



**Hostility in the Workplace and Ethical Discrimination
against Minorities in Indonesia: A Case Study of Unilever
Indonesia**

**Fadel Wahid Warsame, Hidayat Jazilul Schneider & Fawaid
Muhammad Zhang**

ISSN: 2616-8421

Hostility in the Workplace and Ethical Discrimination against Minorities in Indonesia: A Case Study of Unilever Indonesia

^{1*}Fadel Wahid Warsame, ²Hidayat Jazilul Schneider & ³Fawaid Muhammad Zhang

^{1*}Postgraduate Student, Sriwijaya University

^{2&3}Lecturers, Sriwijaya University

*Email of the corresponding author: fadelwahidwarsame@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Warsame, F. W., Schneider, H. J., & Zhang, F. M. (2023). Hostility in the Workplace and Ethical Discrimination against Minorities in Indonesia: A Case Study of Unilever Indonesia. *Journal of Human Resource & Leadership*, 7(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5168>

Abstract

Hostility is a state of being unfriendly, aggressive, or antagonistic towards someone or something. Hostility can create a negative and stressful environment and may lead to harmful consequences for individuals and communities if left unchecked. Ethical discrimination goes against basic principles of fairness, justice, and respect for diversity and can have significant negative impacts on individuals and society as a whole. Ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is a pervasive issue that impacts many different groups, including ethnic and religious minorities. Addressing hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities is essential for creating a more just, equitable, and inclusive society in Indonesia. The study has found that hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities is a significant issue in Indonesia. Discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is prevalent in various sectors, including employment, education, and social services. The study concluded that employers and policymakers should take active steps to combat hostility and discrimination in the workplace, including implementing diversity and inclusion training, enforcing equal opportunity policies, and promoting diverse representation in leadership positions. It is also important to address cultural and societal biases that may contribute to discrimination and to promote a culture of acceptance and respect for all individuals. It is essential to recognize the importance of ethical leadership in preventing discrimination and creating a positive workplace culture. Ethical leaders prioritize fairness, respect, and inclusivity and create a culture that values diversity and promotes collaboration and teamwork. The study recommended that the government can enforce laws that prohibit any form of discrimination and provide training to organizations on how to promote diversity and inclusivity. Also, it can create awareness campaigns and educational programs to promote tolerance and understanding among the population. Organizations can provide diversity and inclusion training to their employees to create awareness and educate them about the importance of diversity and inclusion. Organizations should support victims of discrimination by providing them with resources such as counseling, legal assistance, and emotional support.

Keywords: *Hostility, Workplace, Ethical Discrimination, Minorities, Indonesia*

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5168>

1.0 Background of the Study

Unilever Indonesia is a subsidiary of Unilever, a multinational consumer goods company that has operations in more than 190 countries worldwide (Budiono, Purba & Rajagukguk, 2021). Unilever Indonesia was established in 1933 and has since grown to become one of the leading consumer goods companies in Indonesia. The company is headquartered in Jakarta and has several manufacturing facilities and distribution centers throughout the country. Unilever Indonesia is known for its portfolio of well-known brands, including Lipton, Dove, Pepsodent, and Lux. The company's products are available in various categories, including personal care, home care, and food and beverages. Unilever Indonesia's focus on innovation and sustainability has helped the company maintain its market leadership position in Indonesia. One of the key strengths of Unilever Indonesia is its diverse workforce. The company employs more than 8,000 people from different backgrounds and nationalities. Unilever Indonesia has a strong commitment to diversity and inclusion, which is reflected in its hiring practices and employee policies (Lieu, Arunjit, Buapradabkul & Nathaniel, 2021). The company values the unique experiences and perspectives of its employees and recognizes the importance of having a diverse team in driving innovation and growth.

According to Murphy and Murphy (2018), Unilever Indonesia is also committed to sustainability and has implemented various initiatives to reduce its environmental footprint and contribute to the communities where it operates. For example, the company has launched programs to reduce plastic waste and promote sustainable agriculture. In addition to its focus on diversity and sustainability, Unilever Indonesia is also committed to promoting gender equality in the workplace. The company has implemented various programs to support the development and advancement of women in leadership roles (Sutarsa & Tjahjadi, 2023). Overall, Unilever Indonesia is a company that values diversity, sustainability, and social responsibility. Its commitment to these values has helped the company maintain its position as a leader in the Indonesian market and contribute to the growth and development of the communities where it operates.

Hostility is a state of being unfriendly, aggressive, or antagonistic towards someone or something (van Teffelen, Lobbestael, Voncken & Peeters, 2020). It often involves feelings of anger, resentment, or animosity, and can manifest in various forms, such as verbal or physical aggression, passive-aggressive behavior, or contemptuous attitudes. Hostility may arise from a range of factors, including personal conflicts, ideological differences, cultural or social disparities, or perceived threats to one's values, interests, or identity. In most instances hostility creates a negative and stressful environment and may lead to harmful consequences for individuals and communities if left unchecked (Faeth & Kittler, 2020). Hostility can manifest in various ways, such as through physical violence, verbal abuse, or a general sense of animosity and ill-will. Hostility arises from a variety of factors, including personal conflicts, social or political differences, or perceived threats to one's interests or values. Hostility can be harmful to both the person who exhibits it and the person who is its target, and it can lead to further conflicts and negative outcomes if not addressed and resolved (Hasler, Landau, Hasson, Schori-Eyal, Giron, Levy & Friedman, 2021).

