

Louisiana State University

LSU Scholarly Repository

---

Honors Theses

Ogden Honors College

---

4-26-2011

## The Impact of Minority Status and Language Fluency on Vietnamese Asian Americans in the Predominately English-speaking American Workplace

Lily L. Truong

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.lsu.edu/honors\\_etd](https://repository.lsu.edu/honors_etd)



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Truong, Lily L., "The Impact of Minority Status and Language Fluency on Vietnamese Asian Americans in the Predominately English-speaking American Workplace" (2011). *Honors Theses*. 1513.

[https://repository.lsu.edu/honors\\_etd/1513](https://repository.lsu.edu/honors_etd/1513)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Ogden Honors College at LSU Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact [ir@lsu.edu](mailto:ir@lsu.edu).

The Impact of Minority Status and Language Fluency on Vietnamese Asian Americans in the  
Predominately English-speaking American Workplace

Undergraduate Honors Thesis under the Direction of

Dr. Russell A. Matthews

Department of Psychology

To be submitted to LSU Honors College in partial fulfillment  
Of the Upper Division Honors Program by

Lily L. Truong

April 26, 2011

Louisiana State University  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
Baton Rouge, La

### Abstract

The present study evaluates the effects of minority status, language fluency, and social support on perceived ostracism. Furthermore, the effects of perceived ostracism on well-being, job satisfaction, and workplace counterproductive behavior were evaluated. The investigation is unique in its examination of a virtually unstudied population (i.e., Vietnamese Asian Americans) in the workplace. Participants consisted of members from 2 ethnic statuses, Caucasian ( $n=28$ ) and Vietnamese Asian Americans ( $n=18$ ). Vietnamese Asian Americans were further evaluated to have either fluent ( $n=7$ ) or non-fluent ( $n=11$ ) mastery of the English language. The majority of hypothesized relationships were non-significant, with the exception of one. Though no significant differences were found in perceived ostracism, job satisfaction, or counterproductive work behavior as a result of minority status, results suggest that language fluency in Vietnamese Asian Americans was a significant predictor of perceived ostracism.

The Impact of Minority Status and Language Fluency on Vietnamese Asian Americans in the  
Predominately English-speaking American Workplace

Workplace ostracism, first and foremost, is defined as any act or behaviors of exclusion, rejection, or ignoring of an individual/group by another individual/group that hinders the ostracized individual's ability to establish or maintain positive interpersonal relationships or work-related success or favorable reputation within his/her workplace (Hitlan, Clifton, & DeSoto, 2006; Williams, 2001). These instances of ostracism specifically occur within the work environment, rather than social ostracism in general (Hitlan, Clifton, & DeSoto, 2006; Leary 2001). Though workplace ostracism has long been commonplace within the American work environment, there is no *one* cause of ostracism as it can be attributed to a number of different phenomena (Roberson & Stevens, 2006). Examples can range from the personal, often due to interpersonal conflict, to preconceived notions and reactions to a perceived conflict. Experiences of workplace ostracism have been shown to have significant negative effects on the ostracized individual's or group's overall well-being, job satisfaction, as well as their organizations' success (Hitlan, Schepman, Kelly, Schneider, & Zarate, 2006).

As individuals can perceive exclusion from a number of actions, the perception of ostracism can exist in many forms: receiving the silent treatment, being indirectly shunned, or being accidentally left out (Hitlan et al., 2006; Leary 2001). Perceived ostracism, thus, is defined as an individual's belief that ostracism has taken place regardless of its actual occurrence. Though a large body of literature has focused on general ostracism on those of minority status (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Roberson & Stevens, 2006; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002), studies have been scarce evaluating instances of perceived language-based ostracism in minorities, and even scarcer regarding Asian ethnicities.

Given the diversity of the Asian community (Weathers & Truxillo, 2008), to ensure a more homogenous sample, the present study focuses more specifically on Vietnamese Asian Americans. The experience of this particular group, Vietnamese Asian Americans, is virtually unstudied in terms of workplace ostracism. Therefore, the present study was conducted to examine the effects of perceived ostracism specifically by Vietnamese Asian Americans in the workplace brought about by the presence of language barriers.

The ensuing literature review will provide subsequent introduction to eight inter-related hypotheses and will examine potential predictors of perceived ostracism: minority status and language fluency. Though there are many effects known to derive from perceived ostracism, established research has been shown to focus primarily on its effect on well-being, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior (Roberson & Stevens, 2006; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002; Leary, 2001; Hitlan et al., 2006; De Jong & Shaufeli, 1998). Thus, following the examination of the predictors of perceived ostracism, this paper will further evaluate how these predictors may influence the known effects as well as how the predictors may interact with perceived social support to exact changes on the known effects of perceived workplace ostracism.

#### Predictors: Minority Status and Language Fluency

##### *Minority Status*

Diversity in the workplace can be defined as differences in race, ethnicity, gender, disability, age, and sexual orientation in the work organization (Barak & Levin, 2002; Cox & Blake, 1991; Fernandez, 1991; Jackson, May, & Whitney, 1995). The focus of this study is race/ethnicity; more specifically, how this diversity characteristic has been shown to be rapidly changing in the American workplace (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). The Bureau of Labor

Statistics (2009) has shown a consistent increase in minority populations, therefore increasing diversity in the workplace. For example, between 1998 and 2008, in comparison to Caucasians who reported an increase of 8.9% in the civilian labor force, minority populations (African, Asian, and Latino Americans) reported percentage increases of 11%, 14.7%, and 53.8%, respectively (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). This diversity may consequently increase the group differences found in employees, which may accordingly increase the amount of perceived ostracism in the workplace (Roberson & Stevens, 2006).

Although it is recognized that there are substantial causes for in- and out-group dynamics (through interpersonal relationships, personal biases, etc.), workforce diversity has been shown to be a leading cause in the increase of group differences that may lead to perceptions of ostracism (Ibarra, 1995; Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002; Roberson & Stevens, 2006). Often individuals perceive a clear division between people they feel are similar to them, the in-group, versus those they view as considerably different, the out-group (Roberson & Stevens, 2006). Researchers have also found that the greater the amount of ethnic diversity in a workplace, the more ostracism is perceived in workplace interactions (Milliken & Martins, 1996; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002).

A potential representation of this may be through minority status (Kossek & Zonia, 1993). Established research has expanded on the notion of ethnic diversity and has found that minority status may predict instances of perceived ostracism (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Roberson & Stevens, 2006; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002). Past research further suggests that individuals belonging to a socially disadvantaged minority group tend enact lower status confirmation and therefore are more attentive toward their environment and more likely to take into consideration any incident that can further confirm their lower-status identity (Roberson & Stevens, 2006;

Wirth & Williams, 2009). That is, minorities are more likely to monitor and process information regarding how fairly or unfairly they perceive they or their in-group are treated and are, thus, more likely to have more negative experiences in the workplace as compared to the majority (Ibarra, 1995; Roberson & Stevens, 2006).

In a study by Roberson and Stevens (2006), women, who were classified as the minority member, were more likely than men, the majority member, to cite more concerns on the quality of treatment they received when decisions at the workplace were implemented. The authors found that the lower-status minorities had a tendency to enact a protective bias towards their in-group members versus those they viewed as the out-group (Roberson & Stevens, 2006). Minorities, in this instance, were more likely to excuse negative behaviors from an in-group members than the same behaviors committed by an out-group member, thereby primarily protecting themselves and individuals similar to them from potential ostracism from the majority (Roberson & Stevens, 2006).

In part due to their protective bias, individuals reported less perceived ostracism when they do not perceive their status to be different from those in their environment (Avery, McKay, & Wilson, 2008). Hence, the less similar individuals perceive themselves to be from their workplace (i.e., Asians in predominately Caucasian workplace), the more ostracism is attributed to their group differences (Avery et al., 2008). Further evaluating the ostracism individuals attribute to their group differences, Avery et al. (2008) conducted research on racial groups and confirmed that perceived workplace ostracism was more prevalent among racial minorities, or subordinate groups (i.e., African Americans and Hispanics) than the majority group consisting of Caucasians.

Though there is a growing body of literature examining issues of minority ostracism, previous research has unfortunately been limited in terms of examining the experiences of Asian Americans; most have focused primarily on African Americans and Latino Americans (Avery et al., 2008). This is particularly surprising given the prospective demographic shifts for Asian Americans in the labor workplace. For example, projections of percentage changes from 2008 to 2018 predict the numbers of Caucasians in the civilian labor force to increase minimally by 5.5%, with Blacks showing an increase of 14.1%, Asians of 29.8%, and Hispanics of 33.1% (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). In an effort to address this gap in the literature, this study explicitly examines perceived ostracism experienced by Asian Americans with specific focus on Vietnamese Asian Americans for cultural and ethnic commonality.

