“MY BOSS IS RACIST”: A STUDY OF EMPLOYEES’ PERCEPTIONS OF BOSS’ RACIST COMMENTS ON TWITTER

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies and Research

Angelo State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

by

JUN KIM

May 2019

Major: Communication

“MY BOSS IS RACIST”, A STUDY OF EMPLOYEES’ PERCEPTIONS

OF BOSS’ RACIST COMMENTS ON TWITTER

by

JUN KIM

APPROVED:

Dr. Leslie Rodriguez

Dr. Jonghwa Lee

Dr. June Smith

Dr. Nicole M. Dilts

May 2019

APPROVED:

Dr. Don R. Topliff
Provost, VPAA, and Interim Dean, College of Graduate Studies and Research

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis committee chair Dr. Leslie Rodriguez at Angelo State University for her immense knowledge, enthusiasm, and patience. Whenever I was struggling, she was there for me both online and offline, constantly pushing me forward to make this happen. I would like to also thank all of my committee members, Dr. JongHwa Lee, Dr. June Smith, and Dr. Nicole Dilts for their encouragement and assistance.

Finally, I must express my gratitude to my parents, YongMin Kim and Youngsuk Kim, for believing in me and continuously supporting me spiritually throughout my whole life. Their unfailing love is what has driven me this far, and this accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you, and I will love you forever.

ABSTRACT

Diverse populations in the United States have recognized a structure of systematic racism in American workplace. This study seeks to identify different types of perceived racism by employers and evidence of perceived organizational injustice. To identify racism in the workplace, this study focused on employee tweets. Specifically, two content analyses were conducted to distinguish between perceived racist behaviors. The first analysis uses the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) model of discrimination types to identify the types of discrimination within the tweets, and the second analysis uses Colquitt's (2011) organizational justice to find evidence of organizational injustices within the tweets. Results supported that employees perceived both verbal and nonverbal racist behaviors by their bosses, and those racist behaviors include all three types of workplace, harassment, and policy discrimination as defined by the EEOC. In addition, this study also concluded that employees perceive procedural, interpersonal, distributive, and informational injustices through boss' racist behaviors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS…..…….. iii

ABSTRACT……. iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS……..... v

LIST OF TABLES……..... vii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION…… 1

II. LITERATURE REVIEW……..... 4

System Theory ……..... 4

Cultural Diversity and Inclusion ……..... 6

Racism …… 7

Superior-Subordinate Relationship ……..... 9

Organizational Justice ……..…… 10

Social Media …….……. 14

Twitter ……..... 15

Research Questions……. 16

III. METHOD……..... 17

Content Analysis……..... 17

Unit of Analysis Collection ……..... 18

Research Question One……..... 20

Research Question Two…….. 21

IV. RESULTS……..... 23

Research Question One……..... 23

Verbal……..... 23

Nonverbal……..... 24

Both……..... 25

Verbal Discrimination Types……..... 27

Nonverbal Discrimination Types……..... 28

Both Discrimination Types……..... 29

Research Question Two……..... 34

Interpersonal Injustice……..... 34

Procedural Injustice……..... 35

Distributive Injustice……..... 35

Informational Injustice……..... 36

Verbal Organizational Injustice……..... 37

Nonverbal Organizational Injustice……..... 38

Both Organizational Injustice……..... 41

V. DISCUSSION ……..... 47

Research Question One……..... 47

Research Question Two……..... 51

Limitations and Future Research……..... 55

REFERENCES……..... 57

APPENDIX…….. 69

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Sample Tweets for Verbal, Nonverbal, and Both……..… 26

Table 2 Sample Tweets for EEOC's Discrimination Types……..... 33

Table 3 Sample Tweets for Organizational Justices……..... 38

Table 4 Sample Tweets for Organizational Justice Based on Verbal/Nonverbal Aspect.. 45

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

According to the Pew Research Center (Cohn & Caumont, 2016), the United States is becoming more racially and ethnically diverse. Reportedly, by the year 2055, the U.S. will not have a single race that can be described as a majority. In 2016, nearly 14% of the U.S. population was foreign-born, and 43% of millennials who were born between 1981 and 1996 are nonwhite. As the U.S. becomes more diversified, the minority population has the ability to impact the nation at large socially, politically, and economically as the minority presence becomes more present (Pepple, 2017). This increased presence can be seen at the workplace according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2019), as people of color make up nearly one-third of the labor force. Unfortunately, a diverse workforce can bring forth issues of systemic racism as noted by researchers (Hasford, 2016; Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001).

In 2017, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission reported approximately 84,000 discrimination charges made within their office (EEOC, 2018a). Among the charges, approximately 28,500 (25%) of the total charges were accusation of race-based discrimination by their employers, which supports how perceived racism is present in the workforce. Although 70.2% of the total charges resulted in no reasonable cause, and 1.8% were unsuccessful conciliations (EEOC, 2018c), the mere fact that employees believe that racism exists is a threat to the organization's health, specifically, the superior-subordinate relationship (Rodriguez, 2012).

Racist behavior does not simply mean using racial slurs or segregating someone because of his/her race; instead, racism can occur in many different forms. Waters (1994)

indicated that these acts of discrimination can occur both verbally and nonverbally between superiors and subordinates. Of course there are protective laws such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Becerra, 2015) and organizations such as the EEOC that protect employees from racist acts; however, it is difficult to remedy all racist behavior because not all racist instances are reported by employees (Betigeri, 2017). As such, many employees attempt to deal with the interactions on their own based on their sole perception of what occurred. As a result, their perception of racism alone is enough to affect the superior-subordinate relationship, which ultimately can cause an impact on the workplace (Avery et al., 2007).

Racism can impact employees both emotionally and physically (Avery et al., 2007). With this, racism can also impact employees' perceptions of organizational injustice, which can trigger motivation problems along with other workplace issues (Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005). To combat racism, an inclusive workplace is needed. To successfully create an inclusive workplace for a diverse population, high levels of inclusive leadership (Jain, 2018) and positive relationships are needed (Mor Barak, 2011). However, superiors' racist comments can destroy these efforts by bringing in emotionally charged messages that destroy trust and the relationship (Waldron, 1991). In simple terms, racist behaviors negatively alter superior-subordinate relationships (Avery et al., 2007). Additionally, if the superior-subordinate relationship weakens, perceived organizational injustice further weakens the relationships within the workplace (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

Even with repeated efforts to preserve the superior-subordinate relationships, at times it is difficult to determine what employees truly perceive about their boss' behaviors due to the power differential that limits authentic communication in the workplace (Kumar &

Mishra, 2017). As such, this study seeks to identify a new way to obtain employee perceptions regarding employers specifically relating to racism by exploring their social media accounts. Social media has become a trend for daily-based communication that transfers information faster than traditional media channels (Li & Liu, 2017). More importantly, social media has become an essential platform for employees' online work-related communication due to its horizontal characteristics (Jodka, 2018). In addition, Jodka (2018) noted that employees feel more comfortable communicating authentically about their workplace on social media. Therefore, this research will look at employees' perceptions of racism as expressed on Twitter. Twitter has become one of the most popular social networking channels for work-related content, and employees provide in-group communication and organizational related tweets that can be valuable evidence of their thoughts and perceptions (Van Zoonel et al., 2015). As such, this research seeks to understand the perception of why individuals believe their boss is racist, by analyzing their tweets.

Specifically, this study seeks to understand what types of racist behaviors employees perceive encountering in the workplace during interactions with their boss. These interactions will be explored through the EEOC's discrimination types, and then the researcher will identify types of organizational injustices perceived by employees. In order to achieve these goals, employee tweets regarding racism at work will be explored. This paper will present two research questions followed by a review of relevant literature in Chapter II. Then, methods, which explain the procedures used to conduct this study, will be introduced in Chapter III. Results and concluding tables follow in Chapter IV. Lastly, Chapter V includes a discussion of both theoretical and practical advice that derived from this study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the researcher will provide relevant literature to help understand how racism can negatively impact the workplace by first looking at the workforce with system theory, and how a recent trend in diversity in the U.S. has impacted the workplace. Then, the researcher will look at how the EEOC defines different types of racism, and then introduce the instituted laws and efforts to try to prevent these racist behaviors. Literature regarding superior-subordinate relationships and organizational justice will follow. Lastly, the researcher will provide extant literature on how social media, specifically Twitter, can be a valuable lens to look at employees' perception of a racist boss in the workplace.

System Theory

System theory was introduced after World War II when organizations started looking at themselves as a whole body system (Buckley, 1967). Specifically, the theory emphasized how the structure of organizations was linked to one another as each department or subsystem was all interdependent (Eisenberg, Trethewey, LeGreco & Goodall Jr, 2017). As a result of this linkage, the success within a system highly relied on the dynamic interactions between each individual in the system (Bertalanffy, 1972). In other words, system theory emphasized how the constant flow of information and conversation within the system were necessary (Katz & Kahn, 1966), implying that the sum of the whole body in the organization means more than the sum of the individuals (Buckley, 1967).

System theory supported how the relationship established through communication among individuals in the whole system can impact the full dynamic of the organization.

Almaney (1974) noted that system theory saw an organization where “the whole was not just the sum of parts, but the system itself can be explained only as a totality” (p. 36). Because system theory looked at organizations as a unique systematic community, communication worked as an indispensable system binder to create interrelationships.

Conversely, if the system does not include a healthy flow of communication, it can negatively alter the system as a whole (Almaney, 1974). Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) looked at how relational demographics can disrupt the system as it creates issues in the superior-subordinate relationship in various ways. Additionally, the authors noted in their research that demographical differences can create role ambiguity and conflict between superiors and subordinates because their performance expectations and standards may differ from one another. Baskett (1973) provided evidence on how similarity can increase individual attraction. On the other side, research supported (Rosenbaum, 1986) that people with differences often disengage and create distance between two individuals. As such, dissimilarity can cause repulsion on the other side. Lincoln and Miller (1979) studied how gender, race, and educational background affects work and friendship socializations. Results supported that dissimilarity can affect frequency of communication. In fact, Lincoln and Miller also found that race and gender were positively related to attraction building, which supported how demographical background can affect communication. These effects ultimately lead into not only work perception and attitude, but it also affects the relational aspect of the workforce (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). Therefore, it is important to adopt both personal and social communication tactics, which includes a willingness and ability to work with, listen to, learn from, and appreciate co-workers that are not culturally or racially similar (Blocher, Heppner, & Johnston, 2008). This viewpoint is one of the key elements in a

successful system (Bertalanffy, 1972). However, it is becoming more difficult to create an inclusive workplace due to the diversified workforce that requires somewhat different leadership and cross-cultural policies (Mor Barak et al., 2016; Jain, 2018).

Cultural Diversity and Inclusion

According to Blocher et al. (2008), about one third of the U.S. population are people of color, and the ratio will increase to one half by mid-century. Nowadays, diversity is not only socially and politically important, but it also significantly affects the economy and workforce (Pepple, 2017). Therefore, companies and organizations have been attempting to promote diversity in the workforce in order to enhance the company value through highly competent workers who tend to be more innovative (Mor Barak et al., 2016). When we think of the current workforce where a diverse population represents the whole system, it is important to remove all possible barriers in order to insure an inclusive environment (Mor Barak, 2017). Additionally, to create a safe working environment, it is important to shift policies, treatment, and create cross-cultural collaboration that foster a safe, collaborative, and harmonized inclusive working environment. Mor Barak (2011) defined inclusion as an "individual's sense of being a part of the organizational system" (Mor Barak, 2011). Specifically, Mor Barak noted that inclusion includes both the formal processes through official decision making, and informal processes, such as lunch meetings or coffee time.

