Perceived Ethnic Discrimination: Impact On Role Performance Of Employees In Pakistan

Saadat Ullah*[1] , Dr. Rubina Hanif[2]

Abstract

Background: *The workplace gives you a unique opportunity for identity expression and to work collectively with others in numerous cooperative and competitive situations. Similarly, the workplace gives opportunity to practice ethnic stereotyping, discrimination, and prejudice. Pakistan is consisting of multiple ethnic groups and majority of the group members identify themselves with their ethnic groups.*

Aim*: To investigate the ethnic identity and ethnic discrimination in organizational settings in Pakistan.*

Method*: Convenient sampling techniques was used to collect the data. Sample of the study was 133 university and colleges employees in Islamabad. Data was collected through Ethnic Identity Scale and Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire.*

Outcomes*: A significant amount of ethnic perceived discrimination was found between two groups (Punjabi and Pakhtun). Pakhtun perceived ethnic discrimination from their counterparts belong to Punjabi ethnic group.*

Conclusion: *The study found trends but not significant, that ethnic discrimination at workplace impact the performance of the employees belongs to these groups.*

Keywords*. Discrimination, Employees, Ethnic, Pakhtun, Pakistan, Punjabi, Role Performance.*

Introduction

Pakistan is consisting multiple ethnic identities such as Punjabi, Baloch, Pashtun (Pathan, Pakhtun), Sindi, Saraiki, Muhajir and others (CIA, 2017). Socio-[1]cultural, linguistic and ethnic issues are sensitive, which exist in the society and state. The stereotyping, discrimination and conflicting situation is noticeable between groups at times (Naz, 2017). Ethnic diversity management is quite big deal in Pakistan. These types of behavior affect the workplace where those people work in a co-ethnic environment. Pakistan became the 1st post-colonial country in

---

[1]National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
[2]National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
*Corresponding Author: National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

1971 that went through a secessionist's successful movement because of Bangladesh partition. Subsequently, Post-1971 Pakistan has suffered Bloch revolutions (1973-77, 2002-to date); Pashtun independence (1970s); Sindi decentralization (1980s); and Mohajir's active mobilization based on ethnic group identification (1990s) (Mushtaq, 2009). In many ways, ethnic group conflicts in Pakistan, has endangered the political system and destabilized foundation of the state. The ethnic difference demanded the state and society a lot is to bring equality and evenness (Majeed, 2010).

The degree to which a person identifies with an ethnicity indicates person's sense of belonging to the ethnic group. Thus, the part of one's perception, behavior, thinking and feelings that is due to the ethnic group membership. The social identity theory has emphasized on ethnic and group identity by social psychologists (Tajfel & Turner, 2004; Arshad et al., 2023). This theory explains that ethnic identity is an aspect of one's social identity, defined by Tajfel (1981) as "part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his/her knowledge of his/her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership". Furthermore, ethnic group is one in which the people claim their heritage (Phinney, 1996). It is not that simple for one to leave their ethnic identity at home but comes with the societal faces of ethnic bias to the workplace. You should argue that ethnicity influence the workplace more than any other setting. The workplace gives you a unique opportunity for identity expression and to work collectively with others in numerous cooperative and competitive situations. Similarly, the workplace gives opportunity to practice ethnic stereotyping, discrimination and prejudice (Plaut, Thomas, & Hebl, 2014).

This unevenness is what we call discrimination; is defined as uneven treatment to people because of their group belonging (Allport, Clark, & Pettigrew, 1954). When it is about workplace, discrimination occurs when individuals belong to a stigmatized group "are put at a disadvantage in the workplace relative to other groups with comparable potential or proven success" (Jones, Peddie, Gilrane, King, & Gray, 2016). Research provided evidence that perceived ethnic group discrimination is linked to many undesirable outcomes for organizations and employees (Dipboye & Colella, 2005). Previously, studies found that interpersonal and ethnicity biased discrimination has devastating impact on individuals' performance (Singletary & Hebl, 2009; Salvatore & Shelton, 2007). Numerous researches have considered, how perceived ethnic group discrimination might dent mental health (Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009; Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003). For example, study by Mendoza-Denton, Purdie, Downey, and Davis (2002) notified that rejection sensitivity (expectancy of minority status-based discrimination) can have detrimental effects on ethnic group students' well-being. Furthermore, studies found that perception of ethnic group discrimination is related with high levels of symptoms of depression among Latin and Black individuals (Pieterse, Todd, Neville, & Carter, 2012).

