants from many non-western countries have been permitted to enter the United States. As a result of the Immigration Act of 1965, it has been legally possible for qualified Indians to enter the United States as immigrants under various categories provided by law, and Indian immigrants are entering United States in large numbers every year (Krishnan & Berry, 1992). Immigration of Indians has taken place in many waves since the first Indian immigrants came to the United States in the 1700s (“Indian American,” 2005). A major wave of immigration of Indians to California took place in the first decade of the 20th century, from around 1900 to 1910 (“Indian American,” 2005), and the latest wave of immigration happened during the dot come era of 1990s owing to the shortage of information technology workers in the United States. Since the 1990s, a number of non-immigrants from India have also entered the United States with a work permit visa and many have been granted immigrant status and have thereby become permanent residents. Moreover, every year, non-immigrants from India continue to enter the country on work permit visas.

According to the United States Census Bureau (2000), the number of foreign born Asian Indians in the United States has increased from 450,406 in 1990 to 1,022,552 in 2000, representing an increase of 127 percent. Furthermore, the United States Census Bureau reports that there are over one million immigrants from India in the United States

as of 2000, and the foreign born from India (1 million) represent the third-largest immigrant group in the United States following Mexico (9.2 million) and the Philippines (1.4 million) (US Census Bureau, 2000). Furthermore, according to Census 2000, California has the largest number of foreign born from India (198,201) accounting for more than 19 percent of the Indian population in the United States (Grieco, 2003), and this excludes the naturalized citizens. The Bay Area of California, called the Silicon Valley, so named because of the concentration of high tech companies situated in the area, is a suitable place for surveying the work perceptions of professional Indians because of the large population of Indians employed in the Silicon Valley.

Despite the growing number of professionally skilled migrants from India in the United States, no research so far has examined the work perceptions and perceptions of discrimination of Indians. Social scientists have overlooked this category of migrants, whereas many studies have focused on Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, and other categories of Asians (Sue & Wagner, 1973). As per the 1923 Supreme Court case (United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind) ruling, the official judicial racial classification of Indians has been to classify Indians as Asians or non-Whites ("Indian American," 2005). However, unlike the Chinese or Japanese, Indians are brown/dark skinned with skin color ranging from light brown to black ("Indian History," 2005) and are therefore more susceptible to racism. Though Indians have not been subjected to many violent hate crimes in the past, racist attitudes towards Indians have risen especially due to the recent outsourcing of white-collar services jobs to India; Americans feel that Indian companies are unfairly taking away jobs from the American economy ("Outsourcing," 2005).

Given this scenario, it would be interesting to study how Indians perceive discrimination based on their race. Furthermore, because of the British colonial rule over India for over 200 years, immigrants from India speak English based on British English but with a pronounced accent (Manas, n.d.). The Indian English is characterized by a thick accent and pronounced stress on certain syllables, which makes it difficult for Americans to understand. The heavy Indian accent has recently been cited as the cause for major US companies avoiding Indian call center outsourcing firms (Chaube, 2005). For example, in 2003, Dell Inc. stopped routing corporate customer calls to a technical support call center in Bangalore, India, because some U.S. customers complained that it was difficult to communicate with the Indian technical-support representatives because of their thick accent and scripted responses (“Dell Cancels,” 2003). Despite being literate in English, Indians continue to face hurdles in terms of their English accent and it would be noteworthy to study how Indians perceive discrimination based on their English accent.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 119 respondents working in a wide range of organizations in the Bay Area, California. The sample consisted of 38 women and 80 men; 1 individual did not report his/her gender. The respondents were all of Indian origin (i.e., from the sub-continent of India) and were born in India. About 40.9% of the respondents were immigrants i.e., green card holders, followed by 39.1% non-immigrants and 20% naturalized citizens i.e., Indians who have become citizens of United States. The sample was quite young with the majority of respondents falling within the age group of 31 and 40 (49%), and 39% within the age group of 20 and 30.

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the participants. As indicated in Table 1, the majority of the respondents were working in the technology industry (77.1%), and 10.2 % were working in educational services. More than half of the participants were working in organizations with more than 10,000 employees worldwide (52.5%). The majority of respondents held masters degrees (76.3%), with 11.9% holding doctorate degrees and 11% holding undergraduate degrees.

The average number of years that respondents indicated that they had lived in the U.S. was 10 years ($SD = 4.48$). Respondents indicated that the average tenure in the current company was 6 years ($SD = 4.49$). Almost half of the respondents indicated that they spoke English with a slight accent (49.6%) and 34.2% indicated that they spoke English with a moderate accent.

Table 1

Summary of sample's demographic characteristics

Demographic variable	N	Frequency
Industry		
Technology	91	77.1
Manufacturing	1	.8
Financial services	3	2.5
Healthcare	4	3.4
Educational services	12	10.2
Other	7	5.9
Organizational size		
Over 10,000 worldwide	62	52.5
1,000 - 10,000	25	21.2
100 - 999	19	16.1
Less than 100	12	10.2
Age		
20-25	6	5.1
26-30	40	33.9
31-35	38	32.2
36-40	20	16.9
41-45	9	7.6
More than 50	5	4.2

Table 1 (*continued*).

Summary of sample's demographic characteristics

Demographic variable	N	Frequency
Gender		
Male	80	67.8
Female	38	32.3
Education		
High school	1	.8
Undergraduate	13	11.00
Masters	90	76.3
Doctorate	14	11.9
Accent		
Heavy Accent	3	2.6
Moderate Accent	40	34.2
Slight Accent	58	49.6
No Accent	16	13.7
Status		
Non-immigrant	45	39.1
Immigrant	47	40.9
Naturalized citizen	23	20.00

Procedure

Participants were asked to fill-out a questionnaire. Owing to reasons of privacy and difficulty in obtaining a list of names and addresses of non-immigrants, immigrants, and naturalized citizens for research purposes, the snowball sampling technique was used to collect data from respondents. Snowball sampling is a widely used method of sampling employed when it is difficult or cost prohibitive to locate respondents, and it relies on referrals by initial participants to generate additional participants (Patton, 1990). In this study, the Indian participants were approached using a variety of network sources, including the friends and acquaintances of the researcher.

The survey was hosted online and the survey link as well as the cover letter was emailed to the contact persons who, in turn, emailed the survey link to prospective respondents. Similarly, further participants identified by the contact person received the survey link and the cover letter by email. The cover letter informed participants of the purpose of the study and stated that participation was voluntary albeit appreciated. The cover letter also assured participants that the data collected would be confidential and anonymous. Participants received no monetary compensation for their participation.

