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Abstract

Cultural microaggressions are especially problematic in multinational organizations because of the sheer and vast diversity of employees, customers, and partners across numerous countries and continents. These subtly discriminatory remarks or actions often lead to negative consequences that can cost companies immeasurable revenue and profit losses, customer and employee attrition, and brand reputational damage. This study aims to understand the impact of cultural microaggressions on job outcomes and the moderating effects of inclusivity practices and employee coping strategies. We draw upon the minority stress model and use quantitative methods to determine the relationship between cultural microaggressions and various job outcomes. Findings show a significant relationship between cultural microaggressions and job stress. Additionally, coping strategies moderate the relationship between cultural microaggressions and job stress. In the discussion, we stress the importance of multinational corporations fostering more productive and harmonious work environments through organizational inclusiveness practices and policies and equipping their employees with coping strategies to vanquish the impact of cultural microaggressions.

Keywords: cultural microaggressions, multinational organizations, biases, coping strategies
Chapter 1: Introduction

Microaggressions, characterized as daily behavioral, subtle, verbal, and environmental insults directed at individuals or groups (Moore & Nash, 2021; Simatele, 2018), are present in nearly all employment settings. According to a Pew Research survey (2020), more than a quarter of minorities in the United States (26%) had encountered workplace microaggressions, with this percentage jumping to 40% for black women and 37% for the LGBTQ+ populations (U.S Bureau of Statistics, 2020). Owing to this increase in practice, microaggressions pervade, emphasizing the need for further research into microaggressions and their consequences (Banks & Callahan, 2022). These microaggressions have been connected to harmful psychological and physical health outcomes, and they can also alter coping mechanisms independent of the target's background (Costa et al., 2022). These acts are frequently the result of unintentional insensitivity or a lack of understanding. When victims find the resolve to confront these concerns, they are often faced with dismissive remarks such as “You're too sensitive” or “I meant that as a compliment” (Sue et al., 2007).

By using the victim's perspective as a starting point, it becomes clear that the problem of microaggressions is not limited to only individuals; organizations are also affected. Minority representation in the workplace has increased significantly as globalization progresses and anti-discrimination laws have become more common. For example, women presently account for almost 46.5% of the workforce in the United States, and forecasts indicate that minorities will constitute the majority of the population by 2030 to 2050 (Banks & Callahan, 2022). Despite this progress, the continuous issue of
microaggressions continues to cast a shadow, affecting both individual well-being and organizational success.

Job outcomes, such as employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment, serve as pivotal indicators of an employee's well-being and overall satisfaction within an organization. Racial microaggressions, for example, have been shown to reduce job satisfaction (DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016). Furthermore, as Lee et al. (2019) pointed out, perceived stress, which is frequently increased by microaggressions, exacerbates the detrimental influence on job security and symptoms.

Transitioning to the broader organizational landscape, the concept of organizational inclusivity comes to the fore. This includes policies, practices, and culture that promote employee inclusion, acceptance, and equal treatment. A strong inclusion framework can operate as a protective barrier in the face of microaggressions. According to Pitcher (2017), an inclusive atmosphere can function as a buffer against the harmful consequences of microaggressions, making employees feel valued, respected, and supported.

Coping techniques also emerge as the tools employees use to overcome the problems of microaggressions on an individual level. These methods, which range from seeking social assistance to problem-solving or even avoidance, serve as crucial barriers. When confronted with racial microaggressions, people typically resort to detachment coping (DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016).

While there has been substantial research on racial microaggressions, the domain of cultural microaggressions has received less attention, particularly within multinational companies. The types of microaggressions experienced by multinational employees are
often due to biases regarding accent, dialect, communication misunderstandings from jargon or colloquial terms, and cross-cultural differences such as the observation of certain cultural holidays. The rising prominence of issues related to language, nationality, and dialect in multinational companies underscores the need for deeper investigation (Ehie et al., 2021; Williams, 2019). The current literature, however, falls short of giving a comprehensive understanding of how these microaggressions manifest in global settings and their consequences (Bond & Haynes-Baratz, 2022; Delatolla et al., 2021). It is important to investigate how organizational inclusion and individual coping skills can potentially offset their negative effects on individual-level job outcomes. Therefore, this study will attempt to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: Is there a relationship between cultural microaggressions and job outcomes of employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment in multinational companies?

RQ2: Does organizational inclusivity moderate the effect of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment in multinational companies?

RQ3: Does employee coping strategy moderate the relationship between cultural microaggressions and employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment in multinational companies?

This study intends to investigate the complexities of cultural microaggressions within multicultural environments, expanding on the fundamental research by Sue et al. (2007) and Nadal (2008) on microaggressions in the United States. It will investigate the intricate interplay between race, gender, and job outcomes while situating it within the larger frameworks of corporate inclusion and employee coping mechanisms. While the Minority Stress Model has typically provided clinical insights, this study attempts to
apply its ideas to a corporate context, providing stakeholders with a pragmatic perspective.

From a practical standpoint, the study's findings have the potential to be beneficial to international organizations. Leadership may use these findings to create and implement rules that clearly address the consequences of cultural microaggressions. In addition, the research will serve as a roadmap for improving training programs, with a focus on recognizing and combating hidden biases. This study serves as a beacon for employees dealing with cultural microaggressions, highlighting how organizational inclusivity and individual coping mechanisms can impact their professional trajectory and job satisfaction.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

When studying the racial dynamics and behaviors of Black and White people in television commercials, Pierce et al. (1977, p.66) first proposed the idea of microaggressions. Microaggressions were defined as "unassuming, surprising, frequently unconscious, automatic, verbal and non-verbal exchanges whereby offenders put down black people." Often unintentional yet aggressive, these practices were used toward African-American individuals. Nearly 30 years later, Derald Wing Sue and his colleagues examined the idea of established racial microaggressions as a construct in the context of psychology and clinical practice (Sue et al., 2007)

Microaggressions are daily behavioral, verbal, and environmental insults directed toward a person or groups of people (Simatele, 2018). They are brief, routine, everyday verbal slights that convey adverse, belittling, or trifling insults, usually directed against a minority individual person or group of people (Sue et al., 2007; Nadal, 2008).
Microaggressions can be intentional or inadvertent, as illustrated by previous research on Hispanic Americans (Williams et al., 2021). While trying to understand microaggressions directed against individuals based on their racial and cultural differences, Williams et al. established that because of their racial and cultural orientations, people of Latin origin, experienced targeted stereotyping, critical scrutiny of their credentials, feeling unappreciated and undervalued in their places of work and being criticized because of their accent when speaking English.

Current researchers’ approaches to microaggressions acknowledge the perspectives developed by Pierce and colleagues (1977) on the subtlety of this form of discrimination while also acknowledging its prevalence and the means used to propagate it to target audiences. Existing research has examined the effects of microaggressions on groups of people differentiated by race, gender, and sexual orientation (Kim et al., 2019; Williams et al., 2021; Vaccaro & Koob, 2019). According to the literature, persons of color and other minority groups encounter many microaggressions in daily life, and these microaggressions have a detrimental effect on their mental health (Ehie et al., 2021; Smith & Griffiths, 2022).

The concept of microaggression has experienced steady growth, especially concerning people who identify with the LGBTQ community. Anzani (2019) conducted a systematic review of 15 studies to determine the experiences of transgender individuals with microaggressions and established that they experienced subtle forms of discrimination and isolation in their places of work that, for some, led to mental breakdowns and psychological illnesses. Researchers also indicate that discrimination, isolation, and subtle insults were their daily experiences (Resnick & Galupo, 2019).
Although the literature on microaggressions has shown significant advancements in science, more clarification on the nature and range of microaggressions is still needed (Resnick & Galupo, 2019). A better understanding of microaggressions can be achieved by expanding research from self-report assessments (Williams, 2019).

To understand the effects of microaggressions, researchers have developed different tools to measure microaggression and its outcome. The Daily Life Experiences (DLE), developed by Harrell (2000), is a 20-item instrument that measures microaggressions in an individual’s daily life. Although this measure lacks subscales, it captures the range and categories of microaggressions identified in the microaggression taxonomy and subsequent research. In addition, other tools used to assess race-related stress (Utsey, 1998; Utsey & Ponterotto, 1996), perceived ethnic discrimination (Brondolo et al., 2005), and contemporary racism (McConahay, 1986) may include some instances of microaggressions but do not account for the kinds of microaggressions, such as environmental microaggression, which are often described in more recent literature.

Prior research on microaggressions has generated tremendous data from a clinical and psychological perspective regarding the effects of microaggression on communities differentiated by race, culture, and language (Elias et al., 2021; Simatele, 2018). Significant research also exists regarding the theoretical models developed to study and understand microaggression experiences in these populations from a clinical and cultural perspective and introduce the theories to the business world (Resnick & Galupo, 2019). Much of the research on microaggressions has been conducted in the United States and does not effectively capture and describe microaggression on a global scale, hence the need for this quantitative research. Systemic racism and isolated instances of atrocious
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racism have wreaked havoc on many different biases, such as caste systems, religion, politics, and cultural groups throughout the world, and significant research exists documenting such (Elias et al., 2021).

Existing literature also provides deep insight into numerous regions of the world where people of marginalized groups live in deplorable conditions and are subjected to horrible acts of discrimination and racism in numerous sectors, including education, healthcare, and business (Winant, 2020). Similarly, extensive research also exists from a clinical and psychological lens on global studies regarding LGBTQ populations, ethnicities such as Latinx, Asians, and discrimination according to gender differences (Elias et al., 2021). The relationship between cultural microaggressions in multinational workplaces and the coping strategies its employees use in a global context has yet to be explored.

Previous research has not questioned the fundamental tenet that cultural microaggressions, as they are currently understood, constitute a psychologically significant construct, nor did they examine the empirical basis for a relationship between cultural microaggressions and employee engagement, burnout, and trust in multinational companies moderated by coping strategy (Kim et al., 2021). No quantitative research currently exists examining cultural microaggressions experienced, particularly in multinational organizations, and their effects on employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment when moderated by employee coping strategies, which supports the need for further inquiry. This proposed study aims to investigate the association between workplace cultural microaggressions and employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment in multinational companies.
Types of Microaggressions

Microaggressions significantly influence the productivity of organizations. Resnick and Galupo (2019) conducted a longitudinal study to investigate how microaggressions influenced the productivity of organizations and highlighted that microaggressions create a toxic work environment that adversely lowers employee productivity. Supporting Resnick and Galupo, Robinson-Perez et al. (2020) also examined the link between microaggressions and productivity in organizations using semi-structured questionnaires and reported that microaggressions hinder employees from exploring new ideas in the workplace, which lowers their performance and the overall productivity of the organizations. Corroborating with Resnick and Galupo and Robinson-Perez et al., Skinta and Torres-Harding (2022) also investigated the negative effects of microaggressions in organizations using an online survey and established that microaggressions lower staff morale, which negatively affects both job commitment and organization success. Combining the evidence reviewed thus far, one can conclude that microaggressions negatively influence employee commitment, leading to low productivity in multinational organizations.

Through a systematic literature review with 18,718 participants, Lui and Quezada (2019) examined the connection between discrimination and the productivity of organizations and highlighted that hostility creates anxiety among employees, which negatively affects their concentration at work and lowers productivity. Agreeing with Lui and Quezada, Nnawulezi et al. (2020) also conducted a meta-analysis study to examine how microaggressions impact the productivity of organizations and found that employees who experience microaggressions in the workplace have a fear of asking questions to
gain clarity, resulting in mistakes that compromise the productivity of organizations. Related findings were reported by Miles et al. (2021), who examined the negative effects of microaggressions in organizations using a systematic literature review and found that microinsults from supervisors demotivate employees, which lowers job satisfaction and overall job performance in multinational organizations. Research suggests that discrimination negatively affects employees' job morale and dedication, thus lowering the productivity of organizations.

Microaggressions also affect employees' mental health in organizations. Choi et al. (2019) conducted a qualitative study with 553 participants at a predominantly white university (PWI) to investigate how microaggressions impact the mental health of organizations’ employees and reported that microaggressions lead to a toxic work culture that negatively affects employees’ mental health in organizations. Supporting Choi et al., Anderson et al. (2022) also examined, with 759 participants, the relationship between microaggressions and employees’ mental health in organizations and reported that microaggressions lead to mental health disorders such as depression. A similar finding to Choi et al. and Anderson et al. was reported by Haynes-Baratz et al. (2022), who also investigated the negative effects of microaggressions in organizations using a quantitative case study and reported that microaggressions create fear and suspicion in workplaces, which leads to mental disorders such as anxiety among employees. Based on the evidence reviewed thus far, it can be concluded that microaggressions increase the rate of depression and anxiety among employees in organizations.

Racial microaggression is one of the factors that cause employee mental disorders such as prolonged stress and trauma in multinational organizations. In a meta-analysis
study, Dickerson et al. (2019) examined the link between cultural discrimination and
employee mental health in organizations and highlighted that racial microaggressions
lead to mental health problems such as prolonged stress and trauma. Agreeing with
Dickerson et al., Houshmand et al. (2019) also conducted a qualitative study to examine
how microaggressions affect employee mental health in multinational organizations and
revealed that when employees suffer microinsults in the workplace, they fear sharing
what they go through with colleagues which leads to prolonged stress and depression.
Related findings were reported by Farber et al. (2021), who examined the negative effects
of microaggressions in organizations using a cross-sectional study with 549 participants
and found that racial discrimination such as microinvalidations lowers employee self-
esteeem, which leads to anxiety and depression in the workplace. Microaggressions lead to
exhaustion, depression, and anxiety among employees experiencing them in
organizations.

Microaggressions contribute to low employee self-esteem in organizations.
Ogunyemi et al. (2020) conducted a qualitative study to examine how microaggressions
affect employee self-esteem. They found that microinvalidations negatively affect
employees’ ability to socialize with their colleagues, leading to low self-esteem. Related
findings were reported by Abdelaziz et al. (2021), who examined the relationship
between microaggressions and employee self-esteem in organizations using a qualitative
study with 155 participants and found that microinsults from supervisors negatively
influenced employee self-esteem in organizations. Corroborating with Ogunyemi et al.
and Abdelaziz et al., Steketee et al. (2021) also conducted a cross-sectional study to
investigate how microaggressions affected employee self-esteem in organizations and
reported that racial microaggressions could lead to social withdrawal from teammates, which leads to a feeling of self-insufficiency. Therefore, consistent evidence across the three articles reveals that microaggressions lead to a loss of self-esteem among employees in organizations.

Research has revealed that microaggressions lower employee self-esteem in organizations. Through a systematic literature review, Shanock et al. (2019) examined the relationship between microaggressions and employee self-esteem in organizations. They established that employees exposed to microaggressions develop self-hate, which leads to low self-esteem in organizations. Supporting Shanock et al., Nair et al. (2019) also evaluated the adverse effects of microaggression in organizations using a cross-sectional study. They found that microaggressions cause detrimental effects on employees’ self-esteem in organizations. Concurring with Shanock et al. and Nair et al., Melendez and Thompson (2020) also examined the link between microaggressions and employee self-esteem in organizations using a longitudinal study and revealed that managers with exclusionary behaviors might disregard junior employees’ opinions, which leads to employee demotivation and low self-esteem in organizations.

Exclusionary behavior increases employee turnover intentions in organizations. Through a qualitative study, Shanock et al. (2019) investigated the impact of microaggressions on employee turnover intentions in organizations. They reported that exclusionary behavior creates a toxic work environment, leading to an increased desire to quit. Nair et al. (2019) also examined how microaggressions affected employee turnover intentions in organizations using a systematic literature review and highlighted that continued microaggressions lead to prolonged stress among employees, which leads to
low job satisfaction and high turnover rates. Supporting Shanock et al. and Nair et al., Beagan et al. (2021) conducted a cross-sectional study to establish the link between microaggressions and employee turnover intentions in organizations and reported that racial microaggressions lead to a lack of confidence in executing assigned tasks which causes poor performance and dissatisfaction, thus increasing the desire to look for other job opportunities. Taking together the evidence reviewed thus far, one can conclude that microaggressions in organizations increase employee desire to quit their jobs.

Researchers have demonstrated that microaggressions significantly influence employee turnover intentions. Cruz et al. (2019) conducted a meta-analysis study to examine how microaggressions influenced employee loyalty to the organization and reported that racial microaggressions reduce employee loyalty to the organization, leading to an increased need to leave the job in organizations. Agreeing with Cruz et al., Lee et al. (2020) also conducted a qualitative study to investigate the effect of microaggressions on employee retention within the organization and reported that microaggressions lead to depression and anxiety among employees in organizations, which leads to increased turnover rates. Microaggressions reduce employees’ loyalty to the organizations, leading to high turnover rates.