Recognized throughout the research literature, ostracism, whether actual or perceived, generates similar feelings in the ostracized individual (Leary, 2001). Minority groups ostracized by the majority group as shown have been a common subject of research. Considerable research, therefore, along with common ethnicity among participants, provides the basis for the following:

*Hypothesis 1: Vietnamese Asian American employees will experience greater perceived ostracism compared to Caucasian American employees.*

#### *Language Fluency*

Though ostracism has been relatively common in the workplace, ostracizing behaviors due to language barriers are quickly becoming more commonplace (Hitlan, Schepman, Kelly, Schneider, & Zarate, 2006). In their research, Hitlan, Schepman, et al. (2006), examined the possible consequences that may arise from ostracism, with particular attention paid towards language-based ostracism. The authors compared instances of perceived ostracism between



individuals who were ostracized by coworkers speaking in English (a language they understood and in which they were fluent) and those whose coworkers were speaking Spanish (a language in which they were not fluent; Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). The research found that individuals ostracized in a language foreign to them (i.e., English speakers ostracized by coworkers speaking Spanish) reported higher instances of perceived ostracism (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006).

Therefore, perceived ostracism due to language has been shown to be significantly more damaging than exclusion in a shared language (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). Considering the effect of language barriers:

*Hypothesis 2: Vietnamese Asian Americans with non-fluent mastery of the English language will have a greater level of perceived ostracism than Vietnamese Asian Americans with fluent mastery.*

#### Effects of Perceived Ostracism: Well-Being, Job Satisfaction, & Counterproductive Work Behavior

Perceived ostracism is prominent among both individuals of minority status and those who suffer the ramifications of language barriers (Avery et al., 2008; Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). However, it is dually important to address the effects that perceived ostracism specifically has on those who perceive themselves to be ostracized. Though research has presented a multitude of reactionary behaviors to perceived ostracism, the majority has focused primarily on its effects on well-being, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior (Mor Barak & Levin, 2002; Roberson & Stevens, 2006; Mor Barak & Levin, 2002; Leary, 2001; Hitlan et al., 2006; De Jong & Shaufeli, 1998). Therefore, based on the availability of

data and validated scales, the focus of the present paper will primarily be on well-being, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior.

### *Well-Being*

Well-being, at its most basic definition, refers to contentment, satisfaction, or happiness derived from perceived optimal functioning (McDowell, 2010). Though researchers have sought to define well-being through many different concepts, from physiological, to social and psychological fulfillment (Neugarten, Havighurst, & Tobin 1961; Dupuy, 1984; Bech, Olsen, Kjoller, & Rasmussen, 2003; Williams, 1997; 2001; Krill et al., 2008; Leary, 1995), considerable research has shown support for the concept that well-being may be broken down into four components of fundamental needs: *belonging*, *control*, *self-esteem*, and *meaningful existence* (Williams 1997; 2001; Krill et al., 2008; Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

As a means for psychological fulfillment and greater sense of well-being, individuals have been shown to seek to increase their sense of belonging, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence (Krill et al., 2008). When those needs are lacking, individuals are more likely to experience distress (Krill et al., 2008; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Individuals' sense of well-being, therefore, can be negatively affected by ostracism (Krill, Platek, & Wathe, 2008). Hitlan et al. (2009) determined that an ostracized individual feels unwanted or rejected as a result of ostracism. Thus, their fundamental needs, belonging and self-esteem, are threatened (Hitlan et al., 2006).

Consequently, an individual's well-being has been found to positively correlate with his/her feelings of inclusion (Mor Barak & Levin, 2002). Therefore, the level of ostracism experienced may be a good predictor for an individual's sense of well-being as perceived ostracism may be just as damaging to an individual's well-being as the actual incidence of

ostracism (Mor Barak & Levin, 2002; Hitlan et al., 2006; Lau, Moulds, & Richardson, 2009; Leary, 2001; Williams & Zadro, 2001). In particular, focused research on racial minority groups, particularly Asian and Latino Americans, also found that those who merely perceived more prevalent ostracism from their environment experienced a greater decline in their well-being (Hwang & Goto, 2009).

### *Job Satisfaction*

Job satisfaction can be defined as the degree to which employees have a positive affective orientation toward employment by the organization (Mor Barak & Levin, 2002; Bettencourt & Brown, 1997). Research has shown a negative correlation between workplace diversity and job satisfaction (Long, 1998). Specifically, members of minority groups have been shown to be less satisfied in their jobs than Caucasians (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990)

Further evidence links perceived ostracism to instances of lowered job satisfaction (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). Alternately, Mor Barak and Levin (2002) found that perceived inclusion was the strongest predictor for both job satisfaction and well-being. Furthermore, perceived ostracism has also been postulated to lower the commitment and value an individual feels toward his/her workplace (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hitlan et al., 2006; Jockin, Avery, & McGue, 2001). Perceived ostracism, in turn, has been shown to negatively affect the individual's level of job satisfaction (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006; Allen & Meyer, 1997a; Allen & Meyer, 1997b).

The aforementioned studies suggest that greater instances of perceived ostracism amongst individuals with minority status (racial identity) may be cause for the following:

*Hypothesis 3a: The two factors, perceived ostracism and minority status, would interact to predict well-being, such that Vietnamese Asian Americans who are also ostracized would report lower levels of well-being than Caucasian Americans who may also be ostracized.*

*Hypothesis 3b: Perceived ostracism and minority status would interact to predict job satisfaction, thereby Vietnamese Asian Americans who are also ostracized report lower levels of job satisfaction than Caucasian Americans who may also be ostracized.*

Moreover, language ostracism has been found to be a contributing factor to job dissatisfaction. That is, when individuals are ostracized in a shared language (a language they recognize and understand), they are able to discern the issue at hand and were then able to externalize and cope with the ostracism (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). However, individuals who were unable to bypass the language barrier and who were unable to decipher the communication between their coworkers were more likely to feel psychological distress and a greater loss of control over their situation, often internalizing the ostracism (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006; Williams, 1997). As a consequence of their lower sense of well-being and control in the workplace, ostracized individuals were less likely to attribute value to their work and more likely to feel job dissatisfaction (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). Therefore,

*Hypothesis 4a: Vietnamese Asian Americans with non-fluent mastery of the English language will have a lower levels of well-being compared to Vietnamese Asian Americans with fluent mastery.*

*Hypothesis 4b: Vietnamese Asian Americans with non-fluent mastery of English will have lower levels of job satisfaction than Vietnamese Asian Americans with fluent mastery.*

As an additional product of perceived ostracism, these ostracized individuals are more likely to engage in a form of counterproductive work behavior as a reactive behavior (Jockin et al., 2001). Jockin et al. (2001) found that these reactionary behaviors may then negatively impact the work environment.

#### *Counterproductive Work Behavior*

Aggression and withdrawal are both recognized as forms of counterproductive work behavior (Jockin et al., 2001). Workplace aggression can be observed as any behavior by an individual with the intent to harm another coworker or the organization, including but not exclusive to petty theft (Jockin et al., 2001). The act of aggression not only directly affects the individual's immediate workplace environment, such as their coworkers and supervisors who they may blame for their exclusion, but over time, the actions may negatively impact the organization on a larger scale (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). Along with workplace aggression, ostracized individuals often disengage or withdraw from those they view as responsible for the exclusion (Jockin et al., 2001).

When ostracism continues in the workplace, ostracized individuals will consequently engage in counterproductive work behavior towards neutral third parties (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006; Jockin et al., 2001). The neutral third parties frequently consist of the organization or subordinates the ostracized individuals believe have not supported them nor acted to combat the ostracism (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006; Jockin et al., 2001).

Often a preceding factor to counterproductive work behavior (i.e., withdrawal and theft), ostracism is recognized as being detrimental to the individual and work organizational well-being and should justifiably be examined to mitigate its effects (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). Furthermore, ostracized individuals may engage in withdrawal and aggression (i.e., theft) in

their workplace as a reaction to those they believe to be responsible for the ostracism and those they perceive to have permitted it (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006; Jockin et al., 2001). Due to the greater perceived ostracism experience through minority status, and consequent lower well-being and job satisfaction, the previous literature supports the following:

*Hypothesis 5: Vietnamese Asian Americans are more likely to engage in counterproductive work behavior as compared to Caucasian Americans.*

Further research has indicated that general ostracism, defined as any form of exclusionary behavior regardless of language, remained one of the pervading causes of an individual's workplace counterproductive work behavior (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). Individuals ostracized in a language foreign to them (English speakers ostracized by coworkers speaking Spanish) reported less emotional attachment to the organization, less obligatory feelings to remain with the organization, as well as lower levels of commitment to their workplace, as compared to individuals ostracized in a shared language (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). These factors combine to lead to greater job dissatisfaction among individuals ostracized in a language foreign to them (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006).