Ethnic identity is salient and matters in the workplace where people spend a significant amount of time. This particular problem brings the workplace into the field of ethnic and racial minority studies in Psychology. Workplace is comparatively neglected area: that of individuals experiencing discrimination belong to historically stigmatized ethnic and racial groups (Plaut, Thomas, & Hebl, 2014). Previously, literature has specified some evidence on ethnic discrimination within organization (Brittian, Kim, Armenta, Lee, Umaña-Taylor, Schwartz, &

Castillo, 2015) and it is evident that an organization is not static in mental functioning while containing members of different ethnic groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1985). There is an extensive work on ethnic identity, perceived discrimination based on ethnicity in workplace. Most of the studies, almost all are western studies. There is lack of studies in the field of psychology who studied such variables and its correlation among employees in Pakistan.

Aim of Study

This study aims to investigate the ethnic identity and ethnic discrimination in organizational settings in Pakistan. The study focused to measure these constructs to see which ethnic groups are experiencing discrimination in the offices and organization in Pakistan.

Materials and Methods

Participants

The sample is consisting of N = 140, 88(63%) were men and 47(33%) were women with ethnic identity as Sindi, Baloch, Punjabi, Siraiki, Hindko, Kashmiri and Pakhtun. The data was collected from the employees of Public and private sector Organizations/Offices, where individuals from different ethnic identities were working. Participants were included from Islamabad based Universities. The sample is consisting of only administrative staff, supporting staff and teaching staff. Hence, the study followed a convenient sampling method.

Measure

Ethnic identity was measured using the 17- item Ethnic Identity Scale (Umana-Taylor et al., 2004). Participants rated each item on a scale ranging from 1 = does not describe me at all to 4 = describes me very well. Cronbach's alphas across the three scales ranged from .83 to .90 for Black and Latinos.

Perceived ethnic group discrimination was assessed through Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire-Civilian Version (PEDQ-CV) (22-items) version (Brondolo, Kelly, Coakley, Gordon, Thompson, Levy, & Contrada, 2005). The alpha levels are (Blacks, α = .87; Latinos, α = .88). Internal consistency, construct validity, convergent validity of the brief version and its subscales were adequate. Each item on a scale rating from 1 to 7 (never, sometimes, very often) on the line provided in front of each item, indicate how often the event occurred. The scale was modified for the Pakistani population and Psychometric properties were measured. The alpha level was .90 in this study.

Procedure

The study is not containing any personal identity information of the participants. The study got approved from the ethics review board of the university before administering the survey. The board reviewed the ethical principles of the proposed study in comparison with those of American Psychological Association. Informed consents were obtained from the participants. The researcher briefed and communicated with every participant individually to reduce any confusion related to study and measures.

Analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences 25.0; Windows version (IBM, 2016 b) was run to draw the essential statistical analysis. After minor modification of PEGDQ, the internal consistencies of the instrument was computed through Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient and item-total correlation. Two group's differences such as demographic characteristics were checked through t-test and multiple group's differences were checked through ANOVA (Posthoc) tests. To gain clearer picture, post hoc analysis was also carried to determine which of the group was significantly different from each other. Games-Howell post-hoc test was used. Along this, Cohen's d was calculated to see the effect size of comparisons. Conferring to commonly believed criteria, $d \geq 0.80$ considers as a large effect size, $d = 0.50$ is a medium effect size, and $d \leq 0.20$ is a small effect size (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2013).