Measures

Perceived race discrimination. Perceived race discrimination was measured with 17 items taken from the Workplace Prejudice/Discrimination Inventory (James, Lovato, & Cropanzano, 1994), the acculturative stressors and perceived discrimination scale (Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987), and Dorr's (1992) Perceived Discrimination measure. The items and their sources are given in Appendix A. The words "at work"

was added to all the items taken from the acculturative stressors and perceived discrimination scale because of the current study's focus on perceived discrimination in the work place. A sample item is "At work, I sometimes feel that my ethnicity is a limitation." Using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5), participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Items were summed and averaged. Higher scores indicate more perceived race discrimination. The coefficient alpha was .95.

Perceived accent discrimination. Perceived accent discrimination was measured with 14 items taken from the Workplace Prejudice/Discrimination Inventory (James et al., 1994) and the acculturative stressors and perceived discrimination scale (Mena et al., 1987). The items and their sources are given in Appendix A. Modifications were made to the scale items so that they were tailored to the workplace, and the word "race/ethnicity" was replaced with the word "accent." A sample item is "Because of my accent, my opinions are often ignored at work." Using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5), participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Items were summed and averaged. Higher scores indicate more perceived accent discrimination. The coefficient alpha for this variable was .93.

Organizational justice. Organizational justice was measured by the 16-item scale developed by Schminke, Cropanzano, and Rupp (2002). Six items measured distributive justice, six items measured procedural justice, and four items measured interactional justice. All items were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from *unfair*

(1) to *fair* (5). Participants were asked to rate how fair their companies have been in rewarding them regarding their pay, promotion, performance rating, and opportunities for professional development. An example of an item measuring distributive justice is “The opportunities I have for promotion.” The coefficient alpha for this scale was .83. Items were summed and averaged. Higher scores indicate more distributive justice. An example of an item measuring procedural justice is “The process by which my pay is decided.” The coefficient alpha for this variable was .80. Items were summed and averaged. Higher scores indicate more procedural fairness. An example of an item measuring interactional justice is “The amount of information I get when I want to know something.” Items were summed and averaged. Higher scores indicate more interactional justice. The coefficient alpha for this variable was .88.

Work group composition. Four items were developed to measure the racial composition and composition of accented workers in the work group for the present study. Two items pertained to the composition of the coworkers in terms of their race/ethnicity and English accent. A sample item is “Most of my coworkers are (a) Mostly Indians, (b) Mixed (Indians and Whites/others), and (c) Mostly Whites/others.” Two more items pertained to the ethnicity and the English accent of the immediate manager/supervisor. A sample item is “My immediate supervisor is a(n): (a) Indian , (b) White/others.”

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured with the three-item scale employed in the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh, 1979). Participants indicated overall job satisfaction using

a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). A sample item is “All in all, I am satisfied with my job.” Items were summed and averaged and higher scores indicate greater job satisfaction. The coefficient alpha for this variable was .89.

Affective commitment. Affective commitment was measured with the 6-item affective commitment scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1997). The scale anchors ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). A sample item is “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.” Items were summed and averaged and higher scores indicate more affective commitment. The coefficient alpha for this variable was .81.

Organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior was measured with 18-items taken from three OCB scales (Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Of the 18 items, 6 items assessed organizational citizenship behavior directed towards individuals (OCB-I) and 12 items assessed organizational citizenship behavior directed towards the organization (OCB-O). The items and their sources are given in Appendix A. Using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5), respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. An example item from the OCB-I scale is “I generally go out of the way to help co-workers with work-related problems.” The coefficient alpha for this variable was .81. Items were summed and averaged and higher scores indicate more citizenship behavior directed toward individuals. An example item from the OCB-O scale is “I defend the

organization when other employees criticize it.” The coefficient alpha for this scale was .74. Items were summed and averaged and higher values indicate more citizenship behavior directed toward the organization.

Turnover intentions. Intention to quit the company was measured using a three item scale developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1983). The scale anchors ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). An example item is “It is very likely that I will look for a job outside of this organization during the next year.” Items were summed and averaged. Higher scores on the scale indicate greater intention to quit the company. The coefficient alpha for this variable was .88.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Means, standard deviations, internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's α), and correlations among the predictor and outcome variables are displayed in Table 2. As can be seen from the table, respondents perceived a little race discrimination ($M = 2.06$, $SD = .70$) and accent discrimination ($M = 2.06$, $SD = .64$). A closer look at the predictor variables shows that respondents perceived a relatively high degree of fairness with organizational outcomes ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .80$), procedures ($M = 3.73$, $SD = .90$), and interpersonal treatment ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .96$).

Respondents worked in a variety of work group settings ranging from groups composed mostly of Indians to groups composed mostly of Whites. Seventeen percent of the respondents reported that their work group was composed mostly of Indians, 62.3% indicated that they worked in a mixed group consisting of Indians, Whites, and co-workers of other ethnicity, and 20.2% indicated that they worked in a team consisting mostly of Whites.

Fifty-five percent of the respondents indicated that their immediate supervisor was White or of other ethnicity. When asked about the composition of coworkers who spoke English with an accent, 40.7% indicated that most of their coworkers spoke English with an accent, and 39.8 % indicated that few of their coworkers spoke English with an accent. More than a half of the respondents (57%) reported that their immediate manager did not speak English with an accent.

Table 2

Means, standard deviations, correlations, and internal consistency reliabilities

	Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1	Perceived race discrimination	2.06	.70	(.95)				
2	Perceived accent discrimination	2.06	.64	.85 **	(.93)			
3	Distributive justice	3.95	.80	-.41 **	-.29 **	(.83)		
4	Procedural justice	3.73	.90	-.38 **	-.29 **	.83 **	(.89)	
5	Interactional justice	4.00	.96	-.48 **	-.34 **	.71 **	.72 **	(.88)
6	Job satisfaction	3.86	.70	-.39 **	-.36 **	.61 **	.57 **	.67 **
7	Organizational commitment	3.23	.73	-.24 *	-.21 *	.40 **	.33 **	.41 **
8	Intention to quit	2.61	.87	.16	.18	-.37 **	-.30 **	-.43 **
9	Organizational citizenship behavior - I	3.81	.51	-.09	-.09	.06	.07	.11
10	Organizational citizenship behavior - O	3.70	.41	-.12	-.22 *	.13	.17	.08

Note. $n = 114$; ** $p < 0.01$. * $p < 0.05$.