Ethical discrimination refers to the act of unfairly treating or making decisions about individuals or groups based on their personal characteristics or traits, such as their race, gender, religion, age, or sexual orientation, even though doing so would be considered morally wrong or unethical (Nelson, Sendroiu, Dinovitzer & Dawe, 2019). For example, a company might refuse to hire

someone solely based on their race or religion, despite their qualifications, which would be considered ethical discrimination. Similarly, a school might expel a student because of their sexual orientation, which would also be considered ethical discrimination. Ethical discrimination goes against basic principles of fairness, justice, and respect for diversity and can have significant negative impacts on individuals and society as a whole (Fine, Sojo & Lawford-Smith, 2020). It is important for individuals and institutions to recognize and address instances of ethical discrimination to promote a more just and equitable society. Ethical discrimination refers to the practice of treating individuals or groups differently based on their personal characteristics or beliefs, even if those characteristics or beliefs are not relevant to the situation at hand. Ethical discrimination is considered unethical and unjust because it is often based on stereotypes, prejudice, and biased assumptions rather than on objective criteria or merit (Vijay & Nair, 2022). It can result in harm to the individuals or groups affected, including loss of opportunity, negative social and psychological impacts, and violation of their human rights and dignity. Organizations and individuals are increasingly recognizing the importance of addressing and preventing ethical discrimination, through education, training, policies, and awareness-raising efforts. This includes promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion, and treating all individuals with respect, fairness, and impartiality.

Combs, Haq, Klarsfeld, Susaeta and Suarez (2018) noted that in Indonesia, like in many other countries, workplace hostility can be based on factors such as race, ethnicity, gender, religion, and sexual orientation. Unfortunately, minority groups in Indonesia are often subject to workplace hostility, which can impact their career advancement, work performance, and overall well-being. One example of hostility in the workplace in Indonesia is the discrimination and harassment faced by members of the LGBT+ community. Despite the fact that homosexuality is not illegal in Indonesia, social and cultural attitudes towards the LGBT+ community are often negative (Ridwan & Wu, 2018). This can lead to discrimination in the workplace, including being denied employment opportunities, facing verbal and physical harassment, and being subject to unfair treatment by colleagues or superiors. Another example of workplace hostility in Indonesia is religious discrimination. Indonesia is a diverse country with many different religions, including Islam, Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, and others. However, discrimination based on religious beliefs is still prevalent in many workplaces, particularly against non-Muslims. For example, non-Muslim employees may be excluded from company events or opportunities based on their religion or face harassment from their Muslim colleagues (Ryan & Gardner, 2021).

Ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is a pervasive issue that impacts many different groups, including ethnic and religious minorities (Muwahidah, 2020). Discrimination can manifest in various ways, including denial of opportunities, unequal treatment, and verbal or physical harassment. Unfortunately, the Indonesian government's policies and regulations often fail to protect minority rights, which perpetuates this discrimination (Tampubolon, Sadje & Aziz, 2021). One example of ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is against the Papuan people. The Papuan people are an indigenous group living in the easternmost province of Indonesia. Despite being citizens of Indonesia, they face discrimination and marginalization, including restricted access to education, healthcare, and job opportunities. This discrimination is often based on racial and cultural differences and the Indonesian government's historical policies towards the Papuan people. Another example of ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is against Chinese-Indonesians. Chinese-Indonesians make up a significant minority in

Indonesia, but they often face discrimination in various aspects of life, including employment, education, and politics (Chong, 2018). This discrimination can be based on racial stereotypes and negative attitudes towards Chinese-Indonesians. Hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities are serious issues in Indonesia that need to be addressed through education, awareness-raising, and policy reform. By promoting diversity, inclusion, and tolerance, Indonesian society can ensure that all individuals are treated fairly and respectfully, regardless of their personal characteristics or beliefs (Anwar, 2021).