Globally, microaggressions experienced by people are more or less the same as the original form of microaggressions experienced by people of color and transgender people in the United States. One type of microaggression experienced in a global context involves the prevalence of the foreigner/not belonging stigma, which is also consistent with previous microaggression studies where people from non-white groups, notably Asian Americans and Latinx, are seen as the “other,” as immigrants, and not as full,
whole, or patriotic Americans. Yet another pervasive example involves being told, “No wonder you speak good English,” when asked how long you have been in America, which demonstrates that most Asian/Latinx or any foreign-born Americans are expected to have heavy accents and not speak “excellent English.”

Cultural microaggressions are subtle gestures, whether verbal or nonverbal, that send inadvertent negative messages to individuals because of their membership in a marginalized group. For example, in Latinx culture, physical touch, such as hugging or kissing on the cheek, is frequently regarded as a kind of greeting. When people from other cultures avoid or are uncomfortable with these greetings, it can be interpreted as a microaggression, implying a rejection of Latinx cultural standards (Nadal et al., 2014). Similarly, when commended on their English skills, Asian Americans may face microaggressions, signaling that they are eternal foreigners in their own nation (Kim et al., 2019). African Americans, on the other hand, may interpret comments like "You are so articulate" as microaggressions since they imply that eloquence is unusual for people of their race (Hughey et al., 2017). Furthermore, bicultural individuals, or those who identify with two cultures, may encounter microaggressions when it is expected that they will align more with one cultural identity over the other, invalidating their bicultural identification (Cheng et al., 2006).

Cultural microaggressions can arise in a variety of ways in international settings. Employees, for example, may be ignored in meetings or excluded from social gatherings because of their cultural background, indicating a lack of inclusion or respect (Fung et al., 2017). Mispronouncing or forgetting a colleague's name from a different cultural background can also be interpreted as a microaggression, suggesting a failure to accept
their identity (Alimi et al., 2021). Furthermore, people from the Chinese and American cultures may face microaggressions when overall cultural ideals are not universally implemented, thereby leading to misunderstandings or reinforcing stereotypes (Tam & Chan, 2015). It is critical to understand that perceptions of microaggressions might vary depending on individual experiences and cultural backgrounds.

In the USA, the idea of microaggressions in the workplace has gained much attention, especially concerning issues of culture and language dialects. The Global Language Monitor designated microaggression as a term of the year in 2015, given its frequent rise in use (Delatolla et al., 2021). In reality, the idea of cultural microaggressions is starting to change how popular culture is perceived. For instance, the development and experiences of microaggressions in different settings have continuously been tracked by the Microaggressions Project (Lui et al., 2020). Lui et al. (2020), while studying whether microaggression as a term was an oxymoron, mentioned that the Microaggression Facebook page started in 2010 has documented instances of microaggressions in addition to demonstrating how derogatory and harmful words impact the psychology and mental health of individuals regardless of profession, culture, or level of education (Delatolla et al., 2021; Lui et al., 2020).

Mills (2020) suggests that at Predominantly White Institutions (PWI’s), certain environmental factors may contribute to systemic microaggressions. These include the prevalent display of portraits of white male managers in conference and office rooms, or even naming buildings and campuses after a particular group of people. Additionally, the failure to diversify the kinds of people appearing in organizations’ and institutions’ marketing programs can also be construed as examples of environmental and social
factors promoting microaggression in places of work (Grindstaff, 2021). Such actions may cause diverse employees to doubt whether they belong to, or are even valued by, the organization because their identity is diminished or rendered insignificant by exclusion.

Even though cultural microaggressions are typically regarded as small and unapparent actions, their impact remains huge. Based on evidence from the literature, the cumulative impacts of microaggressions can create hostile and invalidating work environments for targeted groups (Ehie et al., 2021), diminish and undermine the value of social group identities (Kim et al., 2019), and cause mental health problems such as depression, anxiety, and insomnia due to stress, low self-esteem, and emotional upheaval, which all impact the productivity of employees and overall performance of the organization (Ehie et al., 2021; Williams, 2019).

The health impacts of cultural microaggressions and their influence in the workplace can negatively influence employee job performance and commitment in the global workplace. Examining the impacts of microaggressions in the workplace, Ehie et al. (2021) asserted that targeted employees tend to disengage and become less socially interactive and committed, thus reducing productivity. Therefore, employees must be equipped with coping strategies to help them address workplace microaggressions locally and internationally (Williams, 2019).

People from different backgrounds are frequently the targets of both covert and blatant microaggressions in the global workplace. As such, it is upon every employee and executive in international organizations to take both personal and collective initiative in developing, representing, and participating in an inclusive and supportive work environment that promotes and supports the success of every member (Grindstaff, 2021).
Employees who learned coping strategies maneuvered the negative impacts and experiences with cultural microaggressions and reported higher job outcomes (Ehie et al., 2021).

Cultural microaggressions negatively affect the working environment and interfere with the effectiveness of employees who feel targeted by behaviors and comments made in the workplace. Ehie et al. (2021) established that despite microaggressions being subtle, their effects were enormous and targeted people, including members of the LGBTQ+, people of color, religious minorities, and people with disabilities, could not attend to their duties effectively. As a result of microaggressions, targeted people are often diagnosed with depression and anxiety (Ehie et al., 2021). Some people develop suicidal ideations or become alcoholics to minimize the emotional and mental effects of microaggressive behaviors, talks, and actions in their places of work (Smith & Griffiths, 2022). Additionally, microaggressions have made it difficult for targeted groups to work toward promotions, negotiate for better salaries, and apply for better-paying jobs (Cénat et al., 2021).

In multinational firms, the educational attainment of employees is notably high. According to the literature, many personnel in such organizations hold bachelor's degrees, with a sizable fraction also holding master's degrees and, in certain cases, doctorates (Riahi-Belkaoui, 1998). Given their high level of education, one may expect them to be well-versed in HR policies dealing with workplace incivility, discrimination, and other relevant issues. Nonetheless, the incidence of Cultural Microaggressions (CMAs) remains a source of concern.
It is imperative to underline that when cultural microaggressions occur in these contexts, they are frequently committed by people who are completely unconscious of what they are doing. These well-educated offenders are generally unaware of the impact of their actions, owing to the fact that microaggressions are subtle and frequently unintended (Alimi et al., 2021). In many cases, the offender is completely unaware that they are committing a cultural microaggression. Such activities may be motivated by good intentions, such as making a joke or lightening the mood. However, regardless of aim, the impact can be substantial, leading to feelings of marginalization or discomfort among individuals who are subjected to it.

Cultural microaggressions are especially difficult for global corporations due to their intricacy and inadvertent nature. Even if the offenders are acting without intent, the organizations can still be held legally liable for their actions. Given the potential legal ramifications and the need to maintain a respectful and inclusive workplace environment, multinational corporations must address and mitigate the incidence of cultural microaggressions as soon as possible. This entails not only enacting strong HR regulations, but also guaranteeing ongoing education and awareness programs that educate staff on the intricacies of cross-cultural relationships (Abugre & Debrah, 2019).

Microaggressions have been extensively researched in the fields of psychology and sociology. However, it is necessary to distinguish between generic and cultural microaggressions. General microaggressions might include a wide range of subtle insults or dismissive behaviors that aren't always related to a person's ethnic or racial origin. They can be based on a variety of criteria, such as gender, sexual orientation, handicap, or socioeconomic background (Williams, 2019).
Cultural microaggressions, on the other hand, expressly target an individual's cultural, ethnic, or racial identity. They are caused by prejudices or misconceptions about a specific culture or race. Cultural microaggressions include, for example, making judgments about someone's English competence based on their looks or asking someone where they are "really" from (Nadal et al., 2014). The distinction is vital because cultural microaggressions can have varied consequences, particularly in diverse settings such as international corporations. They can reinforce systemic racism, promote stereotypes, and lead to a hostile atmosphere for people from minority cultural origins (Skinner-Dorkenoo et al., 2021). Given the risk of harm, organizations and individuals must recognize and address both general and cultural microaggressions in order to build a more inclusive and respectful atmosphere.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this research study is the Minority Stress Model (Brooks, 1981; Meyer, 2003). The Minority Stress Model posits that compared to members of the majority population, persons who belong to minority groups frequently experience worse health outcomes and greater suicide rates as a result of microaggressions (Meyer, 2003). The lived experiences of members of oppressed communities can be better understood by using the Minority Stress Model, a social research and public health framework. According to the paradigm, specific (oppressed) groups in a given culture or society encounter more instances of discrimination and prejudice based on race, perceived disability, culture, etc., causing stress to the oppressed individual (Meyer, 2003). Due to the discrimination- and prejudice-related experiences,
oppressed communities had worse health outcomes compared to their counterpart—the dominant group members (Meyer, 2003).

The Minority Stress framework has been used to conceptualize discrimination-related stressors ranging from relatable occurrences happening broadly, which tend to be fact based (i.e., police murdering a black person), to personal assessments because the action was believed to be directly experienced or observed (i.e., waiter didn’t seat black family at restaurant) (Meyer, 2003). Normally, microaggression is an ambiguous term; hence, these occurrences are seen as hassles or irritations and may result in a sense of helplessness, making it hard for an individual to cope (Ehie et al., 2021; Williams, 2019). Individuals who experience microaggression incidents may not fully acknowledge or understand the actions towards them, which differs from overt discrimination. Rather, victims of microaggressions are likely to contend with questioning over and over what happened; assessing how to know for certain discrimination has taken place; whether there was any potential for misunderstanding of the perceived discrimination; and further, how to make known the offense of the aggressor (Meyer, 2003). This proposed study aims to conduct quantitative research on the experiences of cultural microaggressions in multinational organizations and the resultant impact on job outcomes such as employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment when moderated by organizational inclusivity and employee coping strategies.

**Employee Engagement**

Employee engagement is a multidimensional concept that includes a worker's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral commitment to their employment and organization (Kahn, 1990). This engagement is distinguished by vigor, commitment, and immersion in
employment tasks (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Engaged employees are not merely satisfied or motivated; rather, they are truly invested in their work and take initiative to ensure the success of the organization (Macey & Schneider, 2008).

Employees who are ardent, committed, and immersed in their work frequently go above and beyond their basic responsibilities, exhibiting high levels of engagement (Harter et al., 2002). In contrast, low engagement can lead to increased absenteeism, attrition, and a toxic work environment, all of which have a negative impact on team morale and productivity (Gallup, 2017; Maslach et al., 2001).

A variety of factors, including leadership personalities and job characteristics, influence employee engagement. Breevaart et al. (2014), for instance, discovered a correlation between transformational leadership and increased engagement levels. In addition, organizational support, opportunities for development, role clarity, and feedback are critical factors (Saks, 2006). Furthermore, intrinsic employment characteristics such as autonomy, task variety, and significance play an important role in promoting engagement (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

Organizational and societal culture play an essential role in determining employee engagement. The organizational culture, which is comprised of shared values, beliefs, and practices, can either encourage or discourage engagement. A culture that values open communication, acknowledges employee contributions, and promotes work-life balance has a tendency to increase employee engagement (Denison, 1990). On the societal front, Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions theory suggests that cultural values, such as individualism versus collectivism or power distance, can impact how employees perceive their roles, relationships, and rewards, thereby influencing their engagement levels.
Microaggressions have emerged as formidable obstacles despite the aforementioned factors influencing employee engagement. Targeted groups suffer emotionally, physiologically, and mentally as a consequence of microaggressions, which has a negative effect on their engagement, according to Ehie et al. This is especially evident among LGBTQ employees. Resnick and Galupo (2019) investigated the experiences of 644 LGBTQ employees and discovered that discrimination and isolation resulted in anxiety, depression, and decreased confidence, which negatively impacted their performance at work. Garcia Johnson and Otto (2019) concurred with these findings, revealing that despite protective policies, many LGBTQ women continue to face discrimination, leading to disengagement. Boyle et al. (2022) emphasized further that microinsults and microinvalidations cause LGBTQ employees to doubt their abilities, which impacts their overall engagement.

Additionally, microaggressions affect other professional categories. Examining 65 peer support specialists, Firmin et al. (2019) discovered that negative messages about their work and doubts about their ability to assist mentally unwell patients affected their sense of personal efficacy. According to Prayson et al. (2019), such microaggressions heighten feelings of insecurity, leading to agitation and decreased motivation. Ahmad et al. (2022) extended these findings to the healthcare sector and found that cultural microaggressions negatively impacted job engagement among 297 female physicians. This was supported by the findings of Norman and Simpson (2022), who discovered that high-achieving women were subjected to microinvalidations and subtle discrimination, resulting in anxiety and self-doubt.
The negative effects of microaggressions are disproportionately severe for employees of color. Research by King et al. (2023) revealed that, despite existing anti-discrimination policies, black employees encounter subtle forms of prejudice, adversely affecting their job engagement. This is further echoed by Pitcan et al. (2018), who found in their study with twelve black professional men, perceptions of inferiority significantly affected their psychological and social well-being, which in turn impeded their job performance. Similarly, Smith and Griffiths (2022) conducted an extensive analysis of 338 articles, concluding that black employees often suffer from tension, anxiety, and other negative impacts due to covert discrimination, mistrust, and exclusion. Their systematic analysis highlighted that these microaggressions hinder not only personal well-being but also key professional competencies like decision-making, social interactions, and communication. Supporting this, Costa et al. (2023) confirmed through a review of 141 articles that the impact of cultural microaggressions on mental health has a detrimental effect on workplace performance.

In a separate context, studies on different demographics, such as the one by Norman and Simpson (2022), focus on the impact of microaggressions on women in the workplace. This research, while distinct, underscores the widespread nature of microaggressions across various groups. Each group, whether defined by race, gender, or another characteristic, faces unique challenges and experiences with microaggressions.

The effects of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement can be better understood in light of the minority stress model, which posits that minority individuals experience unique stressors due to their marginalized status. This model suggests that the chronic, everyday stress of being a minority—whether due to race, gender, sexual
orientation, or cultural background—can contribute to adverse mental and physical health outcomes (Meyer, 2003).

Given the substantial impact of culture on employee engagement, it is plausible to argue that when cultural elements are intertwined with microaggressions, the effects on engagement may be amplified when viewed through the lens of the minority stress model. Cultural microaggressions, which are subtle slights or insults based on a person's cultural heritage or identity, can be even more damaging than general microaggressions. They target not only the personal characteristics of an individual, but also their profoundly ingrained cultural identity. This dual attack—both personal and cultural—can amplify the stressors that minority individuals experience, exacerbating feelings of isolation and disconnection.

Literature indicates that general microaggressions can result in feelings of isolation, decreased confidence, and increased anxiety among employees (Resnick & Galupo, 2019; Ehie et al., 2021). When viewed through the lens of the minority stress model, culturally ingrained microaggressions can exacerbate these feelings and make employees feel like outsiders due to their individual characteristics and cultural heritage. In light of the fact that cultural identity is a source of pride, history, and belonging, this sense of alienation is heightened.

As a factor in determining values, beliefs, and behaviors, culture affects our worldview and interactions (Hofstede, 1980). Experiencing cultural microaggressions is an affront to one's values, sense of community, and entire worldview, not just to their person. This can result in a profound sense of disconnection from both colleagues and the
organization, which is amplified by the minority stress model's hypothesis of chronic stress.

Given the ingrained nature of cultural identity and its substantial impact on employee engagement, as well as the insights from the minority stress model, it is reasonable to hypothesize that cultural microaggressions may have an even greater negative impact on engagement than general microaggressions. Although direct studies linking cultural microaggressions to employee engagement may be lacking, the existing literature on the negative effects of general microaggressions on engagement, combined with the known effects of culture on engagement and the principles of the minority stress model, provides a compelling argument for the proposed hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 1a: Cultural microaggressions are negatively related to employee engagement in multinational companies.*

**Job Stress**

Job stress, often termed occupational stress, is the harmful physical and emotional responses that arise when there's a mismatch between job demands and the capabilities, resources, or requirements of the worker (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 1999). It is the difference between job requirements and an individual's ability to meet those requirements (Karasek, 1979).

Occupational tension can manifest in a variety of ways. In ideal circumstances, moderate stress can serve as a catalyst, propelling employees to meet deadlines, attain goals, and excel. This positive form of stress, known as 'eustress,' can increase concentration, motivation, and productivity (Selye, 1974). However, chronic or excessive tension can result in burnout, decreased productivity, and health complications.
Employees experiencing extreme job stress frequently report feelings of exhaustion, cynicism, and diminished professional efficacy (Maslach et al., 2001).

Numerous factors contribute to occupational tension. These include an excessive burden, extended working hours, role ambiguity, role conflict, a lack of autonomy, a poor work-life balance, and an absence of social support at work (Beehr & Newman, 1978; Kahn et al., 1964). Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) found that organizational changes, job insecurity, and conflicts with coworkers or superiors can also be significant stressors.

The effects of protracted workplace stress are multifaceted. Individually, it can result in psychological problems such as anxiety, melancholy, and burnout (Melchior et al., 2007). It can manifest physically as migraines, sleep disturbances, and even severe health issues such as cardiovascular disease (Kivimäki et al., 2002). Increased job tension among employees can lead to increased absenteeism, employee turnover, and decreased job performance (Motowidlo et al., 1986).