When this inclusive leadership takes place, then, the organization can foster an inclusive workplace. An inclusive workplace model not only limits the policy makers of the company, but it also requires companies and organizations to expand organizational definitions of diversity to include larger systems (Ashford, LeCroy, & Lortie, 2009). One of the ways to foster an inclusive workplace is to recruit individuals who are diverse. This

action requires bringing in inclusive leadership that shows respect to the diverse workforce because inclusive leadership brings the best out of all members in the system (Jain, 2018). Specifically, the leaders are the individuals who can provide not only the support for success and positive commitment, but can also impact on the job satisfaction (Gotsis & Grimani, 2016). It is important to look at the top-down communication since CEOs and boards influence the direction of the whole organization. The governing agencies can improve diverse membership only when the board behaves inclusively and when the policies and practices impact the diverse members in the organization (Buse, Bernstein, & Bilimoria, 2016). However, this inclusive workplace can come with difficulties due to racism within the diverse workforce (Hasford, 2016).

Racism

Racism has been noted as a prevalent issue in modern organizations (Rodriguez, 2012). In 2017, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 2018a) reported that there were approximately 84,000 discrimination charges made with their office. Among the charges, approximately 28,500 cases were race-based discrimination charges against their employers. This number makes up about 25% of the total charges, which shows how discrimination is present in the workforce. Hasford (2016) described racism as “a system of oppression based on physical and cultural difference that is deeply embedded within dominant cultural narratives and social institution” (p. 159). Racism creates several issues, both emotionally and physically, such as absenteeism, along with employee emotional and physical distress (Avery et al., 2007). EEOC (n.d.) defines race discrimination as a behavior such as treating an employee or a candidate unfavorably because of a race or characteristics related to the race. There are laws that protect employees from workplace discrimination.

Specifically, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII") restricts actions that are connected with workplace discrimination, and enables the law enforcement to investigate racial discrimination at work environments (Becerra, 2015). According to the EEOC website (2018b), the EEOC enforces federal laws on racism by performing the following tasks: by filing a lawsuit to protect rights of individuals, trying to prevent discrimination before it occurs, investigating charges of discrimination against employers, and by providing leadership and guidance to federal agencies. The EEOC affects most employers with at least 15 employees, most labor unions, and employment agencies. The commission prevents companies or employers from discriminating against job applicants or employees on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, and other information. In addition, the EEOC strongly regulates discrimination against the employee when that employee complained or filed discrimination against his/her workplace. The EEOC's enforcement includes all work situations including hiring, firing, harassment, promotions, training, wages, and other benefits as well.

Specifically, the EEOC (n.d.) distinguishes race discrimination into three different categories: *work situation*, *harassment*, and *policies/practices.* The first category is named as *race/color discrimination & work situations*. This category includes any condition of employment that includes unequal treatment based on race or color. For example, this category would include employers requiring only employees of color to work on holidays. Additionally, unequal treatment in the process of hiring, firing, payment, job assignments, layoff, training, and fringe benefits would also go in this category. The second category, *race/color discrimination & harassment*, includes offensive or derogatory remarks or racial slurs in relation to an employee's race or color. An example of this category is if an employer

is making a judgment based on a stereotype of a certain race, it is violating the second category of *race/color discrimination & harassment*. However, the EEOC indicates that these behaviors must be very serious and frequent, they must create an offensive work environment, or they must create a critical employment decision. The last category is *race/color discrimination & employment policies/practices*. Unlike the first category, this category addresses issues regarding policies or practices that are not necessarily related to the job, but are impacting a particular race. For example, when a boss tells an employee not to wear a hijab that covers a women's head or face, it is implementing a policy that violates the EEOC regulations because it negatively affects a certain race although that request is not job-related.

The EEOC enforces federal laws, regulations, and sub-regulatory guidance to prevent and punish racism in the workplace. However, protective laws cannot prevent all the racist behaviors as there are simply more racist instances that occur than what is reported by employees (Betigeri, 2017). This trend continues to occur even though diversity in the workforce is increasing (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001). Furthermore, it is difficult to halt all racist acts when racism is often about an individual's perception (McCluney, Schmitz, Hicken, & Sonnega, 2018). Nonetheless, these racist instances can bring negative outcomes, which can negatively alter the existence of the entire system of the organization. Specifically, the superior-subordinate relationship is one of the key areas that racism can negatively affect (Avery et al., 2007).

Superior-Subordinate Relationship

Waldron (1991) reported that maintaining a positive relationship with a supervisor is one of the most important goals in the workplace for subordinates. To successfully build

superior-subordinate relationships, it is important for superiors and subordinates to incorporate high levels of maintenance communication into their relationships. However, several factors can work against this maintenance, one of which is racial comments. Racial comments made by superiors can disrupt achieving the right maintenance communication by showing behaviors that may have a negative impact on the relationship by bringing emotionally charged messages that employees deem unnecessary (Waldron, 1991). Other important dimensions of supervisory communication processes, including formality and tone, have an impact on the relationship (Meiners & Miller, 2004); however, it is equally important to look at how racist comments can interrupt trust. Mutual trust coming from healthy superior-subordinate relationships is very important because it can create positive effects on employee outcomes (Kim, Wang, & Chen, 2018). When it comes to racial comments, it is detrimental as it not only hurts the mutual trust between the superior and subordinate, but it can also create perceptions of organizational injustice, which can cause motivation problems and several other negative workplace issues for employees (Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005).

Organizational Justice

Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) defined organizational justice as "perceptions of the fairness of workplace outcomes or processes" (p. 47). In other words, when certain employees perceive they have been mistreated, those employees may feel their organizational justice unprotected. Largely, organizational justice is categorized into three different justices, which include *distributive*, *procedural*, and *interactional* justices (Colquitt, 2001). *Distributive* justice deals with perceived fairness of outcomes when allocating resources (Deutsch, 1975). *Procedural* justice shows how the decision making process can be as important as the final outcome (Patten, Caudill, Bor, Thomas, & Anderson, 2015).

Interactional justice shows the perception of interpersonal treatment that they receive within the workforce (Colquitt, 2001).

Distributive justice arises when there is a limited resource but needs to be distributed to all, yet there is a perceived injustice in the way the resources are allocated (Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005). *Distributive* justice emphasizes the idea that the organizations should distribute resources fairly and equitably to all organizational community members (Marescaux, De Winne, & Sels, 2019). Therefore, *distributive* justice is often studied in relation to organizational status, such as promotions, job titles, work-hour flexibilities, etc (Greenberg & Ornstein, 1983; Marescaux, De Winne, & Sels, 2019). For example, there are cases when a manager must make a decision based upon his/her own priority in the process of distributing bonuses or equipment. When there are enough to share, the manager can distribute fairly and equally. However, if that is not the case, the manager must utilize his/her own definition of equity, which may be perceived as unfair to the other employees.

Procedural justice comes into effect when there is equality in the processes enacted by the organization (Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005). Research (Chung, Jung, Kyle, & Petrick, 2010) suggested that *procedural* justice is crucial to the superior-subordinate relationship because it is how employees interpret their job satisfaction based upon determining if they are respected. In addition, Konovsky (2000) supported that *procedural* justice is not limited to the size of rewards, but *procedural* justice is also related to how the reward is determined. Because it does consider the psychological perspectives of employees, *procedural* justice ultimately shapes the self-esteem and performance of employees (Cloutier, Vihuber, Harrisson, & Beland-Ouellette, 2018). An example of *procedural* justice in the workplace could be when a company gives out end of the year bonuses. Not only is

who and how much an individual received important, but perceived *procedural* justice occurs in the process of the awarding of the bonus. The procedure used to determine who and how much was received must be transparent to the employees and perceived as fair (Chung, Jung, Kyle, & Petrick, 2010); otherwise, it can deeply impact organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Patten et al, 2014).

Interactional justice focuses on the fairness of interpersonal treatment and perception of communication happening in the organization (Bies & Moag, 1986). *Interactional* justice is not limited to distribution of resources or the decision making process, instead it includes the social interactions between the superior and subordinate, providing evidence of how employees perceive their bosses in relation to the fairness (He, Fehr, Yam, Long, & Hao, 2017). Dignity and respect are other key elements in defining *interactional* justice (Bies, 2001). For example, when there is an issue in the company, it is important to provide a good explanation of why the decision was made in a truthful manner.

In 2001, Colquitt suggested a different approach to defining interactional justice. Colquitt noted how interactional justice was vaguely defined, which resulted in showing high intercorrelation with procedural justice. Therefore, Colquitt insisted that interactional justice be divided into two different organizational justices; *interpersonal* justice and *informational* justice. This perspective of a four-factor structure was first introduced in 1993 by Greenberg; however, Greenberg could not consistently distinguish or measure clearly between procedural and distributive justice, and other justices. Colquitt, though, was able to provide evidence on how interactional justice could be separated into *interpersonal* and *informational* justice.

Interpersonal justice, according to Folger and Bies (1989), is defined as "ensuring fairness in the implementation of decision-making procedures in organizations" (p. 79). For example, employees would feel *interpersonal* injustice when they feel like they were not told politely or respectfully (Colquitt, 2001). On the other hand, *informational* justice focuses on the provision of sufficient and accurate information being provided to all employees (Greenberg, 1993). For example, if an employee was excluded from a company workshop, the employee would feel *informational* injustice.

According to extant literature (Zapata, Carton, & Liu, 2016), it is essential for subordinates to enact appropriate levels of justice in the workplace in order to insure perceptions of fairness by employees in the organization. This task becomes highlighted for superiors when working with a diverse workforce as issues of race appear to highlight perceptions of inequalities when they do occur. Therefore, it becomes essential to remove all possible barriers and create a fair environment to allow a diverse workforce to acculturate into the U.S. workplace. In order to overcome the difficulties experienced by a diverse population and to foster an inclusive working environment, it is essential to implement and enforce policies and procedures, and to create cross-cultural collaboration that are representative of an inclusive organization (Mor Barak, 2017).

As of recent, the majority of studies have studied the concept of justice through more quantitative methods. However, it becomes difficult to truly know what employees perceive within the workplace because perceptions are subjective (Muller, Evans, Frasche, Kern, & Resti, 2018). In addition, the employee-boss communication is related to upward communication where power difference plays a significant role in the workforce (Kumar & Mishra, 2017) in terms of soliciting honest feedback. In other words, it is stated that

employees often feel unsafe to provide honest opinions if confidentiality is not guaranteed due to the possible consequences coming from power difference (Wendlinger, 1973). As such, social media is able to fill this gap by allowing us to study organizational communication from a new angle.

Social Media

Social media and its technologies has changed how people communicate by providing a new media in which to communicate (Han, Hong, Lee, & Kim, 2017). As people utilize social networking sites more on a regular basis, the social effects have been studied for more than half a century (Li & Liu, 2017). It is noted that social media reveals richer information in a timelier manner compared to traditional media. In addition, social media has a strong peer influence that can set economic values or create general consensus (Mai, Shan, Bai, Wang, & Chiang, 2018).