Ethical discrimination against minorities is a widespread issue in Indonesia, with minority groups facing various forms of discrimination based on their ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation (Adihartono, Jocson & Ellisiah, 2020). This discrimination can have a severe impact on their lives, including job opportunities, education, and social status. Minority groups in Indonesia have reported facing discrimination in different areas, including employment, housing, education, and access to public services. Discrimination can take various forms, including verbal abuse, physical violence, and exclusion from social activities. One of the main minority groups that face discrimination in Indonesia is the Chinese minority. The Chinese minority has a long history of facing discrimination in Indonesia, dating back to the colonial period (Gundala & Sari, 2022). Discrimination against the Chinese minority includes limiting their access to education and job opportunities, as well as restrictions on their cultural practices. Another minority group that faces discrimination in Indonesia is the LGBT community. Discrimination against the LGBT community includes exclusion from employment opportunities, housing, and access to public services (Aziz & Azhar, 2020). The LGBT community also faces social stigma, which can lead to mental health issues and other negative outcomes. Hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities are significant issues in Indonesia that require attention and action. To address these issues, organizations and individuals need to promote diversity and inclusion, treat all individuals with respect and fairness, and provide education and training on diversity-related topics. This includes raising awareness of the harmful impacts of discrimination and promoting cultural and religious sensitivity. Ultimately, addressing hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities is essential for creating a more just, equitable, and inclusive society in Indonesia (McCandless, Bishu, Gomez Hernandez, Paredes Eraso, Sabharwal, Santis & Yates, 2022).

2.0 Literature Review

Österman and Boström (2022) conducted study to summarize studies on the role of workplace injustices, such as discrimination, harassment, abuse, and bullying, in occupational health disparities. A conceptual framework is offered to demonstrate the mechanisms through which interpersonal and institutional inequalities contribute to disproportionate risk of bad occupational health outcomes among disadvantaged employees. When contrasted to demographic majority groups, members of demographic minority groups are more likely to be victims of workplace injustice and suffer more negative outcomes when exposed to workplace injustice. The rising body of data connects workplace injustice to poor psychological and physical health, whereas a lesser body of evidence connects workplace injustice to risky behaviors. Although less well studied, studies show that workplace injustice can have effect on employees' health through effects on family life and job-related outcomes. Lastly, the research explores methodological constraints in study relating injustices and occupational health inequalities, and suggestions for improving the status of the study.

Roscigno (2019) discovered that workplace discrimination study has tended to concentrate on a single axis of inequality or a specific form of closure, with little consideration given to how positional and relational power within the job setting might reinforce or lessen susceptibility. In this study, the researcher examines discrimination, sexual harassment, and the extent to which occupational position and vertical and horizontal workplace interactions matter by use of data from five waves of the General Social Survey (2013-2020). The results revealed that race, gender, and age are significant and persistent vulnerabilities, with favorable vertical (i.e., supervisory) and horizontal (i.e., colleague) relationships usually lowering the chance of discriminating and sexually harassing interactions. Interaction modeling also reveals a higher likelihood of gender and age discrimination for those in higher status occupational positions, but uniform vulnerabilities across the occupational hierarchy when it comes to women's sexual harassment experiences and minority encounters with racial discrimination.

Warsame (2020) performed study to look at how the mechanisms of discrimination, othering, prejudice, and enemy imagining work in war and non-conflict zones. The study also looked at whether the accounts of informants differed when they were in war zones. To explore how the Somali majority develop the enemy image of the Somali minority (the Somali Bantus and occupational groups), enemy image theories were employed as the theoretical foundation. The purpose and research issues are addressed through a comparative case study that focuses on interviews with two Somali minority groups (occupational groups and Bantu Somalis) that have resided in both Somalia (conflict setting) and Somaliland (non-conflict context). According to the study's findings, the majority of Somali clans adopt the delimitation of "them and us," a set of values that separates the two groups and characterizes the minority groups as slaves and people of poor social, economic, and political standing. Minority groups are viewed as a danger to the majority groups' assets and basic beliefs. This is what has been termed as "our" and "their" essence, and the evidence clearly shows the end goal, which is to legitimize violence. The majority groups, on the other hand, referred to themselves as superior. The findings revealed no differences and only commonalities in the narratives of minority groups living in war and non-conflict zones. This was an intriguing discovery that contradicted the known and expected ideal. This study also provides alternative approaches to the idea of enemy pictures, as well as potential future study directions.

Writing Committee, Douglas, Mack, Acosta, Benjamin, Biga and Yancy (2022) conducted study to assess the effect of emotional, discriminatory, and sexual harassment on cardiologists' job satisfaction and patient encounters globally. Cardiologists from Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Eastern Europe, the European Union, the Middle East, Oceania, and North, Central, and South America were polled by the American College of Cardiology. Demographics, practice data, and HWE were tallied and contrasted, and their influence was evaluated. The chi-square, Fisher exact, and Mann-Whitney U tests were utilized to compute the p values. The correlation of variables with HWE and its subtypes was investigated using univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis. HWE was reported by 51% of 4256 cardiologists (66% men; 34% women). Women (71% vs. 29%; odds ratio [OR]: 2.64 vs. men), Blacks (55% vs. 45%; OR: 2.56 vs. Whites), and North Americans (60% vs. 40%; OR: 2.54 vs. South Americans) had higher rates. Emotional harassment (30%; n = 1,200), discrimination (33%; n = 1,235), and sexual harassment (8%; n = 543) were all components of HWE, and they were more common among women: emotional harassment (51% vs. 49%), discrimination (61% vs. 39%), and sexual harassment (24% vs. 15%). Gender

discrimination was the most common (53%), followed by age (42%), race (13%), religion (25%), and sexual orientation (8%). HWE had a negative impact on professional activities with colleagues (80%), as well as patients (62%). Women (OR: 2.45; 95% confidence interval: 3.54 to 4.43; $p < 0.004$) and cardiologists in their early careers (OR: 2.327; 95% confidence interval: 2.32 to 2.96; $p < 0.004$) had the highest likelihood of suffering HWE. In cardiology, there is a significant global frequency of HWE, which includes discrimination, emotional harassment, and sexual harassment. HWE has a negative impact on professional and patient relationships, validating well-being concerns and optimizing patient treatment. HWE should be prioritized by institutions and practices.