Therefore, within individuals of minority status, there lies a further division. Individuals who are unable to discern the language spoken and externalize the ostracism by their coworkers are more likely to feel detachment from their organization (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006). This disengagement and further loss of commitment to the workplace predicts that:

*Hypothesis 6: Vietnamese Asian Americans with non-fluent mastery of the English language are more likely to engage in counterproductive work behavior as compared to Vietnamese Asian Americans.*

### Social Support

In coping with perceived ostracism and its effects, research has shown that individuals, regardless of ethnicity, who perceive ostracism often seek to mitigate its effects through social support (Outten, Schmitt, Garcia, & Branscombe, 2009). In a study focusing on coping options, Outten et al. (2009) found that group identification, defined as a sense of shared social identity, plays a key role in the coping process by protecting individuals from possible stressors.

Outten et al. (2009) determined that those of the minority group who have strong racial group identification, therefore perceiving a greater amount of social support, also had higher self-esteem and greater life satisfaction. This is particularly promising to the fulfillment of fundamental needs, thus well-being, proposed by Krill et al, (2008). Additionally, Yoo and Lee (2005) found that a strong ethnic identity correlated with more frequent and successful use of social support as a buffer to the effects of perceived ostracism. Specifically, Asian Americans with a strong sense of social support were able to successfully externalize the adversity they experienced and restore their work and life satisfaction prior to the exclusionary behavior (Yoo& Lee, 2005).

In another study, Wong, Yoo, and Stewart (2007) focused primarily on the social support and psychological well-being of older Chinese and Korean immigrants. In demonstrating correlation between social support and well-being, those who perceived more emotional or companionship support reported a significantly higher level of overall psychological well-being (Wong, Yoo, & Stewart, 2007).

The differences in emotional expression and well-being between the two Asian ethnic groups were suggested to be a result of cultural values and emphasis in inhibiting emotions (Wong et al., 2007). Wong et al. (2007) further proposed that additional research is necessary in determining the differences in psychological well-being between Asian ethnic groups. In an

attempt to eliminate the extraneous variable associated with inherent cultural differences as well as explore the effectiveness of social support, the present study will focus primarily on the interaction between social support and language fluency, such that:

*Hypothesis 7a: Vietnamese Asian Americans with non-fluent mastery of English, who perceive a strong social support system, will have a higher level of well-being than those who perceived a lack of social support.*

*Hypothesis 7b: Vietnamese Asian Americans with non-fluent mastery of English, who perceive a strong social support system, will have a higher level of job satisfaction than those who perceive a lack of social support.*

*Hypothesis 8: Vietnamese Asian Americans with non-fluent mastery of the English language who perceive a strong social support system will engage in less counterproductive work behavior as compared to those who perceive a lack of social support.*

## **Methods**

### **Participants**

Eighty-five participants completed the survey. Of the 85 participants, 59 were born in the United States and 26 were not. Of the 26 internationally born, 20 claimed to have lived the majority of their lives in the United States, with only 6 claiming to not have lived in the United States nor have lived here for most of their lives. The majority of participants have also had some education beyond the high school level ( $n=71$ ), with most indicating professional and related occupations (28.7%), student (24.8%), and sales and related occupations (9.9%) as their top three occupational fields. Work hours ranged between 5 to 80 hours a week, with the majority of participants working 40 hours a week (22.8%).



I eliminated a total of 8 participants on the following basis: those who are currently international residents or employees, those missing greater than 40% of data from the measured constructs, and those who were not currently working. Any individual who reported biracial ethnicity with Asian were thusly regarded as Asian, and therefore given a racial identity question to specify their race. Particular attention was paid toward participants indicating Caucasian or Vietnamese ethnicity.

Out of 77 participants citing either Caucasian ( $n=28$ ) or minority ethnicity ( $n=31$ ), 46 participants entered the primary data analysis: 28 Caucasian Americans and 18 Vietnamese Asian Americans. Of the 18 Vietnamese Asian Americans in the survey, 11 were considered non-fluent and 7 were fluent in English.

### **Procedure**

Upon approval by the IRB Review Board, participants were recruited via web survey through a number of communication networks (i.e., Facebook, forums, and personal referrals). Participants were informed that all participation was voluntary and they could stop at any given time without penalty. Consent to participate was indicated by clicking on a button to initiate the survey. Assignment of participant conditions was determined by the information participants reported. Demographic information specified the racial identity of the participant. Additionally, the participants' self-reported level of English fluency combined with the participants' score on the grammatical exercise verified the participants' language fluency.

Language fluency was specifically accessed among Vietnamese Asian Americans by determining the shared mean performance of all participants on the grammatical exercise consisting of 12 problems ( $M=10.49$ ). Mean-split variable was used to determine level of

fluency. Vietnamese Asian Americans scoring above the total mean were regarded as fluent, while participants at or below 10.49 were assumed to be non-fluent.

### Measures

The following items, when altered, were changed in the following forms: Likert scales for each were altered to be more consistent, such that participants would continue in answering the questions on the similar scales (*strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree*), certain measures which originally had many items (i.e., more than 20) were reduced down to fewer questions, such that participants would not be overwhelmed by too many questions.

*Demographics.* Demographic information was collected on the participants' gender, age, place of birth, race, specific nationality, etc. Where applicable, participants' were asked to report the length of time they immigrated to and have lived in the United States.

*Language fluency.* Language fluency was assessed through two measures: self-report and an English grammar and vocabulary task.

The first is a self-report by participants assessing their perceived level of English fluency on 4 areas (i.e., written, oral, auditory, and reading comprehension). Participants were asked to rate themselves on the 4 items (e.g., "*How would you rate your English writing skills?*"; "*How would you rate your English speaking skills?*"). Participants were given a 4-point rating scale (*Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor*). (See Appendix).

The second measure of English fluency was 12 items selected from the English Proficiency Test (Transparent Language, 2001). The selected items were the first four questions from each of the three sections in the English Proficiency Test: selecting verb tense, identifying wrong word usage from a sentence, and identifying vocabulary to be used. The questions were selected out of an extended test consisting of various sections. The process consisted of

selecting items out of each section, so that the shorter version would consist of the three but would not be as overwhelmingly long for participants. The measure extracted evenly, examining English grammar and vocabulary. Each item had four choices, with only one correct answer. Fluency was measured by mean-split variable of correct answers. (See Appendix).

*Workplace ostracism.* Workplace ostracism was assessed using the Workplace Ostracism Scale (WOS) developed and validated by Ferris, Brown, Berry, and Lian (2008). The scale consists of 10-items (e.g., “*Others ignored you at work.*”; “*Others at work shut you out of the conversation.*”) and is rated on a 7 point Likert-type response scale (1= *Never*, 2 = *Once in a while*, 3 = *Sometimes*, 4= *Fairly often*, 5 = *Often*, 6= *Constantly*, 7= *Always*). (See Appendix).

*Language-based workplace exclusion.* Language-based exclusion factor was assessed using a slightly modified version of the Workplace Exclusion scale (Hitlan, 2005; Hitlan & Noel, 2009). The Workplace Exclusion Scale consisted of 8 items of General Workplace exclusion and 3 items of Language-based Exclusion factors. Participants were asked to report how often they have experienced exclusionary behaviors, both general and language-based, during the past 12 months at their employment (e.g., “*Coworkers giving you the ‘silent treatment’*”, “*Coworkers speaking to one another in a language you do not understand*”, “*Coworkers speaking in English*”) (Hitlan et al., 2006). Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*most of the time*). (See Appendix).

*Fundamental needs.* An adaptation of van Beest and Williams’s (2006) Needs Threat Scale was used to assess sense of belonging (e.g., “*I feel that I belong to my work group.*”), control (e.g., “*I feel that the other employees decide everything.*”), self-esteem (e.g., “*Being in my workplace environment makes me feel insecure.*”), and meaningful existence (e.g., “*During work, it feels as if my presence is not meaningful.*”). The present study altered the scales to be

consistent with the others in the survey. The 20-items, 5 per need, were assessed on a scale of 1 (*strong disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). (See Appendix).

*Job satisfaction.* Three items were extracted from Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh's (1983) job satisfaction measure (e.g., "*All in all, I am satisfied with my job.*"). Job satisfaction was assessed on a 5-point scale of 1 (*strong disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). (See Appendix).

*Counterproductive work behavior.* Six items were taken equally from the two subscales, withdrawal and theft, of the overall counterproductive work behavior scale (Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, & Kessler, 2006). Out of the many sub-measures given, the current study focuses on aggression and withdrawal, therefore, sub-measures petty theft and withdrawal were selected. Participants were asked to report how often they have engaged in the counterproductive work behavior, both theft and withdrawal, during the past 12 months at their employment. Three questions were used to assess withdrawal (e.g., "*How often have you come to work late without permission?*") and three were dedicated to theft (e.g., "*How often have you taken supplies or tools home without permission?*"). The counterproductive work behavior were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*most of the time*). (See Appendix).