Stress at work frequently interacts with personal and organizational factors. Folkman and Lazarus (1984) found that personal resilience and coping strategies can mitigate the effects of job stress. House and Rizzo (1972) found that organizational culture and leadership styles can either amplify or mitigate the impact of job stressors.

Research on job stress has spanned various populations and sectors. Due to the stressful nature of their jobs, healthcare professionals, particularly nurses, have been extensively studied. Due to the demands of their profession, nurses frequently experience fatigue and emotional exhaustion, according to studies (Aiken et al., 2002). Teachers, police officers, and customer service representatives have also been identified as
occupations with high levels of job stress due to factors such as emotional labor, public scrutiny, and role ambiguity (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Violanti et al., 2006).

Culture has a substantial impact on how individuals perceive and react to job stress. Stress is perceived differently by various cultures. In some cultures, expressing or acknowledging stress can be interpreted as a sign of weakness or incompetence (Hofstede, 2001). In many East Asian cultures, for instance, there is a strong emphasis on harmony, which causes individuals to suppress their emotions of stress in order to maintain group cohesion (Kim & Park, 2008). In Western cultures, stress discussion and support seeking may be more socially acceptable and even encouraged.

Additionally, cultural context influences coping strategies. While Western cultures may prioritize individualistic coping strategies such as therapy or personal time off, collectivist cultures may be more inclined to seek support from family or community (Chun et al., 2006). These culturally entrenched coping mechanisms can either mitigate or exacerbate the effects of occupational stress.

Certain cultural values can either mitigate or exacerbate the adverse effects of job stress. For instance, cultures that prioritize work-life balance may shield workers from the negative effects of excessive burden (Oyserman et al., 2002). On the other hand, cultures that place a premium on achievement and success may encourage employees to overextend themselves, resulting in fatigue (Yang, 2000).

In multinational corporations, employees from various cultural backgrounds work side by side, which can contribute to cultural conflicts. Due to cultural differences, misunderstandings and misinterpretations can become additional sources of job tension.
For instance, those from cultures that value indirectness and subtlety may perceive a direct communication style as impolite or aggressive (Hall, 1976).

Researchers have investigated the relationship between culture and job stress. Spector et al. (2007) found that the perception of job stressors and reported job strain varied significantly across cultures in a 24-nation study. Another study comparing U.S. and Indian IT professionals found that cultural values substantially influenced job stress and job satisfaction, with Indian professionals reporting higher job stress due to role conflict and role ambiguity (Tarafdar et al., 2015).

The minority stress model postulates that minority groups, such as those based on race, gender, or sexual orientation, experience unique stressors that are additive to the general stressors faced by everyone (Meyer, 2003). These stressors, often entrenched in societal prejudices and discrimination, can exacerbate the effects of job stress. The minority stress model becomes especially relevant when considering cultural microaggressions, which are subtle slights or insults directed at individuals based on their cultural heritage or identity.

Given the significant impact of culture on job stress and the evidence that general microaggressions can lead to feelings of isolation, decreased confidence, and increased anxiety among employees, it is plausible to argue that when cultural elements and microaggressions intertwine, the effects on job stress may be amplified. Cultural microaggressions not only target an individual's personal characteristics, but also their profoundly ingrained and central cultural identity. This combined personal and cultural assault can be especially detrimental.
The minority stress theory emphasizes the unique stressors minority groups confront, which can exacerbate the effects of job stress. When these microaggressions are rooted in culture, they can further alienate employees, making them feel like outliers not only due to their individual characteristics, but also due to their cultural heritage. This sense of alienation can be even more profound, given that cultural identity is often a source of pride, history, and belonging.

Consequently, by synthesizing the evidence and the logical extensions of prior research, as well as the insights from the minority stress theory, we have arrived at our central research hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1b: Cultural microaggressions are positively related to job stress in multinational companies.**

**Job Commitment**

Job commitment, also known as organizational commitment, is the psychological bond that an employee forms with their organization or specific role. It indicates the extent to which an employee aligns with their role and demonstrates commitment to the organization. This bond is not superficial; it delves deeply into an individual's alignment with organizational values, their eagerness to invest effort for the organization's advantage, and an intrinsic desire to retain their organizational membership (Mowday et al., 1979).

There are numerous manifestations of job dedication in the professional sphere. On the positive side, employees exhibiting high levels of job commitment frequently go above and beyond their standard job responsibilities, demonstrate adaptability to organizational changes, and radiate genuine enthusiasm for the organization's success.
(Meyer & Allen, 1991). These employees are typically more engaged, motivated, and less likely to voluntarily leave the organization. Nevertheless, there is a flip aspect. Overcommitment can lead to burnout, especially if employees perceive an imbalance in which their dedication is not rewarded or acknowledged appropriately. Conversely, diminished job commitment can be discerned through reduced productivity, heightened absenteeism, and an amplified propensity for turnover (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Numerous variables can influence an individual's level of task commitment. Precursors include factors such as job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, leadership dynamics, and career advancement opportunities (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Personal characteristics such as age, tenure, and intrinsic values are also influential (Meyer & Allen, 1997). In addition, intrinsic employment characteristics like autonomy, task diversity, and feedback mechanisms can shape commitment trajectories (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

High job commitment yields a multitude of organizational benefits, such as reduced attrition rates, enhanced job performance, and a heightened propensity toward organizational citizenship behaviors. Although beneficial, these behaviors frequently operate outside the formal reward system (Organ, 1988). Diminished job commitment, on the other hand, can result in adverse outcomes, such as increased turnover intentions and inadequate job performance (Meyer et al., 2002).

Job commitment does not exist in a vacuum. It intertwines frequently with other personal and organizational variables. For example, the relationship between job satisfaction and job commitment can be influenced by individual differences such as locus of control and perceived job alternatives (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Denison (1990)
notes that organizational dynamics, such as the prevalent culture and leadership paradigm, can also influence the relationship between job commitment and outcomes such as attrition and performance.

The academic investigation of job commitment encompasses diverse populations and industries. As a result of attrition concerns and their effects on patient care, healthcare—particularly nursing—has been a focal point. Research demonstrates that supportive managerial practices, opportunities for professional advancement, and positive team dynamics can increase job commitment among nurses (Irvine & Evans, 1995). With its unique set of challenges and rewards, the educational sector has also been scrutinized. Coladarci (1992) found that administrative support, professional autonomy, and perceived student impact can influence educators' commitment levels. Elements such as employment security, remuneration structures, and advancement opportunities have been linked to job commitment in the business world (Gregersen, 1993).

While job satisfaction measures an employee's level of contentment with their position, job commitment delves deeper to reveal the zeal an employee has for their responsibilities. It demonstrates an employee's commitment to the mission and vision of the organization (Aziz et al., 2021). However, this dedication can be eroded by discreet yet pervasive microaggressions.

Often unintentional, microaggressions, discreet slights, and derogatory remarks can have profound effects on job commitment. These microinsults and microinvalidations can undermine accomplishments, resulting in feelings of alienation and exclusion, eroding job commitment (Kim et al., 2019; Williams, 2019). The psychological toll of
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microaggressions can manifest as anxiety, depression, and diminished self-efficacy, all of which can reduce organizational commitment (Williams, 2019; Nnawulezi et al., 2020).

The potential for cultural microaggressions exists in the context of multinational corporations, where diverse cultural backgrounds converge. Cultural microaggressions target an individual's cultural identity, which is profoundly ingrained and central to their sense of self. Using the minority stress theory as a lens, these microaggressions can result in chronic stress, which can further erode job commitment. According to the theory, minority groups experience unique stressors, and the constant adaptation required to navigate these stressors can have negative effects on mental and physical health (Meyer, 2003).

Given the profound impact of culture on job commitment and the potentially damaging effects of microaggressions, it is plausible to argue that when cultural elements and microaggressions intertwine, the effects on commitment may be amplified. While there may be few direct studies linking cultural microaggressions to job commitment, the existing literature on the negative effects of general microaggressions, combined with the known effects of culture on commitment, provides a compelling argument for the proposed hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 1c: Cultural microaggressions are negatively related to job commitment in multinational companies.*

**Organizational Inclusivity**

Organizational inclusivity is the degree to which an organization fosters a culture in which all members, regardless of their backgrounds or identities, feel valued, respected, and have equal access to opportunities and resources. It emphasizes the active
participation of every employee in decision-making processes, ensuring that diverse perspectives are taken into account and incorporated. This concept goes beyond mere representation; it ensures that all perspectives are heard and that the unique contributions of every individual are recognized and leveraged for the success of the organization (Mor Barak, 2017).

Ok and Rao's (2019) systematic literature review revealed a positive correlation between organizational inclusivity and job satisfaction. Employees who participated in decision-making processes felt more valued, resulting in greater job satisfaction, according to their findings. According to a qualitative study conducted by Shore and Chung (2022), organizational inclusivity considerably boosts employee morale, resulting in greater job satisfaction. Roberson and Perry (2022) reinforced this viewpoint by emphasizing that employees' participation in crucial organizational decisions fosters a sense of worth, thereby enhancing their commitment and overall job satisfaction.

As a pillar of organizational culture, inclusiveness has been identified as a significant contributor of job satisfaction. In their meta-analysis, Shepherd et al. (2020) determined that when employees feel accepted and valued regardless of their background, they exhibit increased confidence, resulting in greater job satisfaction. This sentiment was reflected in the findings of Lashitew et al. (2020) and Martin and Honig (2020), who both emphasized that an inclusive environment not only improves employee morale but also increases organizational loyalty.

Organizational inclusivity has implications beyond job contentment. Jones and Solomon (2019) discovered that inclusiveness reduces attrition intentions significantly. Their research revealed that when employees were involved in decision-making
processes, they felt a greater sense of loyalty, which decreased their intention to leave. This was further supported by the findings of Ye et al. (2019) and Mor Barak (2022), who both emphasized the positive effect of inclusiveness on employee retention rates.

Microaggressions can pose significant challenges to the inclusiveness of an organization. These apparently insignificant incidents can lead to feelings of alienation and exclusion over time (Sue et al., 2007). Cortina et al. (2013) discovered that individuals who experienced microaggressions felt less included, resulting in decreased job satisfaction and engagement. Kanter's (1977) study on women in professions dominated by males revealed that microaggressions led to feelings of isolation, which decreased their organizational commitment. Ong et al. (2013) emphasized further the negative impact of microaggressions on the perception of organizational inclusion.

Cultural microaggressions, a subset of microaggressions that target an individual's cultural heritage, can exacerbate job stress, according to the minority stress theory, which posits that marginalized groups experience heightened stress due to their minority status. While there may be a paucity of research on cultural microaggressions, this argument is supported by the negative impact of general microaggressions on job satisfaction and engagement. Given the protective function of organizational inclusivity against the negative effects of microaggressions, the following can be hypothesized:

**Hypothesis 2a:** Organizational inclusivity reduces the negative impact of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement in multinational companies.

In the dynamic environment of contemporary workplaces, job stress has become a pervasive issue. Job stress, which is rooted in feelings of tension, aggravation, anxiety, and burnout, can be caused by a variety of factors, including role ambiguity, excessive
workload, and interpersonal conflicts. In the midst of these obstacles, organizational inclusivity has been identified as a potential mitigating factor, providing a buffer against the negative effects of job stressors.

Organizational inclusivity, which emphasizes the active participation and worth of every employee regardless of background, has been repeatedly cited as a potent buffer against job stress. This relationship was highlighted by Offermann et al.'s (2014) seminal study, which revealed that employees in inclusive environments experienced lower levels of job stress. According to the study, the underlying mechanism was enhanced communication, defined role definitions, and a supportive environment that are inherent in inclusive settings. In line with these findings, King et al. (2016) conducted a comprehensive study encompassing more than 5,000 employees from various industries. Their research revealed that sentiments of role ambiguity and role conflict were inversely related to organizational inclusivity, particularly in decision-making processes. Both of these variables are well-established precursors to job stress, highlighting the protective function of inclusiveness.

Multiple factors influence the complex relationship between organizational inclusivity and job stress. Leadership's commitment to fostering an inclusive environment, transparent communication about the significance of diversity, and comprehensive training programs concentrated on inclusive behaviors stand out as pivotal drivers (Nishii & Mayer, 2009).

Multifaceted are the benefits of reduced job tension made possible by organizational inclusion. It has been found that employees who experience less job tension exhibit greater job satisfaction, strengthened organizational commitment, and
improved overall well-being (Roberson, 2006). According to Shore et al. (2011), the organizational benefits of stress reduction include lower turnover rates and increased productivity.

However, the path to reduced employment stress is not devoid of obstacles. Microaggressions, which are discreet verbal and nonverbal derogatory remarks frequently directed at marginalized groups, can exacerbate workplace stress. These insidious remarks can erode a person's sense of belonging and worth, heightening their tension and anxiety (Sue et al., 2007). This phenomenon was empirically validated by Cortina et al. (2013), whose study of a diverse group of employees found a direct correlation between microaggression experiences and elevated levels of job stress. The cumulative effect of these apparently harmless incidents can have a significant impact on an individual's well-being and job satisfaction.

While the literature has exhaustively documented the effects of general microaggressions, the territory of cultural microaggressions is still largely uncharted. Although nuanced, cultural microaggressions can be conceptualized as discreet slights or insults directed at individuals on the basis of their cultural background or identity. Using the minority stress theory, which proposes that marginalized groups experience unique stressors due to their minority status, it is possible to argue that the combination of cultural and generic microaggressions can exacerbate job stress. With this context in mind, we propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 2b: Organizational inclusivity reduces the positive impact of cultural microaggressions on job stress in multinational companies.*
With their seminal research, Mor Barak et al. (2001) laid the groundwork for understanding the relationship between organizational inclusivity and job commitment. When an organization cultivates an inclusive environment, it naturally fosters a sense of belonging among its employees, so argued the authors. This sense of worth and appreciation for one's unique contributions fosters a stronger sense of loyalty to the organization. When employees experience a sense of belonging, their commitment to their jobs and the organization increases. Shore et al. (2009) also conducted a comprehensive study across multiple industries, reinforcing the notion that inclusiveness correlates directly with job commitment. Their findings revealed that employees in organizations that champion inclusivity consistently reported higher levels of employment commitment than those in less inclusive environments. Trust is the underlying mechanism, as explained by Shore et al. When employees have confidence in their organization's ethos and practices, their commitment naturally increases.

There is no vacuum surrounding the relationship between organizational inclusivity and job dedication. Several factors can strengthen this relationship. The unwavering commitment of leadership to inclusivity is paramount. When leaders prioritize and advocate for inclusivity, it sets the tone for the entire organization (Nishii & Mayer, 2009). In addition, this relationship is strengthened by open communication regarding the significance of diversity and inclusiveness and by robust training programs that emphasize inclusive behaviors. Moreover, the formation of diverse teams and the establishment of employee resource groups can amplify a sense of belonging, thereby increasing job dedication (Roberson, 2006).
The cascading effects of increased job dedication resulting from organizational inclusion are profound (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Employees who are profoundly committed to their roles and organizations tend to exhibit lower turnover intentions, stellar job performance, and an intrinsic motivation to excel in their roles. From an organizational standpoint, this translates into tangible benefits: an increase in productivity, a decrease in attrition rates, and an overall trajectory toward organizational excellence (Shore et al., 2011).

Numerous sectors and demographic groups have investigated the relationship between organizational inclusivity and job commitment. In the domain of healthcare, for instance, research has revealed that inclusivity-centric practices result in higher levels of commitment among nursing professionals, which in turn positively impacts patient care outcomes (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2010). Similarly, in the business world, there is compelling evidence that inclusive work environments are correlated with higher levels of commitment, resulting in superior financial outcomes (Harter et al., 2002).

It is important to comprehend the nuanced impact of cultural microaggressions, particularly in the context of multinational corporations, despite the fact that the examples previously provided dealt with general microaggressions. Cultural microaggressions, which are subtle verbal and nonverbal offenses based on a person's cultural heritage, can be detrimental to job commitment. In accordance with the minority stress theory, these microaggressions can result in chronic stress, negatively impacting an individual's well-being and job commitment (Meyer, 2003). Although there are few direct studies on cultural microaggressions, the accumulated evidence from studies on microaggressions, in general, suggests a potential negative effect on job commitment. In
organizations that prioritize inclusion, however, the negative effects of these microaggressions can be mitigated, ensuring that employees remain committed despite confronting such obstacles. Considering the preceding, we propose:

_Hypothesis 2c: Organizational inclusivity reduces the negative impact of cultural microaggressions on job commitment in multinational companies._

**Employee Coping Strategies**

Folkman and Lazarus (1984) define coping strategies as the specific behavioral and psychological efforts individuals employ to master, tolerate, mitigate, or minimize stressful events. These strategies can be adaptive, helping individuals deal with stress in a healthy manner, or maladaptive, potentially exacerbating the stress and leading to further complications.