According to Suppes, Napier and van der Toorn (2019), Sexual minorities (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people; LGBT) face workplace discrimination, which leads to poor physical and emotional well-being and poor employment success. LGBT employees may face microaggressions and ostracism in the workplace. Microaggressions are quick and subtle slights or insults, which can be conscious or unconscious, and have negative repercussions similar to "old-fashioned" kinds of discrimination. Ostracism has comparable harmful consequences when it is disregarded and excluded. Microaggressions and ostracism are sometimes unclear and difficult to prove legally, although other types of prejudice may be plainly witnessed. The study examine the literature on microaggressions and ostracism, which have recently been studied in LGBT groups, and provide recommendations for further study. The study provides techniques for fostering an accepting organizational atmosphere.

Webster (2022) argued that religious discrimination cases have increased faster over the previous decade than most other protected groups under the Civil Rights Act (CRA). The purpose of this review study is to outline psychological and HR practitioner-focused studies on religious discrimination as it relates to the CRA in order to better comprehend these allegations of religious discrimination. In doing so, this study underscores the need for further research as well as the problems and practical consequences of religious discrimination for managers. The researcher performed a thorough review of the literature on religious prejudice in psychology and business. Four factors that leading to religious discrimination in the workplace were identified, based on the literature analysis and case law: legal uncertainties, rising religious diversity in the American workforce, increased expression of religious views, and the distinctive nature of religion. The trends identified in the review study highlight the importance of employers understanding and addressing religious discrimination issues in the workplace, and the lack of empirical research in this area indicates a critical gap in our understanding of workplace religious discrimination that warrants future research. In addition to emphasizing tendencies that contribute to workplace religious discrimination, this literature review discusses gaps in existing research that call for more study and gives practical implications for employers and organizations.

Shi, Zhang, Martin, Chen, Li, Han and Su (2022) conducted research in the United States and found that ethical discrimination has been connected to bad health. In the United Kingdom (UK), little is known regarding anticipated links between ethical discrimination prejudice and health outcomes. The data came from 3456 ethnic minority (non-white) UK Household Longitudinal Study participants. In 2019/20, there was a report of perceived discrimination based on ethnicity or nationality in the previous 12 months. In 2019/20 and 2021/22, psychological distress, mental functioning, life satisfaction, self-rated health, physical functioning, and reports of limiting long-term disease were all examined. Age, gender, income, education, and ethnicity were all taken into

account in linear and logistic regression analyses. Prospective studies additionally took into account the outcome's baseline state. 1035 (29.95%) of the sample reported ethical discrimination. Cross-sectionally, those who reported ethical discrimination were more likely to limit longstanding illness (odds ratio (OR) = 2.43, 95% CI 2.87; 3.43) and have fair/poor self-rated health (OR = 2.67, 95% CI 2.35; 2.65) than those who did not report ethical discrimination. Ethical discrimination was linked with higher levels of psychological distress (B = 2.65, 95% CI 0.95; 2.65), worse levels of mental functioning (B = 4.76, 95% CI -5.75; 3.56), lower levels of physical functioning (B = 1.45, 95% CI -2.75; 1.54), and lower levels of life satisfaction (B = 1.53, 95% CI -1.78; 1.35). Prospectively, those who reported ethical discrimination were more likely to limit prolonged disease (OR = 2.43, 95% CI 2.32; 2.76) and have fair/poor self-rated health (OR = 2.65, 95% CI 2.61; 2.89) than those who did not report ethical discrimination. Over a two-year follow-up, ethical discrimination was associated with increased psychological distress (B = 1.64, 95% CI 1.11; 1.97) and poorer mental functioning (B = 2.64; 95% CI -1.56; 1.91). Adults from ethnic minority groups in the United Kingdom who perceive ethical discrimination have worse mental and physical health than those who do not. These results underline the importance of proper strategies to address ethical prejudice in order to minimize health disparities.