Additionally, social media has become a tool for organizations to reach out to the public, and to cultivate relationships among groups and individuals (Efimova & Grudin, 2008). It has accelerated the speed of information shared, and it provided space to organize different individuals into one online space (Gruber, Smerek, Thomas-Hunt, & James, 2015). Recent statistics show that Facebook has approximately 2.2 billion active users, YouTube has 1.9 billion active users, Instagram has 1.0 billion users, Twitter has 336 million active users, and LinkedIn has 263 million active users (Statista, 2018a). In addition, Jodka (2018) argued that social media may provide a platform for online work-related communication, which reflects the employee's well-being, as well. Moreover, because of its horizontal characteristics, social media has been and will continuously be one of the main communication methods for the millennial who will make up the U.S. workforce. This

phenomenon also exhibits how social media can demonstrate how employees express themselves. Because it can be a channel for upward communication, some employers have decided to follow employees' social media network accounts, and others have instituted a social media ban for their organizations (Jodka, 2018). This ban by employers exhibits how social media has been used as a communication channel for employees to express themselves honestly about their organizational life. Evidence of this can be seen in the number of tweets that are related to an individual's work life. As such, social media, specifically platforms such as Twitter, can provide insight in these areas since it is perceived as an authentic account of an individual's work life (Hsu & Ching, 2012).

Twitter

Twitter, since its establishment in 2006, has become one of the most popular social media platforms in the market (Twitter Inc, 2017). Twitter has reached 336 million active users in the second quarter of 2018 (Statista, 2018b). When looking at the age differences of users on Twitter as of September 2018 (Statista, 2019), statistics support that more than 21% of Twitter users are U.S. young adults of ages 25 to 34. Surprisingly, individuals ages 55 to 64 followed with the same Twitter user rate. This similarity exhibits that Twitter is widely used by individuals of various ages.

Twitter allows users to post, read messages, and "follow" celebrities or people with their interests (Kassens, 2014). Twitter provides a space for users to express themselves through characters, links, photos, and videos in 140 characters or less. In addition, Twitter has a relatively flat hierarchy that allows information to fly faster than traditional media channels with no actual filter (Gruber *et al.*, 2015). Among many social media networks, research (Van Zoonen et al., 2015) suggested that Twitter has become one of the most

popular communication methods employees utilize to talk about work-related contents. In addition, their research supported that one in every three tweets by employees is a work-related post. Furthermore, 1 in every 4 work-related tweets sent by employees include their coworkers with hashtags or direct tags. Being that tweets include both in-group communication and organizational related tweets, twitter posts from employees can provide significant information on their thoughts and perceptions, which include their accounts of racist communication by their boss.

Research Questions

In order to better understand the topics of the racist comments made by bosses, and in order to understand whether these perceived acts of racism reflect various organizational injustices, the following research questions are presented to guide this study:

RQ1: What were the topics of the racist comments made by bosses?

RQ2: Were the acts of racism evidence of procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational injustice?

CHAPTER III

METHOD

To answer the research questions presented for this study, the researcher conducted a content analysis with public tweets that are specifically related to “racist boss”. The researcher believed that public tweets posted by employees provided authentic and honest communication regarding perceptions of racism (Jodka, 2018). In this chapter, the researcher will provide a detailed discussion of the methods used to both collect and analyze the harvested tweets.

Content Analysis

To answer the research questions presented, a content analysis was conducted of Twitter data containing hashtags of “#racistjob”, “#mybossisracist”, “#racistboss”, and “#myracistboss”, and terms including “racist boss”, “My boss is racist”, and “my racist boss”. Content analysis is a research method frequently used in social science studies (Gungor, 2018). Specifically, content analyses have been viewed as the best research technique for technical communication research because it provides a systematic, quantitative, and an objective analysis that enables examination of messages (Neuendorf, 2003; Krippendorff, 2004).

Researchers have utilized content analyses to create a replicable and reliable study through collecting various artifacts including text, images, videos, symbols, etc (Hurtado & Davis, 2018). Additionally, researchers have stated that content analyses are informal method that allow qualitative data to be analyzed with quantitative aspects (Stacks, 2002). In other words, a content analysis is known as one of the few quantitative ways to analyze written or

spoken languages (Thayer, Evans, McBride, Queen, & Spyridakis, 2007). In fact, a content analysis is also described as a "systematic coding of qualitative or quantitative data based on specific themes or categories" (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). Content analyses are conducted through interpreting the content that are grouped into categories extracted from the written text (Lopez, Ortega-Ridaura, & Ortiz-Betancourt, 2017). Therefore, it is especially useful when the data is composed of mostly text, and when researchers want to understand the meaning or themes shown in the text (Shah & Jha, 2018). Moreover, content analyses focus on the language of the communication using text because it provides room for analyzing the ideas expressed in those texts (Shannon, 2005).

Unit of Analysis Collection

Thayer et al., (2007) provided different terminology for the content collected during the process of a content analysis. According to the research, the specific item or phenomenon measured in a textual content analysis can be described as the *unit of analysis*. For this study, the unit of analysis is the entire tweet. For both research questions, the units of analysis have been secured by going to Twitter.com and harvesting public tweets that contain hashtags of "#racistjob", "#mybossisracist", "#racistboss", and "#myracistboss". This process was done by searching for these hashtags in the search bar. This search produced 69 results. To increase the sample size, the researcher also performed a Boolean search for terms including "racist boss", "My boss is racist", and "my racist boss" using Twitter's "all" search function. An additional 60 tweets were harvested using this feature. A total of 129 public tweets were collected to ensure an appropriate sample size for analysis of the proposed research questions.

For confidentiality purposes, the researcher created a Twitter account solely for this project. For this account, the researcher had no followers nor followed any individuals to insure that they did not have access to private postings through the research process. In addition, only the content in each Twitter posts were analyzed. During the extraction of the units of analysis from the post, only the text tweets were harvested. Profile names, photos, videos, and the posts that included hyperlinks were not included in the units of analysis that were saved. Usernames were substituted with fictitious names to protect the identity of the individuals when names were provided in the study as examples. Furthermore, when posts were copied into a unit of analysis file, the researcher changed any names of individuals or organizations included in the tweets at that time. Furthermore, if examples were included in the manuscript for reference, only hypothetical examples that were similar to the actual tweets were used in the manuscript so that no reader could search for a tweet and potentially identify the name of the individual who posted the content.

To begin the analysis, the tweets were first captured into an excel file. They were then numbered in order of the researcher's keywords. In the process, the researcher deleted tweets that contained the noted hashtags, but were not related to their employment, such as tweets about President Trump.

To become more familiar with the data, the researcher first read through all Tweets without sorting or categorizing. After reading through them multiple times, tweets that did not indicate why the employee perceived the boss was racist were eliminated. This process resulted in the elimination of 27 tweets. For example, one tweet stated, "Three more days, and I'm quitting. Just saying the words brings me happiness. #horribleboss #racistboss". In this Tweet, insufficient information is given to analyze the tweet although the employee

perceived the boss as racist. However, a tweet was included that at least provided the boss' behavior, which made the employee perceive racism. For example, a specific tweet stated, "Sometimes I think about the shit job I had last winter, and my horrible "boss", and I just laugh and laugh. #shitpay #shitjob #racistboss". Even though this tweet does not directly state the act of racism in the text, the hashtags provide evidence on how this individual employee perceived they are not paid enough, and how the boss was racist. In this case, it was decided to include this as one of the units of analysis because evidence of organizational injustice exists. Ultimately, 102 units of analysis made up the sample. The tweets harvested ranged from years 2011 to 2018.

For this study, IRB was granted and a waiver of consent was approved as the research involves no more than minimal risk to the participants and the waiver of consent would not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the participants. Additionally, the research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver due to the logistics of Twitter.

Research Question 1

In order to answer RQ1, a content analysis of the 102 Twitter posts was performed filtering for common themes of perceived racist behaviors utilizing EEOC's discrimination types as a lens. After eliminating 27 units of analysis, the researcher first began by going through several reads of the tweets. The researcher then categorized the tweets into *verbal* and *nonverbal* categories. In the process, the researcher found that some tweets were *both verbal* and *nonverbal*. After the researcher listed them under three categories of *verbal*, *nonverbal*, and *both*, the researcher looked for an emergence of racist behavior based on EEOC's discrimination types in the tweets, which included *workplace, harassment,* and

policies/practices. In the process, the researcher counted the number of instances rather than the number of tweets because some tweets contained more than one discrimination type described in EEOC's discrimination types. For example, a specific tweet stated:

> *My boss is racist asf, and I'm pushing my co-worker to get a lawyer for discrimination. Calling people the n word and making them wear white bc they're black is so disgusting. (Tweet 73)*

In this tweet, the researcher could identify two different instances of discrimination types: *harassment* for calling people the n word, and *policies/practices* for making a specific race wear white clothes. Therefore, the researcher counted 2 different instances, instead of counting this tweet as one unit of analysis. Ultimately, 108 instances of discrimination were counted based on this categorical system.

Research Question 2

For RQ2, I used Colquitt's (2001) categorization of organizational justice as a lens to determine whether the number of tweets showed evidence of the different types of organizational injustices. Colquitt's (2001) dimensionality of organizational justice was used as my lens to categorize the tweets, which supported four types of organizational justices including *distributive, procedural, interpersonal*, and *informational* justices. Much like research question one, a close reading of all tweets was performed prior to categorizing each one to become comfortable with the sample. Again, instead of categorizing each tweet, the researcher counted the number of instances as some tweets contained more than one type of perceived injustice. For example, a specific tweet stated:

> *I said to my boss, I wish we got MLK day off, he said yeah & Juneteenth, too. So, I could eat fried chicken & watermelon. I said that is racist. The other worker said*

> *wish it was back when people could take a humor. Then boss said, I am not racist, a black man told me that joke. (Tweet 69)*

In this tweet, the researcher identified both *procedural* injustice for not having a cultural holiday off, and *interpersonal* injustice for making fun of the specific culture. Therefore, the researcher counted 2 different instances, as opposed to counting this tweet as one instance. Ultimately, 112 instances of organizational injustice made up the sample for research question two.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the researcher will provide the results and concluding tables for each research question. For research question one, the researcher will first categorize the tweets into *verbal* and *nonverbal* instances. And then, the researcher will provide the number of instances based on the EEOC's (n.d.) discrimination types to find out the topics of perceived racist behaviors from employees. After answering research question one, the researcher will provide results for research question two by adopting Colquitt's (2001) organizational justice as a lens to distinguish perceived organizational injustices through employees' tweets.

Research Question One

After categorizing the tweets, two categories emerged for acts of racism: *verbal and nonverbal*. However, a third column was added because the researcher noted that some tweets contained evidence of perceived racism that were *both verbal* and *nonverbal*. As such, the researcher ultimately categorized instances into 3 possible categories: *verbal, nonverbal,* and *both.*

Verbal

Of the 102 tweets analyzed, there were 48 tweets (47.1%) that exhibited verbally perceived racist behavior. Most of the *verbal* topics of racist behavior were direct quotations from what employers said directly to employees. Examples of tweets including *verbal* behaviors were:

> *Boss points to the Swap Meet and says "That's what we call the Mexican Market." #MyBossIsRacist (Tweet 10)*

I'm pro white supremacy, so I hope Tom Brady wins. #shitmybosssays #serverproblems #racistboss (Tweet 30)

No. No. You can't just say this. #RacistBoss (Tweet 42)

To Asian patient: "Go home and wrap me some sushi first!" #myracistboss (Tweet 58)

Holy shit my racist ass boss just said "if you close your doors at night there's a chance you want the wall to be built" (Tweet 99)

In these instances, employees perceived boss' comments as racist behavior. For tweet 40, although the employee did not specifically mention what the boss actually said, the tweet showed the employee's perception of racism from whatever the boss said through the hashtag of #RacistBoss. Interestingly, tweet 58 showed how the employee perceived the boss as racist even though the boss did not directly make the comment about the employee. There were also cases when the boss expressed racial supremacy in their conversations (tweet 30). In addition, a lot of *verbal* comments that employees perceived as racist behavior were related to racial stereotypes (tweet 58, and 99).