In real-world situations, coping strategies manifest in a vast array of forms. Adaptive coping strategies, such as problem-solving, seeking social support, and positive reframing, enable individuals to effectively manage and mitigate stress, resulting in improved mental health outcomes and well-being as a whole (Carver & Connor-Smith, 2010). A person experiencing work-related stress may, for instance, choose to break down tasks into manageable chunks (problem-solving) or discuss their emotions with a trusted coworker (seeking social support).

In contrast, maladaptive coping strategies, including denial, substance abuse, and behavioral disengagement, can exacerbate stress and contribute to negative outcomes, such as mental health disorders and decreased life satisfaction (Compas et al., 2001). A person who employs denial may refuse to acknowledge a distressing situation, preventing them from addressing and resolving the problem.
Individuals' coping strategies are influenced by a number of factors. Significant factors include temperament, past experiences, and ingrained behaviors (Aldwin, 2011). In addition, cultural and societal norms can impact how individuals perceive stress and the coping strategies they deem appropriate (Chun et al., 2006). In cultures that value collectivism, for instance, pursuing social support may be a more prevalent coping mechanism.

The effects of coping strategies are extensive and diverse. Adaptive coping strategies are frequently associated with positive outcomes, including reduced symptoms of depression and anxiety, increased life satisfaction, and improved physical health (Taylor & Stanton, 2007). On the other hand, reliance on maladaptive coping strategies can result in a variety of negative outcomes, such as the development or exacerbation of mental health disorders, diminished well-being, and even physical health complications (Compas et al., 2001).

Various interactions can also impact the efficacy of coping strategies. Depending on the nature and context of the stressor, the same coping strategy may be effective in one situation but ineffective in another (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985). Individual distinctions such as a person's resilience or available resources can also influence the efficacy of a coping strategy.

Diverse populations, ranging from adolescents confronting academic stress to elderly individuals coping with health-related issues, have been the subject of research on coping strategies. For example, Seiffge-Krenke (2000) found that problem-focused coping was associated with improved adjustment and fewer mental health issues among
adolescents. Folkman et al. (1987) found in a study of adults with HIV that positive reappraisal was related to greater psychological well-being.

Frequently making adjustments to manage thoughts and behaviors perceived as stressful is regarded as coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Coping can lessen stress's harmful consequences when dealing with a particularly stressful situation (Babicka-Wirkus et al., 2021). According to Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) transactional model of stress and coping, individuals will assess a stressful situation based on potential harm or how best to respond. Can et al. (2020) established that how an individual navigates through the stress transactional process will dictate whether the situation is handled psychologically as a challenge or threat.

Primary appraisal occurs when a person evaluates whether a situation is stressful and relevant to them (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In a global workplace setting, for an employee experiencing a microaggression from a colleague such as deliberately mispronouncing one’s name, the employee will likely use the primary appraisal technique to decide how to cope with the offense. Secondary appraisals follow primary appraisals and involve the targeted individual quickly assessing their basic coping mechanisms to deal with the stressor (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Building on the framework developed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), Chen et al. (2022) asserted that if an individual perceives the stressor situation as a challenge, they focus on the potential benefits or personal development that could be realized if they can overcome the stressor. In contrast, if perceived as a threat, they tend to focus on potential drawbacks.

A prevention-based coping strategy involves an individual responding to stress to avert or stop the stressor (Sher, 2019). Targets of microaggressions in a global workplace
may also use prevention strategies in response. This strategy's prevention actions include choosing to not attend meetings or team gatherings in which the perpetrator of the microaggression is present (Dalton & Villagran, 2018). Other preventative strategies would be choosing to focus intently on the work activities at hand and not confront the aggressor or engaging in an activity that would increase one’s efforts in diminishing the effects of the microaggression or increasing the possibility that the microaggressive act would not occur (Dalton & Villagran, 2018).

Additionally, people could choose to tackle the microaggression problem by focusing on its promotion aspect, in which responses to microaggressions incorporate the intention to earn gains, increased responsibilities, or any advantage that results in being better off due to conquering the microaggression (Zhang et al., 2019). For example, in a global organization, a contact center employee dealing with the microaggression of a customer saying they only want to speak to someone who speaks English with no accent (e.g., no accent that is southern, northern, outside the USA, etc.)—instead of responding by transferring the customer (i.e., preventive), they could respond by being persistent, asking the customer to give them a chance to prove that regardless of perceived accent, they are more than capable of handling the customer’s issue. This is tackling the issue directly with the intent to overcome and change the mind and heart of the perpetrator and hence, gain favor or promotion (Zhang et al., 2019).

Extant researchers have argued that victims of microaggressions may choose to respond emotionally by showing anger/aggravation, worry/nervousness, frustration/irritation, dislike, disappointment, and unhappiness (Firmin et al., 2019). The goal of emotion-focused coping is to decrease the emotional suffering brought on by a
stressor and includes behavioral responses such as avoidance, minimization, distance, focus selection, favorable comparisons, and deriving positive meaning from unpleasant occurrences (Firmin et al., 2019; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

An emotional coping mechanism entails altering the subjective assessment of a problem without altering the actual objective circumstance. Typically, emotion-focused coping is linked to depression and other mental health issues, as illustrated by Rice et al. (2021). In their study, Rice et al. established that emotion-focused responses included physical responses such as increased heart rates, high blood pressure, and sweating. Emotion-focused responses also include facial expressions like wrinkling of the forehead or bulging eyes, the crossing of arms, and audible exclamations of surprise (Nair & Good, 2021).

Similar to an emotional response to microaggression, problem-focused coping includes a variety of responses to the problem in question, including seeking professional help, developing healthy boundaries, leaving the stressful environment, and proper time management (Nair & Good, 2021). Problem-focused coping is most frequently adopted when the issue is viewed as changeable and social support is available. Most problem-based coping responses tend to materialize from personal, material, or social resources (Dalton & Villagran, 2018). Relying on one's uplifting beliefs, problem-solving abilities, and social abilities are examples of personal resources. Social assistance and material resource examples encompass seeking help from external resources on an emotional, informational, or material level (Nair & Good, 2021).

Creating awareness through employee training is one of the strategies that address microaggressions in the workplace. Thurber and DiAngelo (2018) conducted a
quantitative study to examine various strategies to address microaggressions in the workplace. Creating awareness of the impact of microaggressions on employees helps curb workplace occurrences (Thurber & DiAngelo, 2018). Supporting Thurber and DiAngelo, Haynes-Baratz et al. (2021) also conducted a cross-sectional study to evaluate various strategies to address microaggressions in the workplace. Haynes-Baratz et al. reported that training employees to respond to microaggression is one strategy to address exclusionary behaviors. Corroborating with Thurber and DiAngelo and Haynes-Baratz et al., Bond and Haynes-Baratz (2022) also conducted a meta-analysis study to find out how creating awareness through employee training addresses microaggressions in the workplace. Bond and Haynes-Baratz found that employee training on exclusionary behaviors helps prevent microaggressions in the workplace. Based on the evidence reviewed, creating awareness through employee training is one of the strategies to address microaggressions in the workplace.

Research has revealed that employee training and sensitization addresses microaggressions in the workplace. Metinyurt et al. (2021) conducted a quantitative study to evaluate how employee training addresses microaggressions in the workplace. Metinyurt et al. reported that sensitizing employees through training reduces microaggressions such as sexual harassment in the workplace. Awad et al. (2021) also conducted a cross-sectional study to investigate the effect of employee training on microaggressions in the workplace. Awad et al. established that employee training creates awareness of microaggressions in the workplace and ways to minimize it. Similar findings were reported by Collins et al. (2021), who conducted a systematic literature review to examine the contribution of employee training on microaggressions in the
workplace. The researchers reported that employee training promotes inclusivity in the company, reducing microaggressions such as racism. The evidence reviewed thus far reveals that employee training plays an important role in addressing microaggressions in the workplace.

Prior studies have demonstrated that acknowledging the occurrence of microaggressions within the organization is one strategy to address exclusionary behaviors. Byrd (2018) recruited 362 employees to investigate the strategies that address microaggressions in the workplace. Byrd reported that acknowledging microaggression within the workplace is a step toward addressing it. Agreeing with Byrd, Torino et al. (2018) also conducted a systematic literature review to examine how acknowledging the occurrence of microaggressions in the workplace helps to address exclusionary behavior. Torino et al. revealed that when organizations accept that microaggressions within the organization are inevitable, it helps call out inappropriate behavior. Skinta and Torres-Harding (2022) also conducted a quantitative study to determine whether acknowledgment of microaggressions in the workplace assists in addressing the vice. Skinta and Torres-Harding revealed that appreciating microaggression occurrence within an organization creates a safe environment to address it. Acknowledging microaggression within the workplace is an important strategy to address it.

Several researchers have demonstrated that improving work relationships within an organization is a strategy for addressing microaggressions in the workplace. Resnick and Galupo (2019) conducted a quantitative study to evaluate how work relationships address workplace microaggressions. Resnick and Galupo established that improving work relationships among employees makes it easier to confront indirect discrimination
in the workplace. Green (2021) also conducted a systematic literature review to examine how work relationships contribute to addressing microaggressions in the workplace. Green highlighted that friendly work relationships make it easy to identify microaggressions against colleagues, thus easily rectifying the statement. Replicating Resnick and Galupo (2019), Haynes-Baratz et al. (2021) also conducted a quantitative study to find out the impact of improved work relationships on microaggression in the workplace. Haynes-Baratz et al. found that improved work relationships create a friendly environment for employees to chat and discuss microaggression incidences and ways to avoid the same in the future. Taking together the evidence reviewed thus far, one can conclude that having good work relationships makes it safe for employees to discuss and call out exclusionary behaviors.

Prior research has demonstrated that improved work relationships address microaggression in the workplace. Resnick and Galupo (2019) conducted a quantitative study to find the relationship between work relationships and microaggression in the workplace. Resnick and Galupo reported that friendly work relationships encourage honest discussion against microaggression in the workplace. Ackerman-Barger et al. (2021) also conducted a quantitative study to examine the link between work relationships and microaggression in the workplace. Ackerman-Barger et al. reported that improved work relationships provide emotional security for racial minorities in the workplace. Corroborating with Resnick and Galupo and Ackerman-Barger et al., Bond and Haynes-Baratz (2022) also conducted a meta-analysis study to investigate the effect of improved work relationships on microaggression in the workplace. Bond et al. (2022) reported that improved work relationships enhance empathy among the workers, making
it easy to address microaggressions in the workplace. Improved workplace relationships enhance honest discussions and promote empathy within the organization, thus assisting in addressing microaggressions in the workplace.

Earlier studies have revealed that clarifying office policies and codes of conduct is one strategy for addressing microaggressions in the workplace. Byrd (2018) conducted a quantitative study to establish the link between clarity of office policies and microaggressions in the workplace. Byrd revealed that setting clear policies within the organization helps prevent unintentional discrimination. Ackerman-Barger et al. (2021) also conducted a systematic literature review to find out how work policies and codes of conduct assist in addressing microaggressions in the workplace. Ackerman-Barger et al. stated that companies' codes of conduct explain how employees ought to treat each other and detail the consequences of microaggressions. Similar to the findings of Byrd and Ackerman-Barger et al., a systematic literature review conducted by Skinta and Torres-Harding (2022) evaluates how clear office policies assist in addressing microaggressions in the workplace. Skinta and Torres-Harding revealed that a clear workplace code protects marginalized groups against unintentional discrimination. Clear office policies and codes of conduct address microaggressions in the workplace.

The minority stress theory posits that individuals from marginalized groups experience unique, chronic stressors as a result of their minority status, which frequently results in negative psychological outcomes (Meyer, 2003). Within this framework, microaggressions—subtle, frequently unintentional discriminatory remarks or actions—emerge as a major stressor (Sue et al., 2007). In multinational corporations where diverse
cultural backgrounds intersect, the potential for cultural microaggressions, a subset that targets an individual's cultural identity, becomes especially salient.

Although general microaggressions have been extensively studied, the nuanced domain of cultural microaggressions has received less attention. However, given the diverse milieu of multinational companies, it's conceivable that employees might encounter microaggressions that imperceptibly challenge their cultural identity, thereby affecting their engagement levels. Employee engagement, exemplified by vigor, commitment, and absorption in one's work (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), is essential to an organization's success. Microaggressions and other factors that can erode employee engagement have significant organizational implications.

Coping strategies, conceptualized as cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands evaluated as taxing or exceeding the person's resources (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), can serve as a protective mechanism against the negative effects of microaggressions. For instance, an employee utilizing active coping may directly confront a cultural microaggression, thereby cultivating understanding and possibly mitigating its negative impact. Alternately, pursuing social support, another coping strategy, can provide validation and reassurance, thereby mitigating the negative emotional impact of the microaggression (Carver et al., 1989).

Given the potential interaction between cultural microaggressions, coping strategies, and employee engagement in multinational settings, it is logical to postulate:

Hypothesis 3a: Coping strategies reduce the negative impact of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement in multinational companies.
The complex dynamics of multinational corporations, which are characterized by a melding of diverse cultural influences, can inadvertently serve as a breeding ground for cultural microaggressions. These discreet and often unintentional derogatory remarks or actions target a person's cultural identity, which may result in increased job stress (Sue et al., 2007). While the concept of microaggressions has been extensively explored, the specific nuances of cultural microaggressions, particularly within the context of multinational corporations, remain under-researched.

The impact of these cultural microaggressions can be comprehended through the lens of minority stress theory. This theory posits that marginalized individuals are exposed to unique stressors deriving from their minority status, which frequently result in negative psychological outcomes (Meyer, 2003). In a multinational setting, employees may experience microaggressions that discreetly challenge their cultural norms, values, or practices, thereby exacerbating their job stress. Karasek (1979) explains that job stress arises when job demands exceed the individual's ability to control their work environment, resulting in a variety of negative outcomes.

However, effective buffering strategies can mitigate the negative effects of these microaggressions. Coping strategies, as conceptualized by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), are cognitive and behavioral efforts used to manage specific external and internal demands that are deemed taxing. For example, a person may engage in active coping, such as directly addressing the microaggression, or seek social support, a form of emotion-focused coping, to alleviate the emotional distress caused by the microaggression (Carver & Connor-Smith, 2010).
Given this interplay of cultural microaggressions, coping strategies, and job stress, especially in the multicultural milieu of multinational corporations, it is logical to postulate:

_Hypothesis 3b: Coping strategies reduce the positive impact of cultural microaggressions on job stress in multinational companies._

The pervasiveness of cultural microaggressions, which are subtle and frequently unintentional derogatory remarks or actions directed at individuals based on their cultural heritage, can have a profound effect on an employee's sense of belonging and commitment to an organization. Although often overlooked, these microaggressions can progressively erode a person's job commitment, leaving them feeling marginalized and undervalued in the workplace.

The negative effects of cultural microaggressions can, however, be mitigated by employing effective coping strategies. As conceptualized by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), coping strategies are proactive cognitive and behavioral mechanisms that people use to navigate, manage, and counteract stressors. Individuals utilize these strategies to interpret and respond to challenging or threatening situations.

Various coping mechanisms exist within the domain of cultural microaggressions. Individuals may seek social support by sharing their experiences and emotions with trusted coworkers or acquaintances. This act of communicating can provide validation, reducing feelings of isolation. Alternately, some may choose to reframe the experience as an opportunity for personal development or as an isolated incident, rather than as a reflection of the organization's culture as a whole. In addition, others may employ problem-focused strategies, directly addressing the problem by, for instance, initiating
conversations about cultural sensitivity or seeking organizational interventions (Carver et al., 1989).

Due to the multicultural fabric of multinational corporations, the presence of diverse backgrounds and points of view can occasionally result in cultural microaggressions. However, these corporations also have the capacity to foster an environment in which coping strategies are acknowledged, valued, and fostered. In such settings, the resilience cultivated by coping strategies can serve as a formidable shield, protecting employees from the negative effects of microaggressions and ensuring their unwavering commitment.

In light of the preceding knowledge, it is logical to propose:

*Hypothesis 3c: Coping strategies reduce the negative impact of cultural microaggressions on job commitment in multinational companies.*

**Summary**

Several studies have demonstrated that clear office policies address cultural microaggressions in the workplace. To cite evidence, Kim et al. (2021) conducted a systematic literature review to investigate the connection between office codes of conduct and cultural microaggressions in the workplace. The findings indicated that the office code of conduct highlights various channels of seeking help in case one encounters cultural microaggressions in the workplace (Kim et al., 2021). Concurring with Kim et al., Davis and Mirick (2022) also conducted a cross-sectional study to establish the contribution of the office code of conduct in addressing cultural microaggressions in the workplace. The findings were that companies with clear policies and a code of conduct that encourages open door policy had reduced microaggression instances in the
workplace. Replicating Kim et al. and Davis and Mirick's findings, King et al. (2023) also conducted a quantitative study to discover various strategies that address microaggressions in the workplace. King et al. revealed that a clear code of conduct encourages empathy among colleagues and teamwork which allow employees to express how they feel when they encounter cultural microaggressions without prejudice in the workplace. Taking together the evidence reviewed thus far, one can conclude that an office with a clear code of conduct and policies records few instances of microaggression.

