

Employee Perceptions in the Workplace: Discrimination, Work Motivation, Teamwork/Citizenship, and Locus of Control

Ana Marafuga, Toni DiDona, Jamila Paradas, Antonio E. Cortes, and Mercedes Perera

Carlos Albizu University

Abstract- Research regarding discrimination is plentiful with a general understanding that it can induce stress, prevent access to opportunities, and affect interpersonal relationships (Jang, Chiriboga, & Small, 2008; Miller & Kaiser, 2001). However, research has not yet clarified a relationship between perceived discrimination with other constructs such as work motivation, teamwork/citizenship, and locus of control (LOC). For that reason, the purpose of this study will be to explore those relationships. A sample of 443 participants completed an online survey containing a series of demographic questions, a set of questions regarding the participant's perception of having been discriminated against, as well as valid and reliable measures of the constructs: work motivation, teamwork/citizenship, and LOC. This was done using a convenience, snowball sampling technique, limited to employed individuals 18 years or older. The results showed that individuals who perceived discrimination had, on average, higher LOC scores ($x = 44.88$) than those who did not perceive discrimination ($x = 39.70$). This indicates a higher external LOC score for those who perceived discrimination; meaning they were more likely to see themselves as victims of circumstances beyond their control. However, no significance was found in comparing those who perceived discrimination and those who didn't with the constructs of work motivation and teamwork/citizenship. This study will contribute to the body of knowledge on perceived discrimination by providing additional insight on its relationship with work motivation, teamwork/citizenship, and LOC.

Index Terms- perceptions, discrimination, work motivation, teamwork/citizenship, locus of control, workplace

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the last 52 years, laws have been enacted to prohibit discrimination in the workplace. One of the first laws was Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII), which made it illegal to discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex (EEOC, 2017a). This law was followed by additional pieces of legislation designed to prevent a wider variety of other forms of discrimination. Examples include but are not limited to: The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA), The Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, and Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) (EEOC, 2017b). Despite these laws, discrimination in the workplace continues to exist as evidenced by the 91,648 discrimination charges received by the EEOC in 2016 (EEOC,

2017c). Interestingly, the results of a meta-analysis study on self-reported racial discrimination strongly suggested that what an employee considers to be fair treatment at work may change along with societal changes, such as employment laws (Triana, Jayasinghe, & Pieper, 2015). The researchers also recommended that employers should be aware of major changes in societal norms and rules, in addition to, employment laws.

As different types of discrimination (age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, and race/ethnicity) were explored, the need for organizational policies to address discrimination and include diversity training was identified as a common element in the research (e.g. James, McKechnie, Swanberg, & Besen, 2012; Bjelland et al., 2010; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). An exploratory study with regards to age discrimination, suggested both older and younger workers may feel disparate treatment when it comes to promotions (James et al., 2012). This led the researchers to recommend that the decisions to develop and promote employees need to be based on transparent standards unrelated to age. In another study that evaluated EEOC charges filed regarding age and disability, it was determined that termination issues made up about 60-70% of the charges filed under ADA and/or ADEA (Bjelland et al., 2010). The researchers go on to suggest that inadequately structured employer policies and practices were the reason for these charges.

In a study regarding perceived discrimination against gays and lesbians in the workplace, the results showed that if an organization had supportive policies and practices in place in addition to protective legislation, gay employees would be more likely to disclose their sexual orientation (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). A qualitative study with 26 transgender males who were from the United States discussed how some of these individuals were fearful of being fired for revealing that they were transgender (Dietert & Dentice, 2009). The researchers suggested that these fears came from unsupportive management and discriminatory behavior by coworkers.

Ghumman, Ryan, Barclay, & Markel, 2013), noted a rise of 96% in religious discrimination claims in the workplace based on EEOC statistical data from 2000 through 2010. The researchers also noted that the rise was related to the legal ambiguities around Title VII, increases in religious diversity and expression in the workplace, as well as, characteristics that are unique to religion as compared with other types of discrimination.

