

# The effect of workplace discrimination on job attitudes

A study about the effect of workplace discrimination on employees in the Netherlands on job satisfaction, -connectedness, and -enthusiasm, and how this effect is moderated by perceived organizational support



**Universiteit Utrecht**



Karlijn Wielaart (6214975)

Master's thesis Sociology

Utrecht University

Thesis supervisor: Deni Mazrekaj

Second assessor: Luuk Mandemakers

24th of June 2022

# Table of content

<b>Abstract</b> .....	3
<b>Ethical statement</b> .....	3
<b>Introduction</b> .....	4
<b>Theoretical background</b> .....	6
Social exchange theory.....	6
Perceived organizational support as moderator.....	8
<b>Data &amp; Methods</b> .....	9
Data description.....	9
Variables & operationalization.....	10
Strategy of analysis.....	13
<b>Results</b> .....	14
Descriptive analysis.....	14
Testing of the hypotheses.....	15
<b>Discussion</b> .....	20
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	23
<b>Reference list</b> .....	24

## Abstract

Discrimination is known to have negative effects on different aspects of people's lives, mentally as well as physically. This study looks in to discrimination at work specifically, and at the effects that it has on job satisfaction, job connectedness, and job enthusiasm. Perceived organizational support (POS) in the form of the perceived amount of organizational attention to wellbeing is taken in to account as a moderator for this effect. Based on the social exchange theory and previous research in this field a negative relationship of discrimination on the three job attitudes is expected, and POS is thought to have a buffering role regarding this effect. These hypotheses are tested using data from *WERKonderzoek2019* with multiple regression analyses and the results show a negative effect of workplace discrimination on job satisfaction, -connectedness, and -enthusiasm as expected. The effect is strongest for job satisfaction, and least strong for job enthusiasm. POS is found to have a positive moderating effect for all three job attitudes, meaning a higher level of POS makes the negative effects of workplace discrimination less negative.

**Key words:** workplace discrimination, job satisfaction, job connectedness, job enthusiasm, job attitudes, perceived organizational support, social exchange theory

## Ethical statement

Before the start of this study the research plan and details about the dataset I was planning to use were send to the Ethical Review Board of the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences of Utrecht University for approval. On the first of April 2022 the board gave its approval concerning ethical aspects, as well as data management and privacy issues (including the GDPR) for the study.

**File number:** 22-0798

## Introduction

As a society, we are caring more and more about how we experience our job. Work life seems to be among one of the most important dimensions when studying subjective quality of life (Bowling & Windsor, 2001), and job satisfaction is closely related to global measures of life satisfaction and subjective well-being (Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Bowling et al., 2010). This makes attitudes towards one's job important to study, as it supposedly has a great impact on our daily lives. In this study the focus is on three different attitudes: overall job satisfaction, job connectedness, and job enthusiasm. Positive attitudes towards one's job can be influenced by many different factors, like organizational climate or skill variety (Siu, 2002; Thomas et al. 2004; Glisson & Durick, 1988). Another factor could be the way you are treated at work, for example whether or not you have experienced discrimination at the work place.

According to the *Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau (SCP)*, more than a quarter (27%) of the population in The Netherlands reports that they have to deal with some sort of discrimination in their daily life (2020). At work specifically, 16% percent of people report that they have experienced discrimination, mostly due to age, gender, and/or ethnic background (SCP, 2020). Hence, this number represents the experienced discrimination at the workplace, not the discrimination on the labor market. Scholars have argued that "modern" discrimination takes a different form than it did in the past; it is less literal and more subtle (Cortina, 2008; Deitch et al., 2003; Dipboye & Halverson, 2004; Dovidio & Hebl, 2005). This can make it hard to recognize, which means the 16% of people who report experienced discrimination can be an underestimation of the real number. When people who are not entirely sure whether they have experienced discrimination at work or not are also taken in to account, it comes down to a quarter of the Dutch working population (SCP, 2020).

The effects of workplace discrimination have been widely researched, and studies indicate that it has all kinds of negative consequences. For example, De Castro et al. found that workplace discrimination is related to an increased number of health conditions under Filipino Americans, and that this effect stayed significant after controlling for experienced every day discrimination. Rospenda et al. found that experiencing workplace harassment was linked to more problem drinking for men (2008). From the perspective of an employer, it is not only important to know what workplace discrimination does to the well-being of employees, but also how this relates to their attitude towards their job. Negative job attitudes are predictors of absenteeism, intention to leave, and actual turn-over (Smokrovic et al., 2019; Lee & Mowday, 1987; Hom and Kinicki, 2001; Sablinski et al., 2002;). This means that if the impact of unfair

treatment of marginalized groups at the workplace negatively influences the job attitudes of employees this in turn has negative organizational consequences. For an organization to keep their employees they need to make sure that the attitudes towards the organization amongst their employees are positive. Studies have shown that perceived organizational support (POS) is one of the ways positive organizational outcomes such as less absenteeism, more retention, and higher job satisfaction can be influenced. (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Riggle et al., 2009) ). These effects are found to be true across different cultures (Chiaburu et al., 2015; Rockstuhl et al., 2020). This, in combination with the earlier mentioned negative consequences of workplace discrimination and the idea that positive attitudes towards one's job seem to influence people's personal well-being as well as organizational outcomes, leads to the following research question that I will be trying to answer in this study:

*“To what extent does experiencing discrimination at the workplace affect job satisfaction, -connectedness, and -enthusiasm of employees in The Netherlands, and how is this effect moderated by perceived organizational support?”*

This paper will add to the existing academic literature regarding discrimination and job attitudes in two ways. First, in many studies job satisfaction relating to effects of workplace discrimination, bullying, or harassment is measured by only asking employees how satisfied they are with their job overall (e.g. Deitch et al., 2003; MacIntosh & Doherty, 2010; Parzefall & Salin, 2010). However, job satisfaction is more complex than that. Aspects of a job are for example the contact with your colleagues, the organizational culture, the salary, the management, or the actual tasks that need to be performed (Ravari et al., 2012). Asking whether someone is generally satisfied with their job does not give insights into what part of their job is not satisfactory. That is why in this study, instead of only looking at ‘job satisfaction’, I talk about positive job attitudes as an umbrella term and make a distinction between overall job satisfaction, job connectedness, and job enthusiasm to cover different sides of what a job entails and get a better idea of the mechanism that lies behind negative workplace discrimination effects. The three attitudes I will be studying all have a slight different approach. Overall job satisfaction is about the satisfaction of an employee regarding job, team, and organization. This is a broader concept and measures a combination of feelings towards the tasks, colleagues, and organization as a whole. Job connectedness concerns the social part of a job, like feeling appreciated and feeling like part of the ‘family’ at work. Job enthusiasm concerns the task-related part of a job and looks at the way your actual work inspires you, and how you feel when you are working really hard.

