relationships of the practice of hijab, workplace discrimination, social class, job stress, and job satisfaction among muslim american women

Saba Rasheed Ali, Torricia Yamada, and Amina Mahmood

Religious discrimination in the workplace has received little attention in the research. The present study is an exploratory study that investigated the impact of workplace discrimination on a self-selected sample of diverse Muslim women living across the United States ($N = 129$). The results of this study revealed that workplace discrimination, job stress, social class, and religiosity were related to lower levels of job satisfaction. Implications of the results are discussed in terms of clinical intervention strategies.

• • • •

Islam is the fastest growing religion in the United States (Pew Research Center, 2015a). According to the Pew Research Center (2015b), there are almost 2.8 million Muslims living in the United States, making Islam the fourth largest religion in the United States. After the attacks of September 11, 2001 (9/11), Muslims experienced an increase in religious discrimination (Council on American–Islamic Relations [CAIR], 2008), reflecting an increase in *Islamophobia*, which is a term used to characterize the negative perception of and reaction to Muslims and Islam in Western countries. In 1997, the Runnymede Trust, an independent British research and social policy agency, officially defined Islamophobia as "an outlook or world-view involving an unfounded dread and dislike of Muslims, which results in practices of exclusion and discrimination" (p. 1). Because of this anti-Muslim sentiment, workplace discrimination directed toward Muslims rose after 9/11 (Tahmincioglu, 2010), and Muslims who were highly visible became the targets of this discrimination (Ali, Liu, Humedian, 2004; CAIR, 2008). One of the most highly visible forms of religious expression by Muslim women is the wearing of the traditional head covering, known as the *hijab*. Many Muslim women reported experiencing prejudice and discrimination and consequently chose to remove the hijab after 9/11 (Cole & Ahmadi, 2003), especially in places of work (New York City Commission on Human Rights, 2003). It is likely

• • • •

Saba Rasheed Ali, Department of Counseling Psychology, University of Iowa; Torricia Yamada, Minneapolis VA Health Care System, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Amina Mahmood, private practice, Albany, New York. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Saba Rasheed Ali, Department of Counseling Psychology, University of Iowa, 361 Lindquist Center, Iowa City, IA 52246 (e-mail: saba-ali@uiowa.edu).

that Muslim women may have experienced a great deal of stress from this type of discrimination and possibly lowered satisfaction in their jobs. Yet, to date, there are very few studies that explore Muslim women's issues in general, and no research studies have examined Muslim women's perceptions of workplace discrimination and job satisfaction in particular. The current study is an exploratory examination of how the practice of wearing the hijab is related to religiosity, social class, perceptions of workplace discrimination, job stress, and job satisfaction among a group of Muslim American women.

HIJAB, SOCIAL CLASS, AND DISCRIMINATION

Ali (2009) described the term *hijab* as an Arabic word that has broad meaning for Muslims denoting modesty of dress and action. However, hijab is most commonly used by both Muslims and non-Muslims to refer to the traditional headscarf worn by Muslim women. This headscarf is a piece of cloth that covers the head for the purposes of concealing the hair. The practice of wearing the hijab differs from the practice of niqab, which is wearing the garment the covers the entire face (with the exception of the eyes); practicing hijab only requires a woman to cover her hair.

For some Muslim women, wearing the hijab is a symbolic religious practice that is associated with Muslim women's empowerment and identity. Muslim women who wear the hijab report that the practice identifies to others their faith commitment and is a powerful assertion of their identity (Droogsma, 2007). Hamdan (2007) suggested that the practice of hijab can also be a form of resistance against the imposition of Western culture. She wrote, "In recent years, the hijab has become a form of resistance to Western imperialism. The imposition of Western dress codes and lifestyles in a globalized world prompts many Muslim women to reaffirm their Muslim identity by wearing the hijab (Smith, 2004)" (p. 5).