Nonverbal

Secondly, there were 40 Tweets (39.2%) that indicated perceived racist behavior exhibited in a *nonverbal* manner. Examples of tweets including *nonverbal* acts were:

got fired #racistjob (Tweet 3)

#racistBoss Returns your call when they know very well you left (Tweet 14)

My body is on ache from the work I did in Lodi yesterday. Love me body. LOVE ME. #sotired #workingonmlkday #racistboss (Tweet 29)

I can't feed my babies if you don't give me a paycheck. #racistboss (Tweet 32)

Lol at that time my dad got promoted over a black girl. #racistboss (Tweet 43)

My boss is black and still got me working on MLK day smh he's racist (Tweet 67)

In these instances, employees used hashtag #racistboss (tweet 14, 29, 32, and 43) to describe how they perceived their boss' *nonverbal* behavior as racist when the boss used his/ her authority to make decisions, such as working on a national holiday (tweet 29, and 43), calling after-hours (tweet 14), or even hiring and firing (tweet 3). The employee also noted how the boss made a policy geared toward specific races, which is a *nonverbal* act. In addition, although tweet 29 showed a sarcastic reaction of being tired, the researcher distinguished perceived racism, which was noted through two hashtags of "#workingonmlkday" and "racistboss".

Both

In addition, there were 14 Tweets (13.7%) that showed *both verbal* and *nonverbal* evidence of perceived racism. Examples of *both* types are:

I asked my boss for Monday off and he asked if I'm celebrating the holidays..Is he racist, or am I just showing my embarrassment of not knowing when MLK day is onto him? (Tweet 68)

I said to my boss, I wish we got MLK day off, he said yeah & Juneteenth, too. So, I could eat fried chicken & watermelon. I said that is racist. The other worker said wish it was back when people could take a humor. Then boss said, I am not racist, a black man told me that joke. (Tweet 69)

My boss is racist asf, and I'm pushing my co-worker to get a lawyer for discrimination. Calling people the n word and making them wear white bc they're black is so disgusting. (Tweet 73)

In these instances, the employees experienced perceived racism through the boss' *both verbal* and *nonverbal* behaviors. For example, the employee in tweet 73 perceived racism first when the boss used the "n word" with people, when the "n word" is often described as evidence of discrimination, and the *nonverbal* aspect is shown when the boss has a policy that makes all blacks wear white. Examples of all tweet categories can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample Tweets for Verbal, Nonverbal, and Both

Verbal/Nonverbal/Both	N=102	%	Sample Tweet
Verbal	48	47.1	To Asian patient: "Go home and wrap me some sushi first!" #myracistboss
Nonverbal	40	39.2	#racistBoss Returns your call when they know very well you left
Both	14	13.7	My boss is racist asf, and I'm pushing my co-worker to get a lawyer for discrimination. Calling people the n word and making them wear white bc they're black is so disgusting.

To further answer RQ1, the researcher categorized the tweets by using EEOC's discrimination types, which provide guidance to the different categories of perceived racial discrimination. Because there were tweets that contained more than one type of perceived discrimination, the researcher counted each instance of perceived discrimination as opposed to each individual tweet. After a close read of all the tweets, the researcher was able to categorize all 108 instances into the three existing EEOC discrimination types: *work situation, harassment,* and *policies/practices,* which were harvested from the original 102 public tweets posted by employees.

Verbal discrimination types

Of the 108 total instances, there were 48 instances (44.4%) that showed *verbal* evidence of perceived racism from employer to employee. More specifically, all 48 instances (100%) were categorized as *harassment*. *Harassment* includes not only racial slurs and offensive remarks on a person's race or color, but it also includes simply showing racially-offensive symbols or teasing that are racially offensive (EEOC, n.d.). Examples of *verbal harassment* tweets are:

> *"There's this black man in town who got on my ass at the library last week because I was standing in front of the door." #racistboss (Tweet 16)*
>
> *Now she just used "turn up" in a sentence she playing wit my ethnicity #racistboss (Tweet 20)*
>
> *"or maybe your little sister steals your slice of waterleon" #RacistBoss (Tweet 27)*
>
> *"Ching chong bong chinamen are so squinty eye'd because they're always searching for ways to mess you over" #myracistboss (Tweet 54)*
>
> *My boss is so obliviously racist that she doesn't even realize that everytime a black person comes in he starts talking about basketball. (Tweet 87)*

In these instances, the employees were verbally harassed as a result of by their boss' direct or indirect comments targeting co-workers or customers while the employee was present. Tweet 16 showed that the boss specifically mentioned to the employee how the boss was frustrated because of a black man standing in front of the door. It was not necessary to describe the person as "this black man"; however, the boss put race in the sentence and created perceived racism.

Nonverbal discrimination types

Nonverbal discrimination followed with a total of 41 instances (38.0%). Unlike *verbal* instances where all 48 instances were related to *harassment*, *nonverbal* discrimination varied between different discrimination types. Among the 41 instances, 27 instances (65.9%) fell under *work situation* discrimination, which is related to workplace inequalities including promotions, layoff, job assignments, hiring, firing, payment, etc. (Colquitt, 2001). Examples of *nonverbal work situation* tweets are:

> *#RacistBoss Puts my name 2nd in the org chart when I trained the person above me. (Tweet 13)*
>
> *I can't feed my babies if you don't give me a paycheck. #racistboss (Tweet 32)*
>
> *Only individual at Sunday Funday that has to work tomorrow. #racistboss (Tweet 38)*
>
> *Everybody is off tomorrow but me…#racistboss (Tweet 39)*
>
> *Lol at that time my dad got promoted over a black girl. #racistboss (Tweet 43)*

In these tweets, employees clearly showed how they feel unfairly treated by their boss, resulting in perceived racism. Tweet 32 showed perceived racism when an employee did not receive their paycheck on time. Although it is unclear why the specific employee was not paid, it is not important information as the researcher is simply looking at acts of perceived racism. Therefore, by the employee suggesting evidence of unequal treatment by adding the hashtag of #racistboss at the end, all the tweets listed above are suitable for analysis.

Harassment was also an issue for *nonverbal* instances, as well. Under *nonverbal*, there were 14 instances of *harassment* (34.1%) found during the coding process. Examples of *nonverbal harassment* included:

Ugh… The closer we get to 9/11 we get to, the more anti-islamic hate speech I must listen at my work. #RacistBoss #RepublicanCoworkers (Tweet 41)

My boss is racist and treats me like a pile of poop, my coworkers can all die in hell the treat me like a stray dog, their always ranking on me and hurts my feelings (Tweet 86)

In these instances, employees experienced offensive symbols or even racial slurs that made employees uncomfortable. For example, Tweet 41 showed how the employee perceived racism in the workplace when he or she had to listen to anti-Islamic speech from their boss. Although the employee did not specifically mention what was said made the employee feel discriminated against, it is important to note that having a specific cultural group spoken against can cause perceived racism, as well. Overall, the tweets supported that there are *nonverbal* racial discrimination perceived by employees that occur in this manner.

Both discrimination types

As the researcher mentioned earlier, there were also tweets that presented evidence of *both verbal* and *nonverbal* discrimination. This type of discrimination was distributed to all three EEOC discrimination types. Among 19 Tweets (17.6%) that showed evidence of a combination of *both verbal* and *nonverbal* acts, 6 tweets (31.6%) were *work situation* related. Examples of this category included:

*My boss is not a racist prick and believes in equal opportunity among his employees, regardless of race. He even asked me to keep my salary a secret from others because most of the people from *my* own race don't get paid as much as I do and he doesn't want to shake shit up. (Tweet 64)*

Hey, my boss says that if I don't work tomorrow it's racist against Muslim refugees. Is this right? Please reply, I haven't seen my family in days (Tweet 77)

My boss is making me go home early tonight cuz I called him racist after he made a racist joke so like who's the snow flake lol but what ever jokes on you fam imam go home and do a face massage. (Tweet 81)

In these tweets, employees perceived *both verbal* and *nonverbal* discrimination in work situations. Tweet 77 showed how the boss spoke (*verbal*) to the employee and made the employee work (*nonverbal*) while this employee had not seen his/her family for a long time. Tweet 81 also showed how the employee was asked to leave (*nonverbal*) when this individual reacted to a racist joke (*verbal*) from the boss.

In addition to *work situation*s, there were 9 tweets (47.4%) that supported how employees perceived *harassment* discrimination in relation to *both verbal* and *nonverbal* discriminatory acts. Examples are:

My boss is racist if a black person comes stays at her bar too long she'll tell me they cant stay all day… it drives me crazy mad Starbucks better hire me fr (Tweet 61)

HOLY SHIT? My boss is very racist that he called a black woman (OPPOSING COUNSEL I MIGHT ADD) a N word Bitch to her face. Then he comes back and laughs it off. I need to get the HELL out of here. (Tweet 88)

I said to my boss, I wish we got MLK day off, he said yeah & Juneteenth, too. So, I could eat fried chicken & watermelon. I said that is racist. The other worker said wish it was back when people could take a humor. Then boss said, I am not racist, a black man told me that joke. (Tweet 69)

In these instances, employees showed evidence of perceived racism from being harassed by their bosses in the process of *both verbal* communication and *nonverbal* communication. Tweet 69 showed how a boss utilized humor (*verbal*) that would offend certain races, while the boss did not allow a day off on a holiday (*nonverbal*). Similarly, tweet 61 showed how the boss told (*verbal*) the employee to make the black customers leave (*nonverbal*), which constitutes *harassment* discrimination based on EEOC definitions.

There were also 4 instances (21.0%) that showed *policies/practices* discrimination issue under *both* category. Examples are:

> *My boss is racist asf, and I'm pushing my co-worker to get a lawyer for discrimination. Calling people the n word and making them wear white bc they're black is so disgusting. (Tweet 73)*
>
> *My boss just said I can't play rap in the back cause they'll think everyone who works in the store is racist…..what? (Tweet 90)*
>
> *WOW!!!! I guess I would be fired, cause there is no way my boss is telling me I can't wear NIKE to work, better yet, I quit!! You're RACIST with that shit policy. (Tweet 91)*

In these instances, employees perceived racism through boss' *both verbal* and *nonverbal* behavior in relation to the company's *policies/practices*. For example, tweet 90 showed how the employee felt racism from the boss' policy of not allowing the employee to play rap in the back. Similarly, tweet 91 showed how an employee perceived racism when the boss did not allow the wearing of specific shoe brand to work. Although the boss' reasoning behind these policies are unclear, it is noted from the employees as perceived racism, which is the intent of this study. The researcher also noted that the employee's perception of racism also

came from *how* the policy is delivered to the employee, causing *both verbal* and *nonverbal* perceived racism. Samples of all tweets from this section can be seen pictorially in Table 2.