The second way this study contributes to the existing literature, is by looking at the moderating effect of perceived organizational support in the context of discrimination. POS has been looked at as a moderator for the negative effects of occupational stress at the workplace before (Jain et al., 2013; Malik & Noreen, 2015), and it seems that POS does act as a moderator in these instances. However, when studying the effects of workplace discrimination the effect of POS as a moderator has not yet been studied.

The outcome of this study can help future policy makers, because looking at POS gives a broader look in to how important the *perception* of support is instead of factual support. The evaluation of specific policies that are implemented to support employees. Employers can put all kinds of policies or programs in place, but if this study finds that perceived support is an important factor in moderating negative discrimination effects this means that when implementing these policies the communication towards the employees should not be overlooked. Furthermore, organizations that want to create or improve their policies with regard to providing care for people who have experienced discrimination at work, can also benefit from the findings of this study if differences are found in the way discrimination affects different aspects of a job. One can argue that it is best for organizations to focus on stopping discrimination at the source and making sure instances of unfair treatment do not occur at their workplace, but due to implicit biases unfair treatment of marginalized groups is hard to prevent completely. This means that knowing what aspects of the job are affected most is useful to know when a discrimination instance *does* take place.

## **Theoretical background**

### **Social exchange theory**

To predict the effect of workplace discrimination on job satisfaction, -connectedness, and -enthusiasm, I look in to the mechanism of the social exchange theory (SET). According to Coyle-Shapiro & Shore (2007) and Cropanzano & Mitchell (2005) this is one of the most influential theories when it comes to organizational behavior literature. Broadly speaking this theory states that actors strive for, and expect, a balance between what they give and what they will receive in a situation (e.g. Levine & White, 1961). This ‘exchange’ is not done under any formal contract but is typically based on trust (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). The expectation of receiving is the key here. At work this translates to positive attitudes and behaviors (e.g.

performing well at work) from employees who receive a positive work environment, and therefore negative attitudes and behaviors from employees who expect their work environment to be pleasant but then not receive this (Ma, Samuels, & Alexander, 2003).

Relating this to the current study, I expect that workplace discrimination will negatively influence job attitudes. An employee working at an organization initially expects a safe and pleasant work environment, and will have attitudes accordingly. When an instance of workplace discrimination takes place, the equilibrium of what the employee gives and receives in the situation is disturbed and the situation does not match their expectations. The employee will make this right by adjusting their attitude towards their job downwards.

This expectation is also supported by previous research that has been done in the direction of discrimination and job attitudes. For example, Ensher et al. (2001) found that ethnic or gender discrimination at the workplace, either by coworkers, supervisors, or the organization itself, has a negative influence on job satisfaction. For all three aspects of job satisfaction that I will take in to account in this paper I expect the following:

*H1: The effect of experiencing workplace discrimination on overall job satisfaction, job connectedness, and job enthusiasm is negative*

I expect a difference in effect size for the three job attitudes based on the SET mechanism. This is because the attitudes I test all have a different approach. Job enthusiasm is conceptualized as the attitude towards the task-related part of your job, and job connectedness is conceptualized as the way you feel about your relationship with your co-workers and how you are appreciated by them. Overall job satisfaction is a mixture of the two. Discrimination is linked to the social aspect of work. So, In a work exchange situation where someone experiences discrimination, the expectations they had that were related to social contacts will be violated more than the expectations they had that were task-related. That is why in turn, social-related attitudes will be adjusted the most, and task-related attitudes will be adjusted the least. This leads to the expectation that the negative effect of discrimination is strongest for job connectedness. The smallest effect I expect to see from job enthusiasm.

This is also suggested by previous research. Most found effects of workplace discrimination are related to overall job satisfaction or connection to your job. Sanchez & Brock (1996) studied the effects of perceived workplace discrimination on work-related outcomes. They found that perceived discrimination decreased job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Mowday et al. (1982) found that the psychological bond someone has with their

workplace is a determinant for behavioral investments and intention to stay at the organization they work for. Therefore, the following hypothesis is tested:

*H2: The negative effect of workplace discrimination is strongest for job connectedness, and weakest for job enthusiasm.*

### **Perceived organizational support as moderator**

Previous studies suggest that organizational support (POS) is an important factor in the exchange relationship between the employee and their organization (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003; Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2007). POS is measured in this study as the satisfaction with the amount of attention the organization gives to the personal wellbeing of the employee. Turning to the SET again, I expect POS to moderate the negative effect of discrimination on job attitudes. The expected balance between giving and receiving is disturbed when a discrimination instance takes place which results in less positive job attitudes, but is slightly stabilized again when there is perceived attention to personal wellbeing. The organization then ‘gives’ more in the situation than it does when there is no POS, which helps the employee cope with the negative experience.