Because of recent media attention surrounding women's status in Islam, reactions to the practice of hijab within Western countries has been mixed. For example, in 2003, the French government passed a law that bans the wearing of religious symbols, including the hijab, in public classrooms. Hamdan (2007) noted that the law is intended to prohibit religious symbols across religions, yet it was primarily implemented to force Muslim girls to remove the hijab in public schools. In the American media, images of Muslim women who wear the hijab are often paired with images of terrorism and oppression (Esposito & Mogahed, 2008). Thus, for many Americans, the hijab has come to symbolize Muslims' "backwardness" and gender oppression within Islam as a religion (Droogsma, 2007), and it is commonly believed to be worn by less educated, poor women who are not empowered. Yet, there is quite a bit of research to suggest that Muslim women view wearing the hijab as a symbol of modernity and as an empowered choice for highly educated women (Kulenović, 2006).

Zaal, Salah, and Fine (2007) conducted a qualitative study ($N = 15$) to investigate issues related to Muslim women's religious identification (e.g., wearing the hijab) and their experiences. In this study, women reported that their visual identity as a Muslim seemed to be highly related to experiences with physical intimidation and assault. Allen and Nielsen (2002) issued a summary report on Islamophobia in the European

Union (EU) after 9/11, which indicated that most countries in the EU identified relatively low levels of physical violence, but widespread verbal abuse, harassment, and aggression triggered by an appearance of being Muslim or Arab. Furthermore, in a Canadian study that focused on understanding the diversity of perceived meaning of a hijab, Tabassum (2006) used focus-group methodology to interview a group of hijab-wearing Muslim women ($N = 14$). These women described experiencing dangerous consequences, such as verbal and physical assaults, and reported that assailants often invoked stereotypes about the association between the hijab as the symbol of Muslim identity and terrorism as the reasons for these attacks. Some Muslim women chose to remove the hijab because of the negative reactions by others and perceived threats of discrimination or violence (Cole & Ahmadi, 2003).

WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION

Workplace discrimination has mostly been studied with regard to perceptions of discrimination related to gender, race, and sexual orientation and how these perceptions affect relationships with other coworkers and supervisors. For example, James, Lovato and Khoo (1994) found that value differences with supervisors were associated with perceptions of workplace discrimination using the Workplace Prejudice/Discrimination Inventory (WPDI; James, Lovato, & Cropanzano, 1994) for a group of 89 racially diverse minority workers. Additionally, Church (2012) reported that perceptions of workplace discrimination (as measured by a modified version of the WPDI) were negatively associated with engagement in mentoring of gay and lesbian junior colleagues in a U.S. subsample of gay and lesbian workers, but the opposite was true for the Canadian portion of the subsample. Triana, García, and Colella (2010) used a five-item version of the WPDI and found that aggregated scores on these items were negatively related to affective commitment (emotional attachment and involvement in the employee's organization) and that organizational diversity efforts had mixed results on attenuating this relationship.

Studies have demonstrated that workplace discrimination is related to relationships with coworkers, and the effect of this perceived discrimination might be mitigated by organizational efforts (e.g., Church, 2012 James, Lovato, & Khoo, 1994). However, workplace discrimination has yet to be investigated with regard to clients from different religious backgrounds, particularly Muslims. Given current attitudes toward Muslims in the workplace, it might be expected that they perceive discrimination, and this may have an impact on their well-being. Several civil rights and major research centers have issued reports that detailed the discrimination concerns of Muslims in America. Specifically, CAIR (2008) reported incidents of discrimination, threats, and actual violence that Muslims experienced. The report indicated an 18% increase in workplace discrimination from 2006. Religious identification was most frequently cited as the perceived reason for the discrimination for both hijab-wearing and non-hijab-wearing women.

There has been some research that has investigated discrimination issues in employee hiring procedures. For example, King and Ahmad (2010) conducted an experimental study using confederates to investigate the application of the justification–suppression

and stereotype-content models of prejudice and to examine religious discrimination in hiring practices among a group of 86 store managers. King and Ahmad found that levels of formal or overt discrimination did not differ significantly between female Muslim applicants who wore religious attire and Muslim women who did not, but Muslim women wearing identifiable Muslim clothing experienced covert forms of discrimination, such as hostility and rudeness. More recently, Acquisti and Fong (2013) conducted two randomized experiments on the hiring behaviors of U.S. firms by testing responses from over 4,000 employers on hiring practices using candidate social network profiles. The study found that employers in the United States who identified as the most Republican were less likely to interview job candidates whose social networking presences identified them as Muslim.