*Social support.* The 14-item Duke-UNC Functional Social Support Questionnaire developed by Broadhead, Gehlbach, Gruy, and Kaplan (1988) was used to assess social support. Items were assessed on a 5-point Likert scale 1 (*As much as I would like*) to 5 (*Much less than I would like*) on social support instances (e.g., "*I get... visits with friends and relatives.*") (See Appendix).

*Ethnic identity.* Three items were exacted from The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) (e.g., "*I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.*") The items were

assessed on a 4-point scale (*strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree*) (See Appendix).

*Vietnamese Identity.* 20 items were taken from The IVN subscale: Acculturation of Vietnamese Adolescents (Nguyen & von Eye, 2002). Seven items addressed group interactions (e.g., “*Most of my closest friends are Vietnamese.*”), eight items addressed everyday lifestyles (e.g., “*I want to speak Vietnamese at home.*”), and three items addressed global involvement (e.g., “*It is important to me to preserve my Vietnamese heritage.*”). The present study selected all but one scale on the criteria that all should be affected by daily activity or interaction with an arching interest in identity in general. The items were assessed on a 5 point scale (*strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree*). (See Appendix).

## **Results**

### *Predictors of Perceived Ostracism: Minority Status*

To assess Hypothesis 1 which stated there would be an impact of minority status on perceived ostracism, such that Vietnamese Asian Americans will experience greater perceived ostracism compared to Caucasian American employees, an independent samples *t*-test was computed. Minority status was used as the independent variable and perceived ostracism as the dependent variable of interest. Results indicated that there was no significant difference in mean response of perceived ostracism for Vietnamese Asian Americans ( $M=1.38, SD=0.38$ ) and Caucasian Americans ( $M=1.54, SD=0.56$ );  $t(44)=1.08, p=0.29$ .

### *Predictors of Perceived Ostracism: Language Fluency*

To assess Hypothesis 2 which predicted the impact of language fluency on perceived ostracism, an independent samples *t*-test was employed to compare the mean responses of perceived ostracism between Vietnamese Asian Americans who were fluent in English and

Vietnamese Asian Americans who were not. Results indicated that a significant difference was observed in perceived ostracism between Vietnamese Asian Americans who were fluent in English ( $M=1.09$ ;  $SD=0.11$ ), and Vietnamese Asian Americans who were not ( $M=1.56$ ;  $SD=0.37$ );  $t(16)=3.30$ ,  $p<.05$ .

*Interaction Effect of Perceived Ostracism and Minority Status: Well-Being*

To assess Hypothesis 3a which predicted the interaction of perceived ostracism and minority status and its effect on well-being, such that Vietnamese Asian Americans who are ostracized report lower levels of well-being as compared to Caucasian Americans who are ostracized, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted. First, independent variables were minority status (Caucasian, Vietnamese) and perceived workplace ostracism with dependent variable, well being. The construct well-being was expanded to evaluate four sub-measures of fundamental needs (*Belongingness, Control, Self Esteem, Meaningful Existence*).

For *Belongingness*, the overall regression equation was significant,  $F(2, 43)=7.84$ ,  $p<.05$ ;  $R^2=0.27$ . The significant effect was found to be from work ostracism,  $\beta=0.04$ ,  $p<.05$ . The added effect of minority status did not produce a significant interaction,  $\Delta R^2=0.07$ . Table 1 displays the results for Belongingness.

For *Control*, the overall regression equation was marginally significant,  $F(2, 43)=3.01$ ,  $p<.10$ ;  $R^2=0.12$ . The significant effect was found to be from minority status,  $\beta=0.30$ ,  $p<.05$ . The added effect of work ostracism did not produce a significant interaction,  $\Delta R^2=0.01$ . Table 2 displays the results for Control.

For *Self-Esteem*, the overall regression equation was significant,  $F(2, 43)=8.14$ ,  $p<.05$ ;  $R^2=0.28$ . The significant effect was found to be from work ostracism,  $\beta=-0.52$ ,  $p<.05$ . The

added effect of minority status did not produce a significant interaction,  $\Delta R^2=0.02$ . Table 3 displays the results for Self-Esteem.

For *Meaningful Existence*, the overall regression equation was marginally significant,  $F(2, 43)=2.86, p<0.10; R^2=0.12$ . The marginally significant effect was found to be from work ostracism,  $\beta=-0.29, p=.05$ . The added effect of minority status did not produce a significant interaction,  $\Delta R^2=0.00$ . Table 4 displays the results for Meaningful Existence.

#### *Interaction Effect of Perceived Ostracism and Minority Status: Job Satisfaction*

To evaluate Hypothesis 3b which stated that there would be an interaction effect of perceived ostracism and minority status on job satisfaction, such that Vietnamese Asian Americans who are ostracized report lower levels of job satisfaction as compared to Caucasian Americans who are ostracized, a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted. Independent variables were minority status (Caucasian, Vietnamese) and perceived workplace ostracism with dependent variable, job satisfaction. The overall regression equation was nonsignificant,  $F(2, 43)=2.27, p=0.12; R^2=0.09$ . Table 5 displays the results for job satisfaction.

#### *Effect of Perceived Language-based Ostracism: Well-being*

To assess Hypothesis 4a which stated there would be an effect of language fluency on well-being, an independent samples *t*-test was computed using language fluency as the independent variable and well-being, expanded to each of the four fundamental needs. Results indicated that Vietnamese Asian Americans fluent in English reported no difference in well-being, observed in four different areas of belongingness, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence, as compared to Vietnamese Asian Americans who were not fluent in English. Table 6 displays the results observed for all four fundamental needs.

#### *Effect of Perceived Language-based Ostracism: Job Satisfaction*

To assess Hypothesis 4b which stated there would be an effect of language fluency on job satisfaction, an independent samples *t*-test was computed using language fluency as the independent variable and job satisfaction as the dependent variable. Results showed that Vietnamese Asian Americans fluent in English ( $M=4.19$ ,  $SD=0.66$ ) did not differ significantly in their report of job satisfaction as compared to Vietnamese Asian Americans who were not fluent ( $M=3.58$ ,  $SD=0.92$ );  $t(16)=-1.53$ ,  $p=0.15$ .

*Effect of Perceived Ostracism and Minority Status: Counterproductive Work Behavior*

To evaluate Hypothesis 5 which stated that there would be an effect of perceived ostracism and minority status on counterproductive work behavior, an independent samples *t*-test was conducted. Perceived ostracism was used as the independent variable and the two constructs of counterproductive work behavior, withdrawal and theft, as the dependent variables of interest comparing Vietnamese Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans. Results indicated that there was no significant difference found between Vietnamese Asian Americans ( $M=1.72$ ,  $SD=0.40$ ) and Caucasian Americans ( $M=1.52$ ,  $SD=0.68$ );  $t(44)=-1.12$ ,  $p=0.27$  in the counterproductive work behavior of withdrawal. Furthermore, the counterproductive work behavior construct of theft observed no significant differences between Vietnamese Asian Americans ( $M=1.20$ ,  $SD=0.38$ ) and Caucasian Americans ( $M=1.23$ ,  $SD=0.61$ );  $t(44)=0.14$ ,  $p=0.70$ .

*Effect of Perceived Language-based Ostracism: Counterproductive Work Behavior*

To assess Hypothesis 6 which predicted the impact of language fluency on counterproductive work behaviors, withdrawal and theft, an independent samples *t*-test was computed using language fluency as the independent variable and counterproductive work behaviors, withdrawal and theft, as the dependent variables. Results indicated that there was no



difference in reported engagement in counterproductive work behavior, withdrawal, between Vietnamese Asian Americans who were fluent in English ( $M=1.71$ ,  $SD=0.49$ ) and Vietnamese Asian Americans who were not fluent ( $M=1.73$ ,  $SD=0.36$ );  $t(16)=0.065$ ,  $p=0.95$ . Also, there was no difference observed in counterproductive work behavior, theft, between Vietnamese Asian Americans fluent in English ( $M=1.14$ ,  $SD=0.38$ ) and Vietnamese Asian Americans who were not ( $M=1.24$ ,  $SD=0.40$ );  $t(16)=0.53$ ,  $p=0.61$ .

*Interaction Effect of Social Support and Language Fluency: Well-Being*

To assess Hypothesis 7a which stated there would be an impact of social support in mediating well-being in Vietnamese Asian Americans with non-fluent mastery of English, a multiple linear regression was computed. Social support and language fluency served as independent variables with the four fundamental needs: *Belongingness*, *Control*, *Self-Esteem*, *Meaningful Existence* (i.e., combined to signify well-being) as dependent variables.

For *Belongingness*, the overall regression equation showed no significance,  $F(2, 15)=2.31$ ,  $p=0.13$ ;  $R^2=0.24$ . There was also no interaction observed between language fluency and social support,  $\Delta R^2=0.12$ . Table 7 displays the results for *Belongingness*.