Reliability coefficients presented on the diagonal.

Table 2 (continued).

Means, standard deviations, correlations, and internal consistency reliabilities

Variable	6	7	8	9	10
1 Perceived race discrimination					
2 Perceived accent discrimination					
3 Distributive justice					
4 Procedural justice					
5 Interactional justice					
6 Job satisfaction	(.89)				
7 Organizational commitment	.62 **	(.81)			
8 Intention to quit	-.59 **	-.47 **	(.88)		
9 Organizational citizenship behavior - I	.06	.10	-.17	(.81)	
10 Organizational citizenship behavior - O	.16	.18	-.14	.68 **	(.74)

When one looks at the outcome variables, respondents were generally satisfied with their jobs ($M = 3.86, SD = .70$), emotionally committed to their organization ($M = 3.23, SD = .73$), exhibited OCB-I ($M = 3.81, SD = .51$) and OCB-O ($M = 3.70, SD = .41$), and had less intention of quitting ($M = 2.61, SD = .87$)

Correlations Among Measures

An examination of the inter-correlations among the variables, as displayed in Table 2, shows that perceived race discrimination was significantly correlated to perceived accent discrimination ($r = .85, p < .01$). Furthermore, all of the three organizational justice variables were significantly related to one another as well as with both perceived race and accent discrimination (see Table 2).

With regard to the outcome variables, job satisfaction was significantly and positively correlated with distributive ($r = .61, p < .01$), procedural ($r = .57, p < .01$), and interactional justice ($r = .67, p < .01$), indicating that the more they perceived justice, the more satisfied they were with the job. Organizational commitment and intention to quit were also significantly correlated with distributive justice ($r = .40, p < .01$; $r = -.37, p < .01$), procedural justice ($r = .33, p < .01$; $r = -.30, p < .01$), and interactional justice ($r = .41, p < .01$; $r = -.43, p < .01$) with the former showing a positive relationship, and the latter relating negatively to the three justice variables.

In terms of OCB, only OCB-O was significantly and negatively correlated with perceived accent discrimination ($r = -.22, p < .05$). In general, most of the variables were inter-correlated, but not too highly, indicating the absence of multi-co linearity between the variables.

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1a and 1b predicted that distributive justice would be negatively correlated to both perceived race and accent discrimination. These hypotheses were supported. Distributive justice was negatively related to both perceived race discrimination ($r = -.41, p < .001$) and perceived accent discrimination ($r = -.29, p < .001$). Hypotheses 2a and 2b, which predicted that respondents who perceive more procedural fairness would perceive less race and accent discrimination, were also supported ($r = -.38, p < .001$; $r = -.29, p < .001$, respectively). Furthermore, consistent with Hypotheses 3a and 3b, which predicted that interactional justice would be negatively correlated with perceived race and accent discrimination, respondents perceived significantly less race and accent discrimination when they perceived more interactional fairness ($r = -.48, p < .001$; $r = -.34, p < .001$, respectively).

Hypotheses 4a and 4b stated that individuals who worked with a greater proportion of co-workers from their own ethnic culture would perceive less race and accent discrimination than individuals who worked with coworkers from the host culture. These hypotheses were tested using a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Results showed a significant effect of work group composition on perceived race discrimination, $F(2,111) = 3.43, p < .05$. Even though most respondents did not perceive race discrimination, those who worked in a group composed mostly of Whites perceived greatest race discrimination ($M = 2.34, SD = .99$), followed by those who worked in a mixed-group i.e., composed on Whites, Indians, and coworkers from other ethnicity ($M = 2.02, SD = .58$), and those who worked in a group composed mostly of Indians perceived

the least race discrimination ($M = 1.80$, $SD = .68$). Further analyses showed that the only significant difference among these groups was between a work group composed mostly of Whites and a group composed mostly of Indians. In particular, respondents who worked in a group consisting of mostly Whites perceived more race discrimination than respondents who worked in a group composed mostly of Indians. Thus, these results support Hypothesis 4a. However, Hypothesis 4b was not supported, $F(2, 110) = 1.66$, ns , showing no effect of work group composition on perceived accent discrimination. Hypotheses 5a and 5b, which predicted that individuals who reported to managers/supervisors from their own ethnic culture would perceive less race and accent discrimination than individuals who reported to supervisors from the host culture, were not supported ($r = .07$, ns ; $r = .03$, ns).

In order to answer Research Questions 1 and 2, a multiple regression analysis (MRC) was conducted to determine the joint contribution of all the predictor variables and to examine which predictor variable had the greatest contribution to perceptions of race discrimination and accent discrimination. More specifically, to answer Research Question 1, a MRC was conducted with distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, coworkers' ethnicity, and managers' ethnicity as predictors and perceived race discrimination as a criterion.

The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3. Results showed a significant relationship between the set of the predictors and perceived race discrimination, with these predictors together accounting for 31% of the variance in perceived race discrimination, $R = .56$, $R^2 = .31$, $F(5, 107) = 9.77$, $p < .001$.

Table 3

*Summary statistics for multiple regression analysis
on perceived race discrimination*

Predictor	β^a	
Distributive fairness	-.18	
Procedural fairness	-.06	
Interactional fairness	-.32	**
Co-workers group composition ^b	.26	**
Manager's ethnicity ^c	.04	

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

^a Standardized regression coefficient

^b 1 = Mostly Indians, 2 = Mixed group, 3 = Whites

^c 1 = Indian, 2 = White/Other ethnicity

Three predictors, distributive ($r = -.42, p < .001$), procedural ($r = -.38, p < .001$), and interactional fairness ($r = -.47, p < .001$) were significantly negatively correlated with perceived race discrimination, indicating that the higher the levels of organizational justice, the lower the perception of race discrimination. Coworkers' ethnicity was positively correlated with perceived race discrimination ($r = .23, p < .001$), indicating that the more Whites in a work group, the more perceived race discrimination. Manager's ethnicity, however, was not significantly correlated with perceived race discrimination ($r = .16, ns$). Of these five predictor variables, interactional fairness ($\beta = -.32, p < .001$) and co-worker's ethnicity ($\beta = .26, p < .01$) had a significant relationship with perceived race discrimination: only these two variables emerged as strong predictors of perceived race discrimination.