On the basis of this research, it is possible that Muslim women experience discriminatory practices in their places of work after being hired, but there is a lack of scholarly research, to date, that examines the nature of this discrimination. For example, it is unclear if wearing the hijab, workplace discrimination, stress, social class, and job satisfaction are related to one another. Because no literature or research theory exists that ties these variable together, the current study is exploratory in nature.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The current study was an exploratory study designed to examine job satisfaction among Muslim women in the United States. Specifically, we investigated two research questions: (a) What are the differences between two groups of Muslim women (those who chose to wear or not to wear the hijab) on the variables of social class, religiosity, workplace discrimination, job satisfaction, and job stress? (b) Which of the variables of hijab wearing, social class, religiosity, workplace discrimination, and job stress predicted job satisfaction for both groups of women?

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 129 Muslim women ages 20 to 66 years ($M = 33.05$, $SD = 10.04$) who responded to an online survey that was sent to the electronic mailing lists of Muslim organizations across the United States. Sixty-four percent of participants indicated that they were American citizens ($n = 83$), and 24% were naturalized citizens ($n = 31$); 6% reported that they were in the United States on a work permit ($n = 8$), 2% on a student visa ($n = 3$), and 3% other (e.g., refugee; $n = 4$). Although the majority of participants lived in an urban setting (85%, $n = 110$) compared with a rural setting (15%, $n = 19$), participants were from all different regions of the United States. Specifically, 28% were from the East Coast ($n = 36$), 28% from the Midwest ($n = 36$), 23% from the Northeast ($n = 30$), 12% from the South ($n = 15$), 7% from the West Coast ($n = 9$), and 2% from the Northwest ($n = 3$). Forty-five percent of participants identified being of South Asian descent ($n = 58$), 22% Caucasian ($n =$

28), 11% Arab/Arab American (n = 14), 9% biracial/mixed (n = 11), 8% African American (n = 10), 4% African (n = 5), and 2% Asian (n = 3). All participants identified as being Muslim, and 55% of the participants currently wore the hijab (n = 71). The majority of participants were married (54%, n = 70), 30% were single (n = 39), 12% were divorced (n = 16), and 3% indicated their marital status as other (n = 4). Women endorsed employment in a variety of different settings: 19% health care (n = 25), 13% professional (n = 17), 9% educational/academic (n = 12), 9% students (n = 12), 9% business/finance (n = 11), 8% not-for-profit organizations (n = 10), 8% service/retail (n = 10), 7% administrative/clerical (n = 9), 4% government (n = 5), and 14% other (n = 18). All of the women were employed at least part time (at least 20 hours of work per week). Some percentages in this section do not total 100 because of rounding.

Measures

Demographic information. Demographic information was collected using a background questionnaire that asked the participants to indicate their age, citizenship status, ethnic background (open-ended so that participants could describe their background in their own words), employment status, occupational setting, educational attainment, geographic location, religious identification, marital status, and whether they wore the hijab.

Social class. We measured social class using the MacArthur Subjective Social Status Scale (Adler & Stewart, 2007). The measure uses a picture of a ladder with 10 rungs. Respondents are asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 10 where they consider themselves to stand in relation to others in the United States. Specifically, the instructions ask respondents to "Think of these numbers as representing where people stand in the United States. The highest number represents the people who are the best off—those who have the most money, the most education, and the most respected jobs. The lowest number represents the people who are the worst off—those who have the least money, least education, and the least respected jobs or no job." This measure is widely used in health research. It was developed by the MacArthur SES & Health Network, has been used in a number of studies to predict health outcomes (e.g., Ostrove, Adler, Kuppermann, & Washington, 2000), and has demonstrated better predictive utility of health status than objective measures of SES (e.g. income, education; Singh-Manoux, Marmot, & Adler, 2005).