For *Control*, the overall regression equation showed no significance,  $F(2, 15)=2.99$ ,  $p=0.08$ ;  $R^2=0.29$ . There was also no interaction effect observed,  $\Delta R^2=0.06$ . Table 8 displays the results for *Control*.

For *Self-Esteem*, the overall regression equation showed no significance,  $F(2, 15)=2.59$ ,  $p=0.11$ ;  $R^2=0.26$ . There was also no interaction effect observed,  $\Delta R^2=0.05$ . Table 9 displays the results for *Self-Esteem*.

For *Meaningful Existence*, however, the overall regression equation did show a significant difference,  $F(2, 15)=7.32$ ,  $p<.05$ ;  $R^2=0.49$ . The effect was founded by social

support ( $\beta=0.65$ ,  $p<.05$ ). There was no interaction effect observed between social support and language fluency,  $\Delta R^2=0.03$ . Table 10 displays the results for Meaningful Existence.

#### *Interaction Effect of Social Support and Language Fluency on Job Satisfaction*

To assess Hypothesis 7b which stated that there would be an impact of social support in mediating job satisfaction in Vietnamese Asian Americans with non-fluent mastery of English, a multiple linear regression was computed. Social support and language fluency served as independent variables with job satisfaction as the dependent variable. Results indicated that the multiple regression equation had no overall effect,  $F(3, 14) = 1.55$ ,  $p=0.25$ ;  $R^2=0.09$ . Table 11 displays the results.

#### *Interaction Effect of Social Support and Language Fluency on Counterproductive Work Behavior*

To assess Hypothesis 8 which predicted the effect of social support in mediating counterproductive work behavior in Vietnamese Asian Americans who are non-fluent in English, two multiple regression analyses were conducted. The first used social support and language fluency as independent variables and counterproductive work behavior withdrawal as the observed dependent variable. Results indicated that there was no difference in counterproductive work behavior, withdrawal,  $F(2, 15)=1.69$ ,  $p=0.22$ ;  $R^2=0.18$ . There was also no interaction observed,  $F(3, 14)=1.05$ ,  $p=0.40$ ;  $\Delta R^2=0.00$ . Data are displayed in Table 12.

A second multiple linear regression was conducted to assess counterproductive work behavior – theft. Results indicated no significant difference,  $F(2, 15)=0.14$ ,  $p=0.87$ ;  $R^2=0.02$ . The interaction was also unable to predict instances of counterproductive work behavior, theft,  $F(3, 14)=0.72$ ,  $p=0.56$ ;  $\Delta R^2=0.12$ . Results are displayed in Table 13.

### **Discussion**

The present research was conducted to examine how minority status and language fluency may affect perceived ostracism. More specifically, how an individual's status as a Vietnamese Asian American and his/her degree of English fluency may affect their perception of ostracism. Consequently, the effects of perceived ostracism on an individual's well-being, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior were evaluated. Also, an additional focus in this study was to assess how social support among Vietnamese Asian Americans non-fluent in English may work to mitigate the effects of their hypothesized perceived ostracism due to language and minority status.

The first hypothesis predicted that being of minority status would increase an individual's perception of being ostracized from their predominately Caucasian work environment. Inconsistent with prediction, Vietnamese Asian Americans reported no difference in their perception of ostracism as compared to the responses of Caucasian Americans. Moreover, as a result of the expected higher perceived ostracism and minority status, it was predicted that Vietnamese Asian Americans would have lower levels of well-being and job satisfaction and, as a result, higher instances of counterproductive work behavior than Caucasian Americans. Overall, the results from the study were unresponsive of these hypotheses. With the exception of the Control component of Well-Being, there was no other relationship between minority status and well-being, job satisfaction, or counterproductive work behavior discovered between Vietnamese Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans.

These findings are inconsistent with the body of literature indicating that minority status would be a main predictor of an individual's report of perceived workplace ostracism (Roberston & Stevens, 2006; Avery et al., 2008; Yoo & Lee, 2005; Hwang & Goto, 2009) or that these perceptions of higher ostracism would affect counterproductive work behavior

(Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006; Jockin et al., 2001; Leary et al., 2006). Though unable to contribute support to the effects of minority status, results indicating perceived work ostracism's effect on Belongingness, Self Esteem, and Meaningful Existence (with the exception of Control) was partially congruent with prior literature indicating ostracism's effect on well-being (Lau et al., 2009; Hwang and Goto, 2009; Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hitlan et al., 2006).

Results from this survey were also not representative of perceived ostracism's predicted effect on job satisfaction (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hitlan et al., 2006; Jockin, Avery, & McGue, 2001). Vietnamese Asian Americans did not report a significantly different amount of perceived ostracism due to their minority status, nor did they experience a threat to their fundamental needs or work value strictly. This non-significance in job satisfaction also showed no effect on an individual's tendency to engage in counterproductive work behavior.

The set of non-significant findings may be a result of a number of factors. First, it may be due to the assimilation of Vietnamese Asian Americans in the Caucasian workplace. The study did not include an assimilation measurement to evaluate the extent to which Vietnamese Asian Americans may feel accepted and similar to others in their workplace. Given that the majority of participants were college educated, working in the professional world, and having been born or lived in the United States for the majority of their lives, the likelihood that the Vietnamese Asian American population sampled may have assimilated successfully into the Caucasian culture is high. This is suggested by the lack of perceived ostracism as they may feel themselves as similar to those in their work environment (Roberson & Stevens, 2006).

Alternatively, the survey conducted did not request data on whether participants were in work environments with ethnicities similar to their own. This lack of measure may have, thus,

overlooked instances where Vietnamese Asian Americans may have been employed in workplaces surrounded by other minorities like themselves. As a result of this potential factor, Vietnamese Asian Americans may not feel a particular difference in perceived ostracism due to their minority status, as they are not technically considered the minority within a particular workplace. Due to the pitfalls that may result in Vietnamese Asian Americans reporting similar perceived ostracism to Caucasians, it is probable that this non-significance may have largely prohibited effects of well-being, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior to manifest in participants.

I further hypothesized that language fluency may be a predictor for greater perceived ostracism. That is, with minority status controlled, Vietnamese Asian Americans non-fluent in English would have greater perceived ostracism than other Vietnamese Asian Americans who were fluent in English. In turn, it was predicted that their heightened perception of ostracism would cause Vietnamese Asian Americans non-fluent in English to experience lower levels of well-being and job satisfaction. And finally, due to this lowered well-being and job satisfaction and value, Vietnamese Asian Americans non-fluent in English would be more likely to engage in counterproductive work behavior to counter the negative effects they felt.

Based on the results of this study, language fluency was observed to be indicative of perceived ostracism. Vietnamese Asian Americans non-fluent in English reported higher levels of perceived ostracism than did those who were fluent. This finding is similar to what was reported by Hitlan, Schepman, et al. (2006), who indicated that individuals who were excluded from their coworkers by language cited higher perceptions of prejudice and exclusion than individuals excluded in a language they understood. Additional hypotheses regarding lower well-being (Lau et al., 2009; Hwang and Goto, 2009; Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hitlan et al.,

2006), job satisfaction (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hitlan et al., 2006; Jockin, Avery, & McGue, 2001), and higher counterproductive work behavior (Hitlan, Schepman, et al., 2006; Jockin et al., 2001; Leary et al., 2006) due to this heightened perception of ostracism, however, were not supported by available data.

These findings that are inconsistent with the cited studies may have been affected by the sample size (there were only 18 Vietnamese Asian Americans; 11 fluent, 7 non-fluent). The results suggest that with a larger number of Vietnamese Asian American participants, with adequate participants in each fluency condition, the trending data may potentially intensify and be significant and therefore lend support to the established research literature.

The last set of hypotheses examined social support as an effective mitigating factor for perceived ostracism effects. That is, controlling for minority status and language fluency, Vietnamese Asian Americans non-fluent in English who perceived a strong social support system would have higher well-being, job satisfaction, and lower engagement in counterproductive work behavior than those Vietnamese Asian Americans non-fluent in English who perceived a lack of social support.

Results of this study indicate that there is no relationship between social support and language fluency that may influence job satisfaction and counterproductive work behavior. That is, despite predictions of heightened perceived ostracism due to language barriers, individuals exhibited no use of social support to mitigate the negative effects of ostracism. The data, however, showed a significant difference in the component meaningful existence. That is, instances of social support predicted a higher level of meaningful existence. This lends partial support to Outten et al. (2009), Yoo and Lee (2005), and Wong et al. (2007), for despite inconsistencies regarding Belongingness, Control, and Self-Esteem, social support was able to

mitigate and increase an individual's meaningful existence. Alternately, it was unable to fully support findings by Outten et al. (2009), Yoo and Lee (2005), and Wong et al. (2007) in that ostracized individuals may not often seek social support, nor does social support lead to greater *overall* well-being and work satisfaction.