Results

Characteristics of the individuals (N = 140) participated in the study. Among them 84(63%) were men and 44(33%) were women while 5 individuals did not report their gender. While on ethnic identity, 82(62%) were Punjabi, 27(20%) Pakhtun, 3(2%) sindi, 8(6%) Hindko, 5(4%) Kashmiri and 4(3%) were of Siraiki ethnic group. The study sample categorized on age-based categories where 21-30 years of age were 39(29%), 31-40 years were 57(43%), 41-50 years were 19(14%) and 51-60 years of age participants number was 7(5%) while 11(8%) of them did not report their age. Marital status revealed that 86(65%) are married and 44(33%) are single individuals.

The study purposively modified the instruments to make it understandable and relevant according to the Pakistani ethnic groups. After minor modification of the instruments, the internal consistencies of both instruments were computed through Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients and item-total correlation. These reliability estimates for both scales given in the Table 2; along mean, standard deviation, range, skewness and kurtosis to explore normal distribution of data. Table 2 shows, alpha .73 for Ethnic Identity Scale and .90 for Perceived Ethnic group Discrimination Questionnaire. Reliability coefficients show acceptable to good reliabilities for both measures. According to Andy Field (2013) for psychological constructs reliability below .70 is also acceptable.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Psychometric Properties of the scale and its sub-scales (N=140)

Scales	No. of items	α	Raw scores M (S.D)	Range Potential	Actual	Skew	Kurt
EIS	17	.73	51.23(6.97)	17-68	37-68	.23	-.80
PEGD	22	.90	50.83(19.28)	22-154	22-117	.57	.074
Excl/Rejec	8	.76	18.86(7.44)	8-56	8-44	.67	.34
Stig/Deval	6	.75	14.59(6.45)	6-42	6-35	.66	-.022
Dicr/Work	4	.67	9.35 (4.26)	4-28	4-21	.38	-.73
Threat/Agg	4	.88	8.02 (4.88)	4-28	4-25	1.27	1.12

Note. EIS= Ethnic Identity Scale; PEGD = Perceived Ethnic Group Discrimination; Excl/Rejec

= Exclusion/Rejection; Stig/Deval = Stigmatization/Devaluation; Discr/Work = Discrimination at Work; Threat/Agg = Threat/Aggression.

Difference between Rural and Urban Resident Employees on Study Variables

Mean differences in the Table 2 revealed that residency has shown significant role with Perceived Ethnic Group Discrimination, Role Based Performance, Resolution, Exclusion/Rejection and Threat/Aggression.

Table 2 Mean, Standard Deviation and t-values for participants residing in rural and urban areas along study variables (N=140).

Variables	Rural (n= 89)		Urban (n=41)				95% CI		
	M	SD	M	SD	t(df)	p	LL	UL	Cohen's d
EIS	50.73	6.83	52.80	7.10	-1.58(128)	.11	-4.65	.50	.29
PEGD	53.28	19.73	45.22	17.67	2.23(128)	.02	.92	15.20	.43
WIS	13.92	3.94	14.49	5.42	-.67(128)	.50	-2.23	1.10	.12
RBP	79.63	14.58	86.24	12.23	-2.52(128)	.01	-11.80	-1.42	.49
MH	48.12	8.68	49.85	7.19	-1.11(128)	.26	-4.80	1.34	.21
Explo	18.13	4.29	17.90	4.34	.28(77.03)	.77	-1.39	1.85	.05
Resol	13.39	2.94	14.59	2.53	-2.23(128)	.02	-2.24	-.13	.43
Affir	19.20	2.94	20.32	3.65	-1.85(128)	.06	-2.30	.07	.33
Excl/Rejec	20.20	7.68	15.98	6.22	3.08(128)	.00	1.51	6.93	.60
Stig/Deval	14.92	6.33	13.68	6.85	1.01(128)	.31	-1.18	3.66	.18
Discr/Work	9.57	4.27	8.80	4.31	.94(128)	.34	-.83	2.36	.17
Threat/Agg	8.58	4.93	6.76	4.65	1.99(128)	.04	.01	3.64	.37