Religiosity. We measured religiosity using two scales. The Religious Commitment Inventory–10 (RCI-10; E. L. Worthington et al., 2003) is a self-report measure used to assess how individuals' might incorporate their religious beliefs into their daily lives. Ten questions are answered using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not at all true of me*) to 5 (*totally true of me*) and are loaded onto two factors: Intrapersonal Religious Commitment (e.g., "My religious beliefs lie behind my whole approach to life") and Interpersonal Religious Commitment (e.g., "I enjoy working in the activities of my religious organization"). Higher scores (from 0 to 50) indicate greater religious commitment. Results from scale development studies demonstrated internal consistency (.93)

for the entire measure and for each factor: Intrapersonal Religious Commitment (.92) and Interpersonal Religious Commitment (.87), as well as a subscale intercorrelation ($r = .72$, $p < .001$). Furthermore, test–retest reliability over a 3-week time period was .87, .86, and .83 for the full scale, Intrapersonal Religious Commitment scale, and Interpersonal Religious Commitment scale, respectively. The RCI has yielded strong correlations with measures of religious motivation and belief (E. L. Worthington et al., 2003). For the current study, we obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .91.

The Moslem Attitude towards Religion Scale (MARS; Wilde & Joseph, 1997) is a 14-item survey questioning how important specific Islamic tenets are in the participant's life (e.g., "Allah helps me," "I think the Qu'ran is relevant and applicable to modern day"). Respondents use a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) to indicate their agreement and adherence with specific Muslim tenets. Items are positively scored on a scale of 0 to 70, with higher scores indicating greater commitment to Muslim ideology. Wilde and Joseph (1997) reported an estimated internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of .93, and they reported validity information by demonstrating low correlations between the scale and psychoticism. For the current study, we calculated a Cronbach's alpha of .92.

Workplace prejudice. We measured workplace prejudice using the WPDI (James, Lovato, & Cropanzano, 1994), which is a 16-item measure developed to assess both global (e.g., "Prejudice exists where I work") and specific (e.g., "I have sometimes been unfairly singled out because of my racial/ethnic group") perceptions of workplace discrimination based on race/ethnicity. Participants indicate their level of agreement on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 7 (*completely agree*). Some items are reverse scored, and higher scores indicate greater perceived discrimination at work on a scale of 0 to 112. Scale development studies used factor analysis to finalize item content, and internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was reported to be .93. James, Lovato, & Khoo (1994) provided discriminant validity evidence by demonstrating differences in scores between two groups of minority workers (those who reported experience discrimination and those who did not). For the current study, we obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .77.

Job satisfaction. We measured global job satisfaction using the Job in General scale (JIG), which is a subscale of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; Ironso, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989) and assesses the degree to which the individual is satisfied overall with his or her job. The JIG consists of 18 items. Each item consists of an adjective or short phrase, and respondents are directed to rate if they agree (*yes* = 1), aren't sure (*?* = 0) or disagree (*no* = 0) with the adjective or phrase in relation to their current job position. Some items are reverse scored, and a total score is calculated by summing the number of yes responses. The scores range from 0 to 18, with higher scores indicating greater job satisfaction. The stem for the items reads: "Think of your job at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work?" with workplace characteristics (e.g., fascinating, routine) listed. Development studies (e.g., Ironson et al., 1989) of the JIG scale within the JDI have demonstrated internal consistency (.91), as well as both convergent and discriminant validity. For the present study, we obtained a Kuder–Richardson formula 20 (KR-20) of .87.

Job stress. We measured stress using the Stress in General scale (SIG; Stanton, Balzer, Smith, Parra, & Ironson, 2001), a parallel form of the JIG that measures the amount of reported stress based on yes answers to several attributes. Again, participants are asked to respond *yes*, *no*, or *?* to a series of specific stress characteristics regarding their jobs. Example attributes include demanding, pressure, hectic, and calm. Higher scores on a scale of 0 to 15 indicate a greater degree of stress at work. Development studies (e.g., Stanton et al., 2001) conducted factor analysis and found that the characteristics loaded onto two factors, and the reliability for these factors ranged from .73 to .86. For the current study, we obtained a KR-20 of .80.