These nonsignificant findings may be due to the lack of effects found as a result of perceived ostracism. Without a significant difference in negative effects such as lower well-being in all (or the majority of) components, job satisfaction, and higher counterproductive work behavior, the study was unable to gauge the extent to which social support may help mitigate them.

#### *Limitations*

Some limitations lie, first and foremost, in the recruitment of participants. The researcher was unable to recruit an adequate number of participants to more fully examine differences. Of the entire participant pool recruited, only 18 were Vietnamese Asian Americans, the targeted population, which may have been the reason for the lack of significance though data may be slightly trending. The number of participants was simply not large enough to adequately indicate significance. Due to time constraints and recruitment strategies, participant responses were also severely limited.

One barrier to successful recruitment may have been the method used to recruit participants. The survey was distributed through email and, subsequently, through participant referrals to others. As the study was conducted via Internet, the majority of participants who have knowledge of and access to computer technology are often more fluent than the study's ideal population for non-fluent individuals. Also, those who are non-fluent may not have the English mastery to read and recognize the language of the survey. Consequently, they may have

opted to not participate. As a translated version of the survey in Vietnamese was not available, I was unable to precisely assess how a participant, with minimal grasp of the English language, may react in a predominately English-speaking work environment.

Though the English grammatical exercise and self-assessment may remain, it should be altered to necessitate greater language fluency. That is, it could include verbal and audio exercises to better gauge daily communication. Also, instead of grammatical multiple choice questions, future studies may benefit from devising an objective way to review short answer/essay compilations to better assess English grammar and writing abilities. For non-fluent participants, it may be advantageous to recruit through paper means and, with the exception of the English grammatical assessment, the survey should be in the participants' native language to better assess their responses to various, detailed constructs.

The possible interferences may have resulted in this study's widely fluent population, both Caucasian and Vietnamese Asian Americans. With such a fluent subject pool, the grammatical exercise was insufficient in accurately gauging language capabilities. Those who performed higher than the near perfect mean ( $M=10.49$ ) were deemed fluent, while at or below 10.49 was deemed non-fluent. Through this, I may have identified an individual as non-fluent who otherwise may have a firm mastery of English and who may have simply garnered a few mistakes on the exercise.

The participants referred by coworkers also had similar fluent characteristics. Also, the industry the survey was referred through may have played a factor. One circulation of the survey was through the non-profit organization, American Heart Association. The occupation, having taken place in a non-profit environment may have been less competitive, therefore more nurturing toward employee cooperation and well-being. The work environment may have been



a factor in why individuals perceived a lack of ostracism that consequently showed a lack of a difference in well-being, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior between Caucasian and Vietnamese Asian Americans.

#### *Conclusion and Future Directions*

The present study extends prior limited research on perceived ostracism brought about by minority status and language barriers by Asian Americans, particularly that of the virtually unstudied ethnicity of Vietnamese Asian Americans. Results indicated support of language fluency affecting perception of ostracism. That is, when Vietnamese Asian Americans fluent in English and Vietnamese Asian Americans non-fluent in English were compared, those who were non-fluent showed a significantly greater perception of ostracism from their work environment.

This offers evidence that perceived language-based ostracism may implicate higher reports of perceived ostracism and its negative effects than general workplace ostracism or minority status would alone. On this basis, it is my belief that with the growing ethnic diversity and minority populations in the American workplace, as well as the dissimilar levels of language fluencies it potentially introduces into our work-related interactions, future studies should explore and aim to mitigate the effects of language-based ostracism on all employees and, subsequently, the work organization.

### References

- Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1990a). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 847-858.
- Allen, N.J., & Meyer J.P. (1990b). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Avery, D.R., McKay, P.F., & Wilson, D.C. (2008). What are the odds? How demographic similarity affects the prevalence of perceived employment discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 235-249.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 491-529.
- Bech, P., Olsen, L.R., Kjoller, M., & Rasmussen, N.K. (2003). Measuring well-being rather than the absence of distress symptoms: a comparison of the SF-36 mental health subscale and the WHO-Five well-being scale. *International Journal of Methods Psychiatric Research*, 12(2), 85-91.
- Bettencourt, L.A. & Brown, S.W. (1997). Contact employees: Relationships among workplace fairness, job satisfaction and prosocial service behaviors. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(1), 39-61.
- Broadhead, W.E., Gehlbach, S.H., de Gruy, F.V., & Kaplan, B.H. (1988). The Duke-UNC functional social support questionnaire: Measurement of social support in family medicine patients. *Medical Care*, 26, 709-723.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009, December 11). Table 1. Civilian labor force by age, sex, race,

and Hispanic origin, 1998, 2008, and projected 2018. Retrieved April 17, 2010 from U.S. Department of Labor Website: <http://bls.gov/news.release/ecopro.t01.htm>.

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins G.D., & Klesh J.R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. E. Seashore, E. Lawler, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing Organizational Change*, 71-138. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Cox, T.H. & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 45–56.

De Jong, J. & Schaufeli, W.B. (1998). Job characteristics and employee well being: A test of Warr's Vitamin Model in health care workers using structural equation modeling. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 387–407.

Dupuy, H.J. (1984). The psychological general well-being (PGWB) index. In: NK Wenger, ME Mattson, CD Furberg and J Elinson (Eds.), *Assessment of quality of life in clinical trial of cardiovascular therapies* pp. 170–183. Le Jacq, New York.

Fernandez, J.P. (1991). *Managing a diverse workforce: Regaining the competitive edge*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Greenhaus, J.H., Parasuramn, S., & Wormley, W. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 54–86.

Hickey, T.M. (2007). Fluency in reading Irish as l1 or l2: Promoting high-frequency word recognition in emergent readers. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 471-493.

Hitlan, R.T., Clifton, R. J., & DeSoto, M.C. (2006). Perceived exclusion in the workplace: The

- moderating effects of gender on work-related attitudes and psychological health. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 8, 217-236.
- Hitlan, R.T., & Noel, J. (2009). The influence of workplace exclusion and personality on counterproductive work behaviors: An interactionist perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 18, 477-502.
- Hitlan, R.T., Schepman, S., Kelly, K.M., Schneider, K.T., & Zarate, M.A. (2006). Language exclusion and the consequences of perceived ostracism in the workplace. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 10, 56-70.
- Hwang, W.C., & Goto, S. (2009). The impact of perceived racial discrimination on the mental health of Asian American and Latino college students. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 5, 15-28.
- Ibarra, H. (1995). Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 673–703.
- Jackson, S.E., May, K.E., & Whitney, K. (1995) Understanding the dynamics of diversity on decision making teams. *Team Effectiveness and Decision-Making Organizations*: 204–261.
- Jockin, V., Arvey, R.D., & McGue, M. (2001). Perceived victimization moderates self-reports of workplace aggression and conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1262-1269.
- Kossek, E.E. & Zonia, S.C. (1993). Assessing diversity climate: A field study of reactions to employer efforts to promote diversity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 61–81.
- Krill, A.L., Platek, S.M., & Wathne K. (2008). Feelings of control during social exclusion are partly accounted for by empathizing personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 684-688.

Lau, G., Moulds, M.L., & Richardson, R. (2009). Ostracism: How much it hurts depends on how you remember it. *Emotion, 9*, 430-434.

Leary, M, R, (2001). *Interpersonal Rejection*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Long, B.C. (1998). Coping with workplace stress: A multiple-group comparison of female managers and clerical workers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*(1), 65–78.

McDowell, I. (2010). Measures of self-perceived well-being. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 69*(1), 69-79.

Milliken, F.J. & Martins, L.L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(2), 402–433.

Mor Barak, M.E., & Cherin, D.A. (1998). A tool to expand organizational understanding of workforce diversity: Exploring a measure of inclusion–exclusion. *Administration in Social Work, 22*(1), 47–65.

Mor Barak, M.E., Cherin, D.A., & Berkman, S. (1998). Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 34*(1), 82–104.

Mor Barak, M.E. & Levin, A. (2002). Outside of the corporate mainstream and excluded from the work community: A study of diversity, job satisfaction, and well-being. *Community, Work & Family, 5*(2), 133-157.

Neugarten, B.L., Havighurst, R.J., & Tobin S.S. (1961). The measurement of life satisfaction. *J Gerontol, 16*, 134–143.