Another MRC was conducted to answer Research Question 2 to determine which predictor variable had the greatest contribution to perceived accent discrimination. This MRC was conducted with distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, coworkers' accent, and manager's accent as the predictors and perceived accent discrimination as the criterion variable. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4, and revealed that the five predictors accounted for 14% of the variance in perceived accent discrimination, $R = .38, R^2 = .14, F(5, 110) = 3.67, p < .001$. The three organizational justice predictors, distributive ($r = -.31, p < .001$), procedural ($r = -.30, p < .001$), and interactional fairness ($r = -.33, p < .001$) were significantly and negatively correlated with perceived accent discrimination, indicating that the higher the levels of organizational justice, the lower the perception of accent discrimination.

Table 4

*Summary statistics for multiple regression analysis
on perceived accent discrimination*

Predictor	β^a
Distributive fairness	-.09
Procedural fairness	-.09
Interactional fairness	-.20
Co-workers' accent ^b	.16
Manager's accent ^c	-.03

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

^a Standardized regression coefficient

^b 1 = Most of them, 2 = Half of them, 3 = Few of them

^c 1 = Yes (Accent), 2 = No (No accent)

Coworkers' accent was positively correlated with perceived accent discrimination ($r = .16, p < .05$), and manager's accent was not significantly correlated with perceived accent discrimination ($r = .05, ns$). However, none of the five predictors had significant beta weights.

Hypotheses 6a and 6b expected that perceived race and accent discrimination would be negatively related to job satisfaction. Consistent with these hypotheses, perceived race and accent discrimination were significantly and negatively correlated with job satisfaction ($r = -.40, p < .001$; $r = -.36, p < .001$, respectively), showing that the greater the respondents perceived that they were discriminated against because of their race and their accent, the lesser was their job satisfaction. Hypotheses 7a and 7b, which stated that perceived race and accent discrimination would be negatively related to organizational commitment, were also supported, suggesting that the greater the perception of race and accent discrimination, the lesser the affective commitment towards the organization ($r = -.24, p < .001$; $r = -.21, p < .001$).

To answer research questions 8a and 8b, i.e., what would be the relationship between OCB-I and OCB-O and perceived race and accent discrimination, a correlational analysis was conducted. Results showed that OCB-I was not related to perceived race discrimination ($r = -.09, ns$) or perceived accent discrimination ($r = -.09, ns$).

On the other hand, OCB-O which was not correlated with perceived race discrimination ($r = -.12, ns$), was negatively correlated with perceived accent discrimination ($r = -.22, p < .05$), indicating that the greater the respondents perceived accent discrimination, the less they exhibited OCB-O.

Although Hypotheses 9a and 9b stated that perceived race and accent discrimination would be positively related to intention to quit, results showed that intention to quit was not significantly correlated with perceived race discrimination ($r = .16, ns$) or perceived accent discrimination ($r = .18, ns$). However, the direction of relationship was in the predicted direction for both perceived race and accent discrimination.

Additional Analyses

Additional analyses were conducted in order to further understand perceived race discrimination and accent discrimination. More specifically, it was examined whether demographic variables (e.g., type of industry, education, age, gender) were related to perceived race discrimination and accent discrimination. Interestingly, results showed that education (undergraduate, masters, and doctorate), $F(2,114) = 6.42, p < .01$, and the type of industry for which the respondents worked (technology vs. education) were related to perceived race discrimination, $F(1,105) = 7.44, p < .01$. Those with a doctorate degree perceived most race discrimination ($M = 2.55$), followed by those with an undergraduate degree ($M = 2.32$), and those with a masters degree ($M = 1.93$) perceived the least race discrimination.

Further analyses showed that there were only significant differences between doctorate degree holders and masters degree holders on perceived race discrimination. Likewise, respondents who worked in educational services perceived more race discrimination ($M = 2.45$) than respondents who worked in the technology industry ($M = 1.96$).

Furthermore, a 2 (education: doctorate vs. masters) x 2 (industry type: education vs. technology) two-way ANOVA was conducted on perceived race discrimination. As the sample size of undergraduate degree holders and the sample who were working in other industries like manufacturing and financial services were too small, they were excluded from the two-way ANOVA. Results revealed a significant interaction effect ($F(1, 91) = 7.54, p < .001$). Results of simple effects analyses showed that respondents who held a doctorate degree ($M = 2.98$) perceived more discrimination than respondents who held a masters degree ($M = 1.76$) when they were in the educational services, $F(1, 92) = 15.23, p < .001$, but they did not differ when they were in the technology industry, $F(1, 92) = 2.17, ns$. Similarly, people working in the educational services perceived more discrimination than technology workers when they were doctorate degree holders, $F(1, 92) = 14.15, p < .001$, but it did not differ when they were masters degree holders, $F(1, 92) = .29, ns$. However, the sample size of doctorate degree holders in educational services was small.

A similar 2 (education: doctorate vs. masters) x 2 (industry type: education vs. technology) two-way ANOVA was conducted on perceived accent discrimination. Respondents who held an undergraduate degree and also those who were working in other industries (e.g., financial, manufacturing) were excluded from the analysis owing to small sample size. Results revealed a significant interaction effect ($F(1, 91) = 6.94, p < .01$). Results of simple effects analyses showed that doctorate degree holders perceived more accent discrimination than masters degree holders when they were in the educational services, $F(1, 91) = 11.20, p < .001$, but they did not differ when they were

in the technology industry, $F(1, 91) = .27, ns$. Similarly, people working in the educational services perceived more accent discrimination than technology workers when they were doctorate degree holders, $F(1, 91) = 10.07, p < .001$, but it did not differ when they were graduate degree holders, $F(1, 91) = .06, ns$.

Several additional analyses were conducted using other demographic variables (e.g., age, the number of years in the U.S., tenure, gender, visa status). Results showed that both perceived race discrimination and accent discrimination were not related to respondents' age ($r = .08, ns$; $r = -.03, ns$, respectively), the number of years respondents' lived in the U.S. ($r = .05, ns$; $r = -.05, ns$, respectively), or the number of years respondents' worked for the current organization ($r = .04, ns$; $r = -.01, ns$).