Procedures

Participants for this study were solicited via e-mails from Muslim online communities (e.g., mosques around the country, national Muslim organizations). The link to the survey was sent to the electronic mailing list administrator, who then sent an e-mail with the study link to the electronic mailing list. All participants completed the survey online, including reading through a waiver of consent at the beginning of the survey that had been approved by the human subjects office of the University of Iowa. We checked the IP addresses of each of the participants to ensure no duplication. Approximately 70% of the participants who started the survey were able to complete it, and we used only completed surveys for data analysis. Data collection lasted approximately 3 months.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics, internal consistency reliabilities, and intercorrelations with the current sample for the variables of interest are reported in Table 1. To investigate whether there were differences between the two groups of Muslim women, specifically hijab-wearing and non-hijab-wearing women, on the variables of religiosity, workplace discrimination, job stress, job satisfaction, and social class, we performed a

TABLE 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for the Observed Variables/Measures

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*M*	*SD*	Range
1. Hijab	—									0–1
2. RCI-10	.40**	—						36.97	8.31	10–50
3. MARS	.42**	.70**	—					60.88	10.71	14–70
4. WPDI	.10	.08	.16	—				44.54	22.36	16–95
5. Job stress	.01	–.03	–.04	.28	—			7.33	4.36	0–15
6. JIG	–.14	–.09	.00	–.23	–.26	—		14.27	3.59	1–18
7. SC	–.23**	–.23*	–.35**	–.11	–.11	–.28**	—	6.44	1.64	2–10

Note. Hijab = Arabic word denoting modesty of dress and action; RCI-10 = Religious Commitment Inventory–10; MARS = Moslem Attitude towards Religion Scale; WPDI = Workplace Prejudice/Discrimination Inventory; JIG = Job in General scale; SC = social class.
*p < .05. **p < .01.

multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Box's M test for homogeneity of variance was significant at $p = .001$, indicating violation of the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices; thus, Pillai's trace was interpreted because it has been found to be more robust to deal with violation of assumptions in MANOVAs (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The overall MANOVA was significant, Pillai's trace = .22, $F(6, 121) = 5.84$, $p = .000$. Examination of the univariate results revealed that the hijab-wearing women and the non-hijab-wearing women differed on three measures, including religious commitment measured by the RCI-10, $F(1, 126) = 25.82$, $p = .000$; MARS, $F(1, 126) = 27.44$, $p = .000$; and social class, $F(1, 126) = 7.81$, $p = .000$. Hijab-wearing women reported higher religious commitment and greater commitment to Muslim ideology. However, non-hijab-wearing reported higher social class.

A simultaneous multiple regression was performed to investigate the relationships between religiosity, hijab wearing, workplace discrimination, job stress, social class, and job satisfaction among the sample. The overall regression model was significant. The model was able to account for 14.7% (using the adjusted R^2) of the variance in job satisfaction, $F(6, 121) = 4.63$, $p = .000$, $R^2 = .19$, adjusted $R^2 = .147$, 95% CI [4.30, 14.80]. An examination of the standardized regression coefficients (see Table 2) indicated that only MARS ($\beta = -.28$, $p = .02$), WPDI ($\beta = -.18$, $p = .04$), and social class ($\beta = .27$, $p = .002$) were significantly different than zero, suggesting that for this group of Muslim women, lower adherence to Muslim ideology, lower perceptions of workplace discrimination, and higher social class were predictive of higher levels of job satisfaction. An $f^2 = .23$ (small effect size) was calculated using the formula $f^2 = \dfrac{R^2}{1 - R^2}$ for the regression model.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to explore the relationships among self-identification as a Muslim woman (wearing the hijab) and religiosity, social class, workplace discrimination, job stress, and job satisfaction. Not surprisingly, we found that women who chose to wear the hijab reported higher religiosity, and those who