Note. EIS= Ethnic Identity Scale; PEGD = Perceived Ethnic Group Discrimination; WIS = Workplace Incivility Scale; RBP= Role Based Performance; MH= Mental Health; Explo=Exploration; Resol = Resolution; Affir = Affirmation; Excl/Rejec = Exclusion/Rejection; Stig/Deval = Stigmatization/Devaluation; Discr/Work = Discrimination at Work; Threat/Agg = Threat/Aggression.

Mean differences indicate that employees with rural background have perceived substantially greater amount of discrimination overall and in two sub-types of discrimination (Exclusion/Rejection, Threat/Aggression) at their workplace with a huge effect size of .18-.60 as evident in Table 2. Residents of urban areas employed in the different organizations and offices scored significantly higher on Role Based Performance and Resolution, subscale of Ethnic Identity scales. Mean difference is shown in table 2 with an effect size of .49for Role Based Performance Scale and .43 for Resolution of Ethnic Identity. This implies that employees in the offices and organizations with urban background have significantly higher performance and ethnic identity resolution as

compare to residents of rural background.

      The mean difference for various ethnic groups on discrimination were carried out. The ethnicities were Punjabi, Pashtun, Sindi, Hindko, Kashmiri, and Saraiki, showed statistically significant differences on Perceived Ethnic Group Discrimination total scores and its three subscales (Exclusion/Rejection, Stigmatization/devaluation, discrimination at work), across six groups.

Table 3 Difference across Ethnicities on Study Variables (N=140).

Variables	Punjabi (n=82)		Pakhtun (n=27)		Sindi (n=3)		Hindko (n=8)		Kashmiri (n=5)		Saraiki (n=4)		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
PEGD	45.56	16.35	62.22	20.98	73.33	12.05	55.38	21.92	47.80	17.49	57.75	25.94	4.73	.00
Excl/Rejec	17.17	6.37	23.74	8.58	24.00	5.00	19.38	8.95	16.40	6.34	20.25	6.85	4.00	.00
Stig/Deval	12.55	5.30	18.96	6.67	21.33	4.04	16.88	8.77	12.80	3.83	17.00	9.12	6.12	.00
Discr/Work	8.43	4.05	11.56	3.83	14.67	5.50	9.88	4.12	8.67	3.57	11.00	5.71	3.63	.00
Threat/Agg	7.41	4.56	7.96	5.10	13.33	2.08	9.25	4.74	10.00	8.33	9.50	4.93	1.32	.26

Note. PEGD = Perceived Ethnic Group Discrimination; Excl/Rejec = Exclusion/Rejection; Stig/Deval = Stigmatization/Devaluation; Discr/Work = Discrimination at Work; Threat/Agg = Threat/Aggression.

Pair-wise comparison in Table has shown that on perceived discrimination Pakhtun ethnic group's participants have scored higher and participants from Punjabi ethnic group have reported lower perceived discrimination scores. It also reveals that sub-types; exclusion/rejection, stigmatization/devaluation and discrimination at work have been found significantly higher for participants from Pakhtun ethnic group and lower in participants from Punjabi ethnic group. These results (Table) indicated that across ethnicities they are perceiving different amount of ethnic group discrimination from their colleagues. Punjabi employees perceived PEGD (M= 45.56, SD= 16.35, *p<.01), Pakhun (M= 62.22, SD= 20.98, *p<.01), Sindi (M= 73.33, SD= 12.05, *p<.01), Hindko (M= 55.38, SD= 21.92, *p<.01), Kashmiri (M= 47.80, SD= 17.49, *p<.01) and Saraiki (M= 57.75, SD= 25.94, *p<.01) and this significant difference across these ethnic groups were also found at the subscales of PEGD except for Threat/Aggression.