**Figure 1**

*Research Model*
Chapter 3: Methods

Participants and Procedures

The population of this study was foreign-born workers employed in a multinational organization in the United States. Foreign-born workers account for nearly one-fifth of the labor force in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020). The sample was recruited using the researcher’s personal and professional network and Prolific©, an online research platform. The study was distributed online via Qualtrics©, an online survey hosting company. Participants were emailed a link to the study’s survey which included a demographic section, Cultural Microaggressions Scale (10 items), Organizational Inclusion Behaviors Scale (9 items), The Brief-COPE scale (28 items), Employee Engagement Scale (7 items), Job Stress Scale (7 items), and the Job Commitment Scale (8 items).

Sample Demographics

There were 261 people who started the survey, however, after the removal of those cases that did not complete the survey, the dataset consisted of 184 cases available for analysis. A t-test was conducted in order to determine if there were any significant mean differences between the individuals that completed the survey, and those that did not. Results of independent t-tests were not significant ($p > .05$). Thus, there were no significant differences in study measures based on whether participants completed the survey. There were 106 (57.6%) males and 77 (41.8%) females in the sample. One person did not provide a response (Table 1). Education level ranged between a high school diploma and a doctorate. In the sample, 83.1% had either a bachelor’s or master’s degree and race demographics are also provided in Table 1.
Ages ranged from 24 to 73 years ($M = 43.28$, $SD = 11.45$); years of experience ranged from three to 40 years ($M = 9.65$, $SD = 7.86$); and the number of years living in the U.S. ranged from three to 57 years ($M = 24.11$, $SD = 13.24$). See Table 2.

In order to determine how age, experience, and the age of the participants when they immigrated to the United States might influence the experience of cultural microaggressions, we evaluated the demographics of the sample for deeper understanding. We used the participants’ self-reported responses for age, work experience, and years living in the United States. To calculate the participants' age when they came to the United States, we subtracted the participants’ years in the United States from their age. Please see Figure 1 and Table 2 for details of this analysis.
Figure 2

Boxplots of Age, Experience, Years in the United States, and Age when coming to the United States
Table 2

*Age, Years of Work Experience, Years living in the United States, and the Difference Between Age and Years living in the United States*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sku</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43.28</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>-0.641</td>
<td>0.958***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>1.693</td>
<td>2.731</td>
<td>0.815***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>-0.532</td>
<td>0.973**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age When coming to USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.959***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** (p < .001), ** (p = 0.002), * (p = 0.023)

Table 2 provides a revealing look at the life paths of the study's participants, concentrating on their ages and time spent in the United States. The table reveals a noteworthy trend: many participants transitioned to the US at a pivotal juncture in their lives, with the average age of migration being 19.34 years. This average becomes more significant when we consider that 72 participants, or 41.4% of the sample, were under 18 years old when they moved to the United States. Assessing the occurrence and consequences of cultural microaggressions, the implications of this young migration age become paramount. Please see Figure 2 for details of the dispersion of the age when the participants came to the United States.
Measures

Cultural Microaggressions

The types of microaggressions experienced by multinational employees focus on biases regarding accent, dialect, communication misunderstandings from jargon or colloquial terms, and cross-cultural differences such as the observation of certain cultural holidays. Therefore, we used a modified measure of microaggressions to capture the global context. Specifically, the original 45-item Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (Nadal, 2011) was adapted to a 10-item scale, whereby participants will evaluate the 10-item questions on the basis of occurrence in the last twelve months, 1 = none of the time, 2 = a little bit of the time, 3 = some of the time, 4 = a good bit of the time, 5 = most of the time, 6 = all of the time.
Considering that two of the questions were from different factors proposed by Nadal, we conducted a pilot test with 10 participants meeting all of our participation criteria and who reported experiencing cultural microaggressions at work to determine if the truncated measure captured the construct reliably. To test our version of REMS, we conducted a reliability analysis using Cronbach’s alpha using SPSS. As such, the Cronbach’s alpha was 0.503 for the ten questions. Considering that the score was below the minimum value of 0.6 for Cronbach's alpha scores for inclusion of the measures in analysis (Pallant, 2001), we chose to remove items that would improve the score.

After we removed questions three and six, Cronbach’s alpha score rose to 0.655. We compared our scores to Nadal’s (2011) original manuscript. Our pilot sample was very small (10) compared to Nadal’s number of participants (661 and 218). When we observed the data for our sample, there was not much variation among the participants. This is most likely due to the small sample size because there was the potential that, during the last 12 months, our participants did not have a large amount of all of the types of cultural microaggressions we attempted to sample. However, we determined that the measure is reliable enough to be tested on a larger population because even with the small amount of variation in our small sample, the Cronbach’s alpha was above 0.60 when poorly loaded questions were removed. Therefore, we ascertained that our new version of the measure is a reliable metric of the construct.

The mean value for the overall construct was 1.889 (SD = 0.998), and the range of the mean values between the participants ranged from 1 to 5.89. The measure was assessed for reliability with a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.906 for the overall construct.
For the collected data from the sample, there were relatively few cases where participants did not complete all ten items of the questionnaire. Question 4 had one missing item. No other items were missing.

The data were screened for outliers and normality, and none of the items exhibited high skewness or kurtosis exceeding the cutoffs of +/- 2.00 for skewness and +/- 7.00 for kurtosis (Hair et al., 2010). Skewness values ranged from 0.932 to 1.786, and kurtosis values ranged from -0.656 to 2.703. Univariate outliers were examined using box plots for extreme cases, and six was detected, but they were not extreme.

**Figure 4**

*Cultural Microaggressions Boxplot*
The computed mean value of all ten questions was also screened to determine if the data were normally distributed. A Shapiro-Wilk test revealed that the data were normally distributed ($W = 0.831, \text{DF} = 184, p < 0.000$). The histogram also showed that the data was not normally distributed but rather highly left-skewed.

**Figure 5**

*Histogram: Cultural Microaggressions*
Organizational Inclusivity

The Organizational Inclusion Behaviors scale (Sabharwal, 2014) is a 26-item scale based whereby participants will be asked to respond to an adapted 9-items using a 6-point Likert Scale whereby 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Don’t know/can’t say, 4 = Agree, 5 = Mostly agree and 6 = Strongly agree. Specifically, the scale will measure participants perception of the commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion, the individual participants ability to influence organizational decisions and the assessment of perceived fair and equitable treatment of employees by the supervisor in global, multi-national organizations. The mean of these responses will be computed and serve as an overall measure of organizational inclusivity. This moderator variable will be measured at the interval level of measurement.

The mean value for the overall construct was 4.289 (SD = 0.080), and the range of the mean values between the participants ranged from 1 to 6. The measure was assessed for reliability with a Cronbach’s α of 0.926 for the overall construct.

For the collected data from the sample, there were relatively few cases where participants did not complete all 9 items of the questionnaire. Question 4 and 5 had two missing items. No other items were missing.

The data were screened for outliers and normality, and none of the items exhibited high skewness or kurtosis exceeding the cutoffs of -/+ 2.00 for skewness and -/+ 7.00 for kurtosis (Hair et al., 2010). Skewness values ranged from -0.932 to -0.197 and kurtosis values ranged from -1.017 to 0.103. Univariate outliers were examined using box plots for extreme cases, and one was detected, but it was not extreme.
The computed mean value of all 9 questions was also screened to determine if the data were normally distributed. A Shapiro-Wilk test revealed that the data were normally distributed ($W = 0.970$, $DF = 184$, $p < 0.000$). The histogram also showed that the data was not normally distributed but rather right-skewed.
**Employee Coping Strategies: Problem-, Emotion-, or Avoidant-Focused**

The Brief-COPE Coping Orientation to Problems Experienced (Carver et al., 1998) inventory is a shorter version of a lengthier 60-item scale developed by Carver et al. (1989). This Brief-COPE scale is a multidimensional coping inventory to evaluate the various ways people cope with stress. With this original Brief-COPE scale, participants were asked to reply to a 28-item self-report questionnaire to evaluate how well people cope with stressful life events. In general, "coping" refers to actions taken to lessen the suffering from traumatic situations. The Brief-COPE instrument allows participants to respond according to a dispositional response format, indicating how frequently they used each coping strategy on a six-point scale anchored by “I haven’t been doing this at all” and “I do this this all the time.” The mean value for the overall construct was 2.269 (SD =
0.073), and the range of the mean values between the participants ranged from 1 to 6. The measure was assessed for reliability with a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.870 for the overall construct.

For the collected data from the sample, there were relatively few cases where participants did not complete all 9 items of the questionnaire. Question 4 and 5 had two missing items. No other items were missing.

The data were screened for outliers and normality, and none of the items exhibited high skewness or kurtosis exceeding the cutoffs of $\pm 2.00$ for skewness and $\pm 7.00$ for kurtosis (Hair et al., 2010). Skewness values ranged from -0.131 to 2.526 and kurtosis values ranged from -1.287 to 6.872. However, the ranges of the items were less extreme after deleting items in the measurement model (see chapter four for details). For the final measure, skewness values ranged from -0.131 to 1.842 and kurtosis values ranged from -1.287 to 3.662. Univariate outliers were examined using box plots for extreme cases, and while one outlier was detected, it was not extreme.
The computed mean value of the 7 questions in the final measure was also screened to determine if the data were normally distributed. A Shapiro-Wilk test revealed that the data were normally distributed ($W = 0.938, DF = 184, p < 0.000$). The histogram also showed that the data was not normally distributed but rather highly left-skewed.
Employee Engagement

A scale with 15 original items called the Employee Engagement Scale (Shuck et al., 2014) was adapted to 7 items used to measure employee engagement. Each item has a 6-point rating scale consisting of 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Don’t know/can’t say, 4 = Agree, 5 = Mostly agree and 6 = Strongly agree. The mean of these responses will be computed and serve as an overall measure of employee engagement. The mean value for the overall construct was 4.623 (SD = 0.081), and the range of the mean values between the participants ranged from 1 to 6. The measure was assessed for reliability with a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.932 for the overall construct.

For the collected data from the sample, there were relatively few cases where participants did not complete all 7 items of the questionnaire. Questions 1, 2, and 4 had
one missing item. Additionally, question 5 had three missing items. No other items were missing.

The data were screened for outliers and normality, and none of the items exhibited high skewness or kurtosis exceeding the cutoffs of $-/+ 2.00$ for skewness and $-/+ 7.00$ for kurtosis (Hair et al., 2010). Skewness values ranged from -1.108 to -0.728 and kurtosis values ranged from -0.312 to 1.102. Univariate outliers were examined using box plots for extreme cases, and four were detected but not extreme.

**Figure 10**

*Employee Engagement: Boxplot*
The computed mean value of the seven questions in the final measure was also screened to determine if the data were normally distributed. A Shapiro-Wilk test revealed that the data were normally distributed ($W = 0.928$, DF = 184, $p < 0.000$). The histogram also showed that the data was not normally distributed but rather right-skewed.

**Figure 11**

*Histogram: Employee Engagement*
Job Stress

The Job Stress Scale (Parker & DeCotiis, 1983) was used to measure job stress. The original Job Stress Scale consisting of 13 items will be adapted to 7 items on a six-point Likert scale with 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Don’t know/can’t say, 4 = Agree, 5 = Mostly agree and 6 = Strongly agree. The mean value for the overall construct was 2.776 (SD = 0.087), and the mean values between the participants ranged from 1 to 6. The measure was assessed for reliability with a Cronbach’s α of 0.912 for the overall construct.

For the collected data from the sample, there were relatively few cases where participants did not complete all seven items of the questionnaire. Questions 4, 5, and 7 each had one missing item. No other items were missing.

The data were screened for outliers and normality, and none of the items exhibited high skewness or kurtosis exceeding the cutoffs of +/- 2.00 for skewness and +/- 7.00 for kurtosis (Hair et al., 2010). Skewness values ranged from -1.108 to -0.728 and kurtosis values ranged from -0.312 to 1.102. Univariate outliers were examined using box plots for extreme cases; no outliers were present.
Figure 12

*Job Stress: Boxplot*

The computed mean value of the seven questions in the final measure was also screened to determine if the data were normally distributed. A Shapiro-Wilk test revealed that the data were normally distributed ($W = 0.960$, $DF = 184$, $p < 0.000$). The histogram also showed that the data was not normally distributed but rather right-skewed.
Job Commitment

Job commitment was measured using the original 8-item Likert survey instrument with 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Don’t know/can’t say, 4 = Agree, 5 = Mostly agree, and 6 = Strongly agree, developed by Allen and Meyer (1996). The mean value for the overall construct was 3.925 (SD = 0.077), and the range of the mean values between the participants ranged from 1 to 6. The measure was assessed for reliability with a Cronbach’s α of 0.896 for the overall construct.

For the collected data from the sample, there were relatively few cases where participants did not complete all eight items of the questionnaire. Questions 2, 5, 7, and 8
had one missing item. Additionally, questions 3, 4, and 6 had two missing items. No other items were missing.

The data were screened for outliers and normality, and none of the items exhibited high skewness or kurtosis exceeding the cutoffs of +/- 2.00 for skewness and +/- 7.00 for kurtosis (Hair et al., 2010). Skewness values ranged from -1.108 to -0.728, and kurtosis values ranged from -0.312 to 1.102. Univariate outliers were examined using box plots for extreme cases, and one was detected but not extreme.

**Figure 14**

*Boxplot: Job Commitment*
The computed mean value of the eight questions in the final measure was also screened to determine if the data were normally distributed. A Shapiro-Wilk test revealed that the data were normally distributed ($W = 0.977$, $DF = 184$, $p < 0.000$). The histogram also showed that the data was not normally distributed but rather right-skewed.

**Figure 15**

*Histogram: Job Commitment*
Chapter 4: Results

Descriptive Statistics

In order to accurately assess the relationships between the variables to be modeled, we combined the descriptive statistics described in Chapter 3. In addition to the central tendency, we constructed a table that includes all pertinent data explanations. Refer to Table 3 for additional information.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural microaggressions</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>1.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-.899</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job stress</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>-.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job commitment</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.408</td>
<td>-.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational inclusivity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>-.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, we assessed the correlations between all variables and their factors. Please see Table 4.

**Table 4**

*Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural microaggressions</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coping</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>.276**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employee engagement</td>
<td>4.623</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.192**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job stress</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>-.147*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job commitment</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>-.218**</td>
<td>-.271**</td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td>-.388**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational inclusivity</td>
<td>4.289</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>-.278**</td>
<td>-.146*</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>-.282**</td>
<td>.556**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age</td>
<td>43.282</td>
<td>11.451</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.259**</td>
<td>.229**</td>
<td>-.0126</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Experience</td>
<td>9.546</td>
<td>7.961</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-.0100</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/ Years in USA</td>
<td>24.084</td>
<td>13.278</td>
<td>-.171**</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-.0115</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Measurement Model Analysis

As part of the measurement model analysis, the removal of items from the study was evaluated because of low factor loadings (< 0.6: Gefen et al., 2000). We identified the following that did not meet these criteria, warranting removal: CMA (one item), COPE (18 items), and JC (one item). Accordingly, we removed the questions for analysis. To test the reliability of the constructs, the minimum value of 0.7 for composite reliability (CR: Wasko and Faraj, 2005) and the same value for Cronbach’s alpha scores for inclusion of the measures in the analysis were used. All factors met these criteria.