This expectation is also supported by earlier research. There are no studies that look into the exact same variables as I do in the current study, but there are some results regarding bullying and negative work experiences that help predict the moderating effect of POS on the effect of workplace discrimination on job attitudes. Research done by Parzefall & Salin (2010) on effects of workplace bullying theorizes with POS as a moderator, and tells us that POS might act as a coping mechanism for being bullied at work. Although the authors talk about workplace bullying, I expect the mechanism to work the same for workplace discrimination. Leather et. al (1998) find that POS reduces psychological strain in stressful situations at work, and induces wellbeing and health of workers. Keashly (2001) looked in to how emotional abuse affects employees, and found that a lack of organizational intervention correlated with lower levels of commitment, loyalty, and effort at work. A later study from Dulac et al. (2008) suggests that POS reduces the negative effect of psychological contract breach on negative emotional responses at work. These studies, in combination with the ideas of the SET, lead to the following hypothesis:

*H3: The higher the satisfaction with the perceived organizational support, the less negative the effect of workplace discrimination on positive job attitudes*



## Data & Methods

### Data description

To find out what the effect of workplace discrimination on job satisfaction is I used data from the *WERKonderzoek2019* (CBS, 2020). This study is a co-production of the Dutch ministry of *Binnenlandse zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties* (BZK) and the *Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek* (CBS) and was originally put in place in 1999 by the ministry of BZK under the name POMO to get an insight into the work experiences of employees in the Dutch public sector. One of the main goals was to find out how connected and how enthusiastic public sector employees were regarding their job, which fits the goals of the current study with a focus on job satisfaction. The survey is done every two years, but the 2019 version is the first time it was done in collaboration with the CBS. In this version of the survey extra attention has been paid to the social security of employees in the public sector, which connects well to the mediating effect of organizational attention to personal wellbeing.

The data collection of *WERKonderzoek2019* took place in spring 2019. At first an invitation letter was sent out to all potential participants which contained information about the study and personal login details to the online survey. When people did not respond to the first invitation they received a second or in some cases third letter to combat non-response.

Initially 95000 people were asked to participate in the survey. Based on policy administration information the CBS has on all registered people in The Netherlands, CBS conducted a sector stratified sample. Even though the goal of the study was to look into the public sector, they selected people from non-public sectors as well (excluding the catering-, agricultural-, and industry sector). The response rate was 41,7%, which comes down to 39640 people who eventually participated in the research.

In the current study the analyses are done with a selection of cases from the initial sample to make sure all analyses were performed on the same population. All cases that did not have a valid value on the items that made up the dependent variables were filtered out of the data set first. In this step 2243 cases were excluded from the data resulting in 37397 remaining cases. Secondly all cases that did not have a valid value on items regarding the independent variables (including control- and moderating variables) were filtered out. This reduced the number of valid cases with 26435, resulting in a final selection of 10310 participants. The fact that this is almost a third of the original sample is due to the fact that not all participants filled in the same exact survey. For some respondents the routing lead to a very long survey with a higher change of dropping out, so it was decided to cut some of the questions for some of the respondents (CBS, 2020). Because I want to perform my analyses on one and the same sample,

and because by keeping the selection this way the number of valid cases is still over 10.000, it was decided to not keep any cases with missing or invalid scores in the selection.

## **Variables & operationalization**

### *Dependent variables*

*Overall job satisfaction.* Job satisfaction is measured by asking the respondents how satisfied they were with their 1) *job*, 2) *team*, and 3) *organization*. All three items could be answered on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 stood for 'very unsatisfied' and 5 stood for 'very satisfied'. After performing a factor analysis, the three items appear to load on one factor that explains 62,97% of the variance within the items. This, in combination with a Cronbach's alpha of .701 as a reliability outcome, led to the decision of combining all three items into one new overall job satisfaction variable by taking the mean of the combined scores. A higher score means being more satisfied with your organization.

*Job connectedness.* For measuring how connected the respondent feels to their organization, 4 items were combined. The respondent was given 4 statements and was asked whether they 1= 'very much disagree', 2= 'disagree', 3= 'do not agree, do not disagree', 4= 'agree', or = 'very much agree' with them. The following statements were used: 1) "*I feel appreciated within this organization*", 2) "*I feel emotionally connected to this organization*", 3) "*This organization means a lot to me*", and 4) "*I feel like I am a part of the family within this organization*". The items load on one factor which accounts for 69,68% of the variance within the items, and have a Cronbach's Alpha of .851 when performing a reliability analysis, which is high enough to be considered reliable. The items were combined into one final connectedness-variable where a higher score stands for a higher level of connectedness to the organization.

*Job enthusiasm.* To measure the level of enthusiasm for their job the participants were asked to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 5, how much they agreed with three statements. 1 meaning that they very much disagreed, 5 meaning that they very much agreed. The statements were as follows: 1) "*My work inspires me*", 2) "*I feel happy when I am working hard*" 3) "*When I wake up in the morning, I am excited to go to work*". After performing a factor analysis the items appear to load on one factor, accounting for 69,67% of the variance within this factor. A reliability analysis shows a Cronbach's Alpha of .780. The items were combined into a new

variable where the score is the mean of the scores of the 3 items. The new variable indicates the level of job enthusiasm; a higher score means a higher level of enthusiasm.

### *Independent variables*

*Workplace discrimination.* To measure whether the respondents have been subject to discrimination at the workplace, I look at the answers to the question: “*In the past 12 months, have you been personally discriminated against at work?*”. Participants could answer this question with the following options: 1) “*Yes, because of my gender*”, 2) “*Yes, because of my skin color*”, 3) “*Yes, because of my religion*”, 4) “*Yes, because of my sexual orientation*” 5) “*Yes, because of my age*”, 6) “*Yes, because of something else*”, and 7) “*No*”. A new, dichotomous variable has been created to measure subjective workplace discrimination. For this variable all respondents who chose option 1 through 6 as an answer get a score of (1), and all respondents who answered with option 7 get a score of (0). Now I have a dichotomous variable that indicates whether someone thinks they have been subject to workplace discrimination in the past 12 months (1) or not (0).

*Perceived organizational support.* POS was measured through the question “*How satisfied are you with the attention of the organization to your personal wellbeing?*”. Participants could answer on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 stands for ‘*very unsatisfied*’ and 5 for ‘*very satisfied*’.

### *Control variables.*

*Gender.* The gender of the participants was determined by directly asking what gender the participant identified with on the date of filling in the questionnaire. There were 2 options; 1) “*Male*” and 2) “*Female*”. For easier interpretation the values were re-coded into a dummy variable ‘female’ where 0=male and 1=female.