Table 4 Post Hoc Comparisons of Ethnicities on Study Variables (N = 140)

Variables	(I)	(J)	(I-J)	p	LL	UL
PEGD	Punjabi	Pakhtun	-16.66*	.001	-28.25	-5.08
	Pakhtun	Punjabi	16.66*	.001	5.08	28.25
Excl/Rejec	Punjabi	Pakhtun	-6.57*	.001	-11.10	-2.04
	Pakhtun	Punjabi	6.57*	.001	2.04	11.10
Stig/Deval	Punjabi	Pakhtun	-6.41*	.000	-10.22	-2.61
	Pakhtun	Punjabi	6.41*	.000	2.61	10.22
Discr/Work	Punjabi	Pakhtun	-3.12*	.009	-5.75	-.51
	Pakhtun	Punjabi	3.12	.009	.51	5.75

Note. PEGD = Perceived Ethnic Group Discrimination; Excl/Rejec = Exclusion/Rejection; Stig/Deval = Stigmatization/Devaluation; Discr/Work = Discrimination at Work.

These findings submitted that ethnic minorities perceive significant amount of ethnic group discrimination from the majority ethnic group. The study results also found that the ethnic identity plays a significant role in ethnic group discrimination perception. Ethnicity was a demographic variable as well as the main variable when it comes to the subtypes of ethnic identification and level of ethnic identification. Participants from different ethnic groups such as Punjabi, Pakhtun, Sindi, Hindko, Kashmiri and Saraiki reported significantly different on total PEGD and its subscales.

Moreover, Posthoc comparison revealed that only participants from Pakhtun ethnic group reported significantly higher scores in comparison with Punjabi ethnic group on PEGD total and its three subscales Exclusion/Rejection, Stigmatization/Devaluation and Discrimination at work. A possible explanation could be that Pakhtun are from minority group and Punjabis are the majority ethnic group in Pakistan. The other minority ethnic groups (Sindi, Saraiki, Hindko, Kashmiri) shows non-significant difference with each other and Pakhtun, and Punjabi ethnic groups because their sample was not sufficient.

Predictors of Role Based Performance and Mental Health

To see the predictors of Role Based Performance (RBP) and Mental Health among university administrative staff hierarchical regression analysis was done. The hierarchical regression was conducted because the theory and previous literature suggested the predictors of RBP and Mental health (Yip, 2018). Hence, the analysis was done through the regression model to see the effect of predicting variables on outcome variables.

Table 5 Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Role Based Performance and Mental Health (N = 140)

| Variables | Role Based Performance | | | | | |
| | | | 95% CI | | | |
	β	P	LL	UL	R2	F
Explo	.04	.60	-.43	.73		
Resol	.26**	.007	.35	2.22	.17	3.22**
Affir	.13	.17	-.25	1.41		
Excl/Rejec	.04	.76	-.46	.62		
Stig/Deval	-.10	.49	-.89	.43		
Discr/Work	.01	.92	-.83	.91		
Threat/Agg	-.07	.42	-.74	.31		
WIS	-.16	.06	-1.09	.02		
MH	.62***	.000	.84	1.31	.39	83.75***

Continued…

| Variables | Mental Health | | | | | |
| | | | 95% CI | | | |
	β	p	LL	UL	R2	F
Explo	.01	.88	-.31	.36		
Resol	.15	.09	-.08	.99		
Affir	.07	.46	-.30	.66		
Excl/Rejec	.10	.47	-.20	.43		
Stig/Deval	-.20	.19	-.63	.13		
Discr/Work	.08	.54	-.35	.66		
Threat/Agg	-.07	.40	-.43	.17		
WIS	-.33***	.000	-.93	-.29	.17	3.35**

Note. WIS = Workplace Incivility Scale; Explo=Exploration; Resol = Resolution; Affir = Affirmation; Excl/Rejec = Exclusion/Rejection; Stig/Deval = Stigmatization/Devaluation; Discr/Work = Discrimination at Work; Threat/Agg = Threat/Aggression.
*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p <.001

Table 5 revealed that for Resolution is the main predictor of Role Based performance explaining 17% of variance. It is positively predicting RBP that is with increase in resolution role-based performance will also be enhanced. On the other hand, WIS has been found to be the significant predictor of Mental Health among the other repressors. It has explained 17% of variance. It is negatively predicting Mental Health that is with increase in WIS mental health will decrease.