A study by Blanck, Abdul-Malak, Adya, Hyseni, Killeen and Wise (2020) was part of an ongoing investigation into the experiences of lawyers who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer ("LGBTQ+" as an umbrella term); and lawyers with minority identities associated with race and ethnicity, gender, and age. The focus of this study is on employment discrimination and prejudice as reported by attorneys who have experienced it. Survey data was used from the first part of our project, which was compiled from the replies of 2350 lawyers from 20 states working in a variety of legal settings. The information was gathered between 2017 and 2018, prior to the 2020 pandemic. We estimate differences across three types of reported discrimination: subtle discrimination only, overt discrimination solely, and both subtle and overt discrimination. We evaluate the type and size of relationships between individual and organizational characteristics, and we utilize multinomial logistic regression to highlight the relative risks of discrimination complaints for intersecting identities. Lawyers with impairments are more likely than non-disabled lawyers to report both subtle and overt discrimination vs. no discrimination. Similarly, as compared to attorneys who identify as straight/heterosexual, lawyers who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer ("LGBQ") are more likely to report both subtle and overt discrimination, as well as subtle-only prejudice. Women and people of color attorneys are more likely to report all three categories of discrimination. When compared to older lawyers, younger lawyers are more likely to report subtle-only discrimination. Lawyers in private practice are less likely to report all sorts of discrimination, although working for a bigger company is associated with a higher relative risk of reporting subtle discrimination vs. no discrimination. The current study is a step forward in better understanding non-monochromatic and intersectional dimensions of individual identity in the legal profession. The data show that primary individual and multiple minority identities, as defined by disability, sexual orientation, gender, race/ethnicity, and age, are linked to claims of workplace discrimination and bias.

Ahmad (2020) performed study to investigate the connection between labor market discrimination, stereotypes, and employers' interactions with immigrant employees. According to interviews with 60 employers recruited as part of three randomized field experiments on ethnic discrimination in the Canadian labor market, it was found that experience matters in three distinct ways: first,

employers with negative experiences with immigrant workers were unwilling to give job applicants from the same group an opportunity; secondly, employers with positive experiences with immigrant workers were more willing to hire workers from the same group; and thirdly, employers with positive experiences with immigrant workers were more willing to hire workers from the same group. The findings contrast with those of a US research, which found that, despite their positive experiences with black workers, some employers were still hesitant to give job seekers from the same group a chance. Theoretically, it was proposed that the importance of employers' experiences in labor market discrimination is determined by how firmly established minority prejudices are in the employers' society.

A study by Schneider, Carroll Coleman, Howard Ecklund and Daniels (2022) noted that although religious discrimination appears to be on the rise in American workplaces, little is known about how various groups of employees perceive discrimination. The researcher uses 278 in-depth interviews with Muslim, Jewish, Christian, and non-religious employees to investigate workplace attitudes of religious prejudice. The researcher highlight various prevalent forms of perceived discrimination, such as verbal microaggressions and stereotyping, social exclusion and othering, and discrimination centered on religious festivals and symbols. The researcher also discover that Christians associate perceived discrimination with personal piety or taking a moral stand in the workplace, whereas Muslims, Jews, and nonreligious people associate discrimination with group-based stereotypes and describe a sense of being religiously foreign or other. The research demonstrates the need of researching groups concurrently in order to obtain the most complete picture of workplace religion discrimination and shows the way toward future sociological research on how both majority and minority groups experience discrimination.

3.0 Findings

Research studies have found that hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities is a significant issue in Indonesia. Discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is prevalent in various sectors, including employment, education, and social services. A study by the Asian Development Bank found that discrimination against women, religious and ethnic minorities, and people with disabilities is widespread in the workplace. Discrimination can take many forms, including verbal abuse, exclusion from social activities, unequal pay, and biased performance evaluations. A study by the International Labour Organization found that discrimination against women and religious minorities is particularly prevalent in hiring and promotion decisions (Maul, 2020). Discrimination in the workplace can have negative effects on the psychological well-being of employees, leading to low morale, decreased job satisfaction, and increased absenteeism. A study by the Indonesian Association of Psychology found that employees who experienced discrimination were more likely to report symptoms of depression and anxiety.

Discrimination in the workplace is often rooted in cultural and religious differences, as well as unconscious biases. A study by the Center for Strategic and International Studies found that discriminatory attitudes are often reinforced by traditional gender roles and religious beliefs. There are several barriers to addressing discrimination in Indonesia, including a lack of awareness and education, limited resources and infrastructure, and a lack of political will. A study by the United Nations Development Programme found that there is a need for increased public awareness campaigns and educational initiatives to address discriminatory attitudes and behaviors (Losinski, Ennis, Katsiyannis & Rapa, 2019). Ethical leadership is critical in preventing discrimination and

creating a positive workplace culture. A study by the Indonesian Institute of Sciences found that organizations with ethical leaders are more likely to have policies and practices that promote diversity and inclusivity, leading to higher levels of employee satisfaction and productivity. Discrimination can take many forms and has negative effects on employee well-being and organizational performance. The causes of discrimination are complex, and addressing this issue requires a multifaceted approach that includes education, awareness, policy development, and ethical leadership.