Table 2

Sample Tweets for EEOC's Discrimination Types

Type of Discrimination	N=108	%	Sample Tweet
Verbal	48	44.4	
Work Situation	0		
Harassment	48	100	"Darker-skinned people don't get sunburned because they have more oil in their skin." No, that's melatonin you're taking of. #MyRacistBoss
Policies/Practices	0	0	
Nonverbal	41	38.0	
Work Situation	27	65.9	My boss would make me work during the wedding. -_- any other Saturday ion work 11:30. They been trying me! I worked MLK DAY TO ! #racistjob
Harassment	14	34.1	My boss refuses to speak to anyone on the line who has an accent #racistboss
Policies/Practices	0	0	
Both	19	17.6	
Work Situation	6	31.6	Hey, my boss says that if I don't work tomorrow it's racist against Muslim refugees. Is this right? Please reply, I haven't seen my family in days
Harassment	9	47.4	My boss is racist if a black person comes stay at his cafe too long he'll tell me they can't stay all day… it drives me crazy mad Starbucks better hire me fr
Policies/Practices	4	21.0	My boss just said I can't play rap in the back cause they'll think everyone who works in the store is racist…..what?

Research Question Two

For research question two, the researcher examined the tweets with Colquitt's (2001) categorization of organizational justices. Because there were tweets that contained more than one type of organizational justice, the researcher categorized each instance as opposed to each individual tweet. A total of 112 instances were recorded in the process.

Interpersonal injustice

After categorizing instances into different organizational justices, the researcher found that 74 tweets showed evidence of *interpersonal* injustice instances. This *interpersonal* injustice instance is over half (66.1%) of total instances of perceived organizational injustices from employees, indicating that a lot of organizational injustice is from employees perceiving disrespect. Examples of perceived *interpersonal* injustice tweets are:

Just because I'm Mexican doesn't mean I know how to cook tamales! #MyBossIsRacist (Tweet 9)

"There's this black man in town who got on my ass at the library last week because I was standing in front of the door." #racistboss (Tweet 16)

"The Indians are as bad as the Blacks. They believe we owe them something." #racistboss (Tweet 17)

My boss is racist and treats me like a pile of poop, my coworkers can all die in hell the treat me like a stray dog, their always ranking on me and hurts my feelings (Tweet 86)

Holy shit my racist ass boss just said "if you close your doors at night there's a chance you want the wall to be built" (Tweet 99)

Procedural injustice

Secondly, 26 tweets (23.2%) showed evidence of *procedural* injustice. *Procedural* justice is related to 'how and why' a decision gets made (Colquitt, 2001). It was found that employees often feel treated unequitably in the process of deciding who is working, who gets promoted, etc. Examples of *procedural* injustice tweets are:

got fired #racistjob (Tweet 3)

Am I the only one working tomorrow #RacistJOB (Tweet 5)

My body is on ache from the work I did in Lodi yesterday. Love me body. LOVE ME. #sotired #workingonmlkday #racistboss (Tweet 29)

Everybody is off tomorrow but me…#racistboss (Tweet 39)

How I know my boss is racist: no off for MLK Day (Tweet 66)

Distributive injustice

There were also 8 instances (7.1%) where employees felt *distributive* injustice. D*istributive* injustice showed how employees felt disappointed when they received certain organizational outcomes, such as payments and/or promotions. Examples of *distributive* injustice tweets are:

#RacistBoss Puts my name 2nd in the org chart when I trained the person above me. (Tweet 13)

I can't feed my babies if you don't give me a paycheck. #racistboss (Tweet 32)

Lol at that time my dad got promoted over a black girl. #racistboss (Tweet 43)

Informational injustice

Lastly, *informational* injustice followed with 4 instance (3.6%). *Informational* injustice emphasizes whether the employee was given appropriate information or not. Examples of *informational* injustice tweets are:

> *Black guy with a backpack walks into our shop, my boss calls me into his office n tells me to keep an eye on him. #RacistBoss (Tweet 28)*
>
> *My boss is making me research chocolate companies and Haribo is racist apparently (Tweet 70)*

This justice type indicates that there were instances when employees felt injustice when they realized that they did not receive enough information. Sample tweets of injustice can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Sample Tweets for Organizational Justices

Organizational Justices	N=112	%	Sample Tweet
Procedural	26	23.2	Am I the only one working tomorrow #RacistJOB
Distributive	8	7.1	#RacistBoss Puts my name 2nd in the org chart when I trained the person above me.
Interpersonal	74	66.1	"The Indians are as bad as the Blacks. They believe we owe them something." #racistboss
Informational	4	3.6	Black guy with a backpack walks into our shop, my boss calls me into his office n tells me to keep an eye on him. #RacistBoss

Verbal organizational injustice

To analyze these acts of organizational injustices more thoroughly, the researcher decided to look at the *verbal/nonverbal* aspect of the organizational justices. After categorizing the tweets, the researcher found that there were no instances (N=112) where verbally perceived discrimination is related to *procedural* or *distributive* organizational justices. However, 47 (97.9%) instances of *verbal* discrimination violated *interpersonal* justice. Examples of these tweets include:

> *"Not that I'm making this about the refugees, but with all the refugees coming in, we need to be more security conscious (Tweet 12)*
>
> *"Can you fix the gutters? It looks really ghetto. Make it look like white people live here." – My Boss #RacistBoss (Tweet 21)*
>
> *My boss just told me a joke then said "what? It's not racist" It was racist. #racistboss (Tweet 24)*
>
> *"oh he knows how to wrap a tortilla he's Mexican" #racistboss (Tweet 37)*
>
> *#racistboss me: planet of the apes comes out this week. Boss: just go up the market (Lexington market) (Tweet 40)*

In these instances, employees perceived their employers' *verbal* action as both disrespectful and offensive. Tweet 37 showed how the boss assumed the employee's knowledge on making a tortilla solely based on the employee's racial background. In Tweet 40, although what the boss said did not target the employee directly, the employee still perceived the boss' comment as racist. Since the employee perceived those *verbal* behaviors as both rude and personal, these instances showed how employees perceive the boss' *verbal* racial comments as *interpersonal* injustice.

In addition, there was 1 instance (2.1%) where employees felt *informational* injustice in a *verbal* manner. The number was small; however, it showed a different type of organizational injustice based on the knowledge or explanation the employee received. An example of a *verbal informational* injustice tweet is:

> *Black guy with a backpack walks into our shop, my boss calls me into his office n tells me to keep an eye on him. #RacistBoss (Tweet 28)*

In this instance, an employee was told to watch an individual without the boss explaining why. The only clue that was given to the employee was that the person was black and had a backpack. Although it may stand true that there was no information given to the employee regarding the man other than to watch him and the fact that this individual is black. In this instance, the researcher found that *informational* injustice was present because the employee did not receive proper and sufficient information from the boss.

Nonverbal organizational injustice

Perceived organizational injustice from *nonverbal* instances had a similar level of prevalence (N=42, 37.5%) as perceived organizational injustice from *verbal* instances. However, unlike *verbal* instances, *nonverbal* instances showed all four types of organizational injustices. Among those *nonverbal* instances, *procedural* injustice was found to be the most frequent with 19 instances (45.2%). Examples of *nonverbal procedural* injustice tweets are:

> *Company work us like slaves and on the 4th of July, they feed us……watermelon! SMH #RacistJob! (Tweet 2)*
>
> *My body is on ache from the work I did in Lodi yesterday. Love me body. LOVEME. #sotired #workingonmlkday #racistboss (Tweet 29)*

Trying to talk my boss into letting me go home for Cesar Chavez Day/The Anniversary of when Selena was killed. She'ls not budging. #racistboss (Tweet 48)

How I know my boss is racist: no off for MLK Day (Tweet 66)

My boss is black and still got me working on MLK day smh he's racist (Tweet 67)

In these tweets, the researcher found that the bosses in these instances did not let the employee have a day off, or even made the employee work on holidays or personally important days. So to speak, employees perceived *procedural* injustice when they were unclear with why they need to work on certain days (tweet 2, 29, 66, and 69).

Unlike *verbal* instances, there were 7 *nonverbal distributive* injustice instances (16.7%). Examples of *nonverbal distributive* injustice tweets are:

#RacistBoss Puts my name 2nd in the org chart when I trained the person above me. (Tweet 13)

I can't feed my babies if you don't give me a paycheck. #racistboss (Tweet 32)

Lol at that time my dad got promoted over a black girl. #racistboss (Tweet 43)

My boss is a racist perverted homophobic prick, who does not pay me enough. I need to quit & find a new job, RIGHT NOW! (Tweet 76)

I think my boss is racist and me n coworker found out yesterday that our other coworker gets paid more than us but we all work the same position and honestly I started before him and yes my coworker that's getting paid more is white while the two of us black ppl gets paid less (Tweet 97)

In these instances, employees perceived organizational injustice as they compared the product of a decision, such as payment or promotion with their co-workers. Tweet 32, 76, and 97 talked about how the employees got paid either too little or even not paid at all, and

they perceived it as racism. Tweet 43 showed how an employee got promoted over another employee who was described as a "black girl". It is unknown why there was a wage difference, denied promotion, and denied pay; however, it is important to note that employees perceived the acts as racism, which then lies within the scope of this study. As such, all acts are categorized as *distributive* injustice.

The researcher noted 15 *nonverbal* instances (35.7%) related to *interpersonal* justice. Examples of *nonverbal interpersonal* injustice tweets are:

> *Wey aye Jonathan Blendread lad put ya feet down!! #mackemscum #racistboss (Tweet 26)*
>
> *My boss is white and used the black emoticons is that racist and can I sue? (Tweet 80)*
>
> *My boss is racist and treats me like a pile of poop, my coworkers can all die in hell the treat me like a stray dog, their always ranking on me and hurts my feelings (Tweet 86)*

In these instances, employees perceived their boss' behavior as racism as it did not show enough respect to the employees. Tweet 26 showed that simply putting their feet up on the table can be perceived as racist, and, thus, constitutes *interpersonal* injustice. In addition, even using an emoticon that represents a different race can be perceived as racist and not respectful (Tweet 80). Tweet 86 clearly showed how employees were mistreated, and that they expressed that these mistreatments were due to racism by mentioning "my boss is racist".

Lastly, the researcher distinguished 1 instance (2.4%) that showed lack of *informational* justice. An example of an *informational* injustice tweet includes:

My boss is making me research chocolate companies and Haribo is racist apparently (Tweet 70)

The instance mentioned above showed not only *procedural* injustice, but this tweet also showed that there is possibly *informational* injustice because the employee did not receive any explanation. As *informational* justice focused on fairness in receiving the right information at the right time (Colquitt, 2001), it is evident that the employee felt *informational* injustice that actually led to perceived racism.

Both organizational injustice

The researcher lastly looked at how organizational injustice was prevalent in instances where there were evidence of *both verbal* and *nonverbal* racist occurrences together, which resulted in 22 instances (19.6%), of which 7 instances (31.8%) were related to *procedural* injustice. Example tweets of *procedural* injustice that contained *both verbal* and *nonverbal* behaviors are:

"Do you wanna be in China or you wanna be in England? I guess China cause you're Asian." Jin talks about my next work term.. #racistboss (Tweet 19)

I said to my boss, I wish we got MLK day off, he said yeah & Juneteenth, too. So, I could eat fried chicken & watermelon. I said that is racist. The other worker said wish it was back when people could take a humor. Then boss said, I am not racist, a black man told me that joke. (Tweet 69)

Hey, my boss says that if I don't work tomorrow it's racist against Muslim refugees. Is this right? Please reply, I haven't seen my family in days (Tweet 77)

In these instances, bosses were making *verbal* comments. However, the employees seemed to be angry at not only what the bosses were saying, but also at the result of the comments. In

other words, the procedure of how a decision was made or will be made caused perceived racism, and therefore these instances showed evidence of *procedural* injustice. The employee who wrote tweet 19 perceived the boss as racist because the boss guessed the employee's next work location solely by the race of the employee, which violates *procedural* justice. Tweet 69 and 77 showed how employees were asked to work on religious holidays, which is also a sign of *procedural* injustice (Colquitt, 2001).