Discussion

The aim of the study was to investigate the ethnic identity and ethnic discrimination in organizational settings in Pakistan. Workplace is an important area of research, which gives opportunity to practice ethnic stereotyping, discrimination, and prejudice. Pakistan is consisting of multiple ethnic groups and majority of the group members identify themselves with their ethnic groups. There is lack of studies in the field of psychology who studied such variables and its correlation among employees in Pakistan.

Reliable measures were used to identify the relationship between propose variables of the study (Table 1). The results shows that there were statistically significant differences on Perceived Ethnic Group Discrimination total scores and its three subscales (Exclusion/Rejection, Stigmatization/devaluation, discrimination at work) across Punjabi, Pakhtun, Sindi, Hindko, Kashmiri and Siraiki (Table 3). This finding is supported by previous studies such as Plaut, Thomas, and Hebl (2014) prosper that workplace gives opportunity to practice ethnic stereotyping, discrimination and prejudice and our study find out the Perceived Ethnic Group Discrimination at workplace too. This finding is in line with previous researches such as Brittian et al. (2015). Further, study results also found that the ethnic identity plays a significant role in ethnic group discrimination perception, which is also supported by Plaut, Thomas and Hebl (2014).

Employees with rural background have perceived substantially greater amount of discrimination overall and in two sub-types of discrimination (Exclusion/Rejection, Threat/Aggression) at their workplace with a huge effect size of .18-.60. Residents of urban areas employed in the different organizations and offices scored significantly higher on Role Based Performance and Resolution (subtype) of Ethnic Identity construct. This implies that employees in the offices and organizations with urban background have significantly higher performance and ethnic identity resolution as compare to residents of rural background.

We find out that workplace ethnic diversity exists, and members of the different ethnic group significantly discriminate their counterparts. The study found that Pakhtoon and Punjabi ethnic groups potentially discriminate each other at workplace though the study could not provide enough evidence to find out discrimination among other ethnic groups (Sindi, Baloch,

Siraiki, Kashmiri, Hinko, gilgiti, muhajir) because their sample was not enough to evaluate the discrimination factor with other ethnic groups at workplace (Table 5). The study found trends but not significant, that ethnic discrimination at workplace impact the performance of the employees belongs to these groups (Table 5).

Lee et al. (2021), reported the discrimination among the variable ethnic group based on the different discrimination and prejudice factor. Haar (2023), reported that fundamental prejudice and discrimination usually among the different ethnic groups rely on the variable factors of subjectivity and perception of the group toward their intra-relationships. Moreover, Sarwar and Muhammad (2022), reported that gaps between the variable ethnic groups usually founders upon the different fundamental perspectives of life especially their cultural diversity and diversification in their cognitive abilities. Hence, Jeong and Kim (2022), suggested that in a workplace heterogeneous environment where multiple groups of individuals working together under a similar umbrella perform a different digitized functioning. Study indicated, it affected the potential workplace conjugation and productive communication that lead to the effective and highly negative performance of prejudice resulting in workplace incivility.

Results from the present study indicated that role-based performance positively produces to revolutionary performance in increased in the workplace environment. Whereas it also indicated that workplace in similarity negatively projects the mental health of the respondent in working in different workplaces. Salami et al. (2021), reported that the highly fundamental and most appropriate difference of discrimination and prejudice regarding workplace incivility and roll base performance difference among the Pashtun and Punjabi usually depended upon the historical perspective of contention between these two ethnic groups. Hsiao et al. (2020), reported that families are highly restricted toward their ideology and firm beliefs toward family, religion, culture, and life-related other factors. Derous et al. (2021), also stated a similar perspective about the difference in the variable ethnic groups. Bilotta et al. (2021), also report it similar perspective related to the discrimination among the different races and generation based on the generation gap along with their cultural perspective to deal with the variable construct of human life. Moreover, Lin et al. (2021), also indicated that the potential in the working environment usually depends upon the different cooperation and collaborative strategies. Races is not only focused on the obligation of variable construct through the operationalization of different materials eliminating the bone of contention between the different culture and eternity groups.