*Age.* Age was measured by asking the respondent what their age is on the date of filling in the questionnaire. The ages were then categorized by the CBS into 10 categories. 1) 0-24yrs, 2) 25-29yrs, 3) 30-34yrs, 4) 35-39yrs, 5) 40-44yrs; 6) 45-49yrs, 7) 50-54yrs, 8) 55-59yrs, 9) 60-64yrs, and 10) 65-125yrs. Because only these categories were included in the dataset and not the specific age of the respondent, I decided to divide the respondents in three groups where the first group consists of everyone with a score of 1, 2, or 3 is in one group (0-34 years old), participants with a score of 4, 5, or 6 are in another group (35-49 years old), and lastly everyone

with a score of 7, 8, 9, or 10 are in the last group (50+ years old). The categories were added separately to the regression models as dummy variables.

*Migration background.* The CBS used their policy administration to determine whether the respondent has 1) no migration background, 3) a non-western migration background, or a 4) western migration background. I recoded these categories to dummy-variables which were added separately to the analysis.

*Working hours.* To control for how much time someone spends at their workplace the number of contract hours per week is added to the analysis. This information was extracted from administration data and added to the dataset by the CBS. By law the maximum hours a person can work a week in the Netherlands is 60. I chose to filter out the 7 respondents that had more than 60 contractual work hours per week, because those scores are likely a mistake in the data and 7 cases is only .07% of the whole sample. The score on the eventual variable represents the number of hours the respondent works contractually at their job per week.

*Level of education.* The level of education was measured through several questions. CBS deducted the respondents highest level of education they have had and combined this in to one variable with 9 possible answers: 1) *Lbo, vso*, 2) *Vmbo, lwoo*, 3) *Mavo*, 4) *Havo*, 5) *Vwo*, 6) *Mbo*, 7) *Hbo*, 8) *Wo*, 9) *other*. Respondents with a score of 9 are regarded as missing because ‘other’ gives no information on what kind of education the respondent has had. To make the interpretation of this control variable easier, I recoded the level of education in to three dummy variables based on the CBS education classification (CBS, 2019). The cases with a score of 1, 2, or 3 on the initial education variable were categorized as having a ‘low level of education’, the cases with a score of 4, 5, or 6 were categorized as having a ‘medium level of education’, and lastly the cases with a score of 7 or 8 were categorized as having a ‘high level of education’. These dummies were added separately to the regression model.

An overview of all used variables can be found in Table 1. To get an idea of how the data is distributed the descriptive statistics are given separately for the group that has experienced discrimination and the group that has not. In this table it is clear that the levels of overall job satisfaction, job connectedness, and job enthusiasm are mainly positive in both groups, but are lower for the respondents who have experienced discrimination. The outcome of a more in depth descriptive analysis can be found in the results section.

The majority of respondents in the sample have not experienced discrimination at work in the last year. The respondents have positive job attitudes overall, and are mostly 50+ years

old. The gender distribution is almost equal for the whole sample, and most of the respondents are highly educated. When it comes to migration background for the whole sample the share of people with no migration background is the biggest. Though, it is clear that the group of respondents with a non-western migration background is relatively bigger amongst the people that have experienced discrimination than amongst those who have not. With that, the group of respondents with no migration background is relatively bigger amongst the people that have *not* experienced discrimination than amongst those who have. Lastly, the table shows that people approximately work 32 contractual hours per week.

**Table 1.**  
*Descriptive statistics*

Variable	Experienced discrimination		Not experienced discrimination		Min.	Max.
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<b>Overall job satisfaction</b>	3.38	.82	3.91	.67	1	5
<b>Job connectedness</b>	2.87	.93	3.38	.78	1	5
<b>Job enthusiasm</b>	3.47	.82	3.78	.65	1	5
<b>POS</b>	2.74	1.19	3.49	.98	1	5
<b>Gender (ref=male)</b>	.56	a.	.45	a.	0	1
<b>Age</b>						
<b>0-34 yrs.</b>	.17	a.	.15	a.	0	1
<b>35-49 yrs.</b>	.32	a.	.34	a.	0	1
<b>50-125 yrs.</b>	.50	a.	.51	a.	0	1
<b>Level of education</b>						
<b>Low</b>	.04	a.	.04	a.	0	1
<b>Medium</b>	.23	a.	.26	a.	0	1
<b>High</b>	.73	a.	.70	a.	0	1
<b>Migration background</b>						
<b>None</b>	.78	a.	.90	a.	0	1
<b>Western</b>	.08	a.	.07	a.	0	1
<b>Non-western</b>	.14	a.	.04	a.	0	1
<b>Work hours</b>	32.46	8.06	32.33	7.28	0	45.92
<i>Valid N</i> (Total=10310)	696		9614			

### Strategy of analysis

First, a cross tabulation is done with the main predictor and the three dependent variables to further elaborate on the distribution of the data and the possible effect of workplace discrimination on job satisfaction, -connectedness, and -enthusiasm.

To test the hypotheses a multiple regression is performed. This is done in 2 models for each of the three dependent variables. For the first model the main independent variables

'discrimination' and 'perceived organizational support' are added, together with the control variables. This way the direct effects of discrimination and POS on job satisfaction, connectedness, and enthusiasm are measured.

In the second model the interaction term of POS is added. This model tests whether the effect of experiencing discrimination at the workplace on job attitudes differs for people who are satisfied and who are not satisfied with the attention their organization gives to their personal wellbeing. Before the results of this model can be interpreted the result of the F-test needs to be checked. When the output of the F-test is significant ( $p < .001$ ) that means the interaction term increases the fit of the model and the results of model 2 can be interpreted.

The results of model 2 will show the difference in the effect of experiencing discrimination on the three job attitudes, with people who are not so satisfied with their POS as a reference group.

## **Results**

### **Descriptive analysis**

A cross tabulation between discrimination and job satisfaction, connectedness, and enthusiasm is performed to get a better idea of how the main variables are distributed. For easier interpretation the dependent variables are made dichotomous. Originally all three attitude variables have scores between 1 and 6, where a higher score means more satisfied, more connected, or more enthusiastic. For this analysis all respondents with a score of 3 or lower get the label 'not satisfied', 'not connected', and 'not enthusiastic'. A score that is higher than 3 will now be labeled 'satisfied', 'connected', and 'enthusiastic'. Results of these cross tabulations are shown in table 3.