The researcher also noted that there was only 1 instance (4.5%) that showed *distributive* injustice when a boss communicated *both* verbally and nonverbally in a racist manner. An example tweet of *distributive* injustice is:

> *My boss is not a racist prick and believes in equal opportunity among his employees, regardless of race. He even asked me to keep my salary a secret from others because most of the people from *my* own race don't get paid as much as I do and he doesn't want to shake shit up. (Tweet 64)*

In this instance, the employee and the boss were having a conversation on salary. However, the employee felt unfair treatment when the boss mentioned how he compared the employee's salary with people of his race. Even though the boss talked about equal opportunity, it was shown that there was a salary inequality between employees, and it was related to race. This tweet supported *distributive* injustice.

The most prevalent organizational injustice in relation to *both verbal* and *nonverbal* behavior was *interpersonal* injustice. There were 12 *interpersonal* injustice instances (54.6%) that provided evidence of mistreatment or that had issue with respecting the employee. Examples of *interpersonal* injustice tweets are:

"Do you wanna be in China or you wanna be in England? I guess China cause you're Asian." Jin talks about my next work term.. #racistboss (Tweet 19)

I said to my boss, I wish we got MLK day off, he said yeah & Juneteenth, too. So, I could eat fried chicken & watermelon. I said that is racist. The other worker said wish it was back when people could take a humor. Then boss said, I am not racist, a black man told me that joke. (Tweet 69)

My boss is racist asf, and I'm pushing my co-worker to get a lawyer for discrimination. Calling people the n word and making them wear white bc they're black is so disgusting. (Tweet 73)

HOLY SHIT? My boss is very racist that he called a black woman (OPPOSING COUNSEL I MIGHT ADD) a N word Bitch to her face. Then he comes back and laughs it off. I need to get the HELL out of here. (Tweet 88)

Among these instances, tweet 19 and 69 were introduced earlier as procedural injustice. However, these two instances also showed *interpersonal* justice issue including cultural prejudice and being rude (Colquitt, 2001). In addition, tweet 73 and 88 showed how a racial slur can impact an employee's perception, as well. In both instances, the bosses used racial slurs and were making fun of the employee's culture. All these behaviors, in addition to what the bosses actually said, were perceived as *interpersonal* injustice.

Lastly, there were 2 instances (9.1%) that supported *informational* injustice within the workplace. Examples of *informational* injustice tweets are:

Hey, my boss says that if I don't work tomorrow it's racist against Muslim refugees. Is this right? Please reply, I haven't seen my family in days (Tweet 77)

> *WOW!!!! I guess I would be fired, cause there is no way my boss is telling me I can't wear NIKE to work, better yet, I quit!! You're RACIST with that shit policy. (Tweet 91)*

In these instances, the boss enforced policies, such as working on a certain day (Tweet 77) or giving a dress code (Tweet 91). However, the employees seemed unsatisfied with the policies because proper information was not given to the employees. Because the issue is coming from lack of knowledge, there was evidence of *informational* injustice (Colquitt, 2001). Sample tweets of all occurrences can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4

Sample Tweets for Organizational Justices Based on Verbal/Nonverbal Aspect

Type of Organizational Justice	N=112	%	Sample Tweet
Verbal	48	42.9	
Procedural	0	0	
Distributive	0	0	
Interpersonal	47	97.9	"Can you fix the gutters? It looks really ghetto. Make it look like white people live here." – My Boss #RacistBoss
Informational	1	2.1	Black guy with a backpack walks into our shop, my boss calls me into his office n tells me to keep an eye on him. #RacistBoss
Nonverbal	42	37.5	
Procedural	19	45.2	Me & my dad, Just a couple Mexicans working in the basement… Typical -___- #Racistjob
Distributive	7	16.7	Papa johns owner gave me a free coke today and didn't give one to my coworker #employeeofthemonth #racistboss
Interpersonal	15	35.7	Is it my boss's duty to be racist towards Mexicans right in front of me
Informational	1	2.4	My boss is making me research chocolate companies and Haribo is racist apparently
Both	22	19.6	
Procedural	7	31.8	
			I asked my boss for Monday off and he asked if I'm celebrating the holidays..Is he racist, or am I just showing my embarrassment of not knowing when MLK day is onto him?

Table 4 Continued

Type of Organizational Justice	N=112	%	Sample Tweet
Distributive	1	4.5	My boss is not a racist prick and believes in equal opportunity among his employees, regardless of race. He even asked me to keep my salary a secret from others because most of the people from *my* own race don't get paid as much as I do and he doesn't want to shake shit up.
Interpersonal	12	54.6	My boss is one of "those white people" that says racist stuffs about black people and doesn't think it's racist Bc she sleeps with black guys
Informational	2	9.1	WOW!!!! I guess I would be fired, cause there is no way my boss is telling me I can't wear NIKE to work, better yet, I quit!! You're RACIST with that shit policy.

Overall, the results showed that there was evidence of perceived organizational injustices. Employees perceived all 4 types of organizational injustice through both *verbal* and *nonverbal* behaviors from their bosses. The most frequently perceived organizational injustice was *interpersonal* (N=74), while there were only 4 *informational* injustice instances. Even though at times the context was unclear, it is found that employees do perceive racist behaviors in the workplace, and they utilize Twitter to express what they perceived against their bosses, which remained the scope of this study.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to explore employees' perception of their bosses' racist behaviors through categorizing and analyzing employees' Twitter posts with either hashtags of "#racistjob", "#mybossisracist", "#racistboss", and "#myracistboss", and terms including "racist boss", "My boss is racist", and "my racist boss". Two content analyses were conducted to explore two different research questions. First, the researcher looked at perceived racist behaviors through the lens of the EEOC's (n.d.) discrimination types. The results showed that there were evidences of perceived racist behaviors, supporting how racist behaviors are prevalent in the workplace (Rodriguez, 2012). Specifically, the researcher distinguished that there were both *verbal* and *nonverbal* behavior that employees perceived as racism. Additionally, the results supported how racist behaviors were clearly distinguishable between *work situations, harassment,* and *policies/practices.* The researcher also found that the perceived racist behaviors showed evidences of different organizational injustices. The employees expressed perceived organizational injustice through hashtags or keywords, supporting previous research, which noted that racism has a positive relationship with perceived organizational injustice (Dahanayake, Rajendran, Selvarajah, & Ballantyne, 2018).

Research Question One

Previous research supported that racism is prevalent in the workplace (Rodriguez, 2012; Rosette, Carton, Bowes-Sperry, & Hewlin, 2013). More importantly, this research supported that there are several instances of racist behaviors occurring in the workplace that

go unpunished. According to the EEOC, *harassment* is not punished unless it is serious and frequent enough that it causes an offensive work environment or creates an adverse employment decision (EEOC, n.d.). However, 65.7% (N=71) of discrimination instances fell under *harassment* type from discrimination type of the EEOC. Among the tweets, there were examples that showed simple teasing, which if reported could be seen as not severe enough to result in adverse action by EEOC. For example, one unit of analysis stated "oh he knows how to wrap a tortilla he's Mexican #racistboss" (Tweet 37). Even though the employee stated his/her perception of racism through the hashtag, the stated behavior of the boss did not satisfy the EEOC's guidelines as it was simply stereotyping a culture.

Sulivan, Ong, La Macchia, and Louis (2016) insisted that racially motivated occurrences are frequently unpunished. Additionally, they noted that it is normal to expect a higher rate of occurrence than reported because the victims are exposed to disadvantages when they report instances of racism in the workplace. As such, the employees choose to post it on Twitter where they can be more authentic and honest (Hsu & Ching, 2012). This action though can have a profound effect on the superior-subordinate relationship if noticed by superiors. Because there is a possibility of external risk, such as causing financial loss due to the negatively built company reputation from those tweets, the employers are required to take action (Smith, Stumberger, Guild, & Dugan, 2017). Therefore, employees are vulnerable to the internal consequences, such as a job loss or creating a bad personal image within the workplace brought by their bosses due to the power differences (Kumar & Mishra, 2017). To prevent this issue, the employers started adopting workplace regulations regarding social media that limits privacy of each employee; however, this policy enforcement requires

employee's awareness and trainings on the purpose of the regulation in advance, which often time is difficult for employees to accept it as an affair policy. (Brown & Dent, 2017).

Results also highlight the need for improved communication among bosses and employees. It is possible that bosses may believe their company supports open, upward communication; however, results support that the employees appear to have a difficult time expressing themselves to their superiors. In other words, while system theory emphasized the interdependence and interrelationships of each and every individual in the system (Greenberg et al., 2007), it is found that several employees seem to be suffering from a communication breakdown with their bosses. This can be relieved by adapting a human resource approach where management places more focus on their relations with their employees (Mor Barak, 2017). By looking at organizational communication with more of a human resource approach, which emphasizes the importance of open communication and building relationship between bosses and employees to trigger creativity, adaptability, and to fully pull out potential and motivation from the employees (Eisenberg, Trethewey, LeGreco & Goodall Jr, 2017), employees may perceive their boss' comments more as humor than a direct insult, how superiors indicate they intended the message.

It is also important to note that there were *policy* issues in the workplace. Under the *workplace situation* category, several tweets supported that the employees perceived racism through work related policies, such as working on certain holidays and/or ordering specific work. In addition, there were also *policies/practices* that were not work related including the ban of certain types of music, not allowing certain brands or color, etc. Canary and Mcphee (2009) insisted that employees make sense of the organization through the policies, and they also perceive how they are treated through those policies. Therefore, this study supports that

the organization needs to revisit their policy communication within the workplace. Previous research supported that it is important to consider power distance and uncertainty avoidance as key elements when making organizational decisions and policies (Glenn & Jackson, 2010). This study did not provide the true intent of those policies; however, the results showed that the employees perceived racism based on those policies that were affecting their work/life balance, regardless of the boss' intention. As such, it negatively affects the superior-subordinate relationship.

To minimize these policy issues and to create an inclusive workplace, the researcher suggests having policy training. It is important to develop policy training that can provide a framework on sensitization and consciousness to the issue of racism within the workplace (Maeso & Araujo, 2017). This type of policy training will not only provide reasons for the bosses to be cautious when selecting policies; in addition, this training will emphasize the validity of why providing enough information behind those policies to the employees is important. More specifically, this policy training should give the bosses a chance to understand there are different approaches from different cultures. For example, the American culture relies much on a formal contract while most Asian cultures rely on informal relationships (Eisenberg et al., 2017). Without having these precautionary steps to understand employees and their cultures, the members in the system will not be willing to build trust (Varner & Beamer, 1995); therefore, they will continuously perceive the policies with their own cultural lens, which at times may lead to perceptions of racism when in fact it may not be.