Discussion

The present study examined both the predictors and outcomes associated with perceived race and accent discrimination among immigrants, non-immigrants, and naturalized citizens of Indian origin working in the Bay Area, California. Given the lack of sufficient amount of research on perceived race and accent discrimination in the workplace and the growing importance of workplace diversity, this study sought to investigate organizational justice and work group composition as predictors and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover intention as outcomes of perceived race and accent discrimination. The results of the study show strong support for most of the hypotheses. Although most of the findings in the present study are consistent with previous findings, additional findings contribute to the literature.

The results of the present study suggest that all three types of organizational justice – distributive, procedural, and interactional - are related to both perceived race and accent discrimination. This finding is consistent with previous research (e.g., Foley & Kidder 2002; Frieze et al., 1990; Goldman, 2001). However, unlike the previous studies which measured only one type of organizational justice, the present study examined all three types of justice simultaneously.

Results pertaining to work group composition in terms of co-worker's ethnicity and manager's ethnicity showed that only co-worker's ethnicity was significantly related to perceived race discrimination, indicating that respondents who worked in a group consisting mostly of Indians perceived less race discrimination as compared to

respondents who worked in a group consisting mostly of Whites. This finding is consistent with Ragins and Cornwell (2001) in which they found that gay employees perceived significantly less workplace discrimination when they had a higher proportion of gay coworkers in their work groups. They also found that gay employees perceived significantly less workplace discrimination when they had gay supervisors. This finding, however, is inconsistent with the present study, which found that manager's ethnicity was not related to perceived race or accent discrimination, indicating that working for an Indian manager was not necessarily associated with reduced perceptions of race and accent discrimination. One explanation for this finding is that like the respondents, the Indian managers' themselves may be vulnerable and targeted for race and accent discrimination and this may have reduced their ability to protect their Indian subordinates from discrimination. An alternative explanation may be the ethnicity of the manager. The respondent's manager may have been of another ethnicity (not White or Indian) i.e., Chinese, Japanese, African American and other ethnicity relationships were not tested in this study. Future research could explore the implications of having a non-white manager of a different ethnicity and how that may affect perceptions of race and accent discrimination.

Key findings of this study are that when all the predictors were considered simultaneously, interactional justice and coworker's ethnicity exerted a stronger predictive power than any other predictor variables. These findings indicate the importance of interactional justice perception and the proportion of co-workers with the same ethnicity in one's work group in predicting perceived race discrimination. If

organizations follow their company policies and procedures (that are in accordance with federal laws and legislations), and apply their decisions consistently to and across all employees, the employees are not likely to perceive distributive injustice or procedural injustice. In contrast interactional justice is intangible and there are no mandatory laws or policies indicating how a person is to be treated with respect and courtesy. This then might become the only type of justice through which coworkers and managers show discrimination either overtly or covertly and are not subjected to federal rules or regulations. Therefore, it is not surprising that interactional justice is the strongest predictor of perceived race discrimination.

In terms of outcome variables, consistent with past research findings (Foley & Kidder, 2002; Ensher, Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001; Sanchez & Brock, 1996), the results of the present study also show that perceived race and accent discrimination are related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, unique to the past research, this study uncovered which type of OCB is most important in determining perceived race discrimination.

Most of the studies on perceived discrimination have focused on attitudinal outcomes of perceived discrimination (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment) and have neglected to examine the potential behavioral outcomes or behavioral intentions of perceived discrimination. An exception to this is a study by Ensher et al. (2001) who examined the relationship between perceived race discrimination and OCB, but they did not differentiate OCB into two types (OCB-O and OCB-I) as did the present study. The results of the present study showed that OCB-O was related to perceived race

discrimination, but not to perceived accent discrimination, and that OCB-I was not related to either perceived race discrimination or perceived accent discrimination.

It is interesting to note that when employees perceive that they are discriminated against because of their race, they are less likely to exhibit citizenship behavior towards the organization rather than toward individuals who might have discriminated against them. This could be due to the fact that Indians are from a collectivist culture (Triandis, 1995) and therefore they attribute all actions to the organization as a whole and not toward a specific individual. This may be a reason as to why OCB-O, not OCB-I, was related to perceived race discrimination. However, this interpretation is speculative.

Contrary to previous research conducted by Ragins and Cornwell (2001), in the present study turnover intention was not positively related to perceived race and accent discrimination. This lack of relationship between turnover intention and perceived race discrimination and accent discrimination might be due to the visa status of the sample rather than the absence of the relationships. About 37.8% of the respondents in this study were non-immigrants. As non-immigrants, these respondents are classified as temporary workers employed in jobs that require specialized knowledge and are permitted to work and live in the U.S. for a maximum period of six years. In order to obtain permanent resident status, U.S. law mandates individuals to apply for a green card and the process to obtain permanent status takes anywhere between two and four years and sometimes longer (USCIS, n.d.). Once an individual applies for a green card, he/she cannot leave the organization in which he/she is currently employed as otherwise the entire process has to be started all over again when he/she joins a new organization. This could be one

of the reasons why respondents do not have an intention to quit the company irrespective of whether they perceive they are discriminated against.

Thus, the present study show that perceived discrimination, particularly perceived race discrimination, are not only related to job-related attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment) but also related to job-related behaviors (i.e., OCB-O). Even so, perceived discrimination is more likely to predict work-related attitudes than work-related behavior.

Interestingly, the present study showed the relationship between the type of industry in which respondents work and perceived race discrimination. Results showed that respondents who worked in educational services perceived more discrimination than respondents who worked in the technology industry. This finding is not surprising, given that workplace diversity in the technology industry is greater than the workplace diversity in educational services. Especially, the technology industry in the Bay Area is heavily populated by Indians and people from other ethnic groups. Diversity is commonplace and is not an exception in the technology industry in the Bay Area. However, because the number of Indians employed in educational services is still very small, the few Indians who work in a predominantly White dominated workplace feel that they are discriminated against.

An unexpected but interesting finding was the relationship between the educational level of respondents and perceived race discrimination. Respondents who held doctorate degrees perceived more race discrimination than respondents who held masters degree. This is an unexpected finding given the assumption that higher

educational levels would be associated with lower perception of discrimination. To explore this relationship further and to gain a better understanding of the nature of the relationship, a two-way ANOVA was conducted using type of industry and educational level of respondents as independent variables and perceived discrimination as a dependent variable. Results revealed that those with doctorate degrees in educational services perceived more race and accent discrimination than those with masters degree in educational services. However, there was no difference between those with doctorate degrees and those with masters degree on perceived race discrimination and accent discrimination in the technology industry. In the technology industry, it is immaterial whether one holds a doctorate or masters degree. These findings shed light on the different expectations that educational services have, compared to those that the technology industry has, toward their employees. The findings show that respondents working as professors face both perceived race and accent discrimination. In addition, this was the only finding in which perceived accent discrimination was significantly related emphasizing the fact that in educational services, not having an foreign accent is important given the nature of the job (i.e., teaching).