TABLE 2

Coefficients for Predictor Variables

Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p	95% CI
Hijab	−.81	.66	−.11	−1.20	.22	[−2.10, 0.50]
RCI-10	−.64	.05	−.16	−1.30	.17	[−0.15, 0.02]
MARS	−.95	.04	−.28	2.20	.02*	[0.13, 0.17]
WPDI	−.03	.01	−.18	−2.00	.04*	[−0.05, 0.00]
Job stress	−.13	.07	−.16	−1.80	.06	[−0.27, 0.09]
Social class	.60	.19	.27	3.10	.00*	[0.21, 0.99]

Note. CI = confidence interval; hijab = Arabic word denoting modesty of dress and action; RCI-10 = Religious Commitment Inventory–10; MARS = Moslem Attitude towards Religion Scale; WPDI = Workplace Prejudice/Discrimination Inventory.
*$p < .05$.

did not wear the hijab reported higher social class. More surprisingly, we found that hijab-wearing women did not endorse stronger perceptions of workplace discrimination compared with Muslim women who did not wear the hijab. We also found that for both groups of Muslim women, the variables of workplace discrimination, social class, and religiosity predicted job satisfaction. In other words, women who reported higher levels of commitment to Muslim ideology, stronger perceptions of workplace discrimination, and lower social class reported lower levels of job satisfaction in this sample. These results can shed some light on several national database collections, including the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which reported in 2010 that increasing discrimination claims were being filed by Muslims (an increase of 20% from 2008, and a 60% increase from 2005; Greenhouse, 2010). From the results of the current study, it might be assumed that the discrimination is taking its toll on Muslim women's satisfaction with their jobs. These findings are consistent with Gallup research (Younis, 2009) in which employed Muslim Americans reported lower ratings of overall job satisfaction compared with their peers in other religious groups.

As previously mentioned, King and Ahmad (2010) found that levels of formal or overt discrimination did not differ significantly between female Muslim applicants who wore religious attire and Muslim women who did not, but they found that Muslim women job applicants who wore religious attire experienced covert discrimination. The current study supports these findings, because we did not find that religiously attired women differed in their reports of workplace discrimination, yet both groups' perception of discrimination did predict their job satisfaction. The results of our study also suggest that wearing the hijab is associated with self-reported lower social class and that lower social class is associated with lower job satisfaction for this group of Muslim women. This finding is in direct contradiction with research that suggests that women with higher social status are choosing to wear the hijab as a symbol of their religious commitment and feel empowered by this decision (e.g., Droogsma, 2007; Hamdan, 2007; Kulenović, 2006). More research is needed to clarify the meaning of the results of the current study. Research that uses qualitative perspectives to investigate the meaning of hijab in the workplace among women in different social classes and in different types of positions could shed more light on how wearing the hijab, experiencing discrimination, and having job satisfaction intersect.

Job satisfaction is relatively understudied with respect to the experiences of ethnic and religious minorities and social class (R. L. Worthington, Flores, & Navarro, 2005). However, emerging literature documents the links between discrimination and job stress and satisfaction for immigrant and ethnic minority groups living in Western countries. Valdivia and Flores (2012) found that discrimination was associated with lower job satisfaction for Latino immigrant women living in the rural midwestern United States. These findings are consistent with the results of the current study and highlight the link between job stress and lower job satisfaction for women of color. The majority of Muslim women in the United States are women of color and also belong to the religious minority. This puts them in the position of "triple jeopardy" (Hamdani, 2005, p. 6) of experiencing discriminatory practices. Given the rise of Islamophobia in recent years in the United States, many Muslim women have been

concerned about their ability to hold true to their faith and remain employed (Ali, 2006). This type of daily stress can manifest in several ways and have clinical implications for both the individual and organization.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