Research Question Two

The researcher adapted Colquitt's (2001) 4-dimensional approach to organizational justice instead of the traditional 3-dimension approach to explore RQ2 (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). However, Colquitt's approach was not clearly supported in this research. Although Colquitt separated *interactional* justice into *interpersonal* and *informational* justice to clarify how employees may perceive being 'respected' and being 'informed' differently, the result showed only 4 instances (3.5%) with evidence of perceived *informational* injustice while there were 74 instances (65.5%) of *interpersonal* injustice. Furthermore, there was only 1 tweet (Tweet 40) that represented just *informational* injustice. The other 3 tweets (Tweet 70, 77, and 91) showed evidence of *procedural* injustice along with *informational* injustice, supporting that Colquitt's addition of *informational* justice may belong to *procedural* injustice from the conventional organizational justice theory, which shows unfair treatment occurred during the decision making process (Greenberg, 1987). This finding made sense because giving information can be a way of explaining the validity of a procedure. One example tweet showed how an employee did not receive any explanation on why the specific employee was chosen to research on a candy company. The employee is questioning the process of how he or she was chosen to do the specific work, showing an evidence of procedural injustice from the conventional 3-organizational justice model.

Even though 47.1% (N=48) of tweets presented *verbal* racist behavior, it is important to note that a lot of what bosses actually did that cause perceived racism was not *verbal*; instead, it was more covert communication. Covert communication usually allows embedded messages to come through the cover that may or may not be closely related to the true messages (Tan & Lee, 2019). This result supported that a lot of perceived racism came from

not the overt racist behaviors, such as calling an employee an n word, instead the perception resulted from boss' strategic communication under humor and/or *nonverbal* cues. For example, many of the tweets showed how bosses 'told' employees to work on Martin Luther King Jr. Day. This behavior is hard to prove as racism because the bosses can validate their decision by saying that they did not have someone to work on the specific day to protect themselves from breaking *procedural justice*. It appears through the tweets that the bosses are strategically ambiguous and covert when racism is evident, which can ultimately protect the boss, or it could be that the bosses did not mean it in a racist manner; however, the employees perceived it to be a racism.

Additionally, it is also important to look at how the bosses use racist comments as humor. Among many of the *interpersonal* injustices instances, there were tweets that showed how the bosses made jokes on racial stereotypes. For example, an employee reacted to the boss' comment as "just because I'm Mexican doesn't mean I know how to cook tamales! #MyBossIsRacist" (Tweet 9). It is possible that the boss was simply using humor to communicate with the employee. However, it was not funny to the employee. Instead, the employee clearly perceived the boss' behavior as racist by writing the hashtag of "#MyBossIsRacist". Alvesson and Willmott (2002) insisted that there are employees going through identity issues and may be more fragile to certain *verbal* and *nonverbal* behaviors. In other words, regardless of the boss' intention, it is important that there are employees who may suffer perceived racism from their superior's humor, and these conflicts from opposite sides can interfere with the realization of organizational goals (Putnam & Poole, 1987). Even though the boss may not have intended to hurt anyone, the language can impact reification of surroundings and interpersonal perception as well (Fiedler, Semin, & Bolten, 1989).

This study also supported that racism in the workplace is often strategically performed. As mentioned earlier, over 65% of perceived organizational injustice instances were related to *interpersonal* injustices (N=74). When we think about the nature of different organizational justices, *distributive* justice and *procedural* justice is easy to prove because they are often linked with evidence. However, *interpersonal* justice, which is linked to personal respect is hard to isolate. The majority of the *interpersonal* injustice instances would not be considered as racism by the EEOC, but it still has a negative impact on satisfaction of the employees, leading into several different issues, which include employee retention and motivation. Moreover, at times, there are bosses who know they can be punished legally by their overt racist behaviors; however, they cannot moderate their behavior, which results in instances of interpersonal injustice, which negatively alters the superior-subordinate relationship.

Although the biggest issue seemed to be strategic communication coming from the bosses, it is also important to point out how language can be an issue. There were also examples that showed how the bosses used racial slurs both directly to the employees and indirectly towards others while the employees were present. Regardless of the intention, this study supported that the bosses need to be more aware of their language toward and around their subordinates. It is noted in research that racial slurs are often used from dominant group to subordinate members in the workplace (Rosette et al., 2013). However, there is limited previous organizational communication research that focus on racial slurs and how this interpersonal aggression plays a significant role within the workplace (Rosette, Carton, Bowest-Sperry, & Hewlin, 2013). It is supported, though, that racial slurs or direct *harassment* can threaten the organizational identity of the subordinates (Leets, 2001). When

these types of *verbal* issues continue, the organization can also face employee retainability issues, as well (Hom, Roberson, & Ellis, 2008), along with legal issues.

Regardless of their intention, employers need to look at the organizational leadership to reduce perceived racist behaviors. As this study supported, employees perceive different kinds of organizational injustice from simple teasing to policy issues, even under the covert top-down communication. What this may suggest is that the bosses are not truly understanding the cultural differences from the diverse population to fully create an inclusive workplace. To initiate deeper cultural understanding in the workplace, Fairhurst's (2010) discursive leadership should be adopted as a tool. Discursive leadership emphasized two types of discourses within communication between superiors and subordinates. The first type *small d* emphasized the strategic use of words while sharing a conversation on daily basis. Fairhurst also emphasized the so called *big D*; focusing on the cultural concepts. In other words, discursive leadership teaches employers to consider not only the words they chose to use, but also the different angles and background cultures when communicating with their subordinates. Through analyzing the tweets, the researcher found that the bosses described in the tweets seemed to need improvement in both types of discourses by selecting words and sentences carefully, and by showing appreciation to different cultures rather than advancing stereotypes. Therefore, the recommendation of adopting a discursive leadership and cultural sensitivity training that can teach bosses how cultural insensitivity can create a relational breakdown in the superior-subordinate relationship, and ultimately can interfere the success of whole system is essential (Einsberg et al., 2017).

A thorough discussion indicated how the data supported that there are perceived racist behaviors from boss' to employees found in tweets. Additionally, the researcher

provided communicative tools to reduce those perceived racist behaviors to create an inclusive workplace where employees feel safe and motivated (Mor Barak et al., 2016). With the U.S. population in the workplace becoming more diverse day by day (Pepple, 2017), this study provided important findings that can help leaders and bosses of different organizations communicate with a diverse population. As Mor Barak (2017) insisted, removing all possible barriers to secure an inclusive environment is now essential for the U.S. workplace. To do so, now is the time to consider collaborative cross-cultural policy trainings and leadership changes to build relationships in order to create successful communication between superiors and subordinates.

Limitations and Future Researches

The present study's small sample size limits its findings. This study collected 129 tweets; however, 27 tweets did not contain enough analyzable information. Thus, due to time restraints, the study continued with only 102 samples. With over 300 million active Twitter users, it may have been possible to collect more tweets showing evidence of *verbal* and *nonverbal* perceived racist behaviors or different types of discriminatory and organizational injustices, which would have ultimately affected the results.

This study noted how upward communication is difficult; therefore social media may provide employees a channel to express their perceptions of their boss. At the same time, a previous study (Jodka, 2018) noted that companies started monitoring or banning employees' personal social media accounts due to the possible high cost when negative messages are conveyed to the public regarding the organization (Smith, Stumberger, Guild, & Dugan, 2017). As such, it stands to reason that the data collected may be that of employees who possess more radical tendencies, and do not necessarily represent the average employee.

In addition, this research primarily focused on the text of the tweets. This field of study has great potential to expand in many directions depending on the study's focus. By looking into gender differences between employees who post about their perceived racist boss on Twitter, it is easy to determine whether certain genders perceive racist behaviors differently. Additionally, it would be important to look at the difference in the number of perceived racist actions by geographical locations. The EEOC (2018a) reported that the number of reported racist actions vary by state. However, this study does not provide any evidence of geographical differences. By exploring geographical location, results may clarify whether perceived racism on Twitter matches EEOC's geographical counts of perceived racism. If so, it may be possible that certain areas need to work on communication in the work place more so, which may reveal geographical cultural differences.

Although this research provides an in-depth analysis on how employees perceive their boss' behaviors as racist through analyzing the Twitter data, the true intention of these bosses is unknown. Data from the current study shows the most frequent type of discrimination was *harassment*, and the most frequently experienced organizational injustice was *interpersonal*. It is then logical to assume employees' perception of their boss' behaviors are personal issues. However, because it was not possible to determine the employers' true intentions behind certain behaviors in the workplace, it is not possible to conclude these behaviors as intentionally racist. To further understand organizational communication, this research could seek to explore this topic utilizing a method that allows both parties to be heard.

REFERENCES

Almaney, A. (1974). Communication and the systems theory of organization. *Journal of Business Communication, 12*(1), 35-43.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies, 39,* 619-644.

Ashford, J. B., LeCroy, C.W., & Lortie, K. L. (2009) *Human behavior in the social environment: A multidimentional perspective.* Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Avery, D. R., Mckay, P. F., Wilson, D. C., & Tonidandel, S. (2007). Unequal Attendance: The Relationships between Race, Organizational Diversity Cues, and Absenteeism. *Personnel Psychology, 4,* 875.

Baskett, G. D. (1973). Interview decisions as determined by competency and attitude similarity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57,* 343-345.

Becerra, J. A. (2015). Minimizing subtle racism in the workplace. *Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal. 24*, 459-489.

Bertalanffy, L. (1972). The history and status of general systems theory. *Academy of Management Journal, 15*(4), 407-426.

Betigeri, A. (2017, November 26). As anti-semitism rises, 'I don't feel safe in Australia,' Rabbi says. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/26/world/australia/australia-anti-semitism-racism.html

Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg, & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in Organizational Justice* (pp. 85-108). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J.S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations, 1,* 43-55.

Blocher, D. H., Heppner, M., Johnston, J. (2008). Understanding cultural diversity: Implications for the workforce. *Counseling & Human Development. 41*(2), 1-7.

Brown, M., & Dent, C. (2017) Privacy concerns over employer access to employee social media. *Monash University Law Review, 43*(3), 796-827.

Buckley, W. (1967). *Sociology and modern systems theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019). Labor force statistics from the current population survey. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/cps/tables.htm#charemp

Buse, K., Bernstein, R.S., & Bilimoria, D. (2016). The influence of board diversity, board diversity policies and practices, and board inclusion behaviors on nonprofit governance practices. *Journal of Business Ethics, 133*(2), 179-191.

Canary, H. E., & McPhee, R. D. (2009). The mideation of policy knowledge: An interpretive analysis of intersecting activity systems. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23,* 147-187.

Chung, J. Y., Jung, C. S., Kyle, G. T., & Petrick, J. F. (2010). Servant leadership and procedural justice in the U.S. national park service: The antecedents of job satisfaction. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 28*(3), 1-15.

Cloutier, J., Vihuber, L., Harrisson, D., & Beland-Ouellette, V. (2018). Understanding the effect of procedural justice on psychological distress. *International Journal of Stress Management, 25*(3), 283-300.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London and New York: Routledge Falmer.

Cohn, D., & Caumont, A. (2016, March 31). 10 Demographic trends that are shaping the U.S. and the world. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/03/31/10-demographic-trends-that-are-shaping-the-u-s-and-the-world/

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 386-400.

Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson, *International review of industrial and organizational psychology (Vol. 12,* pp. 317-372). London: John Wiley & Sons.

Dahanayake, P., Rajendran, D., Selvarajah, C., & Ballantyne, G. (2018). Justice and fairness in the workplace: A trajectory for managing diversity. *Equality, Diversity & Inclusion, 37*(5), 470.

Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues, 31*(3), 137-149.