As shown in table 2, 86.1% of the respondents are satisfied with their job overall. If you only look at the group who has not experienced discrimination at work in the last 12 months, this division stays almost the same: 87,6% of people are satisfied with their job overall, and 12,4% is not. However, when taking a look at the group who has experienced discrimination at work in the last 12 months, this division shifts to 64,4% of people who are satisfied, and 35,6% who are not. This difference suggests that there might be a link between discrimination instances and overall job satisfaction. The same thing can be said for job connectedness. 65.9% of people feel connected to their job, and for people who have not felt discriminated against this is 67,4% who do not feel connected. In the group of people who did feel discriminated

against in the past 12 months this distribution changes to 55,7% of people who do not feel connected, and 44,3% who do. This is a shift from the majority of people who have a connection to their job to a majority who does not. This points at an influence of discrimination at the workplace on job connectedness. The distribution of people who are enthusiastic about their job is 83,7% who are, and 16,3% who are not. Again, for the group of employees who have not experienced discrimination in the past 12 months this distribution remains roughly the same; 84,7% of people who feel enthusiastic and 15,3% of people who do not. For the group that has experienced discrimination, the portion of people with higher levels of enthusiasm almost doubles to 30,2% and the portion of people who are not as enthusiastic about their job is 69,8%. This suggests that discrimination has some effect on job enthusiasm as well as on job satisfaction and connectedness.

**Table 2.**

*Cross tabulation discrimination × overall job satisfaction, job connectedness, and job enthusiasm*

		Experienced discrimination		Total
		No	Yes	
<b>Overall job satisfaction</b>	Not satisfied (%)	12.4	35.6	13.9
	satisfied (%)	87.6	64.4	86.1
<b>Job connectedness</b>	Not connected (%)	32.6	55.7	34.1
	Connected (%)	67.4	44.3	65.9
<b>Job enthusiasm</b>	Not enthusiastic (%)	15.3	30.2	16.3
	Enthusiastic (%)	84.7	69.8	83.7

*Source: WERKonderzoek2019*

## Testing of the hypotheses

First I will interpret the results of the regression analyses for all three job attitudes separately. I will end this chapter with a brief overview, and in some instances a comparison, of the important results.

### *Overall job satisfaction*

*Model 1.* Table 3 shows the results of model 1 for overall job satisfaction. The model has an  $R^2$  of .293, which means it explains 29,3% of the variance in job satisfaction. When using this to calculate Cohen's  $f^2$  ( $\frac{R^2}{1-R^2}$ ) this results in an  $f$  of .41 which according to Cohen's guidelines (1988) is a large effect of the model. The output of the regression analysis shows a negative effect of discrimination on overall job satisfaction ( $B=-.269$ ;  $p<.001$ ). This indicates that when

someone has experienced discrimination of any kind at their workplace, the less satisfied they are with their job, which supports H1.

According to output of the analysis the direct effect of POS on job satisfaction is positive and significant ( $B = .353$  ;  $p < .001$ ). The higher the satisfaction regarding the amount of attention their organization has for their personal wellbeing, the higher the overall job satisfaction. No direct effects of the control variables are found, except for the positive effect of being female ( $B = .046$ ;  $p < .001$ ). This suggests that women are more likely to be more satisfied with their job.

*Model 2.* The second model regarding overall job satisfaction is also shown in table 3. The model contains the interaction term for POS and has a significant value for the F-test ( $F = 388.79$  ;  $p < .001$ ), which means it increases the model fit and the results can be interpreted. The  $R^2$  of the model is still .293, which again leads to a 29,3% of explained variance and a large effect size of  $f^2 = .41$  .

The effect of discrimination at the workplace on job satisfaction is in the second model still negative and significant ( $B = -.436$  ;  $p < .001$ ). When inspecting POS the results show a positive and significant direct effect ( $B = .347$  ;  $p < .001$ ), as well as a positive and significant interaction term ( $B = .060$  ;  $p < .01$ ). These results show that experiencing discrimination at work could lead to less overall job satisfaction (H1) and more satisfaction with the POS could make this effect of discrimination less negative. This is in line with H3 which stated that the higher the satisfaction with the perceived organizational support, the less negative the effect of workplace discrimination on positive job attitudes.

### *Job connectedness*

*Model 1.* Table 3 shows the results of the regression analyses for job connectedness. The model has an  $R^2$  of .286 which means it explains 28,6% of the variance within the job connectedness variable. This comes down to a Cohen's  $f^2$  of .40, and is a large effect according to the guidelines of Cohen (1998). The negative and significant effect of discrimination ( $B = -.206$  ;  $p < .001$ ) suggests that experiencing discrimination at work makes people less connected to their job. This shows support for H1 which stated that the effect of experiencing workplace discrimination on job connectedness is negative.

The direct effect of POS is positive and significant ( $B = .411$  ;  $p < .001$ ), which shows that satisfaction with the amount of attention to personal wellbeing could lead to feeling more connected to your job. No effect is found for the control variables.



*Model 2.* Model 2 contains the interaction term for POS. It has a significant value for the F-test ( $F=376.63$  ;  $p<.001$ ), which means it increases the model fit and the results can be interpreted. The second model has a  $R^2$  of .287, means it again explains 28.7% of the variance in job connectedness. This gives the same large effect size as model 1 ( $f^2=.40$ ).

In the second model the effect of workplace discrimination remains significant and negative ( $B=.359$  ;  $p<.001$ ). POS has a positive and significant direct effect ( $B=.406$  ;  $p<.001$ ), and a positive and significant interaction term ( $B=.054$ ;  $p<.05$ ). These results suggest that undergoing discrimination at work might lead to less job connectedness (H1) and a higher level of satisfaction with the POS could make this effect of discrimination less negative. This is in line with H3 which stated that the higher the satisfaction with the perceived organizational support, the less negative the effect of workplace discrimination on job connectedness.