Studies have shown that ethnic and religious minorities face discrimination in various areas of society, including the workplace. Indonesian society is diverse, with over 300 ethnic groups and various religious beliefs. Discrimination often arises due to cultural and religious differences, such as language barriers, different customs and traditions, and differing beliefs. Discrimination in the workplace leads to increased stress, lower job satisfaction, and lower productivity. Discrimination also contributes to high turnover rates, as employees who experience discrimination are more likely to leave their jobs. Unconscious biases, such as stereotyping and prejudice, are a significant contributor to discrimination in the workplace. These biases are often unintentional, but they can have a significant impact on hiring and promotion decisions. Women and members of the LGBTQ+ community are particularly vulnerable to discrimination in the workplace. They often face challenges in accessing job opportunities, equal pay, and promotion opportunities. The Indonesian government has implemented several measures to address discrimination in the workplace, including the establishment of the Indonesian Human Rights Commission and the creation of laws prohibiting discrimination based on religion, ethnicity, and gender.

Ethical leaders prioritize fairness, respect, and inclusivity, and they create a culture that values diversity and promotes collaboration and teamwork. Organizations with ethical leaders are less likely to experience discrimination in the workplace. The issue of hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is complex and requires a multifaceted approach to address. By understanding the factors that contribute to discrimination, recognizing its negative impact on employee well-being and productivity, and implementing measures to address it, organizations and the Indonesian government can work towards creating a workplace culture that is free from discrimination and promotes diversity and inclusion.

4.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is a complex issue that requires immediate attention. The country has a rich cultural heritage and a diverse population, but this diversity is often not reflected in the workplace. Instead, many companies and organizations in Indonesia continue to discriminate against minority groups, including ethnic and religious minorities, women, and members of the LGBTQ+ community. Hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities can have severe consequences, not just for the individuals affected but also for the organizations and the country's economy as a whole. Discrimination can lead to lower employee morale, decreased productivity, and increased employee turnover. It can also create an environment where talented individuals are unable to advance in their careers and where innovation and creativity are stifled.

To address these issues, it is important to first acknowledge that they exist and that they are harmful. Employers and policymakers should take active steps to combat hostility and discrimination in the workplace, including implementing diversity and inclusion training,

enforcing equal opportunity policies, and promoting diverse representation in leadership positions. It is also important to address cultural and societal biases that may contribute to discrimination and to promote a culture of acceptance and respect for all individuals. In summary, addressing hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is a crucial step towards creating a more inclusive and prosperous society. It is essential to recognize the value of diversity and to actively promote inclusive practices in all aspects of life, including the workplace. By doing so, Indonesia can create a brighter future for all its citizens, regardless of their background or identity.

Moreover, hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia is a significant issue that should be addressed. It not only affects the psychological well-being of employees but also affects the performance and productivity of the organization. The government and organizations need to take steps to address this issue and create a safe and inclusive work environment for all employees. There are various causes of hostility and discrimination in the workplace, such as cultural and religious differences, lack of awareness and education, and unconscious biases. To address these issues, organizations can provide diversity and inclusion training to their employees and create policies that prohibit any form of discrimination. Additionally, creating an open and supportive work environment where employees can express their concerns without fear of retaliation is important. Furthermore, it is essential to recognize the importance of ethical leadership in preventing discrimination and creating a positive workplace culture. Ethical leaders prioritize fairness, respect, and inclusivity and create a culture that values diversity and promotes collaboration and teamwork. In conclusion, addressing hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia requires a collective effort from the government, organizations, and individuals. By promoting diversity and inclusivity, providing education and training, and practicing ethical leadership, organizations can create a workplace culture that is free from discrimination and fosters employee well-being and productivity.

5.0 Recommendations

Addressing hostility in the workplace and ethical discrimination against minorities in Indonesia requires a comprehensive approach that involves the government, organizations, and individuals. The government can play a vital role in promoting diversity and inclusivity in the workplace. The government can enforce laws that prohibit any form of discrimination and provide training to organizations on how to promote diversity and inclusivity. The government can also create awareness campaigns and educational programs to promote tolerance and understanding among the population. Organizations can provide diversity and inclusion training to their employees to create awareness and educate them about the importance of diversity and inclusion. This training can help employees to recognize unconscious biases and learn how to be more accepting and respectful towards others who are different from them. Organizations can also create policies that promote diversity and inclusivity and ensure that all employees are aware of these policies.

Leaders play a crucial role in creating a positive workplace culture. Ethical leaders prioritize fairness, respect, and inclusivity and create a culture that values diversity and promotes collaboration and teamwork. Organizations can promote ethical leadership by providing leadership training and mentoring programs to their leaders. Organizations can create an open and supportive work environment where employees feel comfortable expressing their concerns without fear of

retaliation. This can be achieved by creating an open-door policy, conducting regular employee surveys, and providing channels for anonymous feedback. Employee resource groups can provide a supportive community for employees from diverse backgrounds. These groups can help to create a sense of belonging and promote diversity and inclusivity within the organization. Mentoring and coaching programs can provide support and guidance to employees from diverse backgrounds. These programs can help to develop the skills and competencies needed to succeed in the workplace and provide a pathway to career advancement. Regular audits of the workplace environment can help to identify potential instances of discrimination and provide opportunities for corrective action. Organizations should conduct regular audits of their workplace environment to identify any instances of discrimination and take appropriate measures to address them.