Results from the study indicated that ethnic identity and discrimination in the organization setting reported in Pakistan is based on the perspective of a second-world country. This also founders upon the identification of a potential remarkable understanding of human life and perspective to deal with the variable problematic situations that are the product of the racist mind. Therefore, there is a need for appropriate intervention in Pakistani culture and a need to develop the homogeneity among the variable ethnic group so

Implication

Bringing the ethnic issue in consideration of workplace laws and diverse cultural settings harmony. The study encourages policy makers to be aware that members of Pakhtun and Punjabi groups are targeted by discrimination and to consider appropriate interventions at both the individual and organizational levels.

Limitations

This research was limited to government colleges and Universities of Islamabad, which may weaker the value of representative sample, because a great number of employees work at different firms, offices, organizations, and companies. Current study did not include general population and limited sample from different ethnicities. In addition, the study sample does not include a significant number of Sindi, Baloch, Siraiki, Kashmiri, Hinko, gilgiti and muhajir ethnic groups that result in non-significant differences.

Conclusion

Pakistan is consisting multiple ethnic identities such as Punjabi, Baloch, Pashtun (Pathan, Pakhtun), Sindi, Saraiki, Muhajir and others. Socio-cultural, linguistic, and ethnic issues are sensitive, which exist in the society and state. The stereotyping, discrimination and conflicting situation is noticeable between groups at times. Ethnic diversity management is quite big deal in Pakistan. These types of behavior affect the workplace where those people work in a co-ethnic environment. The current study is an attempt to highlight the ethnic discrimination prevalence among employees of the state's organization.

The study concluded that workplace ethnic diversity exists, and members of the different ethnic group significantly discriminate their counterparts. The study found that Pakhtoon and Punjabi ethnic groups potentially discriminate each other at workplace though the study could not provide enough evidence to find out discrimination among other ethnic groups (Sindi, Balochi, Saraiki, Kashmiri, Hinko, Gilgiti, Muhajir) because their sample was not enough to evaluate the discrimination factor with other ethnic groups at workplace. The study found trends but not significant, that ethnic discrimination at workplace impact the performance of the employees belongs to these groups.

References

Allport, G. W. 1954. The nature of prejudice. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Arshad, M., Yaseen, I., Shuja, K. H., & Shahbal, S. (2023). Myths and Attitudes Toward Transgender (Male to Female) by Pakistani Subcultures. KEPES, 21(3), 826-834.

Bilotta, I., Dawson, J. F., & King, E. B. (2021). The role of fairness perceptions in patient and employee health: A multilevel, multisource investigation. Journal of Applied Psychology.

Brittian, A. S., Kim, S. Y., Armenta, B. E., Lee, R. M., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Schwartz, S. J., & Castillo, L. G. (2015). Do dimensions of ethnic identity mediate the association between perceived ethnic group discrimination and depressive symptoms? Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 21(1), 41.

Brondolo, E., Kelly, K. P., Coakley, V., Gordon, T., Thompson, S., Levy, E., Contrada, R. J. (2005). The Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire: Development and Preliminary Validation of a Community Version 1. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35(2), 335-365.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2013). Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Routledge.

Derous, E., Nguyen, H. H. D., & Ryan, A. M. (2021). Reducing ethnic discrimination in resume-screening: a test of two training interventions. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 30(2), 225-239.