While the previous studies recommend for employers to establish better policies and practices in addressing discrimination and incorporating diversity training, a study by

Barak, Cherin & Berkman (1998), shows the importance of also recognizing how people are treated once those policies and practices are implemented. In the study, a company had undergone some changes to promote their value for diversity, showed an interesting dilemma in incorporating these new policies and practices. The researchers administered a company-wide survey and later conducted additional follow-up interviews of 22 employees. These interviews provided further support for the survey results in which Caucasian men viewed the company's practices as fair and inclusive, whereas men and women who were racial/ethnic minorities along with Caucasian women viewed it otherwise. In addition, racial/ethnic minorities and Caucasian women had a stronger value for diversity than did Caucasian men. During the interviews, managers stated that they were color/gender blind. The researchers found this hindered their ability to realize and appreciate the differences amongst employees. Barak et al. (1998), recommended that in addition to diversity training being offered to all employees, it is important for managers to also recognize how people are being treated and potential issues associated with that treatment.

With the abundance of research articles referring to the importance of establishing organizational procedures, practices, and diversity training to address discrimination, the question still remains to better understand individual's experiences with perceived discrimination in the workplace. A theoretical study on coping with stigma found that discrimination can potentially prevent access to opportunities as well as affect interpersonal relationships (Miller & Kaiser, 2001). Another study (Triana et al., 2015) showed there was a negative relationship between perceived racial discrimination and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). However, further investigation is still needed. This leads the researchers to take a more comprehensive look at perceived discrimination and its relationship with the following three constructs: work motivation, teamwork/citizenship, and locus of control (LOC). In the sections that follow, the researchers take a more in-depth look at each of these three factors to gain a better understanding of them and their relationship with perceived discrimination in the workplace.

II. WORK MOTIVATION

Organizations are unaware of employees' perceptions, which may affect work motivation positively or negatively. In a large number of studies and reviews done throughout the years, psychologists have agreed about the importance of motivation in the workplace (Clark, 2003). Work motivation can be related positively or negatively to the workforce. Although, work motivation seems to be a term used loosely in conversation in order to convey what may be occurring in organizations, research findings in correlation with perceptions of discrimination are less abundant. However, it may be of use knowing in which ways employees' work related perceptions can influence organizations, and which will better assist in properly motivating and maintaining employees motivated. The lack of research has been the main conflict for researchers. Most research is centered on why discriminators discriminate and has overlooked those being discriminated (Deitch, Barsky, Butz, Chan, & Bradley, 2003; Dion, 2002;). One particular study by Di Marco et. al. (2016) tries to understand the consequence of perceiving a

discriminatory work environment on employees' health. The research aimed to identify a mediating effect of job satisfaction in the relationship between employees' perceptions of a discriminatory environment and their health and the statistics established that a relationship exists between employees' perceptions of a discriminatory work environment and their health. Therefore, Di Marco et. al. (2016) concluded, that when people consider their organization is being discriminatory against employees who belong to a minority group, their health is affected negatively. This previous study can be related to motivation, as motivation has been found to be directly linked to performance and well-being in organizations (Tremblay, Blanchard, Taylor, Pelletier, & Villeneuve, 2009).

Work motivation has been the center of conversation for more theories than any other topic in the workforce; it is seen as a foundation (Tremblay et. al., 2009). The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) has greatly impacted the development of a large number of organizational and managerial practices to promote a better workplace for employees and to enhance work productivity (Tremblay et. al., 2009; Pinder, 2008). The self-determination theory is based on people's innate tendencies and needs (Gagne & Deci, 2005). SDT evolved from research on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Externally motivated individuals work on tasks because they believe that participation will produce wanted external rewards, like money, and high praise (Ryan & Deci, 2000). On the contrary, intrinsically motivated people perform tasks and act a certain way because they find their job pleasurable and the mere task is reward enough (Gagné et. al., 2010). However, in order to be self-determining, according to Gagne and Deci (2005), people should be the ones to decide how to behave in their environment.

Through the years an extensive amount of definitions have been developed to explain work motivation (Pinder, 2008). Pinder (2008) also states that the definitions have risen from various theories that underlie motivation; where a number of behavioral thinkers have dedicated time to study human behavior while offering pieces that make up the definition. To better understand work motivation, Pinder (2008) combined parts of various interpretations and definitions to describe work motivation as "a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity and duration" (p. 11). Those combined parts are indicated within SDT as intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation meaning an individual's drive comes from within, and can be influenced by the individual's own values, goals and enjoyment (Singh, 2016) and extrinsic motivation means the drive to achieve comes from an outside source or encouragement (Singh, 2016). Organizations have goals, and motivation is the driving force that allows individuals to achieve those said goals. Additionally, perceptions of discrimination can be powered by demographics, intrinsic and extrinsic forces, one's need to be self-determined, and the urge to meet certain needs based on priority and have a relationship with an individual's work motivation. With the lack of research being the present theme, it is the goal of this study to assess the relationship between perceived discrimination and work motivation. Therefore, it is hypothesized that there is a significant difference in work motivation when perceived discrimination is present.

III. TEAMWORK/CITIZENSHIP

Teamwork is known as a set of feelings, actions, and thoughts that each member of the team shares with one another that are essential to the operation of a group and allow for coordinating group tasks, adaptive performance, and fulfilment of task objectives that result in valuable outcomes (Morgan, Glickman, Woodard, Blaiwes, & Salas, 1986; Salas, Sims, & Klein, 2004). After doing a lengthy literature review of both empirical studies and theoretical models, Sala, Sims, and Burke (2005) suggest five core components that are essential to teamwork effectiveness: team leadership, mutual performance monitoring, backup behavior, adaptability, and team orientation. The first component, team leadership, refers to someone's capacity to organize, plan, motivate members, assess performance, develop knowledge, skills and abilities, coordinate and direct activities and tasks, as well as, promote a positive work environment. Mutual performance monitoring is the capability to implement adequate strategies of tasks and establish a common perception of the team atmosphere to effectively audit team members' performance. Backup behavior is the ability to alternate workload between teammates to acquire equilibrium during busy work shifts, and it is also the ability to predict the needs of team members based on their individual responsibilities. Adaptability is the modification of strategies according to the information of the environment through the application of reallocation of intrateam resources and backup behavior. Lastly, team orientation is the disposition to consider other people's behavior during team interactions, and is also the belief that team goals are more important than the independent goals of each member.

Furthermore, study findings demonstrate the difference of teamwork levels between employees of an organization. According to Kiffin-Petersen and Cordery (2003), trust in coworkers and management are strong predictors of employee preference to participate in teamwork, and employees who have worked long amount of years for an organization have more negative attitudes towards teamwork than younger employees. With that in mind, it is important to understand the value of teamwork in the workplace. A review of survey-based research demonstrated support for teamwork's contribution to organizational performance (Delaure, Hootegeem, Procter, & Burrige, 2007). Also, teamwork has been found to have a positive relationship with operational performance, increased productivity, and the quality and efficiency of employees (Hamilton, Nickerson, & Owan, 2003; Cohen, Ledford, & Spreitzer, 1996). Godard (2001) explains that teamwork has a statistical and positive relationship with job satisfaction, task involvement, organizational commitment, belongingness, employee empowerment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Likewise, OCB is an employee's behavior or action that is not obligated by the job role or description; instead, it is based on personal election and contributes to the company's efficiency (Organ, 1988).

According to Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) the different types of citizenship behaviors include: helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and

self-development. OCB has been found to contribute to effective teamwork performance, Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie (1997) found in their research that citizenship behaviors like helping behavior; which refers to voluntarily helping other fellow co-workers and/or preventing conflicts that may occur in the work environment (Podsakoff et. al., 2000), and sportsmanship, which is when an employee shows tolerance to impositions and dilemmas, while not complaining when inconveniences occur (Organ, 1990), had a significant effect on teamwork performance quantity. Meanwhile, only helping behavior had a strong impact on performance quality. OCB was found to be positively correlated to teamwork performance in highly task interdependence orientated groups (Nielsen, Bachrach, Sundstrom, & Halfhill, 2012). Another study's findings suggested that the more employees trusted and were attracted to their coworkers, and felt valued by their organization, the more they were to exhibit citizenship behaviors within the organization even when there was demographic dissimilarity amongst co-workers (Chattopadhyay, 1999).

Additional published research suggested a connection between discrimination and OCB. Ensher, Grant-Vallone, and Donaldson (2001) measured employee's perceptions of discrimination from three sources: supervisors, coworkers, and the organization. Findings showed that all three sources of discrimination had an effect on organizational commitment and job satisfaction, as well as, citizenship behavior. As a matter of fact, Brenner, Lyons, and Fassinger (2010) conducted a study where they measured the effect of heterosexism (willingness of an organization to act out against heterosexism, and a type of discrimination directed towards homosexual and bisexual people) and workplace outness (identity disclosure of being homosexual) on perceived OCB of gay and lesbian employees. Willingness of the workplace to act out against heterosexism was predictive of the workplace outness, which in turn positively predicted OCB helping behavior, while (Brenner et. al., 2010). Also, the study showed that there was a strong relationship between outness and the citizenship behavior of organizational compliance (Brenner et. al., 2010), which according to Borman & Motowidlo (1993) means to be obedient to the regulations and policies of the company.

Regarding the extent of the literature reviewed above, there were several studies that suggested a difference of teamwork and OCB levels between employees (Chattopadhyay, 1999; Kiffin-Petersen et. al., 2003). Also, some studies presented the possible effects certain types of discrimination may have on citizenship behaviors (Ensher et. al., 2001; Brenner et. al., 2010). Therefore, it is hypothesized that there is a difference in the teamwork/citizenship test scores between participants who perceived discrimination and those that did not perceive discrimination.

IV. LOCUS OF CONTROL

Locus of control (LOC) is primarily concerned with learned behavior and the nature and effects of reinforcements. Many factors exist within an individual's work environment that may either enable or hinder performance of a behavior. Factors, such as skills and willpower, are internal to the individual, while factors like task demands and another person's actions are

external to the individual (Ajzen, 1985). According to Ajzen (2002), people differ in the degree to which they view rewards, punishments, or other outcomes and events in their lives caused by their own actions or by factors out of their control. Thus, the distinctions between internal and external causes of a behavior are important in maintaining job satisfaction and increasing employee retention, especially since most current careers are self directed.

LOC was first introduced by Rotter's (1966) social learning theory of personality, is an individual's internal or external source of drive and motivation, identified as an influential factor on people's work attitudes and behavior (Erbin-Roesemann & Simms 1997). Rotter's (1966) locus of control theory separates LOC into two types, internal and external. Individuals with an internal LOC believe that life events depend upon the behaviors and characteristics they possess (Erbin-Roesemann & Simms, 1997), therefore individuals possessing a high perception of internal LOC tend to be more self-confident and assertive, taking responsibility for their own success and failure (Erbin-Roesemann & Simms, 1997). In contrast, individuals with an external LOC perceive reinforcement as an outcome of their environment and not their own behaviors. Hence, those possessing an external LOC perceive themselves as victims of circumstances beyond their control, and see their success and failure on a job as caused by outside forces, e.g. luck (Cadinu, Maass, Lombardo, & Frigerio, 2006).

Research has shown that individuals that possess a high locus of control increase their efforts to perform at actual levels of performance (Weiss & Sermann, 1973). On the other hand, people with low self-esteem tend to lower their standards or withdraw altogether from a task (Brockner, 1988). A study performed by Ng and Butts (2009), observed work environments and strategies useful for retaining employees. The researchers hypothesized employee's intentions to stay at a job as linked to available opportunities for learning, availability of rewards for performance, and high internal versus external LOC. Their results showed a positive relationship between all three variables and high internal LOC.

However, according to Ajzen's (2002) study on perceived behavioral control versus locus of control, researchers tried to clarify assumptions that identified internal and external locus of control as either having control or lack of control over performance of the behavior. A closer look at these assumptions revealed that perceived control over an event is independent of the internal or external locus of the factors responsible for it (Ajzen, 2002). Thus, implying that a person's self-efficacy is also an important factor when analyzing people's beliefs of having control over the behavior (Ajzen, 2002).

As discussed previously, an individual's work environment consists of various factors that can either allow personal and career development or stunt any feasible possibilities for advancement. According to Ng & Butts (2009), there are four valuable characteristics of a nurturing work environment-information sharing, job significance, opportunity for learning, and availability of rewards for performance. If these aspects are not being met within an organization, lower job satisfaction and higher turnover will be the end result. Hence, when an employee believes there to be perceived discrimination within their place of

employment, chances are their LOC or beliefs of being able to control their environment may become affected.

Being discriminated against can induce stress and reduce an individual's psychological well-being (Jang, Chiriboga, & Small, 2008). In a study conducted by Jang, Chiriboga, & Small, (2008), relationships between perceived discrimination and positive and negative affect were explored. The findings demonstrated the role of sense of control as a mediator. Data from the Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS) survey with an N= 1,554; age range= 45 to 74, revealed exposure to a discriminatory experience coupled with a low sense of control to result in increased negative affect. Findings suggested that those with a high sense of control are less perceptible to discrimination and are more resilient to psychological distress (Jang, Chiriboga, & Small, 2008). Therefore, it is hypothesized that there is a significant difference in LOC when discrimination is perceived.

V. METHOD

Participants

Participants were recruited using convenience, snowball sampling and participation was limited to individuals employed at least part-time and were 18 years or older at the time of taking the survey. Participants who selected *unemployed* or *retired* in the survey or who were not 18 years or older were prevented from continuing the survey.

Procedure

The researchers contacted participants through email, text messages, and social media outlets such as LinkedIn, Facebook and Instagram using a unified recruitment message for all communication forums was used. Prior to completing the online survey, participants were provided with an informed consent. The informed consent outlined the point of the study, confidentiality and the right to withdraw at any moment. The informed consent also specified that there were no known risks to participating and it guaranteed their anonymity. After reviewing the informed consent, participants had the choice of selecting *I agree* or *Do not agree*. Only the participants that selected *I agree* were able to complete the survey.

VI. INSTRUMENTATION

The online survey link was hosted on Google Forms and compiled of three instruments. Participants were asked 2 self-developed question by the researchers, "Have you ever felt discriminated against by other employees/managers at your current place of work?" Participants had the option of selecting yes, no, or other, in order to assess perceived discrimination. Only if yes was selected, participants were asked an additional question, "What do you feel was the reason(s) for the discrimination?" and given various choices to select from. The discrimination section was followed by the instrument questionnaire of work motivation, teamwork/citizenship, and locus of control (LOC).

The first instrument, The Motivation at Work Scale (MAWS) (Gagne et. al., 2010), is a 12-item scale which

measures how different types of work motivation may be influenced by situational factors. Participants would indicate their reasons for doing a specific job using a 7 point Likert-scale with anchors that range from 1 (not at all) to 7 (exactly). The scale was developed following the dimensions of motivation that fall under self-determination theory; such as intrinsic and extrinsic motivation concepts. The concepts are broken into subscales: intrinsic, extrinsic, identified regulation, and introjected regulation. Three questions fall under each subscale, with a Cronbach's alpha (α) reliability of the overall scale being .89.

Next was the Teamwork/Citizenship (CIT) 9-item scale, which has five items that are reverse scored (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). This instrument is an adapted scale found within the 24 revised International Personality Item Pool - Value in Action (IPIP-VIA) (ipip.ori.org, 2017). For this scale, participants would indicate how accurately each statement described them on a 5 point Likert-scale with anchors that ranged from 1 (very inaccurate) to 5 (very accurate). The instruments Cronbach α reliability coefficient index of this scale equals .78.

The final instrument used was the Work Locus of Control (WLCS), (Spector, 1988) a 16-item scale, eight of which are reverse scored. Participants would indicate their beliefs about jobs in general on a 6 point Likert-scale, 1 (disagree very much) to 6 (agree very much). The scale is scored so that those exhibiting more external LOC received higher score. The internal consistency or coefficient α , ranges generally from .80 to .85 according to Spector's (1988) English language version. Research conducted by Bond & Bunce (2003) indicated the test-retest reliability for a year as .57, and .60 by Moyle (1995). The WLCS has been shown to relate to a variety of work variables, including job performance and job satisfaction. Also, related to counterproductive behavior and organizational commitment. Permissions for all instruments were either acquired from their original authors or the instrument was found in a public domain for educational purposes.

VII. RESULTS

A total of 443 participants completed the survey, however, the researchers removed participants who did not complete the survey, or who selected *unemployed* or *retired* and were not 18 years or older. This left the researchers with 428 participants of whom were employed at least employed part-time and 18 years or older at the time of taking the survey. The sample age ranged from 19 to 70 with the average age being 38.61 and a mode of 27. There were more female (61.4%) than male (38.6%) participants. There was 51.17% that self identified as Hispanic/Latino, 37.79% were White/Non-Hispanic, 6.31% were Black/African American, and 1.17% were Asian. The sample consisted of 86.65% working full-time at over 40 hours per week and 13.35% working part-time with 68.61% being professional level employees, 9.84% were technical, 9.13% were administrative, and 7.96% were self employed. Majority of the sample had a Bachelor's degree (40.28%), the next highest degree were those with a Master's degree (22.25%), followed by an Associate's degree (9.84%), and a Doctorate degree (5.38%). The first t-test, looked at the index scores of the Work Motivation Scale for people who answered 'Yes and No' for

perceiving discrimination at their current job. Group 1 with an $N = 315$ said they have not perceived being discriminated at their current job. From the participant that answered 'No', the average score is 51.14, the median score 51, and the mode 47. In Group 2 with $N = 113$ people said that they have perceived being discriminated at their current job had an average of 50.21, a median score of 50 and a mode of 49. The homogeneity of variance score for Work Motivation Scores shows a significance (p) of .630; since this is greater than the α level of .05, this suggests that there is no statistically significant difference between the variances of the two groups; the pretest criterion passed. The n for each group as shown in the descriptives table, are greater than 30; this criterion also passes. The t-test revealed there is no difference in the work motivation test scores between the group that did perceive discrimination and those that did not.

For the following t-test, it was hypothesized that there is a difference in the teamwork/citizenship test scores between participants who perceived discrimination and those that did not perceive discrimination. After passing the pre-test criteria (normality, n quota, and homogeneity of variance), the t-test statistics was administered. No significant difference in the teamwork/citizenship test scores between participants who perceived discrimination and those that did not perceive discrimination was found.

In the third t-test, it was hypothesized that there is a difference in the discrimination test scores between participants who perceived discrimination and those that did not perceive discrimination. As previously mentioned, participants were divided into two groups- those who perceived discrimination (YES); $N=112$, with a mean of 44.83, and standard deviation of 11.454 in their place of work and those who did not (NO); $N=315$, with a mean of 39.70, and standard deviation of 11.124. The pre-test requirements were satisfied and resulted in a significant p -value of .000, showing significance between perceived discrimination and locus of control. Hence, a difference in discrimination scores between participants who perceived discrimination and those that did not perceive discrimination was found.

VIII. DISCUSSION

Two of the three t-tests administered did not result in any significance. Locus of Control was the variable that showed a significant relationship to perceived discrimination. According to Spector (1988), the U.S. norms on 5,477 people from 37 samples had means of 40.0, with a mean standard deviation of 9.9, and a mean coefficient alpha of .83. Our results showed that individuals who perceived discrimination had, on average, higher LOC scores (44.88) than those who did not perceive discrimination (39.70). This indicates a higher external LOC score for those who perceived discrimination; meaning they were more likely to see themselves as victims of circumstances beyond their control. Spector's findings compared to our own, indicate that those with a high sense of control are less perceptible to discrimination and are more resilient to psychological distress (Jang, Chiriboga, & Small, 2008). Additionally, the researchers discern that whether an employee perceives being discriminated against in the workplace shows no bearing on their level of Work Motivation and

Teamwork/Citizenship but, that perceived discrimination possibly has some influence over an employee's LOC being external or internal. However, a closer look at individual questions within the MAWS and CIT scales could reveal other significant findings, showing that perceptions of discrimination may have a relationship with other constructs, apart from work motivation, locus of control, and teamwork/citizenship, that haven't been looked at. The researchers recommend investigating deeper into these constructs, as well as others. Additionally, separating teamwork/citizenship into two separate instruments may further provide better insight in understanding the organizational citizenship behavior and teamwork relationships individually with a person's perception of discrimination. This study can contribute to the body of knowledge on perceived discrimination by providing additional insight on its relationship with work motivation, teamwork/citizenship, and LOC.

IX. LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations in this study. First, a convenience sampling method was used due to the limit of time, funds, and other resources. This limits the generalizability of the findings that aren't representative of the population. In other words, the sample isn't representative of the population. It is to be noted that certain adjustments were made to some of the responses in the perceived discrimination question and the grouping of race/ethnicity categories in order to better analyze the data. For the discrimination question, some participants responded to perceived discrimination "N/A" or "not in my current job, but yes in others" instead of yes or no. In those cases, it was decided to analyze them as a No response for the purposes of doing descriptive and inferential statistics. Furthermore, the Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS), since locus of control is a continuum from high to low, cut offs that would distinguish between high and low external or internal locus of control could not be made, therefore no range could be applied to the sum of index scores from our participants and only a general interpretation of the scores was provided. Lastly, another limitation of the study was that the discrimination question was developed by the researchers without explaining to the participants the operational meaning of discrimination. This left the question up to the interpretation of each participant, reducing the reliability of the results.

REFERENCES

[1] Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckman (Eds.), *Action-control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11-39). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

[2] Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 32 (4), 664-683.

[3] Baker, D. D., & Terpstra, D. E. (1986). Locus of control and self-esteem versus demographic factors as predictors of attitudes toward women. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, 7(2), 163-172.

[4] Barak, M. E. M., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34(1), 82-104.

[5] Bjelland, M. J., Bruyère, S. M., Von Schrader, S., Houtenville, A. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, A., & Webber, D. A. (2010). Age and disability employment

discrimination: Occupational rehabilitation implications. *Journal of occupational rehabilitation*, 20(4), 456-471.

[6] Bond, F. W., & Bunce, D. (2003). The role of acceptance and job control in mental health, job satisfaction, and work performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(6), 1057-1067.

[7] Boone James, J., McKechnie, S., Swanberg, J., & Besen, E. (2013). Exploring the workplace impact of intentional/unintentional age discrimination. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(7/8), 907-927.

[8] Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations*: 71-98. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[9] Brenner, B. R., Lyons, H. Z., & Fassinger, R. E. (2010). Can heterosexism harm organizations? Predicting the perceived organizational citizenship behaviors of gay and lesbian employees. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 58, 321-329.

[10] Brockner, J. (1988). Issues in organization and management series. Self-esteem at work: Research, theory, and practice. Lexington, MA, England: Lexington Books/D. C. Heath and Com.

[11] Cadinu, M., Maass, A., Lombardo, M., & Frigerio, S. (2006). Stereotype threat: the moderating role of Locus of Control beliefs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(2), 183-197

[12] Cavalcanti, T., & Tavares, J. (2016). The output cost of gender discrimination: A Model-based Macroeconomics Estimate. *Economic Journal*, 126(590), 109-134.

[13] Chattopadhyay, P. (1999). Beyond direct and symmetrical effects: The influence of demographic dissimilarity on organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(3), 273-282.

[14] Clark, R. E. (2003). Fostering the work motivation of individuals and teams. *Performance Improvement*, 42(3), 21-29.

[15] Cohen, S.G., Ledford, G.E. and Spreitzer, G.M. (1996). A predictive model of self-managing work team effectiveness. *Human Relations*, 49, 643-676.

[16] Delarue, A., Hootegeem, G. V., Procter, S., & Burrige, M. (2007). Teamworking and organizational performance: A review of survey-based research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10, 138-145. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00227.x

[17] Diertert, M., & Dentice, D. (2009). Gender identity issues and workplace discrimination: The transgender experience. *Journal of workplace rights: JWR*, 14(1), 121.

[18] Deitch, E. A., Barsky, A., Butz, R. M., Chan, S., Brief, A. P., & Bradley, J. C. (2003). Subtle yet significant: The existence and impact of everyday racial discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations*, 56(11), 1299-1324.

[19] Di Marco, D., Lopez Cabrera, R., Arenas, A., Giorgi, G., Arcangeli, G., & Mucci, N. (2016). Approaching the discriminatory work environment as stressor: The protective role of job satisfaction on health. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7.

[20] Dion, K. L. (2002). The social psychology of perceived prejudice and discrimination. *Canadian Psychology*, 43, 1-10.

[21] EEOC. (2017a). Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Retrieved March 3, 2017 from <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/titlevii.cfm>

[22] EEOC. (2017b). Laws enforced by EEOC. Retrieved March 3, 2017 from <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/>

[23] EEOC. (2017c). Charge statistics FY 1996 through FY 2016. Retrieved March 3, 2017 from <https://www1.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/charges.cfm>

[24] Erbin-Roesemann, M., & Simms, L. (1997). Work locus of control: the intrinsic factor behind empowerment and work excitement. *Nursing Economic*, 15(4), 183-190.

[25] 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.

[26] Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.

[27] Gagné, M., Forest, J., Gilbert, M. H., Aubé, C., Morin, E., & Malorni, A. (2010). The Motivation at Work Scale: Validation evidence in two languages. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 70(4), 628-646.

- [28] Ghumman, S., Ryan, A. M., Barclay, L. A., & Markel, K. S. (2013). Religious discrimination in the workplace: A review and examination of current and future trends. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28(4), 439-454.
- [29] Godard, J. (2001). High performance and the transformation of work? The implications of alternative work practices for the experience and outcomes of work. *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 54, 776-805.
- [30] Hamilton, B.H., Nickerson, J.A. and Owan, H. (2003). Team incentives and worker heterogeneity: an empirical analysis of the impact of teams on productivity and participation. *Journal of Political Economy*, 111, 465-497.
- [31] Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2015). Making a difference in the teamwork: Linking team prosocial motivation to team processes and effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4), 1102-1127.
- [32] International Personality Item Pool: A Scientific Collaboratory for the Development of Advanced Measures of Personality Traits and Other Individual Differences (<http://ipip.ori.org/>). Internet Web Site.
- [33] Jang, Y., Chiriboga, D. A., & Small, B. J. (2008). PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING: THE MEDIATING AND MODERATING ROLE OF SENSE OF CONTROL. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 66(3), 213-227.
- [34] Kiffin-Petersen, S. A., & Cordery, J. L. (2003). Trust, individualism and job characteristics as predictors of employee preference for teamwork. *The International Journal of Human Management*, 14(1), 93-116
- [35] Maslow, A., (1954) *Personality and Motivation*. New York: Harper
- [36] Michailidis, M. P., Morphitou, R. N., & Theophylatou, I. (2012). Women at work inequality versus inequality: barriers for advancing in the workplace. *International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, 23(20), 4231-4245.
- [37] Miller, C. T. and Kaiser, C. R. (2001), A Theoretical Perspective on Coping With Stigma. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57: 73-92.
- [38] Miller, A. L., & Borgida, E. (2016). The Separate Spheres Model of Gendered Inequality. *Plos ONE*, 11(1), 1-34. *Resource Management*, 14(1), 93-108. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00202
- [39] Morgan, B. B., Glickman, A. S., Woodard, E. A., Blaiwes, A. S., & Salas, E. (1986). Measurement of team behavior in a Navy training environment (Tech. Rep. TR-86-014). Orlando, FL: *Naval Training Systems Center, Human Factors Division*.
- [40] Moyle, P. (1995), The role of negative affectivity in the stress process: Tests of alternative models. *J. Organiz. Behav.*, 16: 647-668. doi:10.1002/job.4030160705
- [41] Nielsen, T. M., Bachrach, D. G., Sundstrom, E., & Halfhill, T. R. (2012). Utility of OCB: Organizational citizenship behavior and group performance in a resource allocation framework. *Journal of Management*, 38(2), 668-685.
- [42] Ng, T. H., & Butts, M. M. (2009). Effectiveness of organizational efforts to lower turnover intentions: The moderating role of employee locus of control. *Human Resource Management*, 48(2), 289-310.
- [43] N. P., Kaifi, B. A., & Khanfar, N. M. (2013). Gender Inequality in the Workforce: A Human Resource Management Quandary. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 2013(Volume 4), number 3, 1-9.
- [44] Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/DC Health and COM
- [45] Organ, D. W. (1990). The subtle significance of job satisfaction. *Clinical Laboratory Management Review*, 4: 94-98.
- [46] Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. New York: Oxford University Press/Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- [47] Perales, F., & Vidal, S. (2015). Looking Inwards: Towards a Geographically Sensitive Approach to Occupational Sex Segregation. *Regional Studies*, 49(4), 582.
- [48] Pinder, C. C. (2014). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Psychology Press.
- [49] Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 262.
- [50] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 16(3), 513-525.
- [51] Ragsin, 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.
- [52] Ramlall, S. (2004). A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 5(1/2), 52-63.
- [53] Rotter, Julian B. "Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement." *Psychological monographs: General and applied* 80.1 (1966): 1.
- [54] Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68.
- [55] Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a "big five" in teamwork? *Small Group Research*, 36, 555-562.
- [56] Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Klein, C. (2004). *Cooperation at work. Encyclopedia of Applied Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 497-505). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- [57] Singh, R. (2016). The Impact of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivators on Employee Engagement in Information Organizations. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 57(2), 197.
- [58] Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological bulletin*, 91(3), 482.
- [59] Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the Work Locus of Control Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61: 335-340. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1988.tb00470.x
- [60] Tremblay, M. A., Blanchard, C. M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L. G., & Villeneuve, M. (2009). Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale: Its value for organizational psychology research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 41(4), 213.
- [61] Triana, M. D. C., Jayasinghe, M., & Pieper, J. R. (2015). Perceived workplace racial discrimination and its correlates: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(4), 491-513.
- [62] Wilson, E. (2014). Diversity, culture and the glass ceiling. *Journal Of Cultural Diversity*, 21(3), 83-8.
- [63] Weiss, H., & Sherman, J. (1973). Internal-external control as a predictor of task effort and satisfaction subsequent to failure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 132-136

AUTHORS

First Author – Ana Marafuga, Carlos Albizu University
Second Author – Toni DiDona, Carlos Albizu University
Third Author – Jamila Paradas, Carlos Albizu University
Fourth Author – Antonio E. Cortes, Carlos Albizu University
Fifth Author – Mercedes Perera, Carlos Albizu University