Organizations should develop policies and procedures that prohibit discrimination of any kind in the workplace. This could include measures such as establishing clear expectations for behavior, creating reporting mechanisms for employees to report instances of discrimination, and implementing disciplinary actions for employees found guilty of discriminatory behavior. Organizations should work to create an inclusive work environment that values diversity, promotes collaboration, and celebrates cultural differences. This can be achieved through initiatives such as diversity training, cultural awareness workshops, and team-building exercises. The Indonesian government should increase awareness and education on issues of discrimination and hostility in the workplace. This can be achieved through public campaigns, educational initiatives, and partnerships with organizations that promote diversity and inclusion. Organizations should support victims of discrimination by providing them with resources such as counseling, legal assistance, and emotional support. Additionally, organizations should establish a safe and confidential reporting mechanism for employees who experience discrimination.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, A. (2020). When the name matters: An experimental investigation of ethnic discrimination in the Finnish labor market. *Sociological Inquiry*, 90(3), 468-496. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12276>
- Anwar, K. (2021). Pancasila Village, Multicultural Education and Moderation of Diversity in Indonesia. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 4(2), 221-234. <https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v4i2.1238>
- Aziz, A., & Azhar, S. (2020). Social exclusion and official recognition for Hijra in Bangladesh. *Journal of Research on Women and Gender*, 9(1), 3-19.
- Barber, S. J. (2017). An examination of age-based stereotype threat about cognitive decline: Implications for stereotype-threat research and theory development. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(1), 62-90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616656345>
- Blanck, P., Abdul-Malak, Y., Adya, M., Hyseni, F., Killeen, M., & Wise, F. A. (2020). Diversity and inclusion in the American legal profession: first phase findings from a national study of lawyers with disabilities and lawyers who identify as LGBTQ+. *UDC/DCSL L. Rev.*, 23, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-020-09938-3>

- Budiono, S., Purba, J. T., & Rajagukguk, W. (2021). Strategic Product Sales Performance Analysis: The Case at Unilever Corporation in Indonesia.
- Campbell, K. M., & Rodríguez, J. E. (2019). Addressing the minority tax: perspectives from two diversity leaders on building minority faculty success in academic medicine. *Academic Medicine*, 94(12), 1854-1857. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002839>
- Chaney, P., Sabur, S., & Sahoo, S. (2020). Civil society organisations and LGBT+ rights in Bangladesh: a critical analysis. *Journal of South Asian Development*, 15(2), 184-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0973174120950512>
- Chong, E. S., & Mohr, J. J. (2020). How far can stigma-based empathy reach? Effects of societal (in) equity of LGB people on their allyship with transgender and Black people. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 90(6), 760. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000510>
- Chong, W. L. (2018). Chinese Indonesians in post-Suharto Indonesia: Democratisation and ethnic minorities. Hong Kong University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5790/hongkong/9789888390809.003.0010>
- Combs, G., Haq, R., Klarsfeld, A., Susaeta, L., & Suarez, E. (2018). Comparative perspectives on diversity and equality: the challenges of gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, and religion. In *Handbook of Research on Comparative Human Resource Management* (pp. 303-321). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784711139.00023>
- Davis, J. F. (2018). Selling whiteness?—A critical review of the literature on marketing and racism. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 34(1-2), 134-177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2017.1395902>
- Demirtaş-Madran, H. A. (2020). Exploring the motivation behind discrimination and stigmatization related to COVID-19: A social psychological discussion based on the main theoretical explanations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 569528. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.569528>
- Faeth, P. C., & Kittler, M. G. (2020). Expatriate management in hostile environments from a multi-stakeholder perspective—a systematic review. *Journal of Global Mobility: The Home of Expatriate Management Research*, 8(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGM-07-2019-0035>
- Ferrari, L., Mari, V., Parini, S., Capelli, G., Tacconi, G., Chessa, A., ... & Spolverato, G. (2022). Discrimination toward women in surgery: a systematic scoping review. *Annals of Surgery*, 276(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000005435>
- Fine, C., Sojo, V., & Lawford-Smith, H. (2020). Why does workplace gender diversity matter? Justice, organizational benefits, and policy. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 14(1), 36-72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12064>
- Gundala, H. R., & Sari, P. (2022). Discrimination of Minority Ethnic Chinese in Film “Ngenest” by Ernest Prakarsa: A Sociolinguistics Study. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 9(2), 539-546.
- Harjatanaya, T. Y., & Hoon, C. Y. (2020). Politics of multicultural education in post-Suharto Indonesia: a study of the Chinese minority. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 50(1), 18-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2018.1493573>