### *Job enthusiasm*

*Model 1.* As shown in table 3, the effect of discrimination on job enthusiasm is negative and significant ( $B=-.148$ ;  $p<.001$ ). This found effect suggests that when someone has experienced any kind of discrimination at their workplace, the less enthusiastic they are with their job. This is in line with H1, which stated that the effect of experiencing workplace discrimination on job enthusiasm is negative.

According to model 1 the direct effect of POS on job enthusiasm is positive and significant ( $B= .230$  ;  $p<.001$ ). The higher the satisfaction regarding the amount of attention their organization has for their personal wellbeing, the higher the level of job enthusiasm. Being female has a positive and significant effect ( $B=.057$ ;  $P<.001$ ), which means women are more likely to be enthusiastic about their job. A negative, significant effect for the younger age category is found ( $B=-.077$ ;  $P<.001$ ) which means that employees under the age of 35 are less enthusiastic about their job than employees aged 35-49. Lastly there is also an effect found of contractual work hours per week on job enthusiasm ( $B=.005$ ;  $P<.001$ ). This means the more hours someone works per week, the higher their level of job enthusiasm.

The model has an  $R^2$  of .135, which means it explains 13,5% of the variance in job satisfaction. When using this to calculate Cohen's  $f^2$  ( $\frac{R^2}{1-R^2}$ ) this results in an  $f^2$  of .16 which according to Cohen's guidelines is a medium-sized effect (1988). The model does explain some of the variance in the dependent variable, but the effect of the independent variables is limited.

*Model 2.* The second model regarding overall job satisfaction is also shown in table 3. The model contains the interaction term for POS and has a significant value for the F-test ( $F=147.05$ ;  $p<.001$ ), which means it increases the model fit and the results can be interpreted. The  $R^2$  of the model is .137, which means it explains 13,7% of the variance in job satisfaction. That is 0,1% more than model 1, and leads to a medium-sized effect of  $f^2 = .16$  (Cohen, 1998).

The effect of discrimination at the workplace on job satisfaction is still negative and significant in the second model ( $B= -.314$ ;  $p<.001$ ). The moderator POS has a positive and significant direct effect ( $B=.226$  ;  $p<.001$ ), as well as a positive and significant interaction term ( $B=.059$  ;  $p<.01$ ). These results show that experiencing discrimination at work could lead to less overall job satisfaction (H1) and more satisfaction with the POS could make this effect of discrimination less negative. This supports H3 which stated that the higher the satisfaction with the perceived organizational support, the less negative the effect of workplace discrimination on positive job attitudes.

### **Result overview**

The direct effect of discrimination was significant and negative for all three attitudes, but it was biggest for overall satisfaction ( $B=-.269$ ), second biggest for job connectedness ( $B=-.206$ ), and smallest for job enthusiasm ( $B=-.148$ ). This partly supports H2 which stated that the effect would be strongest for connectedness and least strong for enthusiasm.

The moderating effect of POS was positive and significant in all three analyses, and only slightly differed between the different outcome variables. It was biggest for overall job satisfaction ( $B=.060$ ), slightly smaller for job enthusiasm ( $B.059$ ), and smallest for job connectedness ( $B.054$ ).

The effect of being female was positive and significant in the cases of overall job satisfaction and job enthusiasm ( $B=.046$ ;  $B=.057$ ), meaning that being a woman is linked to being more satisfied and enthusiastic about/with your job. An effect of age was only found for the younger category in the analysis regarding job enthusiasm ( $B=-.077$ ). Meaning people who are between the ages of 35 and 49 are more enthusiastic about their work than people under the age of 35. The effect of the number of hours you contractually work for your organization was positive for job enthusiasm ( $B=.005$ ). The more time you spend on your job, the more enthusiastic you are regarding your workplace.

**Table 3.***Regression analysis for overall job satisfaction, job connectedness, and job enthusiasm*

Variable	Overall job satisfaction		Job connectedness		Job enthusiasm	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
<b>Constant</b>	2.594*** (.046)	2.614*** (.047)	1.833*** (.068)	1.804*** (.058)	2.756*** (.049)	2.772*** (.049)
<b>Discrimination</b>	-.269*** (.024)	-.436*** (.060)	-.206*** (.027)	-.359*** (.069)	-.148*** (.025)	-.314*** (.064)
<b>POS</b>	.353*** (.006)	.347*** (.006)	.411*** (.007)	.406*** (.007)	.230*** (.006)	.225*** (.006)
<b>Discrimination * POS</b>	.	.060** (.020)	.	.054* (.023)	.	.059** (.021)
<b>Gender</b> (ref=male)	.046*** (.013)	.046*** (.013)	.017 (.015)	.018 (.015)	.057*** (.013)	.056*** (.013)
<b>Age</b> (ref=35-49yrs)						
<b>0-35 y/o</b>	.031 (.018)	.031 (.018)	-.027 (.021)	-.028 (.021)	-.077*** (.019)	-.077*** (.019)
<b>50-125 y/o</b>	-.009 (.013)	-.009 (.013)	.021 (.015)	.022 (.015)	.040** (.014)	0.40 (.014)
<b>Level of education</b> (ref=low level of educ)						
<b>Medium</b>	.021 (.030)	.021 (.030)	.055 (.034)	.056 (.034)	-.006 (.032)	-.007 (.032)
<b>High</b>	.029 (.029)	.029 (.029)	.045 (.033)	.047 (.033)	.027 (.030)	.027 (.030)
<b>Migr. Background</b> (ref=no migr background)						
<b>Western</b>	-.023 (.023)	-.023 (.023)	.016 (.027)	.016 (.027)	.003 (.025)	.002 (.025)
<b>Non-western</b>	-.008 (.029)	-.009 (.029)	.045 (.033)	.045 (.033)	.026 (.030)	.025 (.030)
<b>Work hours</b>	.001 (.001)	.001 (.001)	.002 (.001)	.002 (.001)	.005*** (.001)	.005*** (.001)
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	.293	.293	.286	.287	.135	.136
<b>f<sup>2</sup></b>	.41	.41	.40	.40	.16	.16

\*p&lt;.05 \*\*p&lt;.01 \*\*\*p&lt;.001.