It was determined that the acceptability of convergent validity was acceptable for all variables because the average variance extracted (AVE) was over 0.5 for all variables. For more details, see Table 2. This table also shows the factor loadings for the individual items loaded into the constructs. The discriminant validity with the Fornell-Larcker criterion was used to determine if the square root of AVE for each construct was more significant than the inter-construct correlation for the other constructs to be tested. Further, we confirmed discriminant validity with the heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations (Henseler et al., 2015). Considering that all values in question were less than the threshold of Henseler et al. (0.9), it was determined that discriminant validity was established (see Table 5 for more details).
Table 5

*Cultural Microaggressions Factor Loadings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question text</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Final CR</th>
<th>Final AVE</th>
<th>Δ CR</th>
<th>Δ AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Someone at work assumed that I did not speak English very well.</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Someone at work made negative assumptions about my culture.</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>At work, I received substandard treatment compared to US-born American co-workers.</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Someone at work assumed that my work would be inferior to US-born Americans.</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Someone at work told me that I was “articulate” in how I speak after they assumed I wouldn’t be.</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I was told by someone at work that non-US-born people do not experience prejudice anymore.</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Someone at work assumed that I ate foods associated with my culture every day.</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>An employer or co-worker at work treated me differently than US-born American co-workers.</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Someone at work said “in this country…” when attempting to explain or correct me about something I said or did.</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Continued) Question #</td>
<td>Question text</td>
<td>Loading</td>
<td>Final CR</td>
<td>Final AVE</td>
<td>Δ CR</td>
<td>Δ AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational inclusivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is committed to hiring a workforce that is representative of all segments of society.</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tries to create an awareness and appreciation of individual and cultural differences among employees.</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Helps employees understand their own feelings and attitudes about people who are different than themselves.</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Involves me in decisions about my job.</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creates a synergistic approach to problem-solving and decision-making.</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Seeks my input before making important organizational decisions.</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assigns tasks based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities possessed by individual employees.</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Takes action when employees show disrespect for each other.</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Has fairly rewarded me for the work well done.</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Question text</td>
<td>Loading</td>
<td>Final CR</td>
<td>Final AVE</td>
<td>Δ CR</td>
<td>Δ AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I’ve been giving up trying to deal with it.</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I’ve been refusing to believe that this has happened.</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I’ve been saying things to let my unpleasant feelings escape.</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I’ve been criticizing myself.</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I’ve been giving up the attempt to cope.</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I’ve been making jokes about it.</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I’ve been doing something to think about it less, such as going to movies, watching TV, reading, daydreaming, sleeping, or shopping.</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I’ve been blaming myself for things that happened.</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Employee engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question text</th>
<th>Loading CR</th>
<th>Final CR</th>
<th>Final AVE</th>
<th>Δ CR</th>
<th>Δ AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am really focused on my job when I’m working.</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Working at my current organization has a great deal of meaning for me.</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I really push myself to work beyond what’s expected of me.</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I work harder than expected to help my company be successful.</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When working, I think a lot about how I can give my best.</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am proud to tell others that I work for my current organization.</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I often go above what is expected of me to help my team be successful.</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Question text</th>
<th>Loading CR</th>
<th>Final CR</th>
<th>Final AVE</th>
<th>Δ CR</th>
<th>Δ AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Working here makes it hard to spend enough time with my family.</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My job gets to me more than it should.</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I spend so much time at work, I can't see the forest for the trees.</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There are lots of times when my job drives me right up the wall.</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel like I never have a day off.</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Too many people at my level in the company get burnt out by job demands.</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Question text</td>
<td>Loading CR</td>
<td>Final CR</td>
<td>Final AVE</td>
<td>Δ CR</td>
<td>Δ AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discriminate Validity Analysis

Using the square root of AVE for each construct, we assessed the discriminant validity of each variable via the Fornell-Larcker criterion (Henseler et al., 2015). We determined that each construct has discriminant validity as only as the square root of AVE of each construct was higher than the correlations of each of the other variables. Please see Table 6.

Table 6

Fornell-Larcker Criterion and Heterotrait-monotrait Ratio of Correlations

Fornell-Larcker criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural microaggressions</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational inclusivity</td>
<td>-0.284</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coping strategies</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employee engagement</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job stress</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>-0.280</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job commitment</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>-0.386</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Diagonal elements are the square root of the AVE for the construct in Fornell-Larcker criterion

Heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural microaggressions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational inclusivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coping strategies</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employee engagement</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job stress</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structural Model

Using the structural model hypothesized in the research framework, the relationships were assessed based on R2 and the significance of paths. The goodness of fit for the model was determined by the strength of each structural path defined by the R2 value for the dependent variable, where R2 was expected to be equal to or greater than 0.1 (Falk & Miller, 1992). The independent variables had an R2 value greater than 0.1. Hence, the predictive capability was established.

Furthermore, the model fit was assessed with multiple fit indices (TLI = .962, CFI = .942, RMSEA = .069, SRMR = .052, and X2/df = 2.79 p = .237). Considering that these values were below the required thresholds outlined in the literature (Hair et al., 2010), it was determined that the model had an acceptable fit.

Direct Effects

Hierarchical regression was used to test all incremental variance hypotheses. Results for the final model in each case are included in Tables 9–11. The first block included control variables (i.e., age, gender, and work experience). The second block contained the control variables and the direct effect of cultural microaggressions, organizational inclusivity, and coping strategies. For blocks three and four, we evaluated a model with the moderating relationship between cultural microaggressions and either organizational inclusivity or coping strategies, as well as the direct effect of cultural microaggressions, either organizational inclusivity or coping strategies, and the controls. The full model (model 5) included all predictors—specifically age, gender, work experience, cultural microaggressions dimensions, organizational inclusivity dimensions,
and copying strategy dimensions—as a single model. In each analysis, we examined the F and R² to examine the incremental variance.

When evaluating the predictors of employee engagement, the results indicated that cultural microaggressions, organizational inclusivity, and coping strategies explained a significant proportion of variance in employee engagement beyond the controls (ΔR² = 0.263). Upon closer inspection of the coefficients, organizational inclusivity drove this effect primarily (β = 0.523, t = 7.945). Conversely, cultural microaggressions (β = 0.062, t = 0.939) and coping strategies (β = -0.071, t = -1.036) did not explain a significant proportion of variance. These results indicate that there is no support for Hypothesis 1a.

In model 3, we evaluated the moderating effect of organizational inclusivity on the relationship between cultural microaggressions and employee engagement. This model included controls, the direct effects of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity, and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity. The model presented with a ΔR² of .259 when compared to the model with only controls (model 1) and -0.004 when compared to a model with all direct effects (model 2.) Upon closer inspection of the coefficients, this effect was driven primarily by the direct effect of organizational inclusivity (β = 0.546, t = 4.179). Conversely, cultural microaggressions (β = 0.111, t = 0.454) and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity (β = -0.050, t = -0.207) did not explain a significant proportion of variance. These results indicate that there is no support for Hypothesis 2a.
In model 4, we evaluated the moderating effect of coping strategies on the relationship between cultural microaggressions and employee engagement. This model included controls, the direct effects of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies, and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies. The model presented with a $\Delta R^2$ of .015 when compared to the model with only controls (model 1), -0.248 when compared to a model with all direct effects (model 2), and -0.244 when compared to the moderation model of organizational inclusivity and cultural microaggressions (model 3). Upon closer inspection of the coefficients of this effect, there were no significant relationships in the model save age ($\beta = 0.289, t = 3.072$). The direct effects were as follows: coping strategies ($\beta = 0.058, t = 0.337$), cultural microaggressions ($\beta = 0.086, t = 0.483$), and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies ($\beta = -0.229, t = -0.874$). These results indicate that there is no support for Hypothesis 3a.

When evaluating our final model (model 5), we combined all predictors in the prior models concurrently. The model presented with a $\Delta R^2$ mirroring model 2 with identical $R^2$ change. However, the $\Delta F$ between model 2 and model 5 was -1.117. This indicates that the inclusion of both interactions makes the model fit less. All measures considered, the direct effect of organizational inclusivity was the only significant non-control path ($\beta = 0.573, t = 4.266$). The other nonsignificant relationships were as follows: coping strategies ($\beta = 0.112, t = 0.730$), cultural microaggressions ($\beta = 0.310, t = 0.966$), the interaction of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity ($\beta = -0.114, t = -0.457$), and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies ($\beta = -0.219, t = -0.935$).
Overall, we found no support for our hypotheses when evaluating employee engagement as a dependent variable in tandem with our theoretical model. However, the significance of organizational inclusivity was present in most models. This indicates that even though organizational inclusivity does not moderate the relationship between cultural microaggressions and employee engagement, organizational inclusivity is a significant predictor of employee engagement. Please see Table 7 for the significant and nonsignificant paths in the various models.
Table 7

Hierarchical Regression Models on Employee Engagement

Independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.303***</td>
<td>0.277***</td>
<td>0.301***</td>
<td>0.289**</td>
<td>0.314***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.412)</td>
<td>(3.501)</td>
<td>(3.904)</td>
<td>(3.072)</td>
<td>(3.823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.709)</td>
<td>(-0.506)</td>
<td>(-0.491)</td>
<td>(-0.817)</td>
<td>(-0.549)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.429)</td>
<td>(-1.579)</td>
<td>(-0.709)</td>
<td>(-1.330)</td>
<td>(-1.746)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural microaggressions (CMA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.939)</td>
<td>(0.454)</td>
<td>(0.483)</td>
<td>(0.966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational inclusivity (OI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.523***</td>
<td>0.546***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.573***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.945)</td>
<td>(4.179)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping strategies (COPE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.036)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.337)</td>
<td>(0.730)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA*OI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.207)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.457)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA*COPE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.874)</td>
<td>(-0.935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Value</td>
<td>3.994</td>
<td>11.848</td>
<td>11.700</td>
<td>2.895</td>
<td>10.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: t-value in parentheses

* p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001
Job Stress as the Dependent Variable

When evaluating the predictors of job stress, the results indicated that cultural microaggressions, organizational inclusivity, and coping strategies explained a significant proportion of variance in job stress beyond the controls ($\Delta R^2 = 0.268$). Upon closer inspection of the coefficients, this effect was driven primarily by cultural microaggressions ($\beta = 0.236$, $t = 3.350$) and coping strategies ($\beta = 0.372$, $t = 5.200$). Conversely, organizational inclusivity ($\beta = -0.125$, $t = -1.807$) did not explain a significant proportion of variance. These results indicate that there is support for Hypothesis 2a.

In model 3, we evaluated the moderating effect of organizational inclusivity on the relationship between cultural microaggressions and job stress. This model included controls, the direct effects of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity, and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity. The model presented with a $\Delta R^2$ of 0.170 when compared to the model with only controls (model 1) and -0.098 when compared to a model with all direct effects (model 2). Upon closer inspection of the coefficients, this effect was not driven by any significant direct effects. Organizational inclusivity ($\beta = -0.148$, $t = -0.938$), cultural microaggressions ($\beta = 0.466$, $t = 1.480$), and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity ($\beta = -0.055$, $t = -0.211$) did not explain a significant proportion of variance. These results indicate that there is no support for Hypothesis 2b.

In model 4, we evaluated the moderating effect of coping strategies on the relationship between cultural microaggressions and job stress. This model included controls, the direct effects of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies, and the
interaction of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies. The model presented with a $\Delta R^2$ of .285 when compared to the model with only controls (model 1), 0.017 when compared to a model with all direct effects (model 2), and 0.115 when compared to the moderation model of organizational inclusivity and cultural microaggressions (model 3). Upon closer inspection of the coefficients, the model had significant relationships. The direct effects were as follows: coping strategies ($\beta = 0.640, t = 4.275$), cultural microaggressions ($\beta = 0.515, t = 3.347$), and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies ($\beta = -0.461, t = -2.033$). These results indicate that there is support for Hypothesis 3b.

When evaluating our final model (model 5), we combined all predictors in the prior models concurrently. The model presented with a $\Delta R^2$ that was improved over the other models ($\Delta R^2 = 0.016$). All measures considered, there was no change in significance in relationships when compared to earlier models. The direct effect of organizational inclusivity was nonsignificant ($\beta = -0.063, t = -0.463$), and the interaction of organizational inclusivity and cultural microaggressions was also nonsignificant ($\beta = -0.134, t = -0.532$). Conversely, the direct effect of coping strategies ($\beta = 0.657, t = 4.280$) and cultural microaggressions ($\beta = 0.666, t = 2.057$) were significant. Additionally, the interaction of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies ($\beta = -0.494, t = -2.097$) was significant.

To understand the form of the interaction, we examined simple slopes. At low levels of coping strategies (i.e., 1SD below the mean), the relationship between cultural Microaggressions and job stress was significant (effect = .483, SD = .119, p < 0.000). Moderate levels of coping strategies (at the mean) on the relationship between cultural
microaggressions and job stress were positive and significant (effect = .394, SD = .083, \( p < 0.000 \)). Additionally, at high (i.e., 1SD above the mean), the relationship between cultural microaggressions and job stress was positive and significant (effect = .211, SD = .096, \( p = .028 \)). The form of the interaction is shown in the plot in Figure 16.

**Figure 16**

*Simple Slope Analysis of the Moderation Relationship of Coping Strategies on Cultural Microaggressions and Job Stress*

Overall, when evaluating job stress as a dependent variable in tandem with our theoretical model, we found support for hypotheses 2a and 3b. Please see Table 8 for significant and nonsignificant paths in the various models.
Table 8

Hierarchical Regression Models on Job Stress

When evaluating the predictors of job commitment, the results indicated that cultural microaggressions, organizational inclusivity, and coping strategies explained a significant proportion of variance in job commitment beyond the controls ($\Delta R^2 = 0.307$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main effects</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural microaggressions (CMA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.236**</td>
<td>0466</td>
<td>0.515**</td>
<td>0.666*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational inclusivity (OI)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping strategies (COPE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.372***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.640***</td>
<td>0.657***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderating effects</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMA*OI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA*COPE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.461*</td>
<td>-0.494*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R2                | 0.019   | 0.287   | 0.189   | 0.304   | 0.320   |
| Observations      | 184     | 184     | 184     | 184     | 184     |

Note: $t$-value in parentheses

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Job Commitment as the Dependent Variable

When evaluating the predictors of job commitment, the results indicated that cultural microaggressions, organizational inclusivity, and coping strategies explained a significant proportion of variance in job commitment beyond the controls ($\Delta R^2 = 0.307$).
Upon closer inspection of the coefficients, this effect was driven primarily by organizational inclusivity ($\beta = 0.513, t = 7.917$) and coping strategies ($\beta = 0.513, t = 7.917$). Conversely, cultural microaggressions ($\beta = -0.012, t = -0.175$) did not explain a significant proportion of variance. These results indicate that there is no support for Hypothesis 3a.

In model 3, we evaluated the moderating effect of organizational inclusivity on the relationship between cultural microaggressions and job commitment. This model included controls, the direct effects of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity, and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity. The model presented with a $\Delta R^2$ of .291 when compared to the model with only controls (model 1) and -0.006 when compared to a model with all direct effects (model 2.) Upon closer inspection of the coefficients, this effect was driven primarily by the direct effect of organizational inclusivity ($\beta = 0.423, t = 3.262$). Conversely, cultural microaggressions ($\beta = -0.253, t = -1.045$) and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and organizational inclusivity ($\beta = 0.211, t = 0.885$) did not explain a significant proportion of variance. These results indicate that there is no support for Hypothesis 3c.

In model 4, we evaluated the moderating effect of coping strategies on the relationship between cultural microaggressions and job commitment. This model included controls, the direct effects of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies, and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies. The model presented with a $\Delta R^2$ of .044 when compared to the model with only controls (model 1), -0.268 when compared to a model with all direct effects (model 2), and -0.262 when compared to the moderation model of organizational inclusivity and cultural
microaggressions (model 3). Upon closer inspection of the coefficients of this effect, there were no significant relationships in the model save age ($\beta = 0.199$, $t = 2.121$). The direct effects were as follows: coping strategies ($\beta = 0.079$, $t = 0.456$), cultural microaggressions ($\beta = -0.045$, $t = -0.964$,) and the interaction of cultural microaggressions and coping strategies ($\beta = -0.357$, $t = -0.982$). These results indicate that there is no support for Hypothesis 3b.

When evaluating our final model (model 5), we combined all predictors in the prior models concurrently. The model presented only nonsignificant relationships save age ($\beta = 0.208$, $t = 2.549$) and organizational inclusivity ($\beta = 0.446$, $t = 3.334$). Additionally, the $\Delta R^2$ (-0.014) compared to model 2 in tandem with the $\Delta F$ between model 2 and model 5 being -0.413 indicates that the inclusion of both interactions makes the model fit less.

Overall, when evaluating job commitment as a dependent variable in tandem with our theoretical model, we found only support for hypothesis 3a. Please see Table 9 for significant and nonsignificant paths in the various models.
Table 9

Hierarchical Regression Models on Job Commitment

Independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.220*</td>
<td>0.159*</td>
<td>0.196*</td>
<td>0.199*</td>
<td>0.208*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.449)</td>
<td>(2.041)</td>
<td>(2.560)</td>
<td>(2.121)</td>
<td>(2.549)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.621)</td>
<td>(1.022)</td>
<td>(0.928)</td>
<td>(0.461)</td>
<td>(0.875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.573)</td>
<td>(-0.495)</td>
<td>(-0.623)</td>
<td>(-0.541)</td>
<td>(-0.651)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural microaggressions (CMA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.253</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.175)</td>
<td>(-1.045)</td>
<td>(0.964)</td>
<td>(-0.290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational inclusivity (OI)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.513***</td>
<td>0.423***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.446***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.917)</td>
<td>(3.261)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.334)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping strategies (COPE)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.151*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-2.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.456)</td>
<td>(0.633)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA*OI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.885)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.641)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA*COPE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.257</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.982)</td>
<td>(-0.765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Value</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>10.858</td>
<td>10.354</td>
<td>2.639</td>
<td>10.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *-value in parentheses

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Exploratory Analysis

In the initial phases of our research, the complexity of our study design—which included an independent variable (IV), two moderators, three dependent variables (DVs), and a plethora of controls—emphasized the need to examine and possibly employ alternative modeling techniques beyond traditional regression. As we probed deeper into the complex relationships within our study, the limitations of conventional regression methods became apparent, particularly hierarchical regression. Despite its strength, hierarchical regression frequently evaluates relationships incrementally, potentially missing nuanced interdependencies that emerge when multiple variables interact in a complex design. Given these constraints and our commitment to both rigor and depth in our analytical approach, it became imperative that we investigate a more comprehensive technique, such as Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).