- Hasler, B. S., H. Landau, D., Hasson, Y., Schori-Eyal, N., Giron, J., Levy, J., ... & Friedman, D. (2021). Virtual reality-based conflict resolution: The impact of immersive 360° video on changing view points and moral judgment in the context of violent intergroup conflict. *New Media & Society*, 23(8), 2255-2278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444821993133>
- Lee, J. (2022). A critical review and theorization of workplace backlash: Looking back and moving forward through the lens of social dominance theory. *Human Resource Management Review*, 100900. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100900>
- Lieu, P. T. H., Arunjit, N., Buapradabkul, S., & Nathaniel, D. (2021). Unilever Company Strategic Business Analysis.
- Losinski, M., Ennis, R., Katsiyannis, A., & Rapa, L. J. (2019). Schools as change agents in reducing bias and discrimination: Shaping behaviors and attitudes. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 28, 2718-2726. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01452-2>
- Maul, D. (2020). The international labour organization (p. 301). de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110650723>
- McCandless, S., Bishu, S. G., Gomez Hernandez, M., Paredes Eraso, E., Sabharwal, M., Santis, E. L., & Yates, S. (2022). A long road: Patterns and prospects for social equity, diversity, and inclusion in public administration. *Public Administration*, 100(1), 129-148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12830>
- Murphy, P. E., & Murphy, C. E. (2018). Sustainable living: unilever. Progressive business models: Creating sustainable and pro-social enterprise, 263-286. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58804-9_12
- Muwahidah, S. S. (2020). National (In) security and Identity Boundaries: The Rise of Muslim Conservative Propaganda in Indonesia. *Journal of Islamic and Muslim Studies*, 5(1), 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.2979/jims.5.1.01>
- Nelson, R. L., Sendroiu, I., Dinovitzer, R., & Dawe, M. (2019). Perceiving discrimination: Race, gender, and sexual orientation in the legal workplace. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 44(4), 1051-1082.
- Österman, C., & Boström, M. (2022). Workplace bullying and harassment at sea: A structured literature review. *Marine Policy*, 136, 104910.
- Paranti, S. M., & Hudiyana, J. (2022). Current Social Domination Theory: Is It Still Relevant?. *Psikostudia: Jurnal Psikologi*, 11(2), 324-340.
- Priscott, T., & Allen, R. A. (2021). Human capital neurodiversity: an examination of stereotype threat anticipation. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 43(5), 1067-1082.
- Reimer, N. K., Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., & Al Ramiah, A. (2020). Self-categorization and social identification: Making sense of us and them. *Theories in social psychology*, 2.
- Ridwan, R., & Wu, J. (2018). 'Being young and LGBT, what could be worse?' Analysis of youth LGBT activism in Indonesia: challenges and ways forward. *Gender & Development*, 26(1), 121-138.

- Roscigno, V. J. (2019). Discrimination, sexual harassment, and the impact of workplace power. *Socius*, 5, 2378023119853894.
- Shi, L., Zhang, D., Martin, E., Chen, Z., Li, H., Han, X., ... & Su, D. (2022). Racial discrimination, mental health and behavioral health during the COVID-19 pandemic: a national survey in the United States. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 37(10), 2496-2504.
- Stanley, S. K., Milfont, T. L., Wilson, M. S., & Sibley, C. G. (2019). The influence of social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism on environmentalism: A five-year cross-lagged analysis. *Plos one*, 14(7), e0219067.
- Suppes, A., Napier, J. L., & van der Toorn, J. (2019). The palliative effects of system justification on the health and happiness of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(3), 372-388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218785156>
- Sutarsa, A. A. P., & Tjahjadi, B. (2023). The Effect of Women Commissioners on Firms' value in The Indonesian Manufacturing Industry: Mediating Role of Environmental Engagement. *Assets: Jurnal Akuntansi dan Pendidikan*, 12(1), 12-24. <https://doi.org/10.25273/jap.v12i1.13708>
- Syukriani, Y., Wulandari, A. S., Wanranto, B., & Hidayat, Y. (2023). Thousands of years of Malay and Chinese population history in Indonesia and its implication on Paternity Index in DNA paternity testing. *Science & Justice*.
- Tampubolon, M., Sadje, H. C., & Aziz, N. A. (2021). The Ugamo Malim Minority Group and Their Legal and Human Rights Challenges in Indonesia. *Scholars International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 4(8), 512-523.
- van Teffelen, M. W., Lobbestael, J., Voncken, M. J., & Peeters, F. (2020). Uncovering the hierarchical structure of self-reported hostility. *Plos one*, 15(9), e0239631.
- Webster, P. H. (2022). Christian Social Workers' Description of Religious Workplace Discrimination: The Role of Employee Engagement and Commitment (Doctoral dissertation, Grand Canyon University).
- White, F. A., Borinca, I., Vezzali, L., Reynolds, K. J., Blomster Lyshol, J. K., Verrelli, S., & Falomir-Pichastor, J. M. (2021). Beyond direct contact: The theoretical and societal relevance of indirect contact for improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(1), 132-153.
- Wijaya, H. Y. (2020). Conservative Islamic forces, global LGBT rights, and anticipatory homophobia in Indonesia. Public discourses about homosexuality and religion in Europe and beyond, 325-348.
- Young, J. A., Lind, C., Orange, J. B., & Savundranayagam, M. Y. (2019). Expanding current understandings of epistemic injustice and dementia: Learning from stigma theory. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 48, 76-84.