Notes: Standard errors are between parentheses under the corresponding coefficients. Source: WERKonderzoek2019

## Discussion

In this paper I tried to answer the question “*To what extent does experiencing discrimination at the workplace affect job satisfaction, -connectedness, and -enthusiasm of employees in The Netherlands, and how is this effect moderated by perceived organizational support?*”. The answer to this question could give more insight in how the negative effects of discrimination translate to the workplace, and how the perception of a supportive organization can help lessen the negative effects. It also tells us more about how different job attitudes are formed, and which aspect of a job might be influenced by experiencing discrimination more than the other. By using the Social Exchange theory and earlier research surrounding the subject of workplace discrimination, job attitudes, and POS, I formed hypotheses that I tested using multiple regression analyses and data from *WERKonderzoek2019*.

### Findings and implications

A few noteworthy results came from this study. First of all, a negative effect was found of workplace discrimination on overall satisfaction, connectedness, and enthusiasm. This is support for the idea that the mechanisms described by the SET are applicable in workplace situations. When people do not get the same thing out of a situation as they expected, they adjust their attitudes downwards. When people are discriminated against they do not receive the treatment that they expected and in exchange they will have a lower level of satisfaction, connectedness, and enthusiasm.

The strongest effect of discrimination was found for overall job satisfaction, followed by job connectedness, and the effect on job enthusiasm was the least strong. The SET mechanism can partly explain this. Discrimination is linked to the social aspect of work. In a work exchange situation where someone experiences discrimination, the expectations they had that were social-related will be violated more than the one they had that were task-related. That is why in turn, task-related attitudes will be adjusted the least. The fact that the analyses show that job enthusiasm was least affected by discrimination is therefore supporting evidence for the SET theory at the workplace.

However, because job connectedness was conceptualized as the social aspect of work, this mechanism did make me expect a strongest effect on job connectedness. This was not supported in the results. The reason that the overall job satisfaction was the most affected attitude out of the three, could be because this broader concept contains the measurement of satisfaction with the team and the whole organization the participant works in. The satisfaction

with the team is partly a social aspect and says something about the relations you have with your co-workers. The satisfaction with the organization could be interpreted as satisfaction with the organizational culture, something that can be strongly related to the way colleagues, bosses, managers, etc. treat each other. These two elements of ‘overall job satisfaction’ make it plausible that the exchange mechanism derived from the SET can explain why job satisfaction is affected most by experiencing workplace discrimination.

Next to these direct effects, a moderating effect of the perceived attention to personal wellbeing was also found. For all three of the tested job attitudes, the attention to wellbeing made the direct effect of discrimination less negative. Even though there were differences between these moderating effects on overall satisfaction, job connectedness, and job enthusiasm, these differences were too small to draw any hard conclusions on the results. However, the moderating effect that was found for all three attitudes implies that as an organization, making sure your employees know that you are looking after them has its benefits when it comes to them experiencing discrimination at work. Trying to not let discrimination happen at all still is important, but when it *does* happen within an organization there are things that the employer can do to lessen the negative effects; Make employees feel like they are being looked after by their organization. The perception of support is a factor in how the negative effects of discrimination are moderated, so when employers implement policies or programs to help support their employees, an important note is that communicating that the support should not be overlooked.

### **Limitations and further research**

There are choices made while answering the research question that be done differently in future research to further expand our knowledge surrounding work place discrimination and job attitudes.

First of all it is important to notice that this study uses cross-sectional data. When researching effects using cross-sectional data, there is never the certainty that the effects you find are causal. For example, the results now show a positive effect of work hours on job enthusiasm. The effect could arguably work the other way around; the more enthusiastic you are about your job, the more hours you are willing to work. Cross-sectional data also does not account for the situation the respondent is at the moment of filling in the survey. A concept like job satisfaction for example is sensitive to circumstances (deadlines, busy work week, just had a fun office party). By using longitudinal data you lose a lot of these discrepancies.

There were also some choices made regarding the operationalization of concepts. For the predictor for example, this study does not separate different kinds of discrimination (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity). It is important to know what work place discrimination as a whole does to the attitudes of employees, because in the end it is the feeling of not being treated fairly that has impact based on the SET. It can be argued that it does not matter whether this treatment is because of your gender, age, religion, or skin color, because it all comes down to the fact that you are not treated in the way you expect. Although, it would be interesting to see whether the effects differ between different kinds of discrimination. It is not implausible to think that age discrimination might have a different effect than ethnic discrimination. These differences would be good to take in to account in further research.

Lastly, the generalizability of this research should be mentioned. A few aspects of this study limit the level of generalizability. The fact that this study used data from participants who all work in the Netherlands make the results means I cannot conclude anything about the rest of the world's population. Work environments and types of discrimination differ all over the world, so mechanisms that seem to be active in the Netherlands might work differently in other countries. On top of that, conclusions based on the results of this study should also be drawn with caution. The used sample mainly contains people who work in the public sector, are highly educated, are around the age of 50. This is not a good reflection of the Dutch society, and conclusions about the population of the Netherlands are therefore hard to draw.

This study explores the effect of discrimination on different kinds of positive job attitudes, and finds an overall negative effect that is strongest for overall job satisfaction. There is still a lot of research to be done to grasp the mechanisms behind employees attitudes, but these results show that workplace discrimination is something that should not be overlooked by organizations that strive for less absenteeism, more retention, and satisfied employees.

## **Acknowledgements**

I wrote this thesis while doing an internship at the FNV, the federation of Dutch trade unions. During my time there I saw my colleagues work with so much passion to improve the working conditions of employees all over the country. Standing up for people who can't- or don't know how to stand up for themselves. Committed to make sure every person in the Netherlands gets treated and valued the way they deserve at work. Being in this environment inspired me to study the workplace, with the goal of contributing to a better and safer work-experience for everyone. I want to thank my internship supervisor Evelyne de Beer who guided me through the process of doing an internship for the first time.