Finally, perceived accent discrimination was not related to coworkers' or manager's ethnicity, and was also not related to turnover intention, OCB-I, or OCB-O. These findings could suggest that perceived accent discrimination may not be a significant form of discrimination. Or alternatively, these findings could be due to the fact that because 70% of the sample is from the technology industry, where oral communication is not as crucial as the technical skills needed to perform the job. In

addition, 40% of the respondents indicated that most of their coworkers spoke English with an accent. These might be reasons that respondents did not feel that they were discriminated against because of their accent.

Implications of the Study

Results of the study have important practical implications for managers, individual employees, and Human Resources (HR) professionals. The results suggest that employee perceptions of discrimination are powerful as they have an impact on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCB, and that HR practitioners can play a pivotal role in managing these perceptions. The use of assessment tools like employee opinion survey, climate survey, and exit interviews can help in assessing and addressing perceptions of discrimination (Ensher et al., 2001). Such assessments can help HR professionals identify whether employees perceive discrimination in the workplace and necessary remedial action can be taken immediately.

The results of the present study also indicate that interactional justice is the most important predictor of perceived race and discrimination, suggesting the importance of treating employees with respect and dignity. In order to do this, managers need to understand differences in values, beliefs, or assumptions among their employees. One way to do this effectively is to offer diversity training to both managers and employees.

They can undergo diversity training programs to value and understand the importance of diversity in the workplace. Recent empirical evidence suggests that diversity training can be very effective in changing employee attitudes (Hanover & Cellar, 1998).

Managers in particular have an impact on their subordinates' work behavior and attitude. Managers/leaders can positively impact subordinates behavioral and performance outcomes (OCBs and job performance) and job attitudes (job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intention to quit) (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Given the importance of the manager-subordinate dyad relationship, regular training and development of managerial skills pertaining to effectively managing employee perceptions of diversity and discrimination must be offered to managers on a periodic basis.

Organizations can make diversity training as part of new employee orientation training to show their commitment to addressing employee's perceptions of discrimination early on and thereby, communicating to new employees the need for valuing diversity in the workplace. Mentoring program can also be used in changing employee perceptions. Research suggests that employees with powerful mentors may perceive and also experience less discrimination than those with less influential mentors (Dreher & Cox, 1996).

Diversity programs and mentoring programs are effective only when organizations show long-term commitment to manage diversity in order to change employee attitudes (Ensher et al., 2001). This would require change from top to bottom and requires top management support, a business-driven culture to manage diversity, and an organization wide change effort that rewards diversity-friendly behaviors (Colvin, 1999; Cox, 1993).

In sum, regular assessment of employee perceptions, continuous diversity training and mentoring programs, and organization wide commitment to fostering diversity are some of the ways in which HR practitioners can change their employee's perceptions of discrimination in the workplace.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Despite the present study's contributions to the area of perceived discrimination, it is not without limitations. One limitation of this study is the cross sectional nature of research. This type of research design does not allow one to make causal inferences and it is, therefore, difficult to make the causal direction of the relationship. For example, does perceived race discrimination cause decreased job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior or could the reverse be true? To clarify the causal direction of the relationship, longitudinal research needs to be conducted and future studies should focus on longitudinal and experimental designs in order to better understand the causal effects.

Another limitation of this study is its reliance on self-report data. Self-report data are vulnerable to common method variance or social desirability bias and this is always a concern in surveys measuring attitudes (Howard, 1994). However, recent research has shown that when the variables of interest measured in the study are attitudinal or is related to self-perceptions, it is satisfactory to use self-report data (Spector, 1994; Maurer & Tarulli, 1994). Future research needs to address the issue of measuring perceived discrimination by adopting different methodology and should also control for social

desirability bias. For example, OCB could be rated by coworkers and managers instead of respondents rating themselves.

Another aspect of this study that may be viewed as both a strength and a limitation is the sample. Only one ethnic group (i.e., Indians) was used for this study and therefore the results cannot be generalized to other ethnic groups. However, no research until now has been done examining the perceptions of Indians in the workplace with regard to discrimination, and this study is the first of its kind to explore this dimension. Future studies using diverse sample like Mexicans, African Americans, Chinese, or Japanese would be a contribution to this area of research and further increase the generalizability of the study.

In addition to the sample being only Indians, about 70% of the respondents were from the technology industry and were also highly educated. This limitation could be attributed to the type of sampling employed for data collection. In this study snowball sampling was used to collect data and because of that the sample is not diverse. The fact that the sample consisted of highly educated professional and technical employees limits the generalizability of this study. Future research should replicate the results using blue-collar and skilled trade workers and should use sampling methods such as random sampling or stratified sampling to ensure that the sample is well represented across all industries and levels of education.

Another potential limitation of this study is that it relies on respondents to indicate their perceptions of race and accent discrimination which may or may not reflect actual patterns and practices of discrimination. Individuals may not perceive race or accent

discrimination if they are unaware of discriminatory actions used against them or may perceive even benign actions as discriminatory (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Future research could examine race and accent discrimination within a given organization and also compare these perceptions with more objective forms of wage and promotion discrimination. Further, Ragins & Cornwell found in their study that institutional racism, i.e., the application of the institution's policies and procedures to produce racist consequences (Jones, 1972), also predict perceived discrimination. Institutional racism which reflects the culture of the organization is represented by the organizational policies and practices. Therefore, future studies need to examine whether organizational policies and practices or organizational culture predict perceived race and accent discrimination.

While the present study examined the predictors and outcomes of perceived race and discrimination it did not examine the mediating relationship between the two. Future studies could examine whether perceived race and accent discrimination mediate the relationship between predictors and outcomes.

In conclusion, this study makes an important contribution to the existing literature on perceived race and accent discrimination by examining predictors and outcomes associated with discrimination. The results indicate that employees' perceptions do predict work related attitudes and behaviors such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCB-O. Organizations need to recognize the mantra "perception is reality," because the individual's perception of a situation is his or her reality and that perception of discrimination is sufficient enough to predict work attitudes and behaviors.

Toward that end, HR professional and managers need to ensure that “perception is consistent with reality.”