Nguyen, H. H., & von Eye, A. (2002). The Acculturation Scale for Vietnamese Adolescents

- (ASVA): A bidimensional perspective. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 26(3), 202-213.
- Outten, H.R., Schmitt, M.T., & Garcia, D.M. (2009). Coping options: Missing links between minority group identification and psychological well-being. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 58, 146-170.
- Phinney, J.S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7(2), 156-176.
- Richman, L.S., & Leary, M.R. (2009). Reactions to discrimination, stigmatization, ostracism, and other forms of interpersonal rejection: A multimotive model. *Psychological Review*, 116, 365-383.
- Roberson, Q.M., & Stevens, C.K. (2006). Making sense of diversity in the workplace: Organizational justice and language abstraction in employees' accounts of diversity-related incidence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 379-391.
- Schneider, K. T., Hitlan, R. T., & Radhakrishnan, P. (2000). An examination of the nature and correlates of ethnic harassment in multiple contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 3-12.
- Spector, P.E., Fox, S., Penney, L.M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 446-460.
- Transparent Language (2010). *English Proficiency Test*. Retrieved April 17, 2010, from the Transparent Language Website: <http://www.transparent.com/learn-english/proficiency-test.html>.
- Van Beest, I., & Williams, K.D. (2006). When inclusion costs and ostracism pays, ostracism

- still hurts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 912-928.
- Weathers, V.M., & Truxillio, D.M. (2008) Whites' and Asian Americans' perceptions of Asian Americans as targets of affirmative action. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*, 2737-2758.
- Williams, K.D. (1997). Social ostracism. In R.M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Aversive interpersonal behaviors* (pp. 133-170). New York: Guilford Press.
- Williams, K. D. (2001). Ostracism in and by organizations. In K. D. Williams (Ed.), *Ostracism: The power of silence* (pp. 189 –216). New York: Guilford Press.
- Williams, K. D., & Zadro, L. (2001). Ostracism: On being ignored excluded and rejected. In M. R. Leary (Ed.), *Interpersonal Rejection*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wirth, J.H., & Williams, K.D., (2009) They don't like our kind: Consequences of being ostracized while possessing a group membership. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *12*(1), 111-127.
- Wong, S.T., Yoo, G.J., & Stewart, A.L. (2007). An empirical evaluation of social support and psychological well-being in older Chinese and Korean immigrants. *Ethnicity and Health*, *12*, 43-67.
- Yoo, H.C., & Lee, R.M. (2005). Ethnic identity and approach-type coping as moderators of the racial discrimination/well-being relation in Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*, 497-506.
- Zadro, L., Williams, K.D., & Richardson, R. (2004). How long can you go? Ostracism by a computer is sufficient to lower self-reported levels of belonging, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*, 560-567.

## Appendix

### Language Fluency Self-report Scale

We are interested in how individuals may rate their English written, speaking, hearing, and reading comprehension skills. You are to select which best describes how you feel about your mastery of the English language. There are no right or wrong answers. We should like your honest opinion on each one of the statements.

Please rate the following on a 4-point scale (*Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor*).

1.) How would you rate your writing skills in English?

*Excellent      Good      Fair      Poor*

2.) How would you rate your speaking skills in English?

*Excellent      Good      Fair      Poor*

3.) How would you rate your hearing and oral understanding of English?

*Excellent      Good      Fair      Poor*

4.) How would you rate your reading comprehension of English?

*Excellent      Good      Fair      Poor*

---

### English Proficiency Test (\*asterisk denotes correct answer)

**Select the best answer.**

1.) Maria \_\_\_\_\_ never late for work.

A. am ; B. are ; C. were ; D. is\*

2.) You were \_\_\_\_\_ the New York office before 2 p.m.

A. suppose call ; B. supposed to call\* ; C. supposed calling ; D. supposed call

3.) When I graduate from college next June, I \_\_\_\_\_ a student here for five years.



A. will have been\* ; B. have been ; C. has been ; D. will have

4.) *Mr. Hawkins requests that someone \_\_\_\_\_ the data by fax immediately.*

A. sent ; B. sends ; C. send\* ; D. to send

**Select the underlined word or phrase that is incorrect**

5.) *The majority to the news is about violence or scandal.*

A. The ; B. to ; C. news \* ; D. violence

6.) *Mr. Feinauer does not take critical of his work very well.*

A. does ; B. critical\* ; C. his ; D. well

7.) *I had a enjoyable time at the party last night.*

A. a\* ; B. time ; C. at ; D. last

8.) *Each day after school, Jerome run five miles.*

A. Each ; B. after ; C. run\* ; D. miles

**Select the best word for the blank.**

9.) *The chairperson will \_\_\_\_\_ members to the subcommittee.*

A. appoint\* ; B. disappoint ; C. appointment ; D. disappointed

10.) *We were \_\_\_\_\_ friends in that strange but magical country.*

A. upon ; B. among\* ; C. toward ; D. in addition to

11.) *Many cultures have special ceremonies to celebrate a person's \_\_\_\_\_ of passage into adulthood.*

A. right ; B. rite \* ; C. writ ; D. write

12.) *The hurricane caused \_\_\_\_\_ damage to the city.*

A. extend ; B. extended ; C. extensive\* ; D. extension

---

**Work Ostracism Scale**

<i>Never</i>	<i>Once in a</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Fairly</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Constantly</i>	<i>Always</i>
	<i>while</i>		<i>Often</i>			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. Others ignored you at work.
2. Others left the area when you entered.
3. Your greetings have gone unanswered at work.
4. You involuntarily sat alone in a crowded lunchroom at work.
5. Others avoided you at work.
6. You noticed others would not look at you at work.
7. Others at work shut you out of the conversation.
8. Others refused to talk to you at work.
9. Others at work treated you as if you weren't there.
10. Others at work did not invite you or ask you if you wanted anything when they went out for a coffee break.

---

**Workplace Exclusion Scale with Language-based items**

*How often in the last 12 months have you experienced the following:*

<i>Never</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Most of the time</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

1. Coworkers giving you the “silent treatment”. (Coworker)
2. Coworkers shutting you out of their conversations. (Coworker)

3. Coworkers giving you the impression that they enjoy your company. (Coworker - R)
4. Coworkers interacting with you only when they are required to do so. (Coworker)
5. Feeling accepted by other employees at your organization. (Coworker - R)
6. Employees updating you about important work-related activities. (Coworker - R)
7. Coworkers making you feel like you were not a part of the organization. (Coworker)
8. Coworkers speaking to one another in a language you do not understand well. (Language)
9. Coworkers speaking English on the job. (Language)
10. Being unable to interact with others at work due to language communication difficulties. (Language)
11. Felt as if you were being ostracized by coworkers. (Criterion)

---

**Fundamental Needs Scale**

You are to select which best describes how you feel about your present job. There are no right or wrong answers. We should like your honest opinion on each one of the statements.

Please rate the following on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>Disagree</i>				<i>Agree</i>
1	2	3	4	5

*Belongingness*

1. I feel as one with the other employees.
2. I feel that I belong to my work group.

3. I do not feel accepted by the other employees.
4. During work, I feel connected with one or more employees.
5. I feel like an outsider during work.

*Control*

1. I feel that I could converse as often as I want to with other employees.
2. I feel in control over my workplace environment.
3. I believe that I affect the course of my workplace environment.
4. I feel that I could significantly influence the direction of my workplace.
5. I feel that the other employees decide everything.

*Self-Esteem*

1. Being in my workplace environment makes me feel insecure.
2. I have the feeling of failure during work.
3. I feel that I have the same value as the other employees.
4. I am concerned about what the other employees think about me during work.
5. I feel that the other employees do not like me.

*Meaningful Existence*

1. During work, it feels as if my presence is not meaningful.
  2. I think it is useless that I participate in my workplace.
  3. I feel that my presence during work is important.
  4. I think that my participation in the workplace is useful.
  5. I believe that my contribution to the workplace does not matter.
-

**Job Satisfaction Scale**

You are to select which best describes how you feel about your present job. There are no right or wrong answers. We should like your honest opinion on each one of the statements.

Please rate the following on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>Disagree</i>				<i>Agree</i>
1	2	3	4	5

1. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
2. In general, I don't like my job.
3. In general, I like working for my present employer.

**Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale**

*How often in the last 12 months have you experienced the following:*

<i>Never</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Most of the time</i>
1	2	3	4	5

Withdrawal:

*How often have you...*

*come to work late without permission?*

*stayed home from work and said you were sick when you were not?*

*taken a longer break than you are allowed to take?*

Theft:

*How often have you...*

*taken supplies or tools home without permission?*

*put in to be paid for more hour than you worked?*

*taken something belonging to someone at work?*

---

**Duke-UNC Functional Social Support Questionnaire**

Here is a list of some things that other people do for us or give us that may be helpful or supportive. Please read each statement carefully and rate according to what is CLOSEST to your situation

<i>As much as I</i>	-	-	-	<i>Much less than</i>
<i>would like</i>				<i>I would like</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

Here is an example:

I get...

enough vacation time

1 As much as I would like - 2 - 3 - 4 - Much less than I would like

If you rate a **2**, it means that you get ALMOST as much vacation time as you would like, but not quite as much as you would like.

Answer each time as best as you can. There are no right or wrong answers.