## Reference list

- Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 24(5), 491-509.
- Bowling, N. A., Eschleman, K. J., & Wang, Q. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of the relationship between job satisfaction and subjective well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(4), 915-934.
- Bowling, A., & Windsor, J. (2001). Towards the good life: A population survey of dimensions of quality of life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 2(1), 55-82.
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2020, 9 March). Documentatie Dans-Easy Personeels- en Mobiliteitsonderzoek publieke sector 2019 (DansWerkonderzoek2019).
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2019, 16 August). Verschil levensverwachting hoog- en laagopgeleid groeit. Retrieved from: [https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2019/33/verschil-levensverwachting-hoog-en-laagopgeleid-groeit/opleidingsniveau#:~:text=Laag%3A%20Dit%20omvat%20onderwijs%20op,specialistenopleidingen%20\(mbo%2D4\).](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2019/33/verschil-levensverwachting-hoog-en-laagopgeleid-groeit/opleidingsniveau#:~:text=Laag%3A%20Dit%20omvat%20onderwijs%20op,specialistenopleidingen%20(mbo%2D4).)
- Chiaburu, D. S., Chakrabarty, S., Wang, J., & Li, N. (2015). Organizational support and citizenship behaviors: A comparative cross-cultural meta-analysis. *Management International Review*, 55(5), 707-736.
- Cohen, J. (1988) *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Cortina LM (2008) Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review* 33(1): 55–75.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A., & Shore, L. M. (2007). The employee–organization relationship: Where do we go from here?. *Human resource management review*, 17(2), 166-179.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of management*, 31(6), 874-900.



- Deitch EA, Barsky A, Butz RM, Chan S, Brief AP and Bradley JC (2003) Subtle yet significant: The existence and impact of everyday racial discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations* 56(11): 1299–1324
- Dipboye RL and Halverson SK (2004) Subtle (and not so subtle) discrimination in organizations. In: Griffith RW and O’Leary-Kelly AM (eds) *The Dark Side of Organizational Behavior*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 131–158.
- Detnakin, S., & Rurkkhum, S. (2019). Moderating effect of perceived organizational support on human resource development practices and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business*, 20(3), 215-234.
- Dovidio JF and Hebl MR (2005) Discrimination at the level of the individual: Cognitive and affective factors. In: Dipboye RL and Colella A (eds) *Discrimination at Work: The Psychological and Organizational Bases*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 11–35.
- Dulac, T., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A., Henderson, D. J., & Wayne, S. J. (2008). Not all responses to breach are the same: The interconnection of social exchange and psychological contract processes in organizations. *Academy of management Journal*, 51(6), 1079-1098.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 71(3), 500.
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(1), 42.
- 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.
- Hom, P. W., & Kinicki, A. J. (2001). Toward a greater understanding of how dissatisfaction drives employee turnover. *Academy of Management journal*, 44(5), 975-987.

- Jain, A. K., Giga, S. I., & Cooper, C. L. (2013). Perceived organizational support as a moderator in the relationship between organisational stressors and organizational citizenship behaviors. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*.
- Keashly, L. (2001). Interpersonal and systemic aspects of emotional abuse at work: The target's perspective. *Violence and victims*, 16(3), 233-268.
- Leather, P., Lawrence, C., Beale, D., Cox, T., & Dickson, R. (1998). Exposure to occupational violence and the buffering effects of intra-organizational support. *Work & Stress*, 12(2), 161-178.
- Lee, T. W., & Mowday, R. T. (1987). Voluntarily leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers' and Mowday's model of turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30, 721-743
- Levine, S., & White, P. E. (1961). Exchange as a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relationships. *Administrative science quarterly*, 583-601.
- Lewis, S. E. (2006). Recognition of workplace bullying: A qualitative study of women targets in the public sector. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 16(2), 119-135.
- Ma, C. C., Samuels, M. E., & Alexander, J. W. (2003). Factors that influence nurses' job satisfaction. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 33(5), 293-299.
- MacIntosh, E. W., & Doherty, A. (2010). The influence of organizational culture on job satisfaction and intention to leave. *Sport Management Review*, 13(2), 106-117.
- Malik, S., & Noreen, S. (2015). Perceived organizational support as a moderator of affective well-being and occupational stress. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 9(3), 865-874.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (2013). *Employee—organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. Academic press.
- Parzefall, M. R., & Salin, D. M. (2010). Perceptions of and reactions to workplace bullying: A social exchange perspective. *Human relations*, 63(6), 761-780.

- Ravari, A., Mirzaei, T., Kazemi, M., & Jamalizadeh, A. (2012). Job satisfaction as a multidimensional concept: A systematic review study. *Journal of Occupational Health and Epidemiology*, 1(2), 95-102.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 698.
- Riggle, R. J., Edmondson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of business research*, 62(10), 1027-1030.
- Rospenda, K. M., Fujishiro, K., Shannon, C. A., & Richman, J. A. (2008). Workplace harassment, stress, and drinking behavior over time: Gender differences in a national sample. *Addictive Behaviors*, 33(7), 964-967.
- Ryan, A. M., Gee, G. C., & Laflamme, D. F. (2006). The association between self-reported discrimination, physical health and blood pressure: findings from African Americans, Black immigrants, and Latino immigrants in New Hampshire. *Journal of health care for the poor and underserved*, 17(2), 116-132.
- Sablnski, C. J., & Lee, T. W. (2002). Turnover: An integration of Lee and Mitchell's unfolding model and job embeddedness construct with Hulin's withdrawal construct. *Psychology of Work*, 189-203.
- Siu, O. L. (2002). Predictors of job satisfaction and absenteeism in two samples of Hong Kong nurses. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 40(2), 218-229.
- Smokrović, E., Žvanut, M. F., Bajan, A., Radić, R., & Žvanutb, B. (2019). The effect of job satisfaction, absenteeism, and personal motivation on job quitting: A survey of Croatian nurses. *Journal of East European Management Studies*, 24(3), 398-422
- Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau (2020). *Ervaren Discriminatie in Nederland II*.