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchanges. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Bantel, K.A. & Jackson, S.E. (1989). Top management and innovations in banking: Does the composition of the top team make a difference? *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 107-124.
- Barak, M. E. M., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34(1), 82-104.
- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1988). Voice and justification: Their influence on procedural fairness judgments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 676-685.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Core self-evaluations: A review of the trait and its role in job satisfaction and job performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 5-18.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. R. (1979). *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G. D., & Klesh, J. R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. Seashore & E. E. I. Lawler & P. Mirvis, H. & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing Organizational Change: A Guide to Methods, Measures, and Practices*. New York: John Wiley & sons.
- Cassidy, C., O'Connor, R.C., Howe, C., & Warden, D. (2004). Perceived discrimination and psychological distress: The role of personal and ethnic self-esteem. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51, 329-339.

Caucasian Race (2005, October 20). In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caucasian_race

Chaube, K. (2005, February 8). American clients running away from call centers with heavy Indian accent. *India Daily*. Retrieved November 2, 2005, from <http://www.indiadaily.com/editorial/1552.asp>

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.

Colvin, G. (1999, July 19). The 50 best companies for Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics. *Fortune*, 53-70.

Cox, T. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organization: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cox, T.H., Lobel, S.A., & McLeod, P. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(4), 827-847.

De Dreu, C. K. W., & West, M. A. (2001). Minority dissent and team innovation: The importance of participation in decision making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 1191-1201.

Dell cancels Indian tech support. (2003, November 26). *CNN.com*. Retrieved on October 29, 2005 from <http://www.cnn.com/2003/TECH/biztech/11/24/dell.call.centers.ap/>

Dirks, K.T. & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for organizational research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 611-628.

Dorr, B. W. (1992). *Stereotypes and the perception of discrimination: Understanding minority work-related attitudes and behaviors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.

- Dreher, G. F., & Cox, T. H. (1996). Race, gender, and opportunity: A study of compensation attainment and the establishment of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 297-308.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(1), 51-59.
- Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*(1), 53-72.
- Floyd, M., & Gramann, J.H. (1995). Perceptions of discrimination in a recreation context. *Journal of Leisure Research, 27*, 192-199.
- Foley, S. & Kidder, D. L. (2002). Hispanic law students' perceptions of discrimination, justice, and career prospects. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24*, 23-37.
- Frieze, I. H., Olson, J. E., & Good, D. C. (1990). Perceived and actual discrimination in the salaries of male and female managers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 20*, 46-67.
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 694-734.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of a spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Goldman, B.M. (2001). Toward an understanding of employment discrimination claiming: An integration of organizational justice and social information processing theories. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 361-386.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 55-61.

- Grieco, E. (2003). The foreign born from India in the United States. *Migration Information Source*. Retrieved October 23, 2005 from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?id=185>
- Gutek, B. A., Cohen, A. G., & Tsui, A. (1996). Reactions to perceived sex discrimination. *Human Relations*, 49(6), 791-813.
- Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work Redesigns*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Hanover, J. M. B., & Cellar, D. F. (1998). Environmental factors and the effectiveness of workforce diversity training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(2), 105-124.
- Harris, M.M., Lievens, F., & Van Hove, G. (2004). "I think they discriminated against me": Using prototype theory and organizational justice theory for understanding perceived discrimination in selection and promotion decisions. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 54-65.
- Howard, G. S. (1994). Why do people say nasty things about self-reports? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 399-404.
- Indian American. (2005, October 25). In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_American
- Indian History. (2005, October 23) In *Indian history*. Retrieved on October 23, 2005, from <http://www.indhistory.com/india-caste-system.html>
- James, K., Lovato, C., & Cropanzano, R. (1994). Correlational and known-group comparison validation of a workplace prejudice/discrimination inventory. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 1573-1592.

Jayne, M. E. A., & Dipboye, R.L. (2004). Leveraging diversity to improve business performance; Research findings and recommendations for organizations. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 409-424.

Jones, J. M. (1972). *Prejudice and racism*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Krishnan, A., & Berry, J. W. (1992). Acculturative stress and acculturation attitudes among Indian immigrants to the United States. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 4, 187-212.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory?: New approaches to studying fairness in social relationship. In K.J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.

Lind, E. A., & Taylor, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Skokie, IL: Rand McNally.

Manas. (n.d.) *British India*. Retrieved on October 25, 2005, from University of California, Los Angeles:
<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/southasia/History/British/BrIndia.html>

Maurer, T., & Tarulli, B. (1994). Investigation of perceived environment, perceived outcome, and person variables in relationship to voluntary development activity by employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 3-14

McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 836-844.

- Mena, F. J., Padilla, A. M., & Maldonado, M. (1987). Acculturative stress and specific coping strategies among immigrant and later generation college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9(2), 207-225.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, J.N. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological consideration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, J.N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-98.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., and Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Mirage, L. (1994). Development of an instrument measuring valence of ethnicity and perception of discrimination. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 22, 49-59.
- Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Moorman, R.H. & Blakely, G.L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 127-142.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior*. San Francisco: New Lexington Press.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802.

- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-499.
- Outsourcing: 100 US bills target India. (2005, May 12). *The Economic Times*. Retrieved on October 28, 2005, from <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/articleshow/msid-1108519,curpg-1.cms>
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Phinney, J. S., Madden, T., & Santos, L. J. (1998). Psychological variables as predictors of perceived ethnic discrimination among minority and immigrant adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 937-953.
- Podsakoff, P.M. Mackenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter. R. (1990) Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction and OCB, *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142
- Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1244-1261.
- Sanchez, J. I., & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 704-719.
- Schminke, M., Cropanzano, R., & Rupp, D. E. (2002). Organization structure and fairness perceptions: The moderating effects of organizational level. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89, 881-905.
- Selmi, M. (2003). The price of discrimination: The nature of class-action employment discrimination litigation and its effects. *Texas Law Review*, 81(5), 1249-1335.

- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- Spector, P. E. (1994). Using self-report questionnaires in OB research: A comment on the use of a controversial method. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 385-392.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Stone-Romero, E. F., Stone, D. (2005). How do organizational justice concepts relate to discrimination and prejudice? In Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A., *In handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 439-467). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sue, S. & Wagner, N. N. (1973) *Asian-Aicans: Psychological perspectives*. Ben Lomond, CA: Science and Behavior Books
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549-579.
- United States Census Bureau (2000). *Language use and English-speaking ability: 2000*. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-29.pdf>
- United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (n.d.) *Immigration laws, regulations and guides*. Retrieved September 12, 2005, from <http://www.uscis.gov/graphics/lawsregs/index.htm>
- United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (2005). *Labor force characteristics of foreign-born workers summary*. Retrieved September 9, 2005, from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/forbrn.nr0.htm>

United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2003). *Occupational employment in private industry by race/ethnic group/sex, and by industry, United States, 2003*. Retrieved September 9, 2005, from <http://www.eeoc.gov/stats/jobpat/2003/national.html>

United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (n.d.). *Charge statistics, FY 1992 to FY 2004*. Retrieved September 9, 2005, from <http://www.eeoc.gov/stats/charges.html>

Westhoff, W. (1993). A psychological study of albinism in a predominantly mulatto Caribbean community. *Psychological Reports*, 73, 1007-1010.

Williams, L. J. & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617

Appendix A

Survey Items

Perceived race discrimination (James, Lovato, & Cropanzano, 1994; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987; Dorr, 1992)

1. At work, I sometimes feel that my ethnicity is a limitation.
2. Where I work promotions and rewards are not influenced by racial or ethnic group membership.
3. At work, I have sometimes been unfairly singled out because of my racial/ethnic background.
4. At work, people are intolerant of others from different ethnic backgrounds
5. At work, I feel that others exclude me from their activities because of my ethnicity.
6. There is no racial discrimination in my workplace. (R)
7. At work, I feel that my opinion is not valued because of the color of my skin.
8. Supervisors scrutinize the work of members of my group more than that of members of other racial/ethnic groups.
9. People of my ethnicity are given the same level of responsibility in work settings as people of other ethnic groups. (R)
10. At work, I do not get enough recognition because of my ethnic origin.
11. At work, people of other racial/ethnic groups do not tell me some job-related information that they share with members of their own group.
12. Where I work all people are treated the same, regardless of their racial/ethnic group.(R)
13. At work, many people have stereotypes about my culture or ethnic group and treat me as if they were true.
14. Where I work members of some racial/ethnic groups are treated better than members of other groups.
15. Because of my ethnicity, my opinions are often ignored at work.
16. At work, I am treated poorly because of my racial/ethnic group.
17. At work, people of my ethnicity must work harder than people of other ethnic groups with equal ability in order to receive the same recognition

Perceived accent discrimination (James, Lovato, & Cropanzano, 1994; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987)

1. My accent is a limitation at work.
2. Because of my accent, my opinions are often ignored at work.
3. At work, I have sometimes been unfairly singled out because of my accent.
4. At work, people are intolerant of others who speak English with an accent
5. At work, people think I am unsociable when in fact I have trouble communicating in English.
6. Where I work all people are treated the same, regardless of their accent. (R)

7. At work, I feel uncomfortable when others make jokes or negative commentaries about the accent of the people of my ethnic background.
8. At work, people look down upon me because of my accent.
9. At work, I feel that others exclude me from their activities because of my accent.
10. There is no accent discrimination in my workplace. (R)
11. At work, many people have stereotypes about the English accent of my culture or ethnic group and treat me as if they were true.
12. At work, I do not get enough recognition because of my accent.
13. Where I work people who speak English without an accent are treated better than those who speak with an accent.
14. At work, I am treated poorly because of my accent.

Organizational Justice (Schminke, Cropanzano, and Rupp, 2002).

1. The amount of pay that I receive.
2. The opportunities I have for promotion.
3. The opportunities I have for professional development.
4. My work schedule.
5. My performance ratings.
6. The amount of benefits I receive.
7. The process by which my pay is decided.
8. The way promotions are decided.
9. The procedures for determining who gets professional development opportunities.
10. The policies for setting my work schedule.
11. The procedures for doing my performance evaluations.
12. The policies for determining my benefits package.
13. The amount of respect I receive.
14. The way my manager communicates with me.
15. The explanations I hear when decisions are made.
16. The amount of information I get when I want to know something.

Work group composition

1. My co-workers in my work group are:
 - (a) Mostly Indians
 - (b) Indians and Whites (e.g., Caucasians)
 - (c) Indians and other ethnicity (e.g., Chinese, Hispanic, African American)
 - (d) Indians, Whites and other ethnicity
 - (e) Mostly Whites and other ethnicity
 - (f) Mostly Whites
 - (g) Mostly other ethnicity
 - (h) Not applicable (I do not work in a team)

2. My immediate manager/supervisor is:
 (a) Indian (b) White/Others
3. Composition of coworkers in my work group who speak English with an accent:
 (a) All of them (b) Most of them (c) Half of them (d) Few of them
 (e) No one
4. My immediate manager/supervisor speaks English with an accent:
 (a) Yes (b) No

Job satisfaction (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh, 1979)

1. All in all I am satisfied with my job.
2. In general, I like working here
3. In general, I don't like my job. (R)

Affective commitment (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1997)

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career at this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel like "part of the family" at this organization. (R)
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to my organization. (R)
5. My organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (R)

Organizational citizenship behavior – I (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990; Moorman and Blakely, 1995)

1. I generally go out of the way to help co-workers with work-related problems.
2. I voluntarily help new employees settle into the job.
3. I am generally willing to cover work assignments for colleagues when needed.
4. I show genuine concern and courtesy toward co-workers, even under the most trying business or personal situations.
5. I frequently adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time-off.
6. I always go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.

Organizational citizenship behavior – O (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990; Moorman and Blakely, 1995)

1. I defend the organization when other employees criticize it.
2. I actively promote the organization's products and services to potential users.
3. I comply with company rules and procedures even when nobody watches and no evidence can be traced.
4. I take undeserved work breaks. (R)
5. I do not use company resources to do personal business (e.g., company phones, copy machines, and computer)
6. I avoid consuming a lot of time complaining about trivial matters.
7. I am generally willing to stand up to protect the reputation of the company.
8. I avoid extra duties and responsibilities at work. (R)
9. I generally attend functions that are not required but that help the organization's image.
10. I rarely miss work even when I have a legitimate reason for doing so.
11. I give advance notice when I am unable to come to work.
12. I make constructive suggestions to improve my department/company.

Turnover intentions (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh, 1983)

1. I will probably look for a new job in the next year.
2. I frequently think of quitting this job.
3. It is very likely that I will look for a job outside of this organization during the next year.