Emerging research suggests that identifying oneself as the target of discrimination is a major source of stress that affects an individual's mental and physical well-being (Diboye & Colella, 2013). Counseling could be an important avenue for women to deal with the impact of workplace discrimination. Ali et al. (2004) suggested that counseling may be an important resource for Muslim Americans because it might be a place where Muslim women could discuss issues of discrimination and make decisions about how they would like to display their religious identification. Ali (2009) described a feminist psychotherapy approach for Muslim women that could be used to help them deal with discrimination both within the Muslim community and in their places of work. Career counselors can help Muslim women deal with these issues because of their knowledge of employment-related concerns and expertise in the culture of different types of workplace settings. For example, career counselors could help women identify compensatory strategies for stress, including coping responses, support, and even assertiveness training (to help individuals identify ways of combating the prejudice). Furthermore, it might be particularly helpful to incorporate a discussion about how faith is related to work life, not only in terms of discrimination, but regarding how Muslim women use Islam to cope with stress.

LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations of this study that warrant mentioning. First, both groups of Muslim women may not have responded candidly out of fear or anxiety that Muslim Americans may experience in today's climate because of discriminatory practices (Ali et al., 2004). This may account for the lack of differential findings in perceptions of workplace discrimination between Muslim women who do wear the hijab and those who do not. Researchers investigating this subject further may need to use research strategies that help Muslim women to safely identify issues and discuss issues of workplace discrimination. Second, the WPDI is an inventory used to assess workplace discrimination based on ethnic or racial differences rather than religious differences. Although there is some overlap between these forms of discrimination, it could have been more beneficial to use a discrimination measure that reflects issues that are unique to religious discrimination. One issue is that measures for workplace discrimination based on religious background do not currently exist. Developing religious discrimination measures for the workplace is an important area of research that could help to improve the understanding of Muslim women's discrimination experiences. Considering that the variables investigated in the current study accounted for only 19% of the variance in job satisfaction, more research is needed to better understand other variables that may be contributing

to Muslim women's low satisfaction in their jobs. For example, what is the role of work–family conflict or community attitudes toward working in Muslim communities that might also contribute to Muslim women's satisfaction with their jobs? Despite these limitations, the current study has the potential to inform future research and clinical strategies.

REFERENCES

Acquisti, A., & Fong, C. M. (2013) An experiment in hiring discrimination via online social networks. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2031979

Adler, N. E., & Stewart, J. (2007). The MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status. Retrieved from http://www.macses.ucsf.edu/research/psychosocial/subjective.php#measurement

Ali, S. R. (2006). Psychology and Sunni Muslims. In E.T. Dowd & S. L. Nielson, *The psychologies in religion: Working with the religious client* (pp. 221–236). New York, NY: Springer.

Ali, S. R. (2009). Using feminist psychotherapy with Muslim women. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 20,* 297–316.

Ali, S. R., Liu, W. M., & Humedian, M. (2004). Islam 101: Understanding the religion and therapy implications. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 6,* 635–642. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.35.6.635

Allen, C., & Nielsen, J. S. (2002). *Summary report on Islamophobia in the EU after 11 September 2001.* Retrieved from European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights website: http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/199-Synthesis-report_en.pdf

Church, R. (2012). National differences in effects of perceived workplace discrimination on the mentoring relationships of gay and lesbian protégés. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 16,* 105–114.

Cole, D., & Ahmadi, S. (2003). Perspectives and experiences of Muslim women who veil on college campuses. *Journal of College Student Development, 44,* 47–66. doi:10.1353/csd.2003.0002

Council on American–Islamic Relations. (2008). *The status of Muslim civil rights in the United States: Without fear of discrimination.* Retrieved from http://www.cair.com/images/pdf/CAIR-2008-Civil-Rights-Report.pdf

Dipboye, R. L., & Colella, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Droogsma, R. A. (2007). Redefining hijab: American Muslim women's standpoints on veiling. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 35,* 294–319. doi:10.1080/00909880701434299

Esposito, J. L., & Mogahed, D. (2008). *Who speaks for Islam?* New York, NY: Gallup Press.

Greenhouse, S. (2010, September 23). Muslims report rising discrimination at work. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Hamdan, A. (2007). The issue of hijab in France: Reflections and analysis. *Muslim World Journal of Human Rights, 4,* 1–27.