Dipboye, R. L., & Colella, A. (2005). The dilemmas of workplace discrimination. In R. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases (pp. 425-462). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Haar, J. (2023, March). Perceived discrimination of Māori and Pacific employees in Aotearoa/New Zealand: work and well-being consequences and testing the symbolic interaction perspective. In Evidence-based HRM: a Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship. Emerald Publishing Limited.

Hsiao, A., Ma, E., Lloyd, K., & Reid, S. (2020). Organizational ethnic diversity's influence on hotel employees' satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intention: Gender's moderating role. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 44(1), 76-108.

IBM (2016b). IBM SPSS statistics for windows (24 ed.), Armonk, NY: IBM.

Jeong, Y., & Kim, M. (2022). Effects of perceived organizational support and perceived organizational politics on organizational performance: Mediating role of differential treatment. Asia Pacific Management Review, 27(3), 190-199.

Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E. B., & Gray, A. L. (2016). Not so subtle: A meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. Journal of Management, 42(6), 1588-1613.

Lee, Y., Li, J. Y. Q., & Tsai, W. H. S. (2021). The role of strategic internal communication in workplace discrimination: A perspective of racial minority employees. International journal of strategic communication, 15(1), 37-59.

Lin, D., Shi, Z., Kim, H., & Qu, H. (2022). Customer verbal aggression and employee service sabotage: The mediating role of perceived discrimination. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 107, 103339.

Majeed, G. (2010). Ethnicity and ethnic conflict in Pakistan. Journal of Political Studies, 17(2), 51.

Mendoza-Denton, R., Downey, G., Purdie, V. J., Davis, A., & Pietrzak, J. (2002). Sensitivity to status-based rejection: implications for African American students' college experience. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(4), 896.

Mushtaq, M. (2009). Managing Ethnic diversity and federalism in Pakistan. European Journal of Scientific Research, 33(2), 279-294.

Naz, A. (2017). Ethno-National Movements and National integrity in Pakistan. International Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities and Education, 1(3), 150-160.

Pakistan. (2017). CIA world factbook. Retrieved from http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/countryframe.html

Pascoe, E. A., & Smart Richman, L. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: a meta-analytic review. Psychological bulletin, 135(4), 531.

Phinney, J. S. (1996). Understanding ethnic diversity: The role of ethnic identity. American Behavioral Scientist, 40(2), 143-152.

Pieterse, A. L., Todd, N. R., Neville, H. A., & Carter, R. T. (2012). Perceived racism and mental health among Black American adults: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59(1), 1.

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Hebl, M. R. (2014). Race and ethnicity in the workplace: Spotlighting the perspectives of historically stigmatized groups. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 20(4), 479.

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Hebl, M. R. (2014). Race and ethnicity in the workplace: Spotlighting the perspectives of historically stigmatized groups. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 20(4), 479.

Salami, T., Lawson, E., & Metzger, I. W. (2021). The impact of microaggressions on Black college students' worry about their future employment: The moderating role of social support and academic achievement. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 27(2), 245.

Salvatore, J., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Cognitive costs of exposure to racial prejudice. Psychological Science, 18(9), 810-815.

Sarwar, A., & Muhammad, L. (2020). Impact of employee perceptions of mistreatment on organizational performance in the hotel industry. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 32(1), 230-248.

Singletary, S. L., & Hebl, M. R. (2009). Compensatory strategies for reducing interpersonal discrimination: The effectiveness of acknowledgments, increased positivity, and individuating information. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(3), 797.

Tajfel, H. (1981). Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology. CUP Archive.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations, 33(47), 74.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), Key readings in social psychology. Political psychology: Key readings (p. 276–293). Psychology Press.

Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. Advances in Group Processes, 2, 77-122.

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Yazedjian, A., & Bámaca-Gómez, M. (2004). Developing the ethnic identity scale using Eriksonian and social identity perspectives. Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 4(1), 9-38.

Williams, D. R., Neighbors, H. W., & Jackson, J. S. (2003). Racial/ethnic discrimination and health: findings from community studies. American Journal of Public Health, 93(2), 200-208.