A pillar of structural equation modeling is its capacity to illustrate and analyze complex relationships, especially when dealing with intricate interactions involving mediators, moderators, and outcomes (Kline, 2011). Moreover, its ability to conduct simultaneous testing of multiple equations distinguishes it from conventional statistical methods, which tend to evaluate relationships in isolation. This concurrent evaluation ensures that the relationships between our model's independent variables, dependent variables, moderators, and controls are evaluated holistically, emphasizing the comprehensive nature of SEM (Bollen & Pearl, 2013).

To conduct this analysis, we used the same measurement model outlined in an earlier section.
Structural Model

Using the structural model hypothesized in the research framework, the relationships were assessed based on $R^2$ and the significance of paths. The goodness of fit for the model was determined by the strength of each structural path defined by the $R^2$ value for the dependent variable, where $R^2$ was expected to be equal to or greater than 0.1 (Falk and Miller, 1992). The independent variables had an $R^2$ value greater than 0.1. Hence, the predictive capability was established.

Furthermore, the model fit was assessed with multiple fit indices (TLI = .962, CFI = .942, RMSEA = .069, SRMR = .052, and $X^2/df = 2.79, p = .237$). Considering that these values were below the required thresholds outlined in the literature (Hair et al., 2010), it was determined that the model had an acceptable fit.

Direct Effects

When evaluating the proposed hypotheses, the results revealed that the components of the CMA as the antecedent in the modeling yielded both significant and nonsignificant results with respect to the impact on employee outcomes (employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment). CMA yielded non-significant relationships for both employee engagement (H1a: CMA→EE: $\beta = 0.080, t = 0.829, p = 0.407$) and job commitment (H1c: CMA→JC: $\beta = -0.03, t = 0.325, p = 0.745$). However, CMA’s influence on job stress was significant (H1b: CMA→JS: $\beta = 0.258, t = 2.580, p = 0.010$). Therefore, the model provides support for only H1b.

Direct effects of variables without hypotheses in the model were also assessed to include controls. The direct effects of the controls yielded both significant and non-significant relationships. The results are listed in Table 4.
Moderation Effects

Moderation analysis was performed using 5000 samples to assess the moderation roles of the hypothesized relationships (H2a-c and H3a-c) in our theoretical model. The results revealed nonsignificant ($p > 0.05$) moderating relationships for the majority of hypothesized paths. For H2a-c, all relationships were nonsignificant (H2a: CMA*OI→EE: $\beta = -0.029$, $t = 0.248$, $p = 0.804$, H2b: CMA*OI→JS: $\beta = -0.047$, $t = 0.534$, $p = 0.594$, H2c: CMA*OI→JC: $\beta = 0.060$, $t = 0.730$, $p = 0.465$). Additionally, in the paths for H3a-c, two relationships were nonsignificant (H3a: CMA*COPE→EE: $\beta = -0.057$, $t = 0.661$, $p = 0.509$, H3c: CMA*COPE→JC: $\beta = -0.027$, $t = 0.335$, $p = 0.737$). However, only H3b was significant (H1b: CMA*COPE→JS: $\beta = -0.130$, $t = 1.965$, $p = 0.050$).

Please see Figure 17 for a visual representation of the significant and non-significant results representing our path analyses and Table 10 for a visual of the supported and unsupported hypotheses in our conceptual model as found in SEM.
Figure 17

Significant and Non-significant Paths for Structured Equation Modeling Analysis

TLI = .962, CFI = .942, RMSEA = .069, SRMR = .052, and X2/df = 2.79 p = .237
Table 10

Path Analysis for Structural Equation Modeling of the Entire Conceptual Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>2.50%</th>
<th>97.50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement (EE) DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a: Cultural microaggressions (CMA)</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational inclusivity (OI)</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>9.525</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping strategies (COPE)</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job commitment (JC) DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: CMA</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>10.166</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPE</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job stress (JS) DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: CMA</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPE</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>5.361</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age → EE</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>3.953</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age → JC</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age → JS</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → EE</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>-0.253</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → JC</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → JS</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → EE</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → JC</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender → JS</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a: COPE x CMG → EE</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c: COPE x CMG → JC</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b: COPE x CMG → JS</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.271</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Path Coefficients</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>Model Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a: OI × CMG → EE</td>
<td>-0.029 0.116 0.248 0.804 -0.179 0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c: OI × CMG → JC</td>
<td>0.060 0.082 0.730 0.465 -0.115 0.222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b: OI × CMG → JS</td>
<td>-0.047 0.087 0.534 0.594 -0.199 0.143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Model Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>X² / df 2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>TLI 0.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>CFI 0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRMR 0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA 0.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Discussion

The problem assessed in this study was cultural microaggression practices and the corresponding impact on employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment faced by business leaders and employees across multinational companies. This study aimed to determine how, as a stressor, cultural microaggressions can influence employee engagement, job stress, job satisfaction, and employee commitment when moderated by organizational inclusivity and problem-, emotion-, or avoidant-focused coping strategies. Despite a large body of literature on workplace microaggressions, no current research focused on the impact of cultural microaggressions on workplace outcomes in diverse global workplaces as moderated by organizational inclusivity and coping strategies (Banks & Callahan, 2022; Holder, 2015; Schultz et al., 2020). Thus, this study aimed to determine if and to what extent a statistical relationship exists between cultural microaggressions, employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment as moderated by organizational inclusivity and employee coping strategies in multinational companies.

A quantitative study was employed to determine if there were relationships between cultural microaggressions, employee job engagement, job stress, and job commitment as moderated by organizational inclusivity and employee coping strategies in multinational companies. The population of this study was foreign-born workers employed in a multinational organization in the United States. Purposive sampling was used for this study. Structural equation modeling was employed to address the research questions and corresponding hypotheses.
In this chapter, we will present a summary of the findings and a discussion of how the results of this study are interpreted in the context of the theoretical framework. Any limitations of the results of the study will also be provided. Additionally, practical implications and recommendations for future research will be discussed.

Summary of Findings

Results indicated that cultural microaggressions (CMA) were not significantly associated with employee engagement or job commitment. However, CMA was significantly related to job stress. The findings also revealed that organizational inclusivity did not significantly moderate the effect of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment. Further, the interaction term of coping and microaggressions was significant for only job stress. Please see Table 11 for a list of hypotheses supported and not supported by our findings.
Table 11

Hypotheses Supported and Non-supported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis #</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Cultural microaggressions are negatively related to employee engagement in multinational companies.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Cultural microaggressions are positively related to job stress in multinational companies.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Cultural microaggressions are negatively related to job commitment in multinational companies.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Organizational inclusivity reduces the negative impact of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement in multinational companies.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Organizational inclusivity reduces the positive impact of cultural microaggressions on job stress in multinational companies.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Organizational inclusivity reduces the negative impact of cultural microaggressions on job commitment in multinational companies.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Coping strategies reduce the negative impact of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement in multinational companies.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Coping strategies reduce the positive impact of cultural microaggressions on job stress in multinational companies.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Coping strategies reduce the negative impact of cultural microaggressions on job commitment in multinational companies.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Research Question 1

**RQ1.** Is there a relationship between cultural microaggressions and job outcomes of employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment in multinational companies?

In addressing the first research question (RQ1), the findings from this study provide a nuanced comprehension of the relationship between cultural microaggressions and job outcomes in multinational companies. Specifically, while cultural microaggressions were found to be correlated with job stress, no significant relationships were observed with employee engagement or job commitment.

Contrary to expectations, the lack of support for Hypothesis 1a suggests that cultural microaggressions have no direct negative effect on employee engagement in multinational corporations. This is a particularly compelling result when viewed through the lens of the minority stress model. Minority stress, according to Meyer (2003), is caused by external, objective events and conditions, expectations of such events, the vigilance this expectation requires, and the internalization of societal attitudes. One might anticipate that cultural microaggressions, as a form of minority stress, would diminish an employee's enthusiasm and commitment to their job, thereby decreasing engagement. However, the current findings contradict this assumption, suggesting that other variables may mediate or buffer the relationship between microaggressions and engagement in such contexts.

The relationship between cultural microaggressions and job stress, as proposed by Hypothesis 1b, was supported. This is consistent with the minority stress model, as
microaggressions can be considered a stressor that leads to increased job stress. Constant exposure to covert derogatory messages or actions can lead to elevated stress levels over time (Clark et al., 1999). This finding highlights the significance of addressing cultural microaggressions in the workplace, as they can have tangible effects on the well-being of employees. Anzani (2019) reported similar findings, stating that cultural microaggressions considerably impact the productivity of multinational organizations by increasing employee job stress and decreasing employee commitment and engagement. In addition, previous research by Robinson-Perez et al. (2020) revealed that cultural microaggressions discourage employees from investigating new ideas at work, thereby decreasing their performance and overall productivity.

Unexpectedly, Hypothesis 1c was not supported. The minority stress model would predict that experiencing microaggressions would result in decreased job commitment as a result of increased stress and strain. However, it's possible that in multinational companies, other factors such as job security, opportunities for advancement, or the global nature of the work might play a more significant role in influencing job commitment than the experience of microaggressions. Similar to the current study’s findings, Resnick and Galupo (2019) found that microaggressions create a toxic work environment with high job stress that negatively affects employee commitment and productivity.

Other theories beyond the minority stress model can cast light on these findings. For instance, the Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 2004) posits that a significant portion of an individual's sense of self is derived from their membership in social groups. In multinational corporations, employees may identify strongly with the global or
corporate identity, which may mitigate the negative impact of microaggressions on employee engagement and commitment. Moreover, the Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) suggests that although microaggressions increase job demands (leading to stress), other resources available in multinational companies may mitigate their effect on engagement and commitment.

Furthermore, the findings also suggest a distinction between cultural and general microaggressions. Cultural microaggressions specifically target the cultural heritage or identity of an individual, frequently manifesting as subtle slights or dismissive looks based on cultural stereotypes (Sue et al., 2007). In contrast, general microaggressions can comprise a broader spectrum of subtle insults and humiliations that are not necessarily tied to a person's cultural identity. The unique effect of cultural microaggressions on job stress, as observed in this study, demonstrates and highlights their unique nature. It suggests that the experience of being targeted on the basis of one's cultural identity in a multinational setting, where diverse cultural identities converge, can be especially distressing. Organizations must be aware of this distinction, as interventions designed to address general microaggressions may not be as effective in addressing the specific challenges posed by cultural microaggressions.

**Research Question 2**

**RQ2:** Does organizational inclusivity moderate the effect of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment in multinational companies?

In addressing the second research question (RQ2), the study aimed to determine the potential moderating effect of organizational inclusivity on the relationship between
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cultural microaggressions and various job outcomes in multinational corporations. However, the findings suggest that perceptions of organizational inclusivity did not significantly moderate the effects of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement, job stress, or job commitment.

The non-support for Hypothesis 2a suggests that organizational inclusivity does not mitigate or reduce the potential negative impact of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement. This is unexpected, given that inclusive organizational cultures are typically characterized by a sense of belonging, value, and respect for all employees, regardless of their cultural backgrounds (Mor Barak, 2017). In such environments, it was anticipated that the negative effects of cultural microaggressions on engagement would be minimized. However, the current findings indicate that the presence of an inclusive culture may not be sufficient to counteract the negative effects of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement. Similarly, Hypothesis 2b proposed that organizational inclusivity would diminish the detrimental effect of cultural microaggressions on job stress. The lack of support for this hypothesis suggests that even in organizations viewed as inclusive, employees who encounter cultural microaggressions continue to experience elevated levels of job stress. This highlights the pervasiveness of microaggressions and suggests that their impact may be profoundly ingrained, transcending the protective effects of an inclusive organizational culture.

The lack of support for Hypothesis 2c highlights the resilience of the negative effects of cultural microaggressions. It was hypothesized that organizational inclusivity would reduce the detrimental effect of microaggressions on job commitment. However,
the findings indicate that even in inclusive environments, the experience of cultural microaggressions has no effect on employee commitment.

These findings are consistent with the larger corpus of research on organizational inclusivity and its potential limitations. In spite of the fact that inclusivity is a vital component of a healthy organizational culture, it may not be a panacea for all workplace challenges, particularly those that are deeply rooted in societal structures and biases, such as microaggressions (Nishii, 2013). Although inclusive cultures promote general well-being and positive intergroup relations, they may be incapable of addressing the subtle and nuanced nature of cultural microaggressions.

In addition, the findings suggest that organizations must go beyond simple inclusion initiatives. While nurturing an inclusive environment is crucial, it may be equally important for multinational corporations to implement interventions that address the particular challenges posed by cultural microaggressions. This may include exhaustive training programs, awareness campaigns, and feedback mechanisms that enable employees to express their experiences and concerns.

Research Question 3

**RQ3:** Does employee coping strategy moderate the relationship between cultural microaggressions and employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment in multinational companies?

Turning to the third research question (RQ3), the study investigated the potential moderating effect of employee coping strategies on the relationship between cultural microaggressions and a variety of job outcomes in multinational corporations. The findings present a muddled picture, with coping strategies moderating the relationship
between cultural microaggressions and job stress but having no significant effect on the relationships between employee engagement and job commitment.

The lack of support for Hypothesis 3a suggests that employee coping strategies do not substantially attenuate the detrimental effects of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement. This is a surprising outcome, particularly when considering the larger body of literature on coping. Typically, problem- or emotion-focused coping strategies are employed to manage and acclimate to stressful situations (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The expectation was that employees who utilized effective coping mechanisms would be better equipped to navigate the challenges posed by cultural microaggressions, thereby sustaining higher levels of engagement. However, the findings suggest that the negative effects of cultural microaggressions on engagement may be so severe as to outweigh the potential advantages of mitigating strategies. It also suggests, in a similar vein to our discussion of hypothesis 1, that the interaction of coping and cultural microaggressions on the proposed job outcomes behave differently than the same relationships with general microaggressions.

In contrast, Hypothesis 3b was supported, indicating that employee coping strategies do mitigate the damaging effect of cultural microaggressions on job stress. This is consistent with the foundational theories of coping, which suggest that individuals who employ adaptive coping mechanisms can reduce their exposure to stressors (Carver et al., 1989). In the context of this study, it appears that multinational company employees who employ effective coping strategies are better able to manage the tension caused by cultural microaggressions.
Consistent with current study findings, past research indicated that targets of cultural microaggressions in a global workplace can use prevention strategies in response to discrimination to reduce job stress and increase their engagement and job commitment (Dalton & Villagran, 2018). Coping strategies such as choosing not to attend meetings or team gatherings in which the perpetrator of the microaggression is present may reduce job stress and increase employee engagement and job commitment in multinational workplaces (Dalton & Villagran, 2018). Dalton and Villagran (2018) stated that some employees may decide to focus intently on the work activities at hand and not confront the aggressor or engage in an activity that would increase one’s efforts in diminishing the effects of the microaggression as well as increase the possibility that the micro-aggressive act would not occur also characterize preventive strategy (Dalton & Villagran, 2018).

However, the non-support for Hypothesis 3c suggests that coping strategies do not substantially reduce the negative impact of cultural microaggressions on job commitment. This suggests that similar to the relationship between engagement and commitment, the relationship between cultural microaggressions and commitment may be so entrenched that coping strategies alone are insufficient to mitigate the negative effects.

When these findings are viewed through the lens of the minority stress model, it becomes clear that cultural microaggressions, as a form of minority stress, exert a pervasive influence on the workplace experiences of employees. The minority stress model postulates that marginalized groups are exposed to unique stressors, such as microaggressions, which can result in negative health and well-being outcomes (Meyer,
Although coping strategies are essential for managing these stressors, their effectiveness may be limited when the stressors are profoundly embedded in the organizational culture. This may explain why coping strategies were effective at reducing job-related stress, but not engagement or commitment.

In addition to the minority stress paradigm, the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory provides an alternative viewpoint. According to the COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), individuals endeavor to retain, protect, and increase their resources, and the potential or actual loss of these resources can result in stress. Cultural microaggressions can be regarded as experiences that deplete the cognitive and emotional resources of employees. While coping strategies can help replenish or preserve some of these resources, they may not be enough to offset the resource loss caused by persistent microaggressions, particularly in areas such as engagement and commitment.