Hamdani, D. (2005). *Triple jeopardy: Muslim women's experience of discrimination.* Retrieved from Canadian Council of Muslim Women website: http://archive.ccmw.com/publications/triple_jeopardy.pdf

Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of the Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 193–200.

James, K., Lovato, C., & Cropanzano, R. (1994). Correlational and known-group comparison validation of a workplace prejudice/discrimination inventory. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24,* 1573–1592.

James, K., Lovato, C., & Khoo, G. (1994). Social identity correlates of minority workers' health. *Academy of Management Journal, 37,* 383–396.

King, E. B., & Ahmad, A. S. (2010). An experimental field study of interpersonal discrimination toward Muslim job applicants. *Personnel Psychology, 63,* 881–906.

Kulenović, T. (2006). A veil (hijab) as a public symbol of a Muslim woman modern identity. *Collegium Antropologicum, 30,* 713–718.

New York City Commission on Human Rights. (2003). *Discrimination against Muslims, Arabs, and South*

Asians in New York City since 9/11. Retrieved from http://www.nyc.gov/html/cchr/html/publications/discrimination-against.shtml

Ostrove, J. M., Adler, N. E., Kuppermann, M., & Washington, A. E. (2000). Objective and subjective assessments of socioeconomic status and their relationship to self-rated health in an ethnically diverse sample of pregnant women. *Health Psychology, 19,* 613–618.

Pew Research Center. (2015a). *The future of world religions: Population growth projections, 2010–2050.* Retrieved from http://www.pewforum.org/2015/04/02/religious-projections-2010-2050/

Pew Research Center. (2015b). *Religious composition by country, 2010–2050.* Retrieved from http://www.pewforum.org/2015/04/02/religious-projection-table/2010/number/all/

Runnymede Trust. (1997). *Islamophobia: A challenge for us all.* Retrieved from http://www.runnymede-trust.org/publications/17/32.html

Singh-Manoux, A., Marmot, M. G., & Adler, N. E. (2005). Does subjective social status predict health and change in health status better than objective status? *Psychosomatic Medicine, 67,* 855–861.

Stanton, J. M., Balzer, W. K., Smith, P. C., Parra, L. F., & Ironson, G. (2001). A general measure of work stress: The Stress in General Scale. *Education and Psychological Measurement, 61,* 866–888.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tabassum, R. F. (2006). Listening to the voices of hijab. *Women's Studies International Forum, 29,* 54–66.

Tahmincioglu, E. (2010, September 13). Muslims face growing bias in the workplace. *NBC News.* Retrieved from http://www.nbcnews.com/id/39081887/ns/business-careers/#.U6iRZa0o670

Triana, M. D. C., García, M. F., & Colella, A. (2010). Managing diversity: How organizational efforts to support diversity moderate the effects of perceived racial discrimination on affective commitment. *Personnel Psychology, 63,* 817–843.

Valdivia, C., & Flores, L. Y. (2012). Factors affecting the job satisfaction of Latino/a immigrants in the Midwest. *Journal of Career Development, 39,* 31–49.

Wilde, A., & Joseph, S. (1997). Religiosity and personality in a Moslem context. *Personality and Individual Differences, 23,* 899–900.

Worthington, E. L., Jr., Wade, N. G., Hight, T. L., Ripley, J. S., McCullough, M. E., Berry, J. W., . . . O'Connor, L. (2003). The Religious Commitment Inventory–10: Development, refinement, and validation of a brief scale for research and counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50,* 84–96.

Worthington, R. L., Flores, L. Y., & Navarro, R. L. (2005). Career development in context: Research with people of color. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.)., *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (pp. 225–252). New York, NY: Wiley.

Younis, M. (2009). *Muslim Americans exemplify diversity, potential.* Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/116260/muslim-americans-exemplify-diversity-potential.aspx

Zaal, M., Salah, T., & Fine, M. (2007). The weight of the hyphen: Freedom, fusion and responsibility embodied by young Muslim-American women during a time of surveillance. *Applied Development Science, 11,* 164–177.