Efimova, L., & Grudin, J. (2008). *Crossing boundaries: Digital literacy in enterprises. In Digital literacies: Concepts, policies, practices* (pp. 203–227). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Eisenberg, E. M., Trethewey, A., LeGreco, M., & Goodall, H. L., Jr. (2017). *Organizational communication: Balancing creativity and constraint*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martins.

Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*, 53-72.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2018a). EEOC charge receipts by state (includes U.S. territories) and basis for 2017. Retrieved from https://www1.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/state_17.cfm

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2018b). About EEOC. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2018c). Race-based charges (Charges filed with EEOC) FY 1994 – FY 2017.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (n.d.). Race/Color Discrimination. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/race_color.cfm

Fairhurst, G. T. (2010). *The power of framing: Creating the language of leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management.* London, England: Pitman.

Fiedler, K., Semin, G. R., & Bolten, S. (1989). Language use and reification of social information: top-down and bottom-up processing in person cognition. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 19*(4), 271-295.

Folger, R., & Bies, R. J. (1989). Managerial responsibilities and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2,* 79-89.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E. & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Glenn, C. L., & Jackson, R. L. II. (2010). Renegotiating identity in the field of communication. In S. Allan (Ed.). *Rethinking communication: Keywords in communication research* (pp. 137-149). New York, NY: Hampton Press.

Gotsis, G., & Grimani, K. (2016). Diversity as an aspect of effective leadership: Integrating and moving forward. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 37*(2), 241-264.

Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(1), 9-22.

Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed,), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ:Erlbaum.

Greenberg, J., & Ornstein, S. (1983). High status job title as compensation for underpayment: A test of equity theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(2), 285-297.

Greenberg, C. C., Regenbogen, S. E., Studdert, D. M., Lipsitz, S. R., Rogers, S. O., Zinner, M. J., & Gawande, A. A. (2007). Patterns of communication breakdowns resulting in injury to surgical patents. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 204,* 633-540.

Gruber, D. A., Smerek. R. E., Thomas-Hunt, M. C. & James, E. H. (2015). The real-time power of Twitter: Crisis management and leadership in an age of social media. *Business Horizons*, *58*, 163-172.

Gungor, S. K. (2018). Content analysis of theses and articles on ethical leadership. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(4), 901-920.

Han, Y., Hong, B, Lee, H., & Kim, K. (2017). How do we Tweet? The comparative analysis of Twitter usage by message types, devices, and sources. *The Journal of Social Media in Society*. *6*(1), 189-219.

Hasford, J. (2016). Dominant cultural narratives, racism, and resistance in the workplace: A study of the experiences of young black Canadians. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *57*(1-2), 158-170.

He, W., Fehr, R., Yam, K. C., Long, L., & Hao, P. (2017). Interactional justice, leader-member exchange, and employee performance: Examining the moderating role of justice differentiation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 38*(4), 537-557.

Hom P. W., Roberson, L., & Ellis, A. D. (2008). Challenging conventional wisdom about who quits: Revelations from corporate America. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 1-34.

Hsu, Y. C., & Ching, Y. H. (2012). Mobile microblogging: Using Twitter and mobile devices in an online course to promote learning in authentic contexts. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 13*(4), 211-277.

Hubbell, A. P., & Chory-Assad, R. M. (2005). Motivating factors: Perceptions of justice and their relationship with managerial and organizational trust. *Communication Studies, 56*(1), 47-70.

Hurtado, S., & Davis, R. J. (2018). Institutional commitments to diversity and social justice displayed on websites: A content analysis. *College Student Affairs Journal, 36*(2). 15-31.

Jain, N. (2018). Inclusive leadership and effective communication: An unbreakable bond. *Language in India, 18*(12), 207-215.

Jodka, S. H. (2018). Five common employer social media mistakes and how to avoid them. *Employee Relations Law Journal, 44*(1), 15-20.

Kassens, A. L. (2014). Tweeting your way to improved pass:[#]writing, #reflection, and #community. *Journal of Economic Education, 45*(2), 101-109.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Kim, T. Y., Wang, J., & Chen, J. (2018). Mutual trust between leader and subordinate and employee outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics, 149*(4), 945-958.

Konovsky, M. A. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 489-511.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed), Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Kumar, K. K., & Kishra, K. S. (2017). Subordinate-superior upward communication: Power, politics, and political skill. *Human Resource Management, 56*(6), 1015-1037.

Leets, L. (2001). Explaining perceptions of racist speech. *Communication Research, 58*(2), 341-361.

Li, C., & Liu, J. (2017). Effects of using social networking sites in diffierent languages: Does Spanish or English make a difference? *Computers in Human Behavior, 74*, 257-264.

Lincoln, J. R., & Miller, J. (1979). Work and friendship ties in organizations: A comparative analysis of relational networks. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24,* 181-199.

Lopez, J. S., Ortega-Ridaura, M. I., & Ortiz-Betancourt, I. (2017). Strategies of corporate social responsibility in Latin America: A content analysis in the extractive industry. *Ad-Minister,* (31), 115-135.

Maeso, S. R., & Araujo, M. (2017). The (im)plausibility of racism in Europe: Policy frameworks on discrimination and integration. *Patterns of Prejudice, 51*(1), 26-50.

Mai, F., Shan, Z., Bai, Q., Wang, X. S., Chiang, R. H. L. (2018). How does social media impact Bitcoin value? A test of the silent majority hypothesis. *Journal of Management Information Systems. 35*(1), 19-52.

Marescaux, E., De Winne, S., & Sals, L. (2019). Idiosyncratic deals from a distributive justice perspective: examining co-workers' voice behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics. 154*(1), 263-281.

McCluney, C. L., Schmitz, L. L., Hicken, M. T., & Sonnega, A. (2018). Structural racism in the workplace: Does perception matter for health inequalities? *Social Science & Medicine, 199,* 106-114.

Meiners, E. B., & Miller, V. D. (2004). The effect of formality and relational tone on supervisor/subordinate negotiation episodes. *Western Journal of Communication, 68*(3), 302-321.

Mor Barak, M. E. (2011). *Managing diversity toward a globally inclusive workplace* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Mor Barak, M. E. (2017). *Managing diversity toward a globally inclusive workplace* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Mor Barak, M. E., Lizano, E. L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M. K., Hsia, H. Y., Brimhall, K. C. (2016). The promise of diversity management for climate of inclusion: A state-of-the-art review and meta-analysis. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership and Governance, 40,* 305-333.

Muller, E., Evans, D. P., Frasche, N., Kern, A., & Resti, I. (2018). Stakeholder perceptions of the impact of individualized electronic "Communication Stories" on workplace communication. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 48*(1), 11-25.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2003). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Patten, R., Caudill, J., Bor, S., Thomas, M., & Anderson, S. (2015). Managing a criminal justice crisis: An organizational justice understanding of change in a sheriff's office. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(4), 737-749.

Pepple, D. G. (2017). Managing diversity and inclusion: An international perspective. Jawad Syed and Mustafa Ozbilgin, (eds), London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, pp.356. *European Management Review, 14*(2), 115-117.

Putnam, L., & Poole, M. S. (1987). Conflict and negotiation. In F. Jablin, L. Putnam, K. Roberts, & L. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 549-599). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rodriguez, L. Y. (2012). *Employee racial discrimination complaints: Exploring power through co-cultural theory*. Retrieved from ProQuest.

Rosenbaum, M. (1986). The repulsion hypothesis: On the nondevelopment of relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51,* 111-128.

Rosette, A. S., Carton, A. M., Bowes-Sperry, L., & Hewlin, P. F. (2013). Why do racial slurs remain prevalent in the workplace? Integrating theory on intergroup behavior. *Organization Science, 24*(5), 1402-1421.

Shah, N. R., & Jha, S. K. (2018). Exploring organizational understanding of foundational pillars of social media: A qualitative content analysis of social media policies of technology companies. *Journal of Management Research, 18*(4), 226-245.

Smith, B. G., Stumberger, N., Guild, J., & Dugan, A. (2017). What's at stake? An analysis of employee social media engagement and the influence of power and social stake. *Public Relations Review, 43*(5), 978-988.

Stacks, D. W. (2002). *Primer of public relations research.* New York: Guilford.

Statista. (2018a). Most famous social network sites worldwide as July 2018, ranked by number of active users (in millions). Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/

Statista. (2018b). Number of monthly active Twitter users worldwide from 1st quarter 2010 to 2nd quarter 2018 (in millions). Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/282087/number-of-monthly-active-twitter-users/

Statista. (2019). Distribution of Twitter users in the United States as of September 2018, by age group. Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/192703/age-distribution-of-users-on-twitter-in-the-united-states/

Sullivan, A., Ong, A., La Macchia, S., & Louis, W. (2016). The impact of unpunished hate crimes: When derogating the victim extends into derogating the group. *Social Justice Research, 29*(3), 310-330.

Tan, Y. Y. F., & Lee, S. (2019). Time-division is optimal for covert communication over some broadcast channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security, 14*(5). 1377-1389.

Thayer, A., Evans, M., Mcbride, A., Queen, M., & Spyridakis, J. (2007). Content analysis as a best practice in technical communication research. *Technical Writing and Communication, 37*(3), 267-279.

Tsui, A. S., O'Reilly, C. A. III. (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. *The Academy of Management Journal, 32*(2), 402.

Twitter Inc. (2017). Twitter Usage / Company Facts. Retrieved From https://about.twitter.com/company

Van Zoonen, W., Verhoeven, J. W.M., & Vliegenthart, R. (2015). How employees use Twitter to talk about work: A typology of work-related tweets. *Computers in Human Behaviors, 55*, 329-339.

Varner, I., & Beamer, L. (1995). *Intercultural communication in the global workplace.* Chicago, IL: Irwin.

Waldron, V. R. (1991). Achieving communication goals in superior-subordinate relationship: The multi-functionality of upward maintenance tactics. *Communication Monographs, 58*(3), 289-306.

Waters, H., Jr. (1994). Decision making and race. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18,* 449–467.

Wendlinger, R. M. (1973). Improving upward communication. *Journal of Business Communication, 10*(4), 17-23.

Zapata, C. P., Carton, A. M., & Liu, J. T. (2016). When justice promotes injustice: Why minority leaders experience bias when they adhere to interpersonal justice rules. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(4), 1150-1173.

APPENDIX

ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Graduate Studies

Institutional Review Board

11/28/2018

Dr. Leslie Rodriguez
Dept. of Communication and Mass Media
Angelo State University
San Angelo, TX 76909

Dear Leslie:

The project that you submitted for your student, Jun Kim, titled *"My boss is racist": A study of employees' perception of boss' racial comments on Twitter*" was reviewed by Angelo State University's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Research Subjects in accordance with federal regulations 45 CFR 46 for expedited review and was approved under Category F.7 of 63 FR 60364-60367.

This protocol is approved for one year effective November 28, 2018, and it expires one year from this date. If the study will continue beyond one year, you must submit a request for continuation before the current protocol expires. The documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date of November 28, 2019.

Please note that any revisions to these approved materials must be approved by the IRB prior to initiation. All unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others, and any unexpected adverse events must be reported promptly to this office.

The approval number for your protocol is #ROD-112818. Please include this number in the subject line of in all future communications with the IRB regarding the protocol.

Sincerely,

Teresa (Tay) Hack, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board

Dr. Teresa Hack, IRB Chair | ASU Station #11025 | San Angelo, Texas 76909
Phone: (325) 486-6121 | Fax: (325) 942-2194

Member, Texas Tech University System · Equal Opportunity Employer