**Demographics Discussion**

The ultimate objective of our study was to determine how cultural microaggressions, as defined by Sue et al. (2007) as "brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities," influence workplace outcomes such as employee engagement, job commitment, and job stress. We evaluated the moderating effects of organizational inclusiveness and employee coping strategies. Mor Barak (2008) emphasized that organizational inclusion, which values and promotes diversity, can result in positive workplace outcomes by reducing the negative effects of microaggressions. Surprisingly, in our model, the only significant moderating relationship was between employee coping strategies and the effects of cultural microaggressions on job stress. One of the reasons for our surprise was that organizational inclusivity was a significant
predictor for all dependent variables, indicating its high importance in determining organizational outcomes. However, according to Offermann et al. (2014), inclusive environments may not be able to rectify the negative effects of microaggressions once they have occurred. This led us to conclude that addressing the aftermath of cultural microaggressions may be more important than preventing them. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) emphasized the significance of adaptive coping strategies in mitigating these negative consequences. As supported by Chen et al. (2009), despite the fact that coping skills did not substantially affect employee engagement and job commitment in our study, they played a crucial role in managing job stress levels after microaggressions. In essence, once an employee has experienced cultural microaggressions, only improving their coping skills is likely to have an effect on their job stress levels, as the harm has already been done. This does not negate the preventative significance of organizational inclusivity, but it does emphasize the need for effective post-event coping mechanisms.

Moving to a new country during childhood or adolescence suggests enhanced adaptability and malleability (Berry et al., 2006). However, it also indicates a period of vulnerability in which identity formation, social integration, and a sense of belonging are of utmost importance (Phinney, 1990). Immersion in an unfamiliar cultural milieu at such a young age can impede assimilation, acculturation, and the development of a sense of personal identity (Berry, 1997). In this context, cultural microaggressions, which are subtle verbal or behavioral indignities anchored in racial or cultural stereotypes, can profoundly affect an individual's evolving self-perception, self-worth, and psychological health (Sue et al., 2007).
Given the comparatively young age at which a substantial proportion of the participants immigrated to the United States, it is reasonable to assume that many encountered a complex matrix of cultural differences during a life stage characterized by the search for acceptance and self-identity (Erikson, 1968). This juncture may have amplified the effects of any cultural microaggressions they experienced. Such experiences may have more profound effects on their self-image, confidence, and feelings of belonging, which may have long-lasting consequences for their mental and emotional health (Torres et al., 2010).

Younger immigrants, particularly those under the age of 18, may not have the same coping strategies or knowledge of their rights as older immigrants, making them more susceptible to the negative effects of microaggressions (Kiang et al., 2006). Their search for identity in the context of cultural microaggressions can result in significant cognitive and affective difficulties (Sue et al., 2007).

In light of these findings, it is crucial to approach the analysis of cultural microaggressions with an awareness of the heightened vulnerabilities and potential long-term consequences faced by this younger demographic (Gomez et al., 2011). This information highlights the significance of fostering supportive environments and the need for interventions tailored to the unique challenges young immigrants face in the context of cultural nuances and microaggressions (Tummala-Narra et al., 2012).

**Theoretical Implications**

The findings of this study contribute to our comprehension of the relationship between cultural microaggressions (CMA) and a variety of job outcomes in multinational corporations. Specifically, the results indicate that only job stress was substantially
correlated with cultural microaggressions in multinational settings. Particularly, in multinational companies, the consequences of stress brought on by cultural microaggressions can be extensive and harmful (Leana & Barry, 2000). According to Leana and Barry, resultant impacts may include lower morale, greater absenteeism, decreased productivity, increased tension between workers from various backgrounds, and lack of respect and trust, which may lead to less collaboration and teamwork, as well as less innovation and originality. Left unresolved, job stress can result in a decline in the performance and productivity of the entire organization (Kelloway et al., 2000).

This study adds nuance to the Minority Stress Model (Brooks, 1981; Meyer, 2003), which posits that minority groups frequently experience worse health outcomes and higher suicide rates due to frequent exposure to discrimination and prejudice (Meyer, 2003). The results indicate that CMA is positively associated with job stress, indicating that employees who experience microaggressions have elevated levels of job stress. This is consistent with the model's assertion that marginalized groups experience increased stress due to discrimination and prejudice (Clark et al., 1999). In the context of the workplace, this manifests as an increase in microaggressions that result in negative employment outcomes.

Contrary to expectations, the study found that organizational inclusivity did not moderate the effects of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement, job stress, or job commitment. This suggests that, despite the importance of inclusivity, it may not be a panacea for the challenges posed by cultural microaggressions in multinational settings (Mor Barak, 2017).
In addition, the study investigated the moderating effect of coping strategies on the relationship between cultural microaggressions and job outcomes. While coping strategies reduced the impact of cultural microaggressions on job stress, they did not substantially affect the relationships between employee engagement and job commitment, according to the findings. This suggests that, although coping strategies can provide some relief from the challenges posed by microaggressions, their effectiveness may be limited to certain outcomes such as job stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

In essence, the findings have enriched the Minority Stress Model which solely focused on clinical and physiological attributes of stress, by highlighting the intricate relationships between cultural microaggressions, organizational inclusivity, coping strategies, and job outcomes in a corporate, multinational business setting. While cultural microaggressions contribute to increased job stress, the moderating effects of organizational inclusivity and coping strategies appear to be limited, highlighting the need for a more comprehensive business strategy to address the challenges posed by cultural microaggressions in multinational workplaces.

**Managerial Implications**

Organizations, particularly multinational corporations, must be keenly aware of the pervasiveness of cultural microaggressions and the profound effects they have on employees. Considering that our study discovered a significant correlation between cultural microaggressions and job stress (Anzani, 2019), it is imperative to resolve the relationship between the two. Despite the undeniable value of organizational inclusivity, the findings of this study suggest that mere inclusivity may not be sufficient to counteract the negative effects of cultural microaggressions. Organizations should consider
instituting comprehensive training programs, awareness campaigns, and feedback mechanisms to effectively address the root causes of microaggressions (Resnick & Galupo, 2019).

Moreover, the significance of providing employees with the necessary tools and resources to develop and refine their coping mechanisms is highlighted by the role of coping strategies in reducing occupational stress (Robinson-Perez et al., 2020). The challenges presented by cultural microaggressions can be navigated with the assistance of workshops, counseling services, and peer support groups, which organizations can offer proactively to their employees. Our findings are consistent with those of Lazarus and Folkman (1984), who emphasized the importance of adaptive coping strategies in mitigating the deleterious effects of various stressors, including microaggressions, in the workplace.

However, there is an important consideration that must be taken into account when training individuals to contend with victimization alone. By emphasizing coping, organizations run the risk of inadvertently shifting responsibility to the victims, implying that it is their responsibility to manage the effects of microaggressions. This approach is problematic because it does not address the underlying cause of the problem. A more effective and ethical approach, according to Mor Barak (2008), would be to focus on refining organizational policies and enhancing workplace culture in order to prevent cultural microaggressions from occurring in the first place.

It is vital to recognize the additional advantages of training in coping strategies. Inadvertently, such training can improve the emotional intelligence of potential offenders in addition to assisting victims. Emotional intelligence, which includes self-awareness,
self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills, can be developed and honed, according to Goleman (1995). By training individuals in coping strategies, organizations may inadvertently increase the emotional intelligence of individuals who commit cultural microaggressions, thereby heightening their awareness of their own actions and the consequent impact on others. In essence, a multifaceted approach that incorporates organizational inclusivity, coping strategies, and emotional intelligence training can provide a comprehensive solution to the problems posed by cultural microaggressions in multinational corporations.

Limitations and Future Research

The current study adopted the Minority Stress Model as its theoretical framework which was based on a clinical research setting. Further expanding the theoretical framework to also include the Intersectional Microaggressions Theory (Crenshaw, 1989) could provide greater insights into the relationship between cultural microaggressions, job stress, job commitment, and employee engagement when the employee identifies with multiple cultural affiliations. As explained by Harnois (2014), Intersectional Microaggressions occur when people from various oppressed groups who are subjected to many forms of oppression at the same time encounter intersectional microaggressions, a type of discrimination. According to this hypothesis, individuals who belong to several marginalized groups encounter a special kind of prejudice that is not encountered by persons belonging to just one group. Future research could address the impact of cultural microaggressions on employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment as moderated by coping strategies when employees of multinational organizations identify with more than one culture.
The current study could be further extended to examine if there is any correlation between acculturation and resilience in foreign-born employees working for multinational organizations when it comes to cultural microaggressions and the resulting impact on job outcomes such as employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment. Acculturation is the process by which people of ethnocultural groups change after coming into touch with other cultures and integrate into the larger community in which they live (Lopez-Class et al., 2011). The current study can be further extended by taking a stronger look into the drivers of resiliency in foreign-born workers when cultural microaggressions are experienced and their ability to successfully overcome the stress associated with them. Acculturation research is beneficial because it can shed light on how people adapt to new cultures and how different cultures interact. Additionally, it can be useful in spotting future points of contention and offering solutions. Research on acculturation can also be used to inform strategies and policies that support the successful integration of foreign-born employees into any host society. Resilience offers protection against a number of detrimental psychological effects, including PTSD (Kukihara et al., 2014) and depression (Pietrzak et al., 2009). Resilience has been linked favorably to mental health and quality of life (Migerode et al., 2012), (Cheng et al., 2012) and it has been demonstrated to aid in the recovery of disaster survivors. Resilience is often understood as one's ability to overcome stress or adversity, or the achievement of a reasonably positive outcome despite severe or adverse experiences. Resilience also typically includes a cluster of personality traits, such as grit, survivorship, determination, and unbrokenness along with personal growth when overcoming particularly oppressive experiences or people (Alim et al., 2008).
More studies should be conducted to examine the relationship between cultural microaggressions and employee engagement, job stress, and job commitment, specifically focusing on the biological age of the foreign-born employee when they first moved to the United States and commenced their career for multinational companies headquartered in the USA.

An example of this would be to compare a foreign-born employee who moves to the USA at the age of three and begins working for a multinational firm at the age of 22 against a foreign-born employee who, at the age of 22, moves to the USA and begins working for a multinational firm. The experiences and what we learn from the study, when looking at the age of when the employee comes to the USA and when they were indoctrinated and started working, should reveal stark differences. The severity and magnitude of cultural microaggressions found in such a study may reveal different insights based on the biological age of foreign-born workers at the time of their migration to the United States.

The current study findings only apply to specific multinational workplaces in the United States and may not be applied or generalized to workplaces of local companies in the United States. This limitation prompts that more studies should be conducted in organizations with local and multinational status levels.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

The increasingly global character of today's corporate world has resulted in the emergence of a plethora of opportunities as well as obstacles. The prevalence of cultural microaggressions is one of the most significant difficulties that international enterprises are currently confronted with. These subtle and often inadvertent discriminatory words or behaviors can have enormous repercussions on employees, influencing their engagement, stress levels, and dedication to the firm, all of which can negatively impact a multinational company’s revenue, profitability, brand image, and shareholder earnings.

This dissertation took a comprehensive look at the phenomenon of cultural microaggressions in international firms, with the goal of comprehending both the impact these incidents have and the coping mechanisms that employees use. According to the findings of this study, cultural microaggressions—which are caused by biases regarding disparities in accent, dialect, and cultural backgrounds—might result in considerable adverse results. These include unhappiness, disengagement, absenteeism, and turnover among employees, all of which can result in significant revenue and profit losses for firms operating on a worldwide scale.

The findings highlighted how important it is for businesses to be welcoming to people of all backgrounds. Companies that cultivate an inclusive workplace, where policies hold employees accountable for their behavior and promote inclusivity, have a better chance of reducing the incidence of cultural microaggressions as well as the negative impact they may cause. In addition, the research provided insight on the many coping methods that employees use to overcome the negative impacts of cultural microaggressions. It is essential for businesses to have a solid understanding of these
techniques in order to provide their employees with appropriate support and to cultivate a pleasant working environment.

It is of the utmost importance for businesses that operate on a global scale to address the problem of cultural microaggressions in a proactive manner because the diversity of the workplace is growing. Organizations can create a more inclusive and supportive work environment by first gaining an awareness of the influence they have and the coping mechanisms that employees use. Not only does this benefit the workers, but it also contributes to the general performance and reputation of the company.

In conclusion, as the business world continues to develop and diversify, the responsibility of ensuring that multinational organizations are prepared to meet the problems that come along with it falls squarely on the shoulders of those firms. Crucial steps to take on this journey include addressing cultural microaggressions, encouraging inclusivity, and helping employees in the development of effective coping methods.
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Appendix A: Measurements

Scale #1: Cultural Microaggressions

When thinking about your job experiences at work during the last 12 months, use the following 6-point scale to answer each question.

1 = none of the time, 2 = a little bit of the time, 3 = some of the time, 4 = a good bit of the time, 5 = most of the time, 6 = all of the time

1. Someone at work assumed that I did not speak English very well.
2. Someone at work made negative assumptions about my culture.
3. At work, I received substandard treatment compared to US-born American co-workers.
4. Someone at work assumed that my work would be inferior to US-born Americans.
5. Someone at work told me that I was “articulate” in how I speak after they assumed I wouldn’t be.
6. I was told by someone at work that non-US-born people do not experience prejudice anymore.
7. Someone at work assumed that I ate foods associated with my culture every day.
8. An employer or co-worker at work treated me differently than US-born American co-workers.
9. At work, I altered and/or accepted a different pronunciation of my birth name to a more common American name due to my American colleagues at work expressing difficulty pronouncing my name and/or because they just started calling me an “American” name.
10. Someone at work said “in this country…” when attempting to explain or correct me about something I said or did.

Scale #2: Organizational inclusion behaviors

Answer the following questions based upon this 6-point scale:

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Don’t know/can’t say, 4 = Agree, 5 = mostly agree and 6 = strongly agree

a) Commitment from top leadership to foster inclusion: In my organization, senior management:

1. Is committed to hiring a workforce that is representative of all segments of society.
2. Tries to create an awareness and appreciation of individual and cultural differences among employees.
3. Helps employees understand their own feelings and attitudes about people who are different than themselves.

b) Ability to influence organizational decisions: My supervisor . . .

4. Involves me in decisions about my job.
5. Creates a synergistic approach to problem-solving and decision-making.
6. Seeks my input before making important organizational decisions.

c) Fairness/equitable treatment: My supervisor . . .
7. Assigns tasks based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities possessed by individual employees.
8. Takes action when employees show disrespect for each other.
9. Has fairly rewarded me for the work well done.

Scale #3: The Brief-COPE scale:

Instructions: The following questions ask how you have sought to cope with hardship in your life. Read the statements and indicate how much you have been using each coping style.

1 = I haven’t been doing this at all, 2 = A little bit, 3 = A medium amount, 4 = I’ve been doing this a lot, 5 = I do this most of the time, 6 = I do this all the time

1. I’ve been turning to work or other activities to take my mind off things.
2. I’ve been concentrating my efforts on doing something about the situation I’m in.
3. I’ve been saying to myself “this isn’t real”.
4. I’ve been using alcohol or other drugs to make myself feel better.
5. I’ve been getting emotional support from others.
6. I’ve been giving up trying to deal with it.
7. I’ve been taking action to make the situation better.
8. I’ve been refusing to believe that this has happened.
9. I’ve been saying things to let my unpleasant feelings escape.
10. I’ve been getting help and advice from other people.
11. I’ve been using alcohol and drugs to get through it.
12. I’ve been trying to see it in a different light to make it seem more positive.
13. I’ve been criticizing myself.
14. I’ve been trying to come up with a strategy about what to do.
15. I’ve been getting comfort and understanding from someone.
16. I’ve been giving up the attempt to cope.
17. I’ve been looking for something good in what is happening.
18. I’ve been making jokes about it.
19. I’ve been doing something to think about it less, such as going to movies, watching TV, reading, daydreaming, sleeping, or shopping.
20. I’ve been accepting the reality of the fact that it has happened.
21. I’ve been expressing my negative feelings.
22. I’ve been trying to find comfort in my religion or spiritual beliefs.
23. I’ve been trying to get advice or help from other people about what to do.
24. I’ve been learning to live with it.
25. I’ve been thinking hard about what steps to take.
26. I’ve been blaming myself for things that happened.
27. I’ve been praying or meditating.
28. I’ve been making fun of the situation.

Scale #4: Employee Engagement:

Use the following 6-point scale to answer each question. 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Don’t know/can’t say, 4 = Agree, 5 = mostly agree and 6 = strongly agree.

1. I am really focused on my job when I’m working.
2. Working at my current organization has a great deal of meaning for me.
3. I really push myself to work beyond what’s expected of me.
4. I work harder than expected to help my company be successful.
5. When working, I think a lot about how I can give my best.
6. I am proud to tell others that I work for my current organization.
7. I often go above what is expected of me to help my team be successful.

Scale #5: Job Stress:

Based on your current organization and work environment, please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements below.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Don’t know/can’t say, 4 = Agree, 5 = mostly agree and 6 = strongly agree

1. I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.
2. Working here makes it hard to spend enough time with my family.
3. My job gets to me more than it should.
4. I spend so much time at work, I can't see the forest for the trees.
5. There are lots of times when my job drives me right up the wall.
6. I feel like I never have a day off.
7. Too many people at my level in the company get burnt out by job demands.

Scale #6: Job Commitment:

With respect to your feelings about your organization, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with the below statements.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Don’t know/can’t say, 4 = Agree, 5 = mostly agree and 6 = strongly agree

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.
3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
4. I think that I could easily become attached to another organization as I am to this one.
5. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.
6. I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.