I get...

1. visits with friends and relatives ...
2. help around the house ...
3. help with money in an emergency ...
4. praise for a good job ...
5. people who care what happens to me ...
6. love and affection ...
7. telephone calls from people I know ...
8. chances to talk to someone about problems at work or with my housework ...
9. chances to talk to someone I trust about my personal and family problems ...
10. chances to talk about money matters ...
11. invitations to go out and do things with other people ...
12. useful advice about important things in life ...
13. help with I need transportation ...
14. help when I'm sick in bed ...

---

### **Adaptation of MEIM**

*Excerpt of instructions: In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Mexican-American, Hispanic, Black, Asian-American, American Indian, Anglo-American, and White. Every person is born into an ethnic group, or sometimes two groups, but people differ on how important their ethnicity is to them, how they feel about it, and how much their behavior is affected by it. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about or react to it.*

*Use the numbers given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the each statement.*

<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>Disagree</i>				<i>Agree</i>
1	2	3	4	5

I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background

I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group

I am not very clear about the role of my ethnicity in my life

---

**The Acculturation Scale for Vietnamese Adolescents (ASVA)**

<i>Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly</i>
<i>Disagree</i>				<i>Agree</i>
1	2	3	4	5

Please carefully read the following statements and answer to the best of your ability.

Most of my closest friends are Vietnamese.

I feel at ease with Vietnamese people.

I enjoy going to Vietnamese gatherings or parties.

I often hang out with Vietnamese friends.

I often interact with Vietnamese people.

I often go to Vietnamese gatherings or parties.

I often participate in Vietnamese groups.

I want to speak Vietnamese at home.



I often speak Vietnamese.

I often watch Vietnamese movies or TV programs.

I like to eat Vietnamese food.

I often listen to Vietnamese music.

My room is decorated in Vietnamese style.

I often read Vietnamese newspapers or magazines.

It is important to me to preserve my Vietnamese heritage.

I would like to retain (or keep) the Vietnamese way of life.

As far as behaviors and values, I am Vietnamese.

Table 1

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction between Perceived Ostracism and Racial Identity on Belongingness Component of Fundamental Needs*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	4.72	0.36	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	0.05	0.16	0.44
Perceived Work Ostracism	-0.61	0.16	-0.508*
Model 2			
Constant	5.13	0.77	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	-0.28	0.57	-0.23
Perceived Work Ostracism	-0.90	0.50	-0.75
Perceived Ostracism and Ethnicity Interaction	0.24	0.39	0.35

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.27$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.07$  for Model 2. (\* $p < .05$ )

Table 2

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Perceived Ostracism and Racial Identity on Control Component of Fundamental Needs*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	3.14	0.43	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	0.40	0.19	0.30†
Perceived Work Ostracism	-0.19	0.19	-0.14
Model 2			
Constant	2.56	0.92	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	0.87	0.68	0.65
Perceived Work Ostracism	0.22	0.60	0.165
Perceived Work Ostracism and Ethnicity Interaction	-0.33	0.46	-0.44

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.12$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$  for Model 2.

† $p < .10$  (marginally significant)

Table 3

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Perceived Ostracism and Minority Status on Self-Esteem Component of Fundamental Needs*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	4.60	0.39	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	0.05	0.18	0.035
Perceived Work Ostracism	-0.68	0.17	-0.52*
Model 2			
Constant	4.35	0.84	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	0.25	0.62	0.19
Perceived Work Ostracism	-0.51	0.55	-0.38
Perceived Work Ostracism and Ethnicity Interaction	-0.14	0.42	-0.19

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.28$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$  for Model 2. (\* $p < .05$ )

Table 4

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Perceived Ostracism and Minority Status on Meaningful Existence Component of Fundamental Needs*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	4.4	0.41	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	0.17	0.18	0.14
Perceived Work Ostracism	-0.37	0.18	-0.29†
Model 2			
Constant	4.34	0.87	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	0.22	0.65	0.17
Perceived Work Ostracism	-0.32	0.57	-0.26
Perceived Work Ostracism and Ethnicity Interaction	-0.03	0.44	-0.05

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.12$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.00$  for Model 2.

† $p < 0.1$  (marginally significant)

Table 5

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Perceived Ostracism and Minority Status on Job Satisfaction*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	4.11	0.64	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	0.22	0.29	0.11
Perceived Work Ostracism	-0.53	0.29	-0.27
Model 2			
Constant	3.95	1.39	
Ethnicity (CA and VAA)	0.34	1.03	0.18
Perceived Work Ostracism	-0.42	0.90	-0.22
Interaction of Perceived Work Ostracism and Ethnicity	-0.09	0.70	-0.08

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.12$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.00$  for Model 2. (\* $p < .05$ )

Table 6

*Mean Scale Scores for Well-Being (Measured through Four Fundamental Needs) Between Vietnamese Asian Americans Fluent in English (VAAE) and Vietnamese Asian Americans Non-fluent in English (VAAN). (\*p<.05)*

Constructs	VAA (fluent/non-fluent)		P-value
	VAAE	VAAN	
	<i>M</i>		
Belongingness	4.26	3.80	0.14
Control	3.86	3.56	0.37
Self-Esteem	4.14	3.51	0.06
Meaningful Existence	4.43	4.13	0.25

Table 7

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Language Fluency and Social Support on Belongingness Component of Fundamental Needs*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	2.09	0.98	
Language Fluency	0.50	0.28	0.40
Social Support	0.30	0.21	0.32
Model 2			
Constant	5.82	2.46	
Language Fluency	-2.11	1.62	-1.69
Social Support	-0.64	0.61	-0.69
Language Fluency and Social Support Interaction	0.67	0.41	2.24

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.24$  for Model 1:  $\Delta R^2 = 0.12$  for Model 2. ( $*p < .05$ )



Table 8

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Language Fluency and Social Support on Control Component of Fundamental Needs*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	1.29	0.99	
Language Fluency	0.37	0.29	0.29
Social Support	0.47	0.21	0.49
Model 2			
Constant	3.89	2.60	
Language Fluency	-1.45	1.71	-1.11
Social Support	-0.18	0.64	-0.19
Language Fluency and Social Support Interaction	0.46	0.43	1.49

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.29$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.06$  for Model 2. ( $*p < .05$ )

Table 9

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Language Fluency and Social Support on Self-Esteem Component of Fundamental Needs*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	1.85	1.09	
Language Fluency	0.68	0.32	0.48
Social Support	0.25	0.24	0.23
Model 2			
Constant	4.631	2.87	
Language Fluency	-1.28	1.89	-0.91
Social Support	-0.46	0.71	-0.44
Language Fluency and Social Support Interaction	0.50	0.48	1.48

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.26$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.05$  for Model 2. (\* $p < .05$ )

Table 10

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Language Fluency and Social Support on Meaningful Existence Component of Fundamental Needs*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
<hr/>			
Model 1			
Constant	1.71	0.67	
Language Fluency	0.39	0.19	0.37
Social Support	0.50	0.14	0.65*
<hr/>			
Model 2			
Constant	3.27	1.78	
Language Fluency	-0.70	1.17	-0.67
Social Support	0.11	0.44	0.14
Language Fluency and Social Support Interaction	0.28	0.29	1.11

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.49$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.03$  for Model 2. (\* $p < .05$ )

Table 11

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Language Fluency and Social Support on Job Satisfaction Component of Fundamental Needs*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	1.06	1.34	
Language Fluency	0.69	0.39	0.40
Social Support	0.45	0.29	0.35
Model 2			
Constant	1.22	3.68	
Language Fluency	0.59	2.42	0.34
Social Support	0.41	0.91	0.32
Language Fluency and Social Support Interaction	0.03	0.61	1.11

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.25$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.09$  ( $*p < .05$ )

Table 12

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Language Fluency and Social Support on Counterproductive Work Behavior – Withdrawal Component*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	2.82	0.65	
Language Fluency	-0.06	0.19	-0.07
Social Support	-0.26	0.14	-0.43
Model 2			
Constant	2.96	1.78	
Language Fluency	-0.16	1.17	-0.19
Social Support	-0.29	0.44	-0.49
Language Fluency and Social Support Interaction	0.03	0.29	0.13

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.18$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.00$  ( $*p < .05$ )

Table 13

*Multiple Linear Regression Results and Interaction Between Language Fluency and Social Support on Counterproductive Work Behavior – Theft Component*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>	<i>Beta</i>
Model 1			
Constant	1.42	0.68	
Language Fluency	-0.10	0.20	-0.14
Social Support	-0.02	0.15	-0.03
Model 2			
Constant	-0.79	1.74	
Language Fluency	1.45	1.15	1.90
Social Support	0.54	0.43	0.95
Language Fluency and Social Support Interaction	-0.39	0.29	-2.18

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.02$  for Model 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.12$  ( $